|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ✠ |  | *Sin* |
| ** |
| *Grace* |
| Dr Paul Hahn  Theology Department  University of St Thomas  Houston TX 77006  © 2021 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[On Theological Method 1](#_Toc503052845)

[Natural Revelation 2](#_Toc503052846)

[“Theology” 4](#_Toc503052847)

[On Theological Method (](#_Toc503052848)[Paul Hahn) 6](#_Toc503052849)

[On Theological Method 8](#_Toc503052850)

[Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation](#_Toc503052851) [(*Dei Verbum*) on Scripture 14](#_Toc503052852)

[The Inspiration and Inerrancy of the Bible 20](#_Toc503052853)

[Development of Doctrine 26](#_Toc503052854)

[Doctrinal Development:](#_Toc503052855) [The Truth of a Doctrine and Its Expression 29](#_Toc503052856)

[Church Documents: Their Relative Authority 35](#_Toc503052857)

[The Two Characteristics of the Intellectual Life 36](#_Toc503052858)

[Introduction to the Doctrines of Grace 39](#_Toc503052859)

[Summary of Catholic Anthropology 40](#_Toc503052860)

[Free Will 42](#_Toc503052861)

[Supernatural Revelation](#_Toc503052862) [(Salvation History; God’s Plan of Salvation) 46](#_Toc503052863)

[Objective and Subjective Redemption 49](#_Toc503052864)

[“Grace” 50](#_Toc503052865)

[Sin: Original and Personal 51](#_Toc503052866)

[Gen 2:4b-3 52](#_Toc503052867)

[The Nature of the First Sin 54](#_Toc503052868)

[Official Roman Catholic Statements on Gen 1-3 57](#_Toc503052869)

[Original Sin in Gen 3 61](#_Toc503052870)

[Original Sin in Scripture 66](#_Toc503052871)

[The Adam-Christ Typology 68](#_Toc503052872)

[Original Sin in Rom 5:12-21 70](#_Toc503052873)

[Rom 1-3 as the Context for Rom 5 79](#_Toc503052874)

[The Patristic Development](#_Toc503052875) [of the Doctrine of Original Sin 81](#_Toc503052876)

[A Summary of the States of Nature 87](#_Toc503052877)

[“Preternatural” 89](#_Toc503052878)

[Theses on Original Sin 90](#_Toc503052879)

[Concupiscence 96](#_Toc503052880)

[The Weakness of the Fallen Will 99](#_Toc503052881)

[Good Acts Without Grace 107](#_Toc503052882)

[The Catholic Position 107](#_Toc503052883)

[Protestant Positions 109](#_Toc503052884)

[Sin (and God’s Anger) in the Old Testament 111](#_Toc503052885)

[Some Principles of Morality 114](#_Toc503052886)

[Fundamental Stance and Fundamental Option;](#_Toc503052887) [Mortal and Venial Sin 116](#_Toc503052888)

[Catholic Moral Systems 118](#_Toc503052889)

[Providence and Predestination 120](#_Toc503052890)

[Providence I 121](#_Toc503052891)

[Providence II 126](#_Toc503052892)

[Providence in World Religions 128](#_Toc503052893)

[Predestination, Grace, and Free Will in the Synoptic Gospels 134](#_Toc503052894)

[Predestination, Grace, and Free Will in John 137](#_Toc503052895)

[Paul and Predestination 140](#_Toc503052896)

[God’s Universal Salvific Will: 1 Tim 2:4 152](#_Toc503052897)

[Augustine on Predestination, Grace, and Free Will 153](#_Toc503052898)

[Predestination 159](#_Toc503052899)

[Calvin on Predestination 168](#_Toc503052906)

[Holy Willie’s Prayer 171](#_Toc503052907)

[The Number of the Saved 173](#_Toc503052908)

[Grace in Scripture 175](#_Toc503052909)

[The God of the Old Testament 176](#_Toc503052910)

[The State of Justification: Some Scriptural Images 183](#_Toc503052911)

[The State of Justification as Sonship 190](#_Toc503052912)

[Sanctifying and Actual Grace 195](#_Toc503052913)

[The Distinction Between Sanctifying](#_Toc503052914) [and Actual Grace in Paul’s Letters 196](#_Toc503052915)

[Doctrines of Grace in the Patristic Period 198](#_Toc503052916)

[Augustine on Grace and Predestination 199](#_Toc503052917)

[Pelagianism 200](#_Toc503052918)

[Semi-Pelagianism 205](#_Toc503052923)

[The Grace of Perseverance 209](#_Toc503052924)

[Doctrines of Grace in the Medieval Period 211](#_Toc503052925)

[Overview of Catholicism, Orthodoxy,](#_Toc503052926) [and Protestantism on Grace 212](#_Toc503052927)

[Deification in Orthodox Christianity 213](#_Toc503052928)

[Created Grace 219](#_Toc503052929)

[Aquinas on God Moving the Free Will 229](#_Toc503052930)

[The Theological and Moral Virtues 230](#_Toc503052931)

[The Gifts of the Holy Spirit 258](#_Toc503052932)

[Charisms 260](#_Toc503052933)

[Merit 263](#_Toc503052934)

[Doctrines of Grace During the Reformation 279](#_Toc503052935)

[Why the Reformation Happened 280](#_Toc503052936)

[The Development of Luther’s Theology, 1517-20 287](#_Toc503052937)

[Aside: The Eucharist as Sacrifice 292](#_Toc503052938)

[Indulgences 295](#_Toc503052939)

[The Catholic Teaching on Indulgences 297](#_Toc503052940)

[The Last Things 300](#_Toc503052941)

[Scripture References That Oppose “Faith Alone” 314](#_Toc503052942)

[The State of Justification as Forgiveness of Sin 317](#_Toc503052943)

[The State of Justification as New Creation](#_Toc503052944) [(Sanctification, Transformation, Regeneration) 323](#_Toc503052945)

[John Henry Newman](#_Toc503052946) [on the Lutheran Concept of Justification 330](#_Toc503052947)

[Certainty of Salvation 345](#_Toc503052948)

[The Council of Trent: Sessions and Topics 358](#_Toc503052949)

[Major Statements on Justification](#_Toc503052953) [in Trent’s *Decree on Justification* and *Canons* 361](#_Toc503052954)

[Trent, *Decree on Justification*, Chapter 6 Sentence 1 368](#_Toc503052955)

[Trent on Justification as Mere Non-Imputation of Sins 369](#_Toc503052956)

[Doctrines of Grace in the Modern Period 371](#_Toc503052957)

[Human Freedom and Grace: 372](#_Toc503052958)

[“The Unity of the Divine and the Human Action” 372](#_Toc503052959)

[Jansenism 380](#_Toc503052960)

[*Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* 389](#_Toc503052961)

[Appendix A: Luther’s Theological Development 396](#_Toc503052962)

[Luther on the Severe Wounding](#_Toc503052963) [of Human Nature after the Fall 397](#_Toc503052964)

[Luther on “Faith Alone” 399](#_Toc503052965)

[The Reformers on Justification](#_Toc503052966) [as Mere Non-Imputation of Sins 404](#_Toc503052967)

[Imputed Righteousness 406](#_Toc503052968)

[*Simul Justus et Peccator* (No Increasing Holiness) 408](#_Toc503052969)

[Against Good Works 410](#_Toc503052970)

[Luther and the Indulgences Controversy 413](#_Toc503052971)

[Luther on Church Authority 416](#_Toc503052972)

[*Sola Scriptura* 422](#_Toc503052973)

[Luther on the Sacraments in General 425](#_Toc503052974)

[The Sacraments and Faith Alone 425](#_Toc503052975)

[The Number of the Sacraments 425](#_Toc503052976)

[Luther on the Sacrament of Reconciliation 426](#_Toc503052977)

[Luther on Baptism 428](#_Toc503052978)

[Luther on Holy Orders 429](#_Toc503052979)

[Luther on the Eucharist 430](#_Toc503052980)

[The Sacramentarian Controversy](#_Toc503052981) [(1524-1536) 431](#_Toc503052982)

[Luther on Church-State Relations 434](#_Toc503052983)

[Other Appendices 436](#_Toc503052984)

[A Summary Chronology of Universal History 437](#_Toc503052985)

[Major Forms of Christianity 438](#_Toc503052986)

[Bibliography 439](#_Toc503052987)

# On Theological Method

## Natural Revelation

1. **creation**
   1. “God has shown grace to men in many ways. When he broke through his own transcendence to create a reality distinct from himself, this was an act of grace, insofar as it was an act of love and mercy.” (Schmaus ix)
   2. “The continuing creative activity whereby God constantly sets in motion the causes immanent in the world [and] guides the world to its ultimate fulfillment manifests the continuance of his grace.” (Schmaus ix)
2. **the doctrine**
   1. “Even in the fallen state, man can, by his natural intellectual power, know religious and moral truths.” [*de fide*] (Ott 233)
   2. restatements
      1. “. . . man can know God by the sole light of reason.” (Ott 234)
      2. “. . . man’s natural powers were not destroyed in the Fall . . ., although they were weakened by the loss of the preternatural gifts.” (Ott 233)
3. **scripture**
   1. Wis 13:1-9, “For all people who were ignorant of God were foolish by nature; and they were unable from the good things that are seen to know the one who exists, nor did they recognize the artisan while paying heed to his works . . . 5For from the greatness and beauty of created things comes a corresponding perception of their Creator. . . . 8not even they are to be excused; 9for if they had the power to know so much that they could investigate the world, how did they fail to find sooner the Lord of these things?”
   2. Rom 1:19-20, “what can be known about God is plain to them [wicked people], because God has shown it to them. 20Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made.”
4. **doctrinal declarations**
   1. Vatican I
      1. Vatican I (dogmatic constitution *The Catholic Faith*, 1870): God “can be known with certitude by the natural light of human reason from created things . . . nevertheless, it has pleased His wisdom and goodness to reveal Himself and the eternal decrees of His will to the human race in another and supernatural way . . .” (Denzinger § 1785)
      2. Vatican I (canons on *The Catholic Faith*, 1870): God “can . . . be known with certitude by those things which have been made, by the natural light of human reason . . .”
   2. Pius X (“Oath Against the Errors of Modernism,” from the motu proprio *Sacrorum antistitum*, 1910): “I profess that God, the beginning and end of all things, can be certainly known and thus can also be demonstrated by the natural light of reason “by the things that are made” [Rom 1:20], that is, by the visible works of creation, as the cause by the effects.”
   3. Vatican II (*Dei Verbum*)
      1. God “gives men an enduring witness to Himself in created realities (see Rom. 1:­19‑20).” (ch. 1 art. 3)
      2. God “can be known with certainty from created reality by the light of human reason (see Rom. 1:20) . . .” (ch. 1 art. 6)
      3. But “it is through His revelation that those religious truths . . . accessible to human reason can be known by all men with ease . . .” (ch. 1 art. 6)
      4. God also “chose to share with [men] those divine treasures which totally transcend the understanding of the human mind.” (ch. 1 art. 6)
5. **limits of natural capability**
   1. “In the state of fallen nature it is morally impossible for man without Supernatural Revelation, to know easily, with absolute certainty and without admixture of error, all religious and moral truths of the natural order.” [*de fide*] (Ott 235)
   2. doctrinal declarations: Vatican I (dogmatic constitution *The Catholic Faith*, 1870): “it must be attributed to this divine revelation that those things, which in divine things are impenetrable to human reason by itself, can, even in this present condition of the human race, be known readily by all with firm certitude and with no admixture of error. Nevertheless, it is not for this reason that revelation is said to be absolutely necessary, but because God in His infinite goodness has ordained man for a supernatural end, to participation, namely, in the divine goods which altogether surpass the understanding of the human mind . . .” (Denzinger § 1786)
   3. speculation
      1. “. . . without supernatural Revelation, in point of fact only few men achieve a perfect knowledge of God and of the natural moral law . . .” (Ott 235)
      2. “The reason . . . lies in the “wound of ignorance” . . . caused by the Fall, that is in the weakening of man’s power of cognition.” (Ott 235)

## “Theology”

1. **concept of theology**
   1. “Theology” means, etymologically, “teaching concerning God” (θεός “God” + λόγος “reason,” “discourse,” “science”). (See Augustine, *City of God* 8.1: *de divinitate ratio sive sermo*, “on the divine, rationally or pastorally??is this a good translation?.”)
   2. So theology is “the science of God.” (Ott 1) “Science” does not mean here the study of nature (physics, chemistry, biology, etc.). Like Latin *scientia*, it means here an organized body of knowledge. “By “science” in the objective sense is understood today a system of methodically worked-out knowledge about a unitary object.” (Ott 2)
2. **object of theology**
   1. material object
      1. first material object: God.
      2. second material object: “created things [in] their relation to God.” *Summa theologiae* 1.1.7: “In sacred science [*sacra doctrina*] all things are considered under the aspect of God, either because they are God himself or because they refer to God as their beginning and end.” (Ott 1)
   2. formal object
      1. “Theology is a unitary science, as it has a single formal object: God and the created world . . . As Revelation is a communication of the Divine knowledge, so theology is, in the words of St. Thomas, a stamp or impression imposed by the Divine knowledge, which is unitary and absolutely simple, on the created human spirit” (*ST* 1.1.3). (Ott 3)
3. **natural and supernatural theology**
   1. natural theology
      1. Natural theology “is the scientific exposition of the truths concerning God, in so far as these can be known by natural reason and thus may be regarded as the culmination of philosophy.” (Ott 1)
      2. “Natural theology was first expounded by Plato. It is so called by St. Augustine, in agreement with Varro, *Theologia Naturalis*, and since the 19th century it is also called theodicy.” (Ott 1)
   2. supernatural theology
      1. “The formal object of natural theology is God, as He is known by natural reason from creation; the formal object of supernatural theology is God, as He is known by faith from Revelation . . .” (Ott 1)
      2. Rom 1:19-20, “For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. 20Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made.”
      3. See Augustine, *City of God* 6.5.
      4. See Aquinas, *ST* 1.1.1 ad 2.
   3. both: “Natural theology and supernatural theology differ:
      1. “in their principles of cognition, unaided human reason [and] reason illuminated by faith . . .;
      2. “in their means of cognition, the study of created things [and] divine revelation . . .;
      3. “in their formal objects, God as Creator and Lord [and] God one and three . . .” (Ott 1)

## On Theological Method

## Paul Hahn

Each discipline in a university investigates some portion of reality. Biology studies organisms; geology, the earth; astronomy, the stars. History, sociology, auto mechanics: each carves out for itself some portion of reality to study.

The same is true for theology. It studies ultimate reality, the portion of reality that frames all the rest. Theology is concerned with the ultimate questions: is there a God? a soul? life after death? a purpose to life? And, most mysterious of all: why does anything exist? Why is there anything rather than just nothing?

These are religious questions. As Vatican Council II said,

Men look to the various religions for answers to those profound myster­ies of the human condition which, today even as in olden times, deeply stir the human heart: What is a man? What is the meaning and the purpose of our life? What is goodness and what is sin? What gives rise to our sorrows and to what intent? Where lies the path to true happiness? What is the truth about death, judgment, and retribution beyond the grave? What, finally, is that ultimate and unutterable mystery which engulfs our being, and whence we take our rise, and whither our journey leads us? (*Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions* [1965] § 1)

The council calls these questions “mysteries,” but there are different kinds of mysteries. Some things you know for certain: water boils at 32° Fahrenheit. That is not mysterious. Some truths you do not know but can find out. What year did Samuel Richardson write *Pamela*, the first modern English novel? That is a mystery only until you look it up: 1740. These mysteries are like murder “mysteries”: they are mysteries with a knowable solution. Still other truths, though they have a definite answer, will always remain mysteries. How many shrimp were in the Pacific at 12:02 a.m. EST on March 4, 1990? There *is* an exact answer to that question; God, being omniscient, knows it. Maybe a thousand years from now, we will have the right equipment and will track the exact shrimp population every moment. But, barring time travel, we will never know the number for that moment in 1990; that answer will always be a mystery. Finally, some truths we apparently *cannot* know, not because we lack the technology, but because they pertain to realities that are inherently unknowable. These are the “mysteries” that Vatican II is referring to. No one really knows what happens after death (near death experiences do not tell us: they are *near* death experiences and at any rate may be subjective rather than objective). No one really knows why we exist. No one really knows why there is evil. No one really knows whether God exists. (Most of us hold beliefs about these matters, and some of us hold such beliefs so firmly that they approach certainty. But no belief, by its very nature, can be completely certain; a completely certain conviction is no longer belief but knowledge.) These are *religious* mysteries, because religions give answers to them. The portion of reality that theology carves out for itself to study is the answers to these and other questions that a particular religion gives.

If theology studies the answers of a particular religion, then theology must be something different from religion. Whereas religion involves worship, theology is, according to its etymology, the study of God (*theos* “God” + *logos* “discourse about”). Aquinas (ad 1225-1274) said theology is the study of God and of everything else in relation to God; even the chair you are sitting on is part of theology’s subject matter, insofar as it exists in relation to God. But the classic definition of theology is that of Anselm (ad 1033-1109): theology is *fides quaerens intellectum*, “faith seeking understanding.” This definition makes two valuable points about theology.

One is that faith precedes understanding. Theology is not a person using reason to determine the truth of a religion, then believing that religion because it has been proven to the person’s satisfaction. No: in theology one uses reason to investigate the faith one already holds. That is why theology can only be done “from the inside,” from within a faith community. A nonbeliever can engage in philosophy of religion, or comparative religion, or sociology of religion, or psychology of religion, and so on. Such disciplines do not require a commitment to a religion’s beliefs. A theologian, on the other hand—Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, or whatever—presupposes the truth of a particular religion’s assertions.

This raises the question whether it would not be better to stand outside all religions, so as to view them all objectively. After all, to commit to a particular religion is to affirm that one religion is superior to the others, and such an affirmation goes against the prevailing liberal tenor of modern western societies. But a scholar who deliberately refrains from personal commitment to a traditional religion is still asserting the superiority of one religious stance over all others. That scholar is asserting that agnosticism is the superior stance (agnosticism is the belief that one cannot know whether God exists; by extension it means that all religious questions are unanswerable) or that atheism is the superior stance (atheism is the belief that God does not exist; by extension it means that all religious realities do not exist). One who chooses to refrain from commitment is committing himself to a choice; in short, everyone holds *some* position concerning religious questions. Not to commit is just as much a commitment to one possible belief system as is commitment to a traditional belief system.

In fact, it may be that some aspects of reality are only knowable by means of commitment. If, for example, Jesus is truly alive today and can be the terminus of a personal relationship (with yourself as the other terminus), then no one who remains aloof from that relationship can know Jesus in the same way as one who enters into that relationship.

## On Theological Method

1. **theology as a science**
   1. the scientific character of theology
      1. “. . . theology is a true science, because it uses as principles the securely founded basic truths of Divine Revelation and draws from these new knowledge (theological conclusions) by a strict scientific method and unites the whole in a closed system.” See *ST* 1.1.2. (Ott 1)
      2. “The questions posed by the Schoolmen were exclusively those pertaining to speculative theology. The development of historical research at the beginning of the modern era led to an extension of the concept of “science” which permits its application to positive theology [i.e., scripture and Church history] also. . . . Theology possesses a unitary object, uses a methodical process adapted to the object, and unites its results in a closed system. The dependence of theology upon Divine authority and that of the Church does not derogate from its scientific character, because [that dependence] cannot be dissociated from the object of theology.” (Ott 2)
      3. “Theology transcends all other sciences by: the sublimity of its object [and] by its practical purpose which is eternal bliss, i. e., the ultimate destination of mankind (cf. S. th. I i, 5).” (Ott 2)
      4. “According to St. Thomas theology is both a speculative and a practical science . . .” See *ST* 1.1.4. (Ott 2)
   2. theology as a science of faith
      1. “It [theology] is concerned with faith in the *objective sense* (fides quae creditur) that which is believed, and in the *subjective sense* (fides qua creditur) that by which we believe. Theology like faith accepts, as the sources of its knowledge, Holy Writ and Tradition (remote rule of faith) [2] and also the doctrinal assertions of the Church (proximate rule of faith). But as a science of faith it seeks by human reason to penetrate the content . . . of the supernatural system of truth . . .” (Ott 2-3)
      2. classic expressions of theology as a science of faith
         1. Augustine (ad 354-430): “Believe that you may understand” (*Sermo* 43.7.9). (Ott 3)
         2. Anselm (ad 1033-1109): “I believe that I may understand” (*Proslogion* 1). (Ott 3)
         3. Anselm: theology is *Fides quaerens intellectum*, “Faith seeking to reach the intellect” but usually translated “Faith seeking understanding.” (Ott 3)
         4. Richard of St. Victor († ad 1173): “Let us hasten from faith to knowledge. Let us endeavour so far as we can, to understand that which we believe.” (*De Trinitate*, prologue). (Ott 3)
   3. Newman on systematic theology: “All theological definitions come short of concrete life. Science is not devotion or literature. If the Fathers are not cold, and the Schoolmen are, this is be­cause the former write in their own persons, and the latter as logicians or disputants. St. Athanasius or St. Augustine has a life, which a system of theology has not. Yet dog­matic theology has its use and its importance notwithstanding.” (New­man 31)
2. **classification of the discipline of theology**
   1. traditional
      1. “*Dogmatic theology*, which includes *Fundamental* [or “natural”] *Theology*, i. e., as the basis of Dogmatic Theology.” (Ott 3)
      2. “*Biblical-historical Theology*:
         1. “Biblical introduction, Hermeneutics, Exegesis;
         2. “Church History, History of Dogmas, History of Liturgy, Church Legal History, Patrology.” (Ott 3)
      3. “*Practical Theology:* Moral Theology, Church law, Pastoral Theology, including Catechetics and Homiletics.” (Ott 3) One should also include here “ascetical-mystical theology” (theology of prayer).
   2. modern: Catholic college and university catalogs typically classify theology courses as
      1. scripture
      2. Church history
      3. systematic theology
      4. moral theology
      5. spirituality (formerly “ascetical-mystical theology”)
   3. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
      1. *Guidelines Concerning the Academic Mandatum in Catholic Universities* part 2 no. 4: ““Catholic theological disciplines” . . . signifies
         1. Sacred Scripture,
         2. dogmatic theology,
         3. moral theology,
         4. pastoral theology,
         5. canon law,
         6. liturgy,
         7. and church history (cf. canon 252).”
      2. Of the seven subdivisions here mentioned, the first, second, third, and seventh match the first four of the “modern classification.” Of the remainder, “canon law” and “liturgy” are typically not taught in colleges and universities but are taught in seminaries; hence the discrepancy. Presumably, then, “spirituality” in the “modern classification” must be a sub-subdivision of “Pastoral theology” (along with, perhaps, pastoral counseling, spiritual direction, homiletics, practical application of the sacraments, etc.)
3. **concept and method of dogmatic theology**
   1. concept
      1. “. . . only the theoretical truths of Revelation concerning God and His activity are dealt with in dogmatic theology . . ., while the practical teachings of Revelation regulating the activity of men are the object of moral theology . . .” (Ott 3)
      2. Scheeben’s definition of dogmatic theology (*Dogmatik*, “Introduction” 2): “the scientific exposition of the whole theoretical doctrine revealed by God about God Himself and His activity and which we accept on the authority of the Church.” (Ott 3)
   2. method
      1. “The method of dogmatic theology is both positive and speculative.” (Ott 3)
      2. “Positive dogmatic theology is concerned with doctrines that” (1) are contained in scripture and tradition, and that (2) are proposed to our belief by the Church’s teaching authority. [3] When dogmatic theology defends such doctrines, “it becomes controversial theology,” i. e., apologetics. (Ott 3-4)
      3. “Speculative dogmatic theology, which is identical with the so-called scholastic theology, [is] the application of human reason to the content of revelation.” (Ott 4)
      4. Pius XI, “in the Apostolic Institution “Deus scientiarum Dominus” 1931, directs that Sacred Theology “is to be presented according to the positive as well as to the scholastic method.” The speculative exposition is to proceed “according to the principles and teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas” (Article 29) (cf. St. Thomas, Quodl. IV 9, 18).” (Ott 4)
4. **concept and classification of dogma**
   1. concept
      1. “By dogma in the strict sense is understood a truth immediately (formally) revealed by God which has been proposed by the Teaching Authority of the Church to be believed as such.” See Vatican Council I (D 1792): “All those things are to be believed by [faith] which are contained in the Word of God written or handed down and which are proposed for our belief by the Church . . .” (Ott 4)
      2. “immediately”
         1. Thomists say that a dogma must be contained in scripture or tradition “either explicitly or implicitly.” (Ott 4)
         2. Scotists say “a Truth can be proposed as a dogma, if it . . . may be derived from a Truth or Revelation by the aid of a truth known by Natural Reason.” [4] A problem with this view is that such a dogma “is supported not solely by the authority of the Revealing God, but also by the natural knowledge of reason, while the Church demands for the dogma a Divine Faith . . .” (Ott 4-5)
      3. “proposed”
         1. Promulgation of a dogma by the teaching authority of the Church implies the obligation of the faithful to believe it. [4] “Dogma in its strict signification is the object” of both divine faith and Catholic faith. It is the object of divine faith because divinely revealed; it is the object of Catholic faith because of “infallible doctrinal definition by the Church.” (Ott 4-5)
         2. Promulgation can be in an extraordinary manner (a solemn declaration by a pope or a general council) or through the ordinary teaching power of the Church. “The latter may be found easily in the catechisms issued by the Bishops.” (Ott 4)
         3. “If a baptised person deliberately denies or doubts a dogma properly so-called, he is guilty of the sin of heresy [and] becomes subject to the punishment of excommunication . . .” (Ott 5)
         4. “If, despite the fact that a Truth is not proposed for belief by the Church, one becomes convinced that it is immediately revealed by God, then, according to the opinion of many theologians (Suarez, De Lugo), one is bound to believe it with Divine Faith (fide divina). However, most theologians teach that such a Truth prior to its official proposition of the Church is to be accepted with theological assent (assensus theologicus) only, as the individual may be mistaken.” (Ott 5)
         5. “Protestantism rejects the Teaching Authority of the Church, and consequently also the authoritative proposition of the content of Revelation by the Church. It claims that the Biblical Revelation attests itself.” Liberal Protestantism (and Catholic Modernism) rejects in addition “the objective Divine Revelation, by conceiving Revelation as a subjective religious experience . . . As against Modernism, the Catholic Church stresses that dogma [is] the expression of an *objective truth*, and its content is *immutable*.” (Ott 5)
   2. classification
      1. by content
         1. general dogmas (“the fundamental truths of Christianity”)
         2. special dogmas (“the individual truths contained therein”) (Ott 5)
      2. by relation with reason
         1. pure dogmas (known solely through revelation, e. g., the trinity)
         2. mixed dogmas (known by natural reason also, e. g., God’s existence) (Ott 6)
      3. by promulgation or not
         1. formal dogmas (proposed by the magisterium as truths of revelation)
         2. material dogmas (truths of revelation not so proposed, hence not strictly dogmas) (Ott 6)
      4. by relation to salvation
         1. necessary dogmas (these “must be explicitly believed by all in order to achieve eternal salvation”)
         2. nonnecessary dogmas (for which “implicit faith . . . suffices,” see Heb 11:6, “without faith it is impossible to please God, for whoever would approach him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who seek him”) (Ott 6)
5. **Catholic truths**
   1. The magisterium’s “primary object [is] immediately revealed truths and facts. The infallible doctrinal power of the Church extends, however, secondarily to all those truths and facts which are a consequence of the teaching of Revelation or a presupposition of it . . . [Truths] intrinsically connected with the truths of Revelation so that their denial would un­der­mine the revealed truths are called *Catholic Truths* [or] Ecclesiastical Teachings . . . to distinguish them from the *Divine Truths* . . .” (Ott 8)
   2. types of Catholic truths
      1. *Theological conclusions* “are derived from two premisses, of which one is an immediately revealed truth, and the other a truth of natural reason. Since one premiss is a truth of Revelation, theological conclusions are [“mediately”] revealed. If however both premisses are immediately revealed truths, then the conclusion also must be regarded as being immediately revealed and as the object of Immediate Divine Faith . . .” (Ott 8)
      2. *Dogmatic facts* are “historical facts, which are not revealed, but which are intrinsically connected with revealed truth, for example, the legality of a Pope or of a General Council, or the fact of the Roman episcopate of St. Peter. The fact that a defined text does or does not agree with the doctrine of the Catholic Faith is also, in a narrower sense, a “dogmatic fact.” In deciding the meaning of a text the Church does not pronounce judgment on the subjective intention of the author, but on the objective sense of the text (D 1350 . . .).” (Ott 9)
      3. *Truths of reason* are not revealed but “are intrinsically associated with a revealed truth, e. g., those philosophic truths which are presuppositions of the acts of Faith (knowledge of the supersensual, possibility of proofs of God, the spirituality of the soul, the freedom of will), or philosophic concepts, in terms of which dogma is promulgated (person, substance, transubstantiation, etc.). The Church has the right and the duty [of] proscribing philosophic teachings which directly or indirectly endanger dogma [Vatican I, D 1798].” (Ott 9)
6. **theological opinions**
   1. “Theological opinions are free views on aspects of doctrines concerning Faith and morals, which are neither clearly attested in Revelation nor decided by the Teaching Authority of the Church.” (Ott 9)
   2. “Their value depends upon the reasons adduced in their favour (association with the doctrine of Revelation, the attitude of the Church, etc.).” (Ott 9)
   3. “A point of doctrine ceases to be an object of free judgment when the Teaching Authority . . . is clearly in favour of one opinion.” (Ott 9)
7. **theological grades of certainty**
   1. *de fide*
      1. “The highest degree of certainty appertains to the immediately revealed truths. The belief due to them is based on the authority of God Revealing (fides divina), and if the Church, through its teaching, vouches for the fact that a truth is contained in Revelation, one’s certainty is then also based on the authority of the Infallible Teaching Authority of the Church (fides catholica). If Truths are defined by a solemn judgment of faith (definition) of the Pope or of a General Council, they are “de fide definita.”” (Ott 9)
      2. “Catholic truths or Church doctrines, on which the infallible Teaching Authority of the Church has finally decided, are to be accepted with a faith which is based on the sole authority of the Church (fides ecclesiastica). These truths are as infallibly certain as dogmas proper.” (Ott 9)
   2. *sententia fidei proxima:* “A Teaching proximate to Faith [is] a doctrine, which is regarded by theologians generally as a truth of Revelation, but which has not yet been finally promulgated as such by the Church.” (Ott 9)
   3. *sententia certa:* “A Teaching pertaining to the Faith, i. e., theologically certain (sententia ad fidem pertinens, i. e., theologice certa) is a doctrine, on which the Teaching [9] Authority of the Church has not yet finally pronounced, but whose truth is guaranteed by its intrinsic connection with the doctrine of revelation (theological conclusions).” (Ott 9-10)
   4. *sententia communis:* “Common Teaching (sententia communis) is doctrine, which in itself belongs to the field of the free opinions, but which is accepted by theologians generally.” (Ott 10)
   5. *sententia probabilis:* “Theological opinions of lesser grades of certainty are called probable, more probable, well-founded (sententia probabilis, probabilior, bene fundata). Those which are regarded as being in agreement with the consciousness of Faith of the Church are called pious opinions (sententia pia). The least degree of certainty is possessed by the tolerated opinion (opinio tolerata), which is only weakly founded, but which is tolerated by the Church.” (Ott 10)
   6. infallibility
      1. “. . . not all the assertions of the Teaching Authority . . . are infallible and consequently irrevocable.” (Ott 10)
      2. “Only those are infallible which emanate from General Councils representing the whole episcopate, and the Papal Decisions Ex Cathedra (cf. D 1839).” (Ott 10)
      3. “The ordinary and usual form of the Papal teaching activity is not infallible.” (Ott 10)
      4. “Further, the decisions of the Roman Congregations (Holy Office, Bible Commission) are not infallible.” (Ott 10)
         1. “Nevertheless normally they are to be accepted with an inner assent which is based on the high supernatural theology of the Holy See . . . The so-called “silentium obsequiosum,” that is, “reverent silence,” does not generally suffice.” (Ott 10)
         2. “By way of exception, the obligation of inner agreement may cease if a competent expert, after a renewed scientific investigation of all grounds, arrives at the positive conviction that the decision rests on an error.” (Ott 10)
8. **theological censures**
   1. A theological censure is a “judgment which characterises a proposition . . . as contrary to Faith or at least as doubtful.” (Ott 10)
   2. “The usual censures are the following . . .” (Ott 10)
      1. “A Heretical Proposition . . . signifies that the proposition is opposed to a formal dogma . . .” (Ott 10)
      2. A “Proposition Proximate to Heresy . . . signifies that the proposition is opposed to a truth which is proximate to the Faith (Sent. fidei proxima) . . .” (Ott 10)
      3. A “Proposition Savouring or Suspect of heresy . . .” (Ott 10)
      4. An “Erroneous Proposition [is] opposed to a truth which is proposed by the Church as a truth intrinsically connected with a revealed truth [or] opposed to the common teaching of theologians . . .” (Ott 10)
      5. A “False Proposition [is one] contradicting a dogmatic fact . . .” (Ott 10)
      6. A “Temerarious Proposition [is one] deviating without reason from the general teaching . . .” (Ott 10)
      7. A “Proposition Offensive to pious ears [is one] offensive to religious feeling . . .” (Ott 10)
      8. A “Proposition badly expressed [is one] subject to misunderstanding by reason of its method of expression . . .” (Ott 10)
      9. A “Captious Proposition [is one] reprehensible because of its intentional ambiguity . . .” (Ott 10)
      10. A “Proposition exciting scandal . . .” (Ott 10)

## Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation

## (*Dei Verbum*) on Scripture

Vatican Council II, 1965

1. **tradition and scripture** (ch. 2)
   1. relation of tradition and scripture
      1. The Church “has always maintained them [the scriptures], . . . together with sacred tradition, as the supreme rule of faith . . .” (ch. 6 art. 21)
      2. Tradition “takes the word of God entrusted . . . to the Apostles, and hands it on to their successors in its full purity . . .” (ch. 2 art. 9) (This is *tradition as verb.*)
      3. Tradition and scripture, “flowing from the same divine wellspring, in a certain way merge into a unity and tend toward the same end.” (ch. 2 art. 9) (This is *tradition as noun.*)
      4. Tradition and scripture “form one sacred deposit of the word of God, commit­ted to the Church. Holding fast to this deposit the entire holy people united with their shepherds remain always steadfast in the teaching of the Apostles, in the common life, in the breaking of the bread and in prayers [Acts 2:42] . . .” (ch. 2 art. 10)
      5. “Consequently it is not from Sacred Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed.” (ch. 2 art. 9)
   2. development of doctrine: “This tradition which comes from the Apostles develops in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. For there is a growth in the understanding of the realities and the words which have been handed down. . . . For as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves for­ward toward the fullness of divine truth . . .” (ch. 2 art. 8)
      1. John 14:17, “This is the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. You know him, because he abides with you, and he will be in you.”
      2. John 15:26, “When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who comes from the Father, he will testify on my behalf.”
      3. John 16:7, “Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you.”
      4. John 16:13, “When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears, and he will declare to you the things that are to come.”
   3. magisterium: “But the task of authentically interpreting the word of God, whether written or handed on, has been entrusted exclusively to the living teaching office [i. e., the magisterium] of the Church, whose au­thor­ity is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ. This teaching office is not above the word of God, but serves it . . .” (ch. 2 art. 10)
   4. tradition, scripture, and magisterium
      1. Tradition, scripture and the magisterium “are so linked and joined together that one can­not stand without the others . . .” (ch. 2 art. 10)
      2. “. . . all together and each in its own way under the action of the one Holy Spirit contribute effectively to the salvation of souls.” (ch. 2 art. 10)
2. **inspiration and inerrancy**
   1. inspiration
      1. “Those divinely revealed realities which are contained and presented in Sacred Scripture have been committed to writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.” (ch. 3 art. 11)
      2. “In composing the sacred books, God chose men and while employed by Him they made use of their powers and abilities, so that with Him acting in them and through them, they, as true authors, consigned to writing everything and only those things which He wanted.”
      3. “. . . the books of both the Old and New Testaments in their entirety, with all their parts, are sacred and canonical because written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God as their author . . .” (ch. 3 art. 11)
      4. “For the words of God, expressed in human language, have been made like human discourse, just as the word of the eternal Father, when He took to Him­self the flesh of human weakness, was in every way made like men.” (ch. 3 art. 13)
      5. “For the Sacred Scriptures contain the word of God and since they are inspired really are the word of God . . .” (ch. 6 art. 24)
   2. inerrancy
      1. “. . . everything asserted by the inspired authors or sacred writers must be held to be asserted by the Holy Spirit . . .” (ch. 3 art. 11)
      2. Therefore, “Scripture must be acknowledged as teaching solidly, faithfully and without error that truth which God wanted put into sacred writings[[1]](#footnote-1) for the sake of salvation.” (ch. 3 art. 11)
   3. principles of exegesis
      1. “However, since God speaks in Sacred Scripture through men in human fash­ion, the interpreter . . . should carefully investigate what meaning the sacred writers really intended, and what God wanted to manifest by means of their words.” (ch. 3 art. 12)
      2. *literary forms*
         1. “To search out the intention of the sacred writers, attention should be given, among other things, to “literary forms.” For truth is set forth and expressed differently in texts which are variously historical, prophetic, poetic, or of other forms of discourse.” (ch. 3 art. 12)
         2. “The interpreter must investigate what meaning the sacred writer [ex­press­ed] by using contemporary literary forms in accordance with the situation of his own time and culture. . . . attention must be paid to the customary and characteristic styles of feeling, speaking and narrating which prevailed at the time of the sacred writer, and to the patterns men normally employed at that period in their everyday dealings with one another.” (ch. 3 art. 12)
      3. *progressive revelation*
         1. “Israel daily gained a deeper and clearer understanding of His ways and made them more widely known among the nations . . .” (ch. 4 art. 14)
         2. The Old Testament books reveal knowledge of God and man “in accor­dance with the state of mankind before the time of salvation established by Christ . . . [They] contain some things which are incomplete and temporary, . . . and in them the mystery of our salvation is present in a hidden way.” (Ch. 4 art. 15)
         3. “The word of God, which is the power of God for the salvation of all who believe (see Rom. 1:16), is set forth and shows its power in a most excellent way in the writings of the New Testament. For when the fullness of time arrived (see Gal. 4:4), the Word was made flesh . . . This mystery had not been manifested to other generations as it was now revealed . . .” (ch. 5 art. 17)
         4. Christ is “the fullness of all revelation.” (ch. 1 art. 2)
         5. There is progressive revelation even in the New Testament: for in “the epistles of St. Paul and other apostolic writings [Jesus’] true teaching is more and more fully stated . . . For the Lord Jesus was with His apostles as He had promised (see Matt. 28:20) and sent them the advocate Spirit who would lead them into the fullness of truth (see John 16:13).” (ch. 5 art. 20)
      4. *unity of scripture*: “But, since Holy Scripture must be read and interpreted in the sacred spirit in which it was written, no less serious attention must be given to the content and unity of the whole of Scripture if the meaning of the sacred texts is to be correctly worked out.” (ch. 3 art. 12)
      5. *tradition*: “The living tradition of the whole Church must be taken into account along with the harmony which exists between elements of the faith.” (ch. 3 art. 12)
      6. *prayer*: “prayer should accompany the reading of Sacred Scripture, so that God and man may talk together; for “we speak to Him when we pray; we hear Him when we read the divine saying” [Ambrose, “On the Duties of Ministers” 1.20.­88].” (ch. 6 art. 25)
      7. *submission to the Church*: “It is the task of exegetes to work according to these rules toward a better understanding and explanation of the meaning of Sacred Scripture, so that through preparatory study the judgment of the Church may mature. For all of what has been said about the way of interpreting Scrip­ture is subject finally to the judgment of the Church, which carries out the divine commission and ministry of guarding and interpreting the word of God.” (ch. 3 art. 12)
3. “**The Old Testament**” (ch. 4)
   1. In “preparing the salvation of the whole human race,” God chose “a people to whom He would entrust His promises.” (ch. 4 art. 14)
   2. “The plan of salvation foretold by the sacred authors, recounted and explained by them, is found as the true word of God in the books of the Old Testament: these books, therefore, written under divine inspiration, remain permanently valuable.” (ch. 4 art. 14)
   3. “The principal purpose to which the plan of the old covenant was directed was
      1. “to prepare for the coming of Christ . . .
      2. “to announce this coming by prophecy . . ., and
      3. “to indicate its meaning through various types [see 1 Cor 10:11, “These things happened to them to serve as an example, and they were written down to instruct us, on whom the ends of the ages have come”].” (ch. 4 art. 15)
   4. The Old Testament books “give expression to a lively sense of God [and] contain a store of sublime teachings about God, sound wisdom about human life, and a won­derful treasury of prayers . . .” (ch. 4 art. 15)
   5. God “arranged that the New Testament be hidden in the Old and the Old be made manifest in the New [Augustine, “Quest. in Hept.” 2.73]. For, though Christ estab­lished the new covenant in His blood, still the books of the Old Testament with all their parts, caught up into the proclamation of the Gospel, acquire and show forth their full meaning in the New Testament . . . and in turn shed light on it and explain it.” (ch. 4 art. 16)
4. “**The New Testament**” (ch. 5)
   1. gospels
      1. “. . . among all the Scriptures, even those of the New Testament, the Gospels have a special preeminence . . .” (ch. 5 art. 18)
      2. “It devolves on sacred bishops . . . to give the faithful entrusted to them suitable in­struc­tion in the right use of the divine books, especially the New Testament and above all the Gospels.” (ch. 6 art. 25)
      3. The gospels “are of apostolic origin. For what the Apostles preached [they] and apostolic men, under the inspiration of the divine Spirit, handed on to us in writing: the foundation of faith, namely, the fourfold Gospel . . .” (ch. 5 art. 18)
      4. The gospels, “whose historical character the Church unhesitatingly asserts, faithfully hand on what Jesus Christ, while living among men, really did and taught for their eternal salvation . . .” (ch. 5 art. 19)
      5. “. . . the Apostles handed on to their hearers what He had said and done. This they did with that clearer understanding which they enjoyed[[2]](#footnote-2) after they had been . . . taught by the light of the Spirit of truth.[[3]](#footnote-3) The sacred authors wrote the four Gospels, selecting some things from the many which had been handed on by word of mouth or in writing, reducing some of them to a synthesis, explaining some things in view of the situation of their chur­ches and preserving the form of proclamation but always in such fashion that they told us the honest truth about Jesus . . . (see Luke 1:2‑4).” (ch. 5 art. 19)
   2. other writings: “the New Testament also contains the epistles of St. Paul and other apostolic writings . . .” (ch. 5 art. 20)
5. “**Sacred Scripture in the Life of the Church**” (ch. 6)
   1. “The Church has always venerated the divine Scriptures just as she venerates the body of the Lord . . .” (ch. 6 art. 21)
   2. preaching
      1. “Therefore, like the Christian religion itself, all the preach­ing of the Church must be nourished and regulated by Sacred Scripture. For in the sacred books, the Father who is in heaven meets His children with great love and speaks with them; and the force and power in the word of God is so great that it stands as the support and energy of the Church, the strength of faith for her sons, the food of the soul, the pure and everlasting source of spiritual life. Consequently these words are perfectly applicable to Sacred Scripture: “For the word of God is living and active” (Heb. 4:12) and “it has power to build you up and give you your heritage among all those who are sanctified” (Acts 20:32; see 1 Thess. 2:13).” (ch. 6 art. 21)
      2. Exegesis “should be so done that as many ministers of the divine word as possi­ble will be able effectively to provide the nourishment of the Scriptures for the people of God, to enlighten their minds, streng­then their wills, and set men’s hearts on fire with the love of God.” (ch. 6 art. 23)
   3. translations
      1. “Easy access to Sacred Scripture should be provided for all the Christian faith­ful.” (ch. 6 art. 22)
      2. “That is why the Church from the very beginning accepted as her own that very ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament which is called the Septua­gint; and she has always given a place of honor to other Eastern transla­tions and Latin ones, especially the Latin translation known as the Vulgate.” (ch. 6 art. 22)
      3. “But since the word of God should be accessible at all times, the Church . . . sees to it that suitable and correct translations are made into different languages, especially from the original texts of the sacred books.” (ch. 6 art. 22)
      4. “And should the opportunity arise and the Church authorities approve, if these translations are produced in cooperation with the separated brethren as well, all Christians will be able to use them.” (ch. 6 art. 22)
   4. exegetes
      1. “The Church is concerned to move ahead toward a deeper understanding of the Sacred Scriptures so that she may increasingly feed her sons with the divine words. Therefore, she also encourages the study of the holy Fathers of both East and West and of sacred liturgies.” (ch. 6 art. 23)
      2. “Catholic exegetes then and other students of sacred theology, working dili­gently together and using appropriate means, should devote their energies, under the watchful care of the sacred teaching office of the Church, to an ex­plora­tion and exposition of the divine writings. . . . The sacred synod encour­ages the sons of the Church and Biblical scholars to continue energetically, following the mind of the Church, with the work they have so well begun, with a constant renewal of vigor.” (ch. 6 art. 23)
   5. scripture and theology
      1. “Sacred theology rests on the written word of God, together with sacred tradition, as its primary and perpetual foundation. By scrutinizing in the light of faith all truth stored up in the mystery of Christ, theology is most powerfully streng­thened and constantly rejuvenated by that word.” (ch. 6 art. 24)
      2. “. . . the study of the sacred page is, as it were, the soul of sacred theology.[[4]](#footnote-4) By the same word of Scripture the ministry of the word also, that is, pastoral preaching, cate­chetics and all Christian instruction, in which the liturgical homily must hold the foremost place, is nourished in a healthy way and flourishes in a holy way.” (ch. 6 art. 24)
      3. Especially clergy and “catechists who are legitimately active in the ministry of the word” “must hold fast to the Sacred Scriptures through diligent sacred reading and careful study . . . so that none of them will become “an empty preach­er of the word of God outwardly, who is not a listener to it inwardly” [St. Augustine, *Sermons* ??179.1] since they must share the abundant wealth of the divine word with the faithful committed to them, especially in the sacred liturgy.” (ch. 6 art. 25)
      4. “. . . all the Christian faithful, especially Religious, . . . should gladly put themselves in touch with the sacred text itself, whether it be through the liturgy, rich in the divine word, or through devotional reading, or through instructions suitable for the purpose and other aids which, in our time, with approval and active support of the shepherds of the Church, are commendably spread everywhere.” (ch. 6 art. 25)
      5. “. . . translations of the sacred texts, which are to be provided with the necessary and really adequate explanations . . .” (ch. 6 art. 25)
      6. “Furthermore, editions of the Sacred Scriptures, provided with suitable footnotes, should be prepared also for the use of non‑Christians and adapted to their situation. Both pastors of souls and Christians generally should see to the wise distribution of these in one way or another.” (ch. 6 art. 25)
      7. Through “the reading and study of the sacred books “the word of God may spread rapidly and be glorified” (2 Thess. 3:1) . . . Just as the life of the Church is strengthened through more frequent celebration of the Eucharistic mystery, similarly we may hope for a new stimulus for the life of the Spirit from a growing reverence for the word of God, which “lasts forever” (Is. 40:8; see 1 Peter 1:23‑25). (ch. 6 art. 26)

## The Inspiration and Inerrancy of the Bible

Paul Hahn

First let us consider the etymologies of “inspiration” and “inerrancy.” The root of “inspiration” is the Latin *spir-*, meaning “breath,” “wind,” or “soul” (as in “spirit”).[[5]](#footnote-5) “Inspiration” is applied to the Bible because the authority of the words God breathed to the prophets (“Hear the word of the Lord,” “The word of the Lord came to me,” etc., over 500 times in the prophets) came to be recognized as invested in the written texts also. As 2 Tim 3:16 says, “All scripture is inspired by God” (*theopneustos*, literally “God-breathed”). The root of “inerrancy” is *err-*, as in “error.” Inerrancy means the Bible is without error.

Most Christian denominations teach that the Bible is inspired and without error, but *how* it is inspired and *how* it is without error is explained differently. Let us begin with inspiration. There are two basic positions.

The first is the *dictation theory*, the idea that God dictated the words of scripture to the biblical writers. The dictation theory has been a tendency throughout Church history; some medieval paintings show a dove—the Holy Spirit—perched on an evangelist’s shoulder with its beak in his ear. But the theory hardened with the Protestant Reformation. Seeing every word of scripture as directly from God bolstered the Protestant claim that the only authority in religion is scripture.[[6]](#footnote-6) Already in 1566, to fix the authority of every detail of scripture, the *Second Helvetic Confession*, “one of the most authoritative statements of Reformed theology” (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, “Helvetic Confession”), asserted that even the vowel points in the Hebrew text were divinely inspired (Pelikan 4.346-47)—even though the vowel points were not added until the 800s ad! But the dictation theory reached its climax in American evangelicalism: “evangelical discussions concerning verbal inspiration . . . are dictation theories” (Trembath 91).

The second of the basic positions concerning inspiration has no fixed name but might be called the *subtle theory* of inspiration. God’s action on those who contributed to the biblical text is imagined, not as a blatant dropping of words into an author’s mind, but as a more subtle process: prompting an idea here, causing a sentence structure or word choice to well up there. It is not necessary that the author even know that God is influencing him; it is even probable in many cases that he did not.

One advantage to the subtle theory is that it allows the human authors to contribute to scripture. In the dictation theory, the human authors are mere “secretaries” (as the *Second Hel­vetic Confession* calls them): God’s words drip into their heads and flow out their arms, but their minds and personalities are shunted aside. The subtle theory, on the other hand, explains why the styles of biblical authors vary. Mark, for example, writes “gutter Greek”: he thinks in Aramaic, he constructs simple sentences, and his vocabulary is “street language” that contemporary Greeks would have found at times offensive. Luke, on the other hand, writes exquisite Greek: he crafts elegant periodic sentences, he uses admired rhetorical flourishes, and he selects vocabulary acceptable in polite society. If God equally dictated Mark’s, Luke’s, and the other biblical authors’ words, why are not all biblical books in one style—“God’s style,” whatever that is?

Which theory of inspiration one holds will determine which theory of inerrancy one holds. All believers agree that “God can neither deceive nor be deceived” (cannot lie or make an error); so if one believes that God dictated every word of scripture, then the Bible must be absolutely inerrant, i.e., must contain no error of any kind. But if one believes that God subtly influenced the human authors, it need not follow that every detail of scripture is literally true. So the dictation theory of inspiration requires a theory of absolute inerrancy, but the subtle theory of inspiration permits a theory of limited inerrancy.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *theory of inspiration* |  | *theory of inerrancy* |
|  |  |  |
| dictation theory | → | absolute inerrancy |
| subtle theory | → | limited inerrancy |

Today, the combination of dictation theory and theory of absolute inerrancy is called “fundamentalism.” The term came about in this way. The anti-intellectual (Hofstadter 28-141) theology of American frontier tent revivals was incorporated into a series of Bible conferences in the late 1800s; the conferences’ theology in turn was embodied in a series of twelve booklets, *The Fundamentals*, in 1909-1912. The term “fundamentalism” was coined in 1920 to refer to the theology of *The Fundamentals*. The booklets “presupposed the verbal inspiration of scripture in every detail as the basis for their whole system . . . Christian orthodoxy was identified with biblical inerrancy” (Hudson 147-48). The booklets covered doctrines besides inspiration and inerrancy: they affirmed the virgin birth, bodily resurrection, and so on; but today this broader theology of conservative American Protestantism is called “evangelicalism,” while “fundamentalism” is used to emphasize the evangelical approach to scripture. Present-day denominations that tend toward fundamentalism include Southern Baptists, the Assemblies of God, Pentecostal churches, “non-denominational” churches, and others.

One advantage to the subtle theory of inspiration is that it explains the diversity of styles in scripture. Similarly, one advantage to the theory of limited inerrancy is that it explains the many contradictions that actually exist in scripture. Fundamentalists, of course, deny on *a priori* grounds that the Bible has contradictions. This forces them to defend themselves against the hundreds of contradictions that can be found in scripture; for if even one contradiction can be shown to exist in scripture, then the whole fundamentalist position collapses.[[7]](#footnote-7) But which is better: to presume *a priori* that God must have inspired in this way, and therefore that the scriptures are inerrant in this way; or to begin with the Bible *as it actually is*, and to infer from the nature of the text how God apparently inspired and therefore how the scriptures are inerrant?

The theory of limited inerrancy is able to explain contradictions in scripture because it does not demand that inerrancy extend to the whole of scripture. The biblical quality of *inspiration* extends to the whole of scripture, because God was always present and influencing the contributors to the Bible; but the biblical quality of *inerrancy*, though it results from inspiration, does not extend to the whole of scripture, since God was not concerned, apparently, with the truth of peripheral details. If the Bible is imagined as a circle, then the circle of inspiration coincides with the biblical circle, i.e., extends to its periphery; but the circle of inerrancy is smaller, lying somewhere between the periphery and the center.

The crucial question is, of course: where does one draw the line? Which are the “peripheral details” with whose truth God was not apparently concerned? Clarity in this matter has been emerging only gradually over the past several centuries.

One type of assertion in the Bible that is now recognized as not necessarily inerrant is scientific truths. The Galileo case was an important episode here. Until the 1500s everyone accepted geocentrism (sun, planets, and stars revolve around the earth); one only needed to look up to prove it.[[8]](#footnote-8) But in 1543, the Polish priest Nicolaus Copernicus presented arguments for heliocentrism (planets revolve around the sun). Only ten people were convinced during the 1500s (*Encarta*, “Copernicus”), but one of them was the Italian Galileo Galilei. When the Church was considering condemning heliocentrism in the 1610s, Galileo set about reminding the Church “of its standing practice of interpreting Scripture allegorically whenever it came into conflict with scientific truth, quoting patristic authorities and warning that it would be ‘a terrible detriment for the souls if people found themselves convinced by proof of something that it was made then a sin to believe’” (de Santillana ??need bib entry). But scripture supported geocentrism (Mark 1:32, for example, refers to the sun *going down*), and the Church in 1616 declared heliocentrism erroneous. In 1633, the Inquisition tried Galileo for heresy, forced him to curse heliocentrism, and placed him under house arrest for the last eight years of his life.

Since then the Church has come to realize that statements in scripture referring to the subjects of the natural sciences need not always be taken literally. Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893) said:

There can never, indeed, by any real discrepancy between the theologian and the physicist . . . If dissension should arise between them, here is the rule also laid down by St. Augus­tine [ad 357-430] for the theologian: “Whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures.” . . . The Catholic interpreter . . . should show that these facts of natural science which investigators affirm to be now quite certain are not contrary to the Scripture rightly explained . . . (*Rome* 21-23)

Leo added a caution: one “must, nevertheless, always bear in mind, that much which has been held and proved as certain has afterwards been called in question and rejected” (*Rome* 23).

Fifty years later, Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (1943) indicated that even historical references in scripture need not be literally true.

. . . discov­eries [in] archaeology or in ancient history or literature . . . make better known the mentality of the ancient writers . . . the ancient peoples of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech which we use today: but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. What those exactly were the commentator cannot deter­mine in advance, but only after a careful examina­tion of the ancient literature of the East. (*Rome* 97-99)

Again a useful caution was appended: “if the wished-for solution [to a given difficulty in scripture] be slow in coming or does not satisfy us, since perhaps a successful conclusion may be reserved to posterity, let us not wax impatient . . . No wonder if to one or the other question no solution wholly satisfactory will ever be found . . .” (*Rome* 101)

Finally, Vatican Council II, a meeting of all the Catholic bishops in the world from 1962-1965, recognized that even *religious* statements in scripture need not always be true. In *Dei Verbum* (*Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*, 1965), the council pointed out that revelation in the Bible is *progressive*: what is said at one place in scripture may be corrected or overturned at another place. This principle of progressive revelation, long recognized in Catholic exegesis (biblical interpretation), appears several times in *Dei Verbum*. For example:

* Christ is “the fullness of all revelation” (ch. 1 § 2). If Christ is the fullness, then what preceded him must have been less than full. Therefore, scripture leading up to Christ, the Old Testament, contains religious affirmations that are inadequate or incorrect.
* Vatican II says this explicitly elsewhere in the document: the Old Testament books “contain some things which are incomplete and temporary . . .” (ch. 4 § 15).
* “Israel daily gained a deeper and clearer understanding of His ways . . .” (ch. 4 § 14) Therefore, later understandings in the Old Testament that contravene earlier ones are generally to be preferred.
* “The word of God . . . shows its power in a most excellent way in the writings of the New Testament. . . . This mystery had not been manifested to other generations as it was now revealed . . .” (ch. 5 § 17)
* There is progressive revelation even within the New Testament: for in “the epistles of St. Paul and other apostolic writings [Jesus’] true teaching is more and more fully stated . . . For the Lord Jesus was with His apostles as He had promised (see Matt. 28:20) and sent them the advocate Spirit who would lead them into the fullness of truth [John 14:16-17, 26; 15:26; 16:7, 13-14] . . .” (ch. 5 § 20)

By affirming the principle of progressive revelation, *Dei Verbum* indicated that even religious statements must be assessed in context before being accepted as inerrant. But the document went further. In the most authoritative statement on inerrancy by the Catholic Church to date, the council asserted: “the books of Scripture must be acknowledged as teaching firmly, faithfully, and *without error* that truth which God wanted put into the sacred writings for the sake of our salvation” (ch. 3 § 11, italics added). The Bible does not teach inerrantly every statement of scripture, not even every religious statement; what it *does* teach inerrantly is those statements which assert salvific truth.[[9]](#footnote-9) To use the image of circles again: the set of all assertions in the Bible is of wider compass than the set of assertions declaring truths necessary for salvation.

The gradual recognition that inerrancy is limited was well summarized a quarter of a century ago by the Catholic scripture scholar, Raymond Brown:

Only gradually have we learned to distinguish that while all Scripture is inspired, all Scripture is not inerrant. . . . not every affirmation of truth is so germane to God’s purpose in inspiring the Scriptures that He has committed Himself to it. Already in *Providen­tis­simus Deus* (1893) Pope Leo XIII acknowledged that the scientific affirmations of the Bible were not necessarily inerrant, since it was not God’s purpose to teach men science. Eventually the same principle was applied to historical affirmations, but the last frontier has been religious affirmations. . . . Vatican II has made it possible to restrict inerrancy to the essential religious affirmations of a biblical book made for the sake of our salvation. (Brown 115)

The subtle theory of inspiration and the theory of limited inerrancy are the established teaching of the Catholic Church. They seem also to be the understanding of inspiration and inerrancy in Eastern Orthodox and in “mainline” Protestant churches: Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, and so on.
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## Development of Doctrine

1. **Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch on the development of doctrine**
   1. “The history of Christian theology is always the record of a continuous conversation, carried on within the church and between the church and the world in which it lives. Thus the development of theology is always a dual move­ment . . . It is the effort of this community to understand itself and to make clear the nature of its faith—in relation to the thought and life of earlier generations, in relation to new insights into the meaning of the gospel, and in relation to the perspectives of the world to which the community proclaims the gospel.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 161)
2. **Farrelly on the development of doctrine**
   1. “The development of the Church’s understanding of an element [71] of revelation is seen in the official teaching of the Church and in the witness to that teaching contained in the belief of the faithful.” (Farrelly 71-72)
      1. “It is the magisterium of the Church that constitutes the official proximate norm of faith and the agent that canonizes, as it were, a new stage of theological understanding of the revealed truth. So the official teaching of the Church has the first place in order of importance in our study of tradition.” (Farrelly 72)
      2. “But a second norm of the Church’s teaching is the witness given to Catholic belief in different ages by the faithful. The privileged witnesses of this belief are, of course, the Fathers and the theologians, so we shall investigate their teaching in the different periods of the history of the Church. [Farrelly refers to a teaching being “in accord with the Church’s official teaching and theological tradition that is a witness to the belief of the Church.” 107] . . . we are interested not in the individual Father or theologian for his own sake but for his function as a witness to the belief of the Church [since] it is the moral unanimity of such witnesses or the special witness of one as receiving general acceptance by the Church that is the basis of their value as norms of faith . . .” (Farrelly 71-72, 107)
   2. why doctrines develop
      1. heresy
         1. An example is Semipelagianism (those who say that God gives grace only after a person first turns to God).
         2. “. . . there are found at times in the Eastern Fathers statements which Semipelagians could later use to defend their orthodoxy. For instance, St. John Chrysostom says that when we have desired to advance in the ways of the spirit, God increases that desire.” (Farrelly 75)
         3. “But such statements of the Eastern Fathers . . . are directly contrary to other statements of the same Fathers, and so show not a definite Semipelagian doctrine, but that lack of accuracy that is common before a heresy has made the Church aware of a particular difficulty.” (Farrelly 75)
      2. better philosophical tools
         1. “Moreover, the Greek Fathers did not achieve a perfectly adequate expression of *how* God’s initiative in the order of grace and man’s free will were harmonized; this is due in part to the lack of the philosophical tools necessary for this. Hence a certain ambivalence or inexactness of expression appears from time to time.” (Farrelly 75)
3. **Ott on the development of doctrine**
   1. “The Liberal Protestant concept of dogma (cf. A. von Harnack) as well as Modernism (cf. A. Loisy) assumes . . . that the content of dogma changes radically in the course of time.” (Ott 6)
      1. See Vatican I’s condemnation of Anton Günther’s († 1863) proposal: “If anybody says that by reason of the progress of science, a meaning must be given to dogmas of the Church other than that which the Church understood and understands them to have let him be anathema” (D 1818). (Ott 6)
   2. “The ground for the immutability of dogmas lies in the Divine origin of the Truths which they express. Divine Truth is as immutable as God Himself.” (Ott 6) Mark 13:31, “Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.”
   3. development of material dogmas
      1. “. . . *substantial* growth took place in human [6] history until Revelation reached . . . Christ” (italics added: i. e., dogmas *evolved* in salvation history up to Christ but have only *developed* since). (Ott 6-7)
         1. Heb 1:1-2, “Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, 2but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son . . .”
         2. The difference between *evolution* of doctrine and *development* of doctrine was well stated by the Church Father, Vincent of Lerins († before 450): “For progress [= development] it is necessary that something should increase of itself, for alteration [= evolution], however, that something should change from one thing to the other.” (*Commonitorium* 23 [D 1800]) (Ott 8)
      2. “With Christ and the Apostles General Revelation concluded. (*sent. certa.*)” (Ott 7)
         1. scripture
            1. “Christ was the fulfillment of the Law” (Matt 5:17, 21-48). (Ott 7)
            2. Christ was “the absolute teacher of humanity . . .” (Ott 7)

Matt 23:10, “you have one instructor, the Messiah.”

Matt 28:20, “teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you. And remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age.”

* + - * 1. Christ’s coming was “the fullness of time” (Gal 4:4). (Ott 7)
        2. The apostles saw preservation of the faith as their task. 1 Tim 6:20, “Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the profane chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge . . .” Cf. 1 Tim 6:14, 2 Tim 1:14, 2:2, 3:14. (Ott 7)
      1. tradition
         1. “St. Irenaeus (Adv. haer [*sic*] III 1; IV 35, 8) and Tertullian (De praesc. 21) stress, against the Gnostics, that the full truth of Revelation is contained in the doctrine of the Apostles which is preserved unfalsified through the uninterrupted succession of the bishops.” (Ott 7)
         2. Pius X “condemned the proposition that: The Revelation . . . was not terminated with the Apostles.” (D 2021) (Ott 7)
  1. development of formal dogmas
     1. There is development “in the knowledge and in the ecclesiastical proposal of Revealed Truth, and consequently also in the public faith of the Church . . .” (Ott 7) This development occurs in several ways.
        1. “Truths which formerly were only implicitly believed are expressly proposed for belief.” Aquinas, *ST* 1-2.7, “There was an increase in the number of articles believed explicitly . . .” (Ott 7)
        2. “Material Dogmas are raised to the status of Formal Dogmas.” (Ott 7)
        3. “. . . truths which were always believed, i. e. [*sic*], the Hypostatic Union, . . . Transubstantiation, etc., are formulated in new, sharply defined concepts.” (Ott 7)
        4. “Questions formerly disputed are explained and decided, and heretical propositions are condemned.” Augustine, *City of God* 2.1: “a question moved by an adversary gives an occasion for learning.” (Ott 7)
        5. “There may be also a progress in the confession of faith of the individual believer . . .” (Ott 8)
     2. “The exposition of [dogmas] is prepared by theological science and promulgated by the Teaching Authority of the Church under the [7] direction of the Holy Ghost (John 14, 26 [“But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you”]).” (Ott 7-8)
     3. “These new expositions of dogmatic truth are motivated, on the one hand, by the natural striving of man for deeper understanding of Revealed Truth, and on the other hand by external influences, such as the attacks arising from heresy and unbelief, theological controversies, advances in philosophical knowledge and historical research, [and] development of the liturgy . . .” (Ott 8)

## Doctrinal Development:

## The Truth of a Doctrine and Its Expression

1. **Schmaus on Trent**
   1. “It is essential . . . to distinguish between the council’s intention and its manner of speaking. The council cannot express itself [56] in a non-temporal language, but must use the thought forms and idiom of its time in order to proclaim the divine self-revelation in a way that meets the needs of the particular situation. The eternal divine and the temporal human are not to be identified, although the two elements are bound most closely together.” (Schmaus 56-57)
   2. “Here we see a method which is at work throughout the history of the development of dogma, for it is a characteristic quality of human dialogue. In the concern to safeguard a truth which has been threatened, it is proclaimed with such disproportionate emphasis as to become dis­placed from its context in the whole body of truths. Thus presented, it cannot be overlooked or forgotten; but it takes a long time in history before that doctrine can return to the context of the whole of truth and be seen again in its proper perspective. . . . the Council of Trent [heavily] stressed the divine act of judgment in the process of justification.” (Schmaus 64)
2. **Pius XII**, ***Humani Generis*** (1950)
   1. Pius XII denied “that dogmas should be expressed in the concepts of the philosophy ruling at any particular time.” (Ott 6)
   2. Many “think that the way is paved to satisfy present-day needs, by expressing dogma in the terms of contemporary philosophy, whether of “immanence” or of “idealism,” or “existentialism,” or of any other system. Certain more daring persons contend that this can and ought to be done for this reason, because they maintain that the mysteries of faith can never be expressed by notions that are adequately true, but only by so-called “approximative” notions, always changeable, by which truth is indicated to a certain degree, but is also necessarily deformed. So they think that it is not absurd, but quite necessary that theology in place of the various philosophies which it has used as its instruments in the course of time, substitute new notions for old ones, so that in ways that are different, and even in some degree opposite, yet possessing the same value, as they say, render the same divine truths in a human way. They add also that the history of dogmas consists in presenting the various successive forms with which revealed truth has clothed itself, according to the different doctrines and opinions which have arisen in the course of the ages.” (Denzinger § 2310)
   3. But “such endeavors lead not only to dogmatic “relativism,” as it is called, but actually contain it; indeed, the contempt for the doctrine as commonly handed down, and for the phraseology by which the same is expressed, more than sufficiently bear this out. Surely there is no one who does not see that the phraseology of such notions not only as employed in the schools but also by the magisterium of the Church herself, can be perfected and polished; and, besides, it is noted that the Church has not always been constant in employing the same words. It is also evident that the Church cannot be bound to any system of philosophy which flourishes for a brief period of time; for, what has been set in order over many centuries by common consent of Catholic teachers, in order to achieve some understanding of dogma, without doubt does not rest on so perishable a foundation. Rather they are based on principles and notions derived from a true knowledge of created things; and surely in deriving this knowledge, truth divinely revealed has through the Church illumined the mind like a star. Therefore, it is no wonder that some such notions were not only employed by ecumenical councils but also so sanctioned that it is not right to depart from them.” (Denzinger § 2311)
   4. “Therefore, to neglect, or to reject, or to deprive so many great things of their value, which in many instances have been conceived, expressed, and perfected after long labor, by men of no ordinary genius and sanctity, under the watchful eye of the holy magisterium, and not without the light and guidance of the Holy Spirit for the expression of the truths of faith ever more accurately, so that in their place conjectural notions may be substituted, as well as certain unstable and vague expressions of a new philosophy, which like a flower of the field exists today and will die tomorrow, not only is the highest imprudence, but also makes dogma itself as a reed shaken by the wind. Moreover, the contempt for the words and ideas which the scholastic theologians customarily use, tends to weaken so-called speculative philosophy, which they think is void of true certitude, since it rests on theological reasoning.” (Denzinger § 2312)
   5. Moreover, “those eager for novelty easily pass from a contempt for scholastic theology to a neglect, and even a disrespect for the magisterium of the Church, which supports that theology by its authority.” (Denzinger § 2313)
3. **John XXIII**, **prayer at the beginning of Vatican Council II** (11 Oct. 1962) (“Allocutione in Concilii Vaticani inauguratione,” *AAS* 54 or 84 [1962]: 792): “This certain and unchangeable doctrine, to which faithful obedience is due, has to be explored and presented in a way that is demanded by our times. One thing is the deposit of faith, which consists of the truths contained in sacred doctrine, another thing is the manner of presentation, always however with the same meaning and signification.” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
4. **Vatican Council II**, ***Decree on Ecumenism*** (*Unitatis Redintegratio*) (21 Nov. 1964) § 6: if “there have been deficiencies . . . in the way that church teaching has been formulated—to be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself—these can and should be set right at the opportune moment.” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
5. **Vatican Council II**, ***Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*** (*Gaudium et Spes*) (7 Dec. 1965) § 62: “theologians [should] seek continually for more suitable ways of communicating doctrine to the men of their times; for the deposit of Faith or the truths are one thing and the manner in which they are enunciated, in the same meaning and understanding, is another.” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
6. **Paul VI**, **Encyclical Letter *Mysterium fidei*** (3 Sept. 1965) (*AAS* 57 [1965]: 753ff.)
   1. “Who would ever tolerate that the dogmatic formulas used by the ecumenical councils for the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation be judged as no longer appropriate for men of our time therefore that others be rashly substituted for them? In the same way it cannot be tolerated that any individual should on his own authority modify the formulas which were used by the Council of Trent to express belief in the Eucharistic Mystery. For these formulas, like the others which the Church uses to propose the dogmas of faith, express concepts which are not tied to a certain form of human culture, nor to a specific phase of human culture, nor to one or other theological school.”(*Catholic Desktop Library*)
   2. “No, these formulas present that part of reality which necessary and universal experience permits the human mind to grasp and to manifest with apt and exact terms taken either from common or polished language. For this reason, these formulas are adapted to men of all times and all places. But the most sacred task of theology is, not the invention of new dogmatic formulas to replace old ones, but rather such a defense and explanation of the formulas adopted by the councils as may demonstrate that divine Revelation is the source of the truths communicated through these expres­sions.” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
   3. “It must be admitted that these formulas can sometimes be more clearly and accurately explained. In fact, the achievement of this goal is highly beneficial. But it would be wrong to give to these expressions a meaning other than the original. Thus the understanding of the faith should be advanced without threat to its unchangeable truth. It is, in fact, the teaching of the First Vatican Council that “the same signification (of sacred dogmas) is to be forever retained once our Holy Mother the Church has defined it, and under no pretext of deeper penetration may that meaning be weakened” [Dogmatic Constitution *De Fide Catholicae* canon 4].” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
7. **Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith**, **Declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae***, § 5 (in its entirety) (*AAS* 65 [24 June 1973]) (from *Catholic Desktop Library*, where it is called *Declaration in Defense of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church against Certain Errors of the Present Day*)
   1. “The transmission of divine Revelation by the Church encounters difficulties of various kinds. These arise from the fact that the hidden mysteries of God “by their nature so far transcend the human intellect that even if they are revealed to us and accepted by faith, they remain concealed by the veil of faith itself and are as it were wrapped in darkness.”[[10]](#footnote-10) Difficulties arise also from the historical condition that affects the expression of Revelation.
   2. “With regard to this historical condition, it must first be observed that the meaning of the pronouncements of faith depends partly upon the expressive power of the language used at a certain point in time and in particular circumstances. Moreover, it sometimes happens that some dogmatic truth is first expressed incompletely (but not falsely), and at a later date, when considered in a broader context of faith or human knowledge, it receives a fuller and more perfect expression. In addition, when the Church makes new pronouncements she intends to confirm or clar­ify what is in some way contained in Sacred Scripture or in previous expressions of Tradition; but at the same time she usually has the intention of solving certain questions or removing certain errors.
   3. “All these things have to be taken into account in order that these pronouncements may be properly interpreted. Finally, even though the truths which the Church intends to teach through her dogmatic formulas are distinct from the changeable conceptions of a given epoch and can be expressed without them, nevertheless it can sometimes happen that these truths may be enunciated by the Sacred Magisterium in terms that bear traces of such conceptions.
   4. “In view of the above, it must be stated that the dogmatic formulas of the Church’s Magisterium were from the very beginning suitable for communicating revealed truth, and that as they are they remain forever suitable for communicating this truth to those who interpret them correctly.[[11]](#footnote-11) It does not however follow that every one of these formulas has always been or will always be so [i.e., suitable] to the same extent. For this reason theologians seek to define exactly the intention of teaching proper to the various formulas, and in carrying out this work they are of considerable assistance to the living Magisterium of the Church, to which they remain subordinated.
   5. “For this reason also it often happens that ancient dogmatic formulas and others closely con­nected with them remain living and fruitful in the habitual usage of the Church, but with suitable expository and explanatory additions that maintain and clarify their original meaning. In addition, it has sometimes happened that in this habitual usage of the Church certain of these formulas gave way to new expressions which, proposed and approved by the Sacred Magisterium, presented more clearly or more completely the same meaning.
   6. “As for the meaning of dogmatic formulas, this remains ever true and constant in the Church, even when it is expressed with greater clarity or more developed. The faithful therefore must shun the opinion, first, that dogmatic formulas (or some category of them) cannot signify truth in a determinate way, but can only offer changeable approximations to it, which to a certain extent distort or alter it; secondly, that these formulas signify the truth only in a indeterminate way, this truth being like a goal that is constantly being sought by means of such approximations. Those who hold such an opinion do not avoid dogmatic relativism and they corrupt the concept of the Church’s infallibility relative to the truth to be taught or held in determinate way.
   7. “Such an opinion clearly is in disagreement with the declarations of the First Vatican Council, which, while fully aware of the progress of the Church in her knowledge of revealed truth,[[12]](#footnote-12) nevertheless taught as follows: “That meaning of sacred dogmas . . . must always be maintained which Holy Mother Church declared once and for all, nor should one ever depart from that meaning under the guise of or in the name of a more advanced understanding.”[[13]](#footnote-13) The Council moreover condemned the opinion that “dogmas once proposed by the Church must, with the progress of science be given a meaning other than that which was understood by the Church, or which she understands.”[[14]](#footnote-14) There is no doubt that, according to these texts of the Council, the meaning of dogmas which is declared by the Church is determinate and unalterable.
   8. “Such an opinion is likewise in contrast with Pope John’s assertion regarding Christian doctrine at the opening of the Second Vatican Council: “This certain and unchangeable doctrine, to which faithful obedience is due, has to be explored and presented in a way that is demanded by our times. One thing is the deposit of faith, which consists of the truths contained in sacred doctrine, another thing is the manner of presentation, always however with the same meaning and signification.”[[15]](#footnote-15)
   9. “Since the Successor of Peter is here speaking about certain and unchangeable Christian doctrine, about the deposit of faith which is the same as the truths contained in that doctrine and about the truths which have to be preserved with the same meaning, it is clear that he admits that we can know the true and unchanging meaning of dogmas. What is new and what he recommends in view of the needs of the times pertains only to the modes of studying, expounding and presenting that doctrine while keeping its permanent meaning.
   10. “In a similar way the Supreme Pontiff Paul VI exhorted the pastors of the Church in the following words: “Nowadays a serious effort is required of us to ensure that the teaching of the faith should keep the fullness of its meaning and force, while expressing itself in a form which allows it to reach the spirit and heart of the people to whom it is addressed.”[[16]](#footnote-16)”
8. ***National Catechetical Directory*** § 27: ecumenical dialogue “should avoid words and methods of explaining doctrine that could “lead separated brethren or anyone else into error regarding the true doctrine of the Church” (LG, 67).” (*Welcome to the Catholic Church*)
9. **Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity**, ***Directory for the Application of the Principles and Norms of Ecumenism*** (11 Dec. 1994)
   1. § 61: Catechesis “should expound clearly, with charity and with due firmness the whole doctrine of the Catholic Church . . . avoiding expressions and ways of presenting doctrine which would be an obstacle to dialogue.” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
   2. § 74: “Students must learn to distinguish between on one hand revealed truths, which all require the same assent of faith, and on the other hand the manner of stating those truths and theological doctrines. . . . Students should therefore learn to make the distinction between the “deposit of faith itself or the truths which are contained in our venerable doctrine,” [*Ecumenical Directory*, *AAS* 1970, 74] and the way in which these truths are formulated; between the truths to be proclaimed and the various ways of perceiving them and shedding light upon them; between the apostolic tradition and strictly ecclesiastical traditions, and at the same time they should learn to recognize and respect the permanent value of dogmatic formulations. From the time of their philosophical formation, students should be prepared to appreciate the legitimate diversity in theology which derives from the different methods and language theologians use in penetrating the divine mysteries. From which it follows that different theological formulations are often more complementary than contradictory.” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
   3. § 181: “In assessing and assimilating new forms of expression of the faith, which may appear in statements issued from ecumenical dialogue, or even ancient expressions which have been taken up again in preference to certain more recent theological terms, Catholics will bear in mind the distinction made in the Decree on Ecumenism between “the way that Church teaching has been formulated” and “the deposit of faith itself.”[[17]](#footnote-17)168 They will take care however to avoid ambiguous expressions especially in the search for agreement on points of doctrine that are traditionally controversial. They will also take account of the way in which the Second Vatican Council itself applied this distinction in its own formulation of Catholic faith . . .” (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
10. **John Paul II**, ***Veritatis Splendor*** § 29 (referring to Vatican Council II, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* § 62): theologians should “look for *a more appropriate way of communicating* doctrine to the people of their time; since there is a difference between the deposit or the truths of faith and the manner in which they are expressed, keeping the same meaning and the same judgment.”

## Church Documents: Their Relative Authority

“. . . there are different kinds of papal documents with different levels of authoritativeness. One visible sign of this diversity is the kind of seal affixed to the document. The most authoritative documents are sealed with a lead seal (in Latin *bulla*) and on that account are called “bulls”; lesser documents are sealed with wax, and on others the papal seal is merely stamped in ink.” (Sullivan 21)

“. . . the most authoritative [kinds of papal document] are “apostolic constitutions,” “apostolic letters,” “encyclical letters,” and “apostolic exhortations.” Such documents are usually addressed to the universal church.” (Sullivan 21)

“The following list ranks in decreasing order of formal authority: apostolic constitutions, encyclical letters, encyclical epistles, apostolic exhortations, apostolic letters, letters, and messages.” (Miller 9 n. 1)

“See Francis G. Morrisey, “Papal and Curial Pronouncements: Their Canonical Significance in Light of the 1983 Code of Canon Law,” *The Jurist*, 50 (1990), 102-125.” (Miller 9 n. 1)

## The Two Characteristics of the Intellectual Life

[There are] two basic qualities in the intellectual’s attitude toward ideas—qualities that may be designated as playfulness and piety.

piety

[The intellectual] lives for ideas—which means that he has a sense of dedication to the life of the mind which is very much like a religious commitment. This . . . implies a special sense of the ultimate value in existence of the act of comprehension. Socrates, when he said that the unexamined life is not worth living, struck the essence of it.

. . . the intellectual task [has] been conceived as a *calling* . . . in the service of truth. The intellectual life has here taken on a kind of primary moral significance. It is this aspect of the intellectual’s feeling about ideas that I call his piety. The intellectual is *engagé*—he is pledged, committed, enlisted. What everyone else is willing to admit, namely that ideas and abstractions are of signal importance in human life, he imperatively feels.

Of course what is involved is more than a purely personal discipline and more than the life of contemplation and understanding itself. For the life of thought, even though it may be regarded as the highest form of human activity, is also a medium through which other values are refined, reasserted, and realized in the human community. [28] Collectively, intellectuals have often tried to serve as the moral antennae of the race . . . The thinker feels that he ought to be the special custodian of values like reason and justice which are related to his own search for truth . . . intellectuals are properly more responsive to such values than others; and it is the historic glory of the intellectual class of the West in modern times that, of all the classes which could be called in any sense privileged, it has shown the largest and most consistent concern for the well-being of the classes which lie below it in the social scale. Behind the intellectual’s feeling of commitment is the belief that in some measure the world should be made responsive to his capacity for rationality, his passion for justice and order: out of this conviction arises much of his value to mankind . . .

playfulness

[The intellectual’s] piety, by itself, is not enough. He may live for ideas, as I have said, but something must prevent him from living for *one idea*, from becoming obsessive. When one’s concern for ideas, no matter how dedicated and sincere, reduces them to the service of some central limited preconception or some wholly external end, intellect gets swallowed by fanaticism. If there is anything more dangerous to the life of the mind than having no independent commitment to ideas, it is having an excess of commitment to some special and constricting idea. The effect is as observable in politics as in theology: the intellectual function can be overwhelmed by an excess of piety expended within too contracted a frame of reference. [29]

Piety, then, needs a counterpoise, something to prevent it from being exercised in an excessively rigid way; and this it has, in most intellectual temperaments, in the quality I would call playfulness. We speak of the play of the mind; and certainly the intellectual relishes the play of the mind for its own sake, and finds in it one of the major values in life. What one thinks of here is the element of sheer delight in intellectual activity. . . . the curiosity of the playful mind is inordinately restless and active. This very restlessness and activity gives a distinctive cast to its view of truth and its discontent with dogmas. . . .

Whatever the intellectual is too certain of, if he is healthily playful, he begins to find unsatisfactory. The meaning of his intellectual life lies not in the possession of truth but in the quest for new uncertainties. Harold Rosenberg summed up this side of the life of the mind supremely well when he said that the intellectual is one who turns answers into questions. . . .

piety and playfulness

But in using the terms *play* and *playfulness*, I do not intend to suggest any lack of seriousness; quite the contrary. Anyone who has watched children, or adults, at play will recognize that there is no contradiction between play and seriousness, and that some forms of play induce a measure of grave concentration not so readily called forth by work. And playfulness does not imply the absence of practicality. In American public discussion one of the tests to which intellect is constantly submitted when it is, so to speak, on trial is this criterion of practicality. But in principle intellect is neither practical nor impractical; it is extra-practical. [30] To the zealot overcome by his piety and to the journeyman of ideas concerned only with his marketable mental skills, the beginning and end of ideas lies in their efficacy with respect to some goal external to intellectual processes. The intellectual is not in the first instance concerned with such goals. This is not to say that he scorns the practical: the intrinsic intellectual interest of many practical problems is utterly absorbing. Still less is it to say that he is impractical; he is simply concerned with something else, a quality in problems that is not defined by asking whether or not they have practical purpose. . . .

One may well ask if there is not a certain fatal contradiction between these two qualities of the intellectual temperament, playfulness and piety. Certainly there is a tension between them, but it is anything but fatal: it is just one of those tensions in the human character that evoke a creative response. It is, in fact, the ability to comprehend and express not only different but opposing points of view, to identify imaginatively with or even to embrace within oneself contrary feelings and ideas that gives rise to first-rate work in all areas of humanistic expression and in many fields of inquiry. Human beings are tissues of contradictions, and the life even of the intellectual is not logic, to borrow from Holmes, but experience. Contemplate the intellectuals of the past or those in one’s neighborhood: some will come to mind in whom the note of playfulness is dominant; others who are conspicuously pious. But in most intellectuals each of these characteristics is qualified and held in check by the other. The tensile strength of the thinker may be gauged by his ability to keep an equipoise between these two sides of his mind. At one end of the scale, an excess of playfulness may lead to triviality, to the dissipation of intellectual energies on mere technique, to dilettantism, to the failure of creative effort. At the other, an excess of piety leads to rigidity, to fanaticism, to messianism, to ways of life which may be morally mean or morally magnificent but which in either case are not the ways of intellect.

Historically, it may be useful to fancy playfulness and piety as being [32] the respective residues of the aristocratic and the priestly backgrounds of the intellectual function. The element of play seems to be rooted in the ethos of the leisure class, which has always been central in the history of creative imagination and humanistic learning. The element of piety is reminiscent of the priestly inheritance of the intellectuals: the quest for and the possession of truth was a holy office. As their legatee, the modern intellectual inherits the vulnerability of the aristocrat to the animus of puritanism and egalitarianism and the vulnerability of the priest to anticlericalism and popular assaults upon hierarchy. We need not be surprised, then, if the intellectual’s position has rarely been comfortable in a country which is, above all others, the home of the democrat and the antinomian.

It is a part of the intellectual’s tragedy that the things he most values about himself and his work are quite unlike those society values in him. Society values him because he can in fact be used for a variety of purposes, from popular entertainment to the design of weapons. But it can hardly understand so well those aspects of his temperament which I have designated as essential to his intellectualism. His playfulness, in its various manifestations, is likely to seem to most men a perverse luxury; in the United States the play of the mind is perhaps the only form of play that is not looked upon with the most tender indulgence. His piety is likely to seem nettlesome, if not actually dangerous. And neither quality is considered to contribute very much to the practical business of life. [33]

# Introduction to the Doctrines of Grace

## Summary of Catholic Anthropology

1. **Humans are God**’**s image**.
   1. Gen 1:26-27, “Then God said, ‘Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness . . .’ 27So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.”
   2. “The primordial affirmation of [the Church’s] anthropology is that man is God’s image [Gen 1:26-27] . . . Respect man! He is the image of God!” (John Paul II, “Address to the Third General Assembly of Latin American Bishops,” 1979)
   3. “. . . man is not wrong when he regards himself . . . as more than a speck of nature or a nameless constituent of the city of man.” (Vatican II, *Gaudium et spes* [“On the Church in the Modern World”], 1965)
2. **body and soul**
   1. A human being “shares in both orders, being composed of spirit and body.” ([12th ecumenical] Lateran Council IV, *Symbol*, ad 1215)
   2. “Though made of body and soul, man is one.” (Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et spes*, 1965)
3. **the body**
   1. The body may have evolved from “previously existing and living matter . . .” (Pius XII, *Humani generis*, 1950)
   2. Man “is obliged to regard his body as good and honorable since God has created it and will raise it up on the last day.” (Vatican II, *Gaudium et spes*, 1965)
4. **the soul**
   1. “God [is] creator in each man of his spiritual and immortal soul.” (Paul VI, *Profession of Faith*, 1968) (Cf. Anastasius II, ad 498: parents do not transmit souls [traducianism], but God “imparts souls.” Also Benedict XII, ad 1341.)
   2. The soul did not exist before conception. (Against Origen’s pre-cosmic fall: [local] Council of Constantinople, ad 543; Council of Braga, ad 561.)
   3. Everyone has only “one rational and intellectual soul . . .” ([8th ecumenical] Council of Constantinople IV, ad 869-870)
   4. “. . . the rational or intellective soul [is] the form of the body . . .” ([15th ecumenical] Council of Vienne, ad 1311-1312)
   5. “The intellectual soul is . . . immortal . . .” (Lateran Council V, ad 1513)
   6. Every soul is “an individual entity [and not] common to all [as] the universal spirit.” ([18th ecumenical] Lateran Council V, ad 1513)
   7. Man “recognizes in himself a spiritual and immortal soul . . . by his interior qualities he outstrips the whole sum of mere things. He plunges into the depths of reality whenever he enters into his own heart; God, Who probes the heart, awaits him there; there he discerns his proper destiny beneath the eyes of God. Thus, when he recognizes in himself a spiritual and immortal soul, he is not being mocked by a fantasy born only of physical or social influences, but is rather laying hold of the proper truth of the matter.” (Vatican II, *Gaudium et spes*, 1965)
5. **monogenism**: **There is one human race**. (Pius XII, *Summi Pontificatus*, 1939; *Humani generis*, 1950)
   1. Acts 17:26, “From one ancestor he made all nations to inhabit the whole earth . . .”
   2. “All peoples form a single community; their origin is one . . . One also is their final goal, God.” (Vatican Council II, *Nostra aetate* [“On Non-Christian Religions”])
   3. “. . . it is by no means apparent how such an opinion [as polygenism] can be reconciled with . . . original sin, which proceeds from a sin truly committed by one Adam . . .” (Pius XII, *Humani generis*) (Note that “polygenism is rejected because “it does not appear” to be reconcilable with the doctrine of original sin inherited by all from Adam. Recent theology, however, is seeking explanations of original sin under the supposition of polygenism, and so tries to remove the reason for its rejection.”—Neuner and Dupuis, *Christian Faith* 125)
6. **Humans have free will**.
   1. The theology of grace is not directly concerned with “social and political freedom” but with two other types of freedom. (Schmaus 13)
   2. “metaphysical-psychological freedom”: “the power to choose between objects . . .” (Schmaus 13)
   3. “eschatological freedom”: “freedom from sin, from the law, from death, and from Satan”; this is “the fruit of grace.” (Schmaus 14)

## Free Will

Include “retreat from from free will,” passage from *Sin and Law* by Louis Monden.

1. **freedom**
   1. “Freedom means the absence of con­straint or hindrance; it implies that some force or tendency is seeking to exert itself, and that nothing is preventing it from doing so.” (Pontifex 9)
   2. “. . . what are the powers which a man has, and which may or may not exert themselves without hindrance?” (Pontifex 9)
      1. “The special characteristic of man, as opposed to other things in the world around us, is that he is aware of himself and of his environment far more fully than is anything else. As a result . . . his needs and tendencies on [9] many levels, . . . instead of being mere blind forces, . . . become for him conscious desires. . . . man has the power, not only to be aware of himself as affected by external objects . . . but also to analyse, clarify, and classify the objects . . .” (Pontifex 9-10)
      2. “Man is [both an] individual [and] a member of human society.” (Pontifex 10)
         1. “First, as to his individual personality. [10] . . . There would be no progress in perfection unless men were active centres of thought, and unless this led to external good conduct. . . . each creature is intended to reflect and reveal God’s perfection in a way which is, to some extent, unique . . . this can only be achieved if each creature is, under God, a primary source of activity. The individual must not, therefore, be merely passive to outside influences, a mere instrument in their hands, but must develop his own person­ality and initiate activity himself.” (Pontifex 10-11)
         2. “Secondly, . . . the social aspect . . . [Man] depends on his fellow men for his own perfection, just as they depend on him. He must be a source of activity, but this activity must aim at the good of all mankind. [Otherwise] man has not reached the full enjoyment of his individual powers.” (Pontifex 11)
   3. ways in which man is free
      1. “Man can be called free in all the different ways in which his powers seek to exert themselves.” (Pontifex 11)
         1. *bodily freedom*: “He is free in one sense if his bodily powers are able to act un­hindered . . .” (Pontifex 11)
         2. *psychological freedom*: “He is free in another sense if his intellectual powers are able to act unhindered. Lack of education and training is plainly a hindrance . . .” (Pontifex 11)
         3. “Again a man is free in another sense if he acts in obedience to reason rather than passion, for then he acts in such a way as to reach a more important end.” (Pontifex 11)
         4. Man is “only free in the fullest sense if all his powers have reached their fullest development, and are able to act in their highest in­tensity. Plainly this can never happen in the present life, but only in the next life through enjoyment of the beatific vision.” (Pontifex 11)
      2. *political freedom*
2. **free choice**
   1. “Man is often called free in the sense that he is said to be able to choose between two or more courses of action without being forced to choose one or other by anything except his own will. If this is so, he is free because his power of action is not determined by objects outside himself . . . This brings us to the familiar controversy” of free will versus determinism. (Pontifex 12)
   2. “An act of choice implies that before the act took place there was a con­flict of desire, more than one course being possible, and that the agent was not so determined either from outside or from within that only one course could be followed.” (Pontifex 37)
   3. arguments against free choice
      1. “The determinist relies chiefly on showing that man’s actions can be explained by causes which seem quite adequate, with­out bringing in free choice.” (Pontifex 12)
      2. “If we are asked why a man acted in a particular way we tend at once to assume that he did so because he had a certain type of character. But [character is largely] inherited and depends on physical causes. Moreover, different nations have types of character peculiar to themselves . . .” (Pontifex 12)
      3. Hastings Rashdall’s “objec­tions to indeterminism” (i.e., free will) (see *The Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. 2, around p. 317) (Pontifex 13)
         1. Statistics “show that a great many actions occur with a regularity which suggests that causes other than free choice have produced them. When statistics show, for example, a steady increase in crimes of violence we look at once to social changes as an explanation rather than to free choice.” (Pontifex 12)
         2. “. . . we shall have to abstract all that a man owes to inherited character . . . before we can call him good or bad.” (Pontifex 13)
         3. “. . . we shall have to abstract all that a man owes . . . to the influence of others, before we can call him good or bad.” (Pontifex 13)
            1. Rashdall (p. 322): “extreme Indeterminism would carry with it (as it did avowedly for Kant) the startling consequence that no man can really be made better by the in­fluence of another.” (qtd. in Pontifex 13)
            2. Indeterminism must “treat as good all the people who might have been good under good influence, however bad in fact they are. . . . if goodness depends entirely on a man’s free choice and if this can be decisively affected by good influence, a man ought to be regarded as good if we think he would have become good had he been subjected to a sufficiently powerful good influence.” (Pontifex 13)
         4. “. . . a man may act from the highest motives and yet not be acting from free choice. His act may be fully determined by causes outside his own will, and yet his act may be a fully personal act, and a good act. For he may have no desire but to do the right thing, and may [13] act on the motive of this desire with full deliberation and awareness of the purpose in view. To be free from all desire for wrong is surely a perfection, and therefore to wish only to do right can imply no lack of goodness. But there can be no possibility of choice if there is no conflict of desire, and hence an act done without any choice may be done solely from the highest motive, the desire for good, and it may fully express the individual personality. After all this must happen when a creature enjoys the beatific vision, for then the creature is faced with an object clearly able to satisfy every possible desire, and a contrary desire would be inconceivable.” (Pontifex 13-14)
   4. rebuttals of arguments against free choice
      1. the argument from statistics and physical causes
         1. “. . . in view of statistics and of the physical causes [15] which determine conduct, we must narrow the field of free choice . . .” (Pontifex 15-16)
         2. “Very many kinds of human action are clearly produced by causes other than free choice, and the problem is to see how we can plausibly find space for it.” (Pontifex 16)
         3. “. . . we are very frequently capable of making by our free choice some effort, however slight, in a certain direction, that is to say, of focusing our attention on a given end and acting accordingly in some degree, or of not doing so.” (Pontifex 16)
            1. “A par­ticular man at a particular time may not be capable of fully determining for himself the external act in question, but he may be capable of some degree of effort towards determining it.” (Pontifex 16)
            2. “For example, a criminal may have inherited a character of low intelligence and strong tendencies to evil, and all this may have been made worse by his environment. When a temptation to crime comes it may not be in his power to make such a strong effort that he will refrain from it, but it may be in his power to make some effort.” (Pontifex 16)
            3. “. . . all that the statistics show is that certain causes, arising from circumstances and physical facts, occur regularly . . . They do not show how often some freely chosen effort is made or omitted, or its degree of intensity. There may have been no possibility that this would show itself in outward act, and so statistics omit it altogether. Of course such a theory would not imply that free choice never causes outward acts, but only that this does not occur so often as might be expected.” (Pontifex 16)
         4. “Moreover, we may suppose that some people can exercise free choice far more easily than others. After all it is commonly agreed that training and education have as part of their purpose to develop self-control, that is to say, the power of the individual person to exercise free choice in the right direction.” (Pontifex 16)
         5. Rashdall “says, “Granted that an inmost kernel of undetermined action exists, it is something which is wholly inaccessible to human observation” (p. 323). This seems far too sweeping. I should agree that free choice is not nearly so visible in external conduct as might at first sight be expected, but I should hold that it is visible fairly frequently in some men at certain times, and that even the unsuccessful effort made to resist an overwhelming physical tendency may show in outward signs.” (Pontifex 17)
      2. Concerning the “objections to indeterminism which arise from the apparent absurdities to which it may seem to lead [see Rashdall’s “objections to indeterminism” above]: that a man’s real virtue or vice lies in that element alone which his free choice contributes to his conduct, and that, therefore, all that is due to the influence of others must be omitted if we are to estimate his conduct truly. I think an answer can be made to this, but it will be better to leave it until later on, when we consider the problems connected with God’s providence and free choice.” (Pontifex 17)
      3. “The fact of sin, that is to say, of wrong done by free choice, lies at the root of Christianity. Original sin would have no meaning in Christian doctrine, if it had been brought about by irresist­ible causes. The whole doctrine and practice of forgiveness of sins presupposes that they have been committed by free choice. For the Christian, or in any case for the Catholic, the matter is undoubtedly settled.” (Pontifex 15)
   5. arguments for free choice
      1. Most people claim “that at times they are directly and clearly aware of their power to choose. For example, they would feel sure that on certain occasions they have the power either to make a little more effort to carry out some purpose, or not to make it. Whatever difficulties may follow from this conviction, it seems to them so clear that it must be treated as a starting point for discussion.” (Pontifex 14)
      2. Free will is “supported by the instinctive way in which mankind acts . . . A court of law carries out its work in quite a different spirit from a group of doctors. At least, in common opinion punishment is not the same as the healing of disease.” (Pontifex 14)
      3. “. . . responsibility is usually regarded as an important virtue . . .” (Pontifex 14)
         1. If a determinist says that responsibility means only “that we ought to have the right desires and intentions, . . . then responsibility has not been ex­plained but explained away.” (Pontifex 15)
         2. For responsibility also means “that we ourselves can in some degree determine our desires . . .” (Pontifex 15)
      4. “. . . remorse is a feeling which most men have, yet, unless there is free choice, it must be baseless.” (Pontifex 15)
      5. “. . . how do we come to discuss whether we really have free choice, if there is no such thing?” (Pontifex 15)
      6. “How did . . . the mistaken notion that there was such an idea, ever arise, if there was nothing whatever in reality to justify it?” (Pontifex 15)
   6. conclusions
      1. “. . . there are, then, undoubtedly strong arguments on both sides . . .” (Pontifex 15)
      2. “From the point of view of natural reason alone, . . . all that could be said is that everyone must make up his mind for himself.” (Pontifex 15)
      3. But if one adds “the authority of the Church, . . . there can be no question . . .” (Pontifex 15)
         1. “The fact of sin, that is to say, of wrong done by free choice, lies at the root of Christianity.” (Pontifex 15)
         2. “Original sin would have no meaning in Christian doctrine, if it had been brought about by irresist­ible causes.” (Pontifex 15)
         3. “The whole doctrine and practice of forgiveness of sins presupposes that they have been committed by free choice.” (Pontifex 15)
         4. So, “For the Christian, or in any case for the Catholic, the matter is undoubtedly settled.” (Pontifex 15)
         5. “. . . though we are committed to accepting the fact of free choice, there is wide scope for discussion about how and when it takes place.” (Pontifex 15)

## Supernatural Revelation

## (Salvation History; God’s Plan of Salvation)

1. **revelation**: “. . . God chose to reveal Himself . . . This plan of revelation is realized by deeds and words having an inner unity: the deeds wrought by God in the history of salva­tion manifest and confirm the teaching and realities signified by the words, while the words proclaim the deeds and clarify the mystery contained in them.” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 2)
2. **salvation**: “Salvation consists in peace with God, . . . peace with oneself and with others.” [ix] “The salvation proclaimed by Scripture is peace, concord between God and man, and harmony among men.” [12] “Peace” in the New Testament “does not, as a rule, refer to a disposition in the individual person but to a state of the world. Peace is the condition of right relationship to God: it should bring about ordered relationships among men [1 Cor 14:33, “God is a God not of disorder but of peace”]. If everything is ordered and things stand in [112] right relation to one another, this constitutes a state of wholeness and health, the state of salvation. In the New Testament peace has the same meaning as salvation: only God can bring about salvation.” (Schmaus ix, 12, 112-113)
3. **salvation history**: **God’s interventions in history**
   1. “. . . God has shown grace in that again and again he has turned towards man, who had forsaken him . . .” (Schmaus ix)
   2. “The divine covenant in its various historical stages served this end . . .” (Schmaus ix)
      1. God “from the start manifested Himself to our first parents.” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 3)
      2. “. . . He called Abraham in order to make of him a great nation . . .” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 3)
      3. “. . . through Moses and the prophets, He taught this people to acknowledge Him­self the one living and true God, provident father and just judge, and to wait for the Savior promised by Him, and in this manner prepared the way for the Gospel down through the centuries.” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 3)
      4. “Then . . . He sent His Son . . .” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 4)
         1. “This Gospel had been promised in former times through the prophets, and Christ Himself had fulfilled it and promulgated it with His lips.” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 2 art. 7)
         2. “Jesus perfected revelation by fulfilling it through his whole work . . .” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 4) Christ “is both the mediator and the fullness of all revelation.” (ch. 1 art. 2) In Christ “the full revelation of the supreme God is brought to completion . . .” (ch. 2 art. 7)
         3. “The Christian dispensation, therefore, as the new and definitive covenant, will never pass away and we now await no further new public revelation . . .” (Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* ch. 1 art. 4)
         4. “In Christ, as the representative of the whole of humanity—indeed, of the whole creation—God has definitively reunited human history and the universe to himself . . .” (Schmaus x)
      5. “In and through the Church man encounters Jesus Christ, who is the bearer of salvation, and salvation itself. [ix] . . . Christ remains accessible in the Church, for he is salvifically present in it, as the People of God and his own Mystical Body . . .” (Schmaus x)
      6. “Until the second coming of Christ, the history of God’s relations with man . . . will not be lifted by any new word or act to a higher level of divine self-disclosure. Nevertheless as universal salvation history, the forward thrust of world history, it moves into the future endeavouring to draw every man . . .” (Schmaus x)
4. **God’s plan as a** “**mystery**”
   1. Rom 16:25, “Jesus Christ [is] the mystery that was kept secret for long ages . . .”
   2. Eph 1:9-11, God “has made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure that he set forth in Christ, 10as a plan for the fullness of time, to gather up all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth. 11In Christ we have also obtained an inheritance, having been destined according to the purpose of him who accomplishes all things according to his counsel and will . . .”
   3. Eph 3:3-19, “the mystery was made known to me by revelation, . . . 4. . . the mystery of Christ. 5In former generations this mystery was not made known to humankind, as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit: 6that is, the Gentiles have become fellow heirs . . . 8this grace was given to me to bring to the Gentiles the news of the boundless riches of Christ, 9and to make everyone see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things; 10so that through the church the wisdom of God in its rich variety might now be made known . . .”
   4. Col 1:26-2:2, “the mystery . . . has been hidden throughout the ages and generations but has now been revealed to his saints. 27To them God chose to make known how great among the Gentiles are the riches of the glory of this mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory. . . . 2:2God’s mystery, that is, Christ himself . . .” See Col 4:3, “the mystery of Christ . . .”
   5. 1 Tim 3:16, “the mystery of our religion is great: He was revealed in flesh, vindicated in spirit, seen by angels, proclaimed among Gentiles, believed in throughout the world, taken up in glory.”
   6. Heb 1:1-3, “Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, 2but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom he also created the worlds. 3He is the reflection of God’s glory and the exact imprint of God’s very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word. When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high . . .”
5. **the law as tutor in Paul**
   1. Rom 3:20-22, “. . . “no human being will be justified in his sight” by deeds prescribed by the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin. 21But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe.”
   2. Rom 4:3-16, “For what does the scripture say? “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness.” . . . 9“Faith was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness.” 10How then was it reckoned to him? Was it before or after he had been circumcised? It was not after, but before he was circumcised. 11He received the sign of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness that he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised. . . . 14If it is the adherents of the law who are to be the heirs, faith is null and the promise is void. 15For the law brings wrath; but where there is no law, neither is there violation. 16For this reason it depends on faith, in order that the promise may rest on grace and be guaranteed to all his descendants, not only to the adherents of the law but also to those who share the faith of Abraham . . .”
   3. Rom 7:5-13, “While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. . . . 7if it had not been for the law, I would not have known sin. I would not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, “You shall not covet.” 8But sin, seizing an opportunity in the commandment, produced in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead. . . . 13Did what is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, working death in me through what is good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure.”
   4. Gal 2:16-19, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law. . . . 19For through the law I died to the law, so that I might live to God.”
   5. Gal 3:8-26, “the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, declared the gospel beforehand to Abraham, saying, “All the Gentiles shall be blessed in you.” 9For this reason, those who believe are blessed with Abraham who believed. . . . 17My point is this: the law, which came four hundred thirty years later, does not annul a covenant previously ratified by God, so as to nullify the promise. 18For if the inheritance comes from the law, it no longer comes from the promise; but God granted it to Abraham through the promise. 19Why then the law? It was added because of transgressions . . . 21Is the law then opposed to the promises of God? Certainly not! For if a law had been given that could make alive, then righteousness would indeed come through the law. 22But the scripture has imprisoned all things under the power of sin, so that what was promised through faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe. 23Now before faith came, we were imprisoned and guarded under the law until faith would be revealed. 24Therefore the law was our disciplinarian until Christ came, so that we might be justified by faith. 25But now that faith has come, we are no longer subject to a disciplinarian, 26for in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith.”

## Objective and Subjective Redemption

1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . in the free decision of Christ, the human race has once more surrendered itself to God. But what took place in Christ must be actualized for every individual . . .” (Schmaus x)
   2. “We may regard the Redemption objectively or subjectively.” (Ott 177)
2. **objective redemption**
   1. “Objectively the Redemption is the work of the Redeemer . . .” (Ott 177)
   2. “The Redemption objectively considered, was fulfilled through the teaching and directing activity of Christ. In a supreme degree, however, it was effected on the Cross.” (Ott 177)
3. **subjective redemption**
   1. “. . . subjectively the Redemption is the realisation of the Redemption in individual men, or the application of the fruits of the Redemption to individual men (Justification).” (Ott 177)
   2. Objectively, “Christ’s work of Redemption effected the salvation of humanity from the burden of sin. [But subjectively,] the work of the Redemption must consist in . . . the [*individual’s*] turning towards God . . .” (Ott 177)
4. **synonyms**
   1. Sometimes, instead of “objective and subjective redemption,” “redemption and salvation” are used.
   2. “Christ has already redeemed us . . . [But] redemption [= objective redemption] is not the same as salvation [= subjective redemption] but is a necessary prelude. . . . in one sense we are all redeemed by Christ’s death on the Cross . . . but our salvation is conditional.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)

## “Grace”

HERE DO GLEASON, 39-56.

1. Greek *charis* (χάρις) became Latin *gratia*, from the adjective *gra­tus*, “pleas­ing.” (Daujat 10)
2. Christianity is the revelation that God loves us. That love’s effect is grace. (Daujat 9)
3. Our existence and our human nature are gifts, but grace is the added gift of his own divine sanctity. “By creation God is Love which gives; by grace he is Love which gives himself.” (Daujat 17-20??)

# Sin: Original and Personal

## Genesis 2:4b-3

**2** 4b In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, 5 when no plant of the field was yet in the earth and no herb of the field had yet sprung up—for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no one to till the ground; 6 but a stream would rise from the earth, and water the whole face of the ground—7 then the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being. 8 And the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, in the east; and there he put the man whom he had formed. 9 Out of the ground the Lord God made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food, the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. 10 A river flows out of Eden to water the garden, and from there it divides and becomes four branches. 11 The name of the first is Pishon; it is the one that flows around the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; 12 and the gold of that land is good; bdellium and onyx stone are there. 13 The name of the second river is Gihon; it is the one that flows around the whole land of Cush. 14 The name of the third river is Tigris, which flows east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates. 15 The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it. 16 And the Lord God commanded the man, “You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; 17 but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.” 18 Then the Lord God said, “It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper as his partner.” 19 So out of the ground the Lord God formed every animal of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called every living creature, that was its name. 20 The man gave names to all cattle, and to the birds of the air, and to every animal of the field; but for the man there was not found a helper as his partner. 21 So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; then he took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh. 22 And the rib that the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. 23 Then the man said, “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Woman, for out of Man this one was taken.” 24 Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh. 25 And the man and his wife were both naked, and were not ashamed.

**3** 1 Now the serpent was more crafty than any other wild animal that the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, “Did God say, ‘You shall not eat from any tree in the garden’?” 2 The woman said to the serpent, “We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden; 3 but God said, ‘You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the middle of the garden, nor shall you touch it, or you shall die.’” 4 But the serpent said to the woman, “You will not die; 5 for God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” 6 So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate; and she also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate. 7 Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made loincloths for them­selves. 8 They heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden at the time of the evening breeze, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden. 9 But the Lord God called to the man, and said to him, “Where are you?” 10 He said, “I heard the sound of you in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.” 11 He said, “Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?” 12 The man said, “The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me fruit from the tree, and I ate.” 13 Then the Lord God said to the woman, “What is this that you have done?” The woman said, “The serpent tricked me, and I ate.” 14 The Lord God said to the serpent, “Because you have done this, cursed are you among all animals and among all wild creatures; upon your belly you shall go, and dust you shall eat all the days of your life. 15 I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will strike your head, and you will strike his heel.” 16 To the woman he said, “I will greatly increase your pangs in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.” 17 And to the man he said, “Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, ‘You shall not eat of it,’ cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life; 18 thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field. 19 By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return.” 20 The man named his wife Eve, because she was the mother of all living. 21 And the Lord God made garments of skins for the man and for his wife, and clothed them. 22 Then the Lord God said, “See, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever”—23 there­fore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from which he was taken. 24 He drove out the man; and at the east of the garden of Eden he placed the cherubim, and a sword flaming and turning to guard the way to the tree of life.

## The Nature of the First Sin

1. **Adam and Eve sinned because they were immature**.
   1. Theophilus of Antioch (c. ad 150) wrote: “Adam, as yet only a child in years, was not fit to receive know­ledge. . . . God wished him to con­tinue simple and sincere by remain­ing a child.” (*Ad Autolycum* 2:23) (Hauret 111)
   2. Irenaeus (c. ad 180) wrote: “He was yet a child who had to grow natu­rally to reach his per­fection. . . . He did not have the perfect use of his facul­ties and so was easily de­ceived by the tempter.” (*Adver­sus haereses* 4:38) (Hauret 112)
   3. Clement of Alexandria (c. ad 200) wrote: “The first man played in Paradise as freely as a child. . . . he was led astray by lusts and came to manhood, by disobedi­ence.” (*Exhor­tation to the Greeks* 11) (Hauret 111)
   4. objections
      1. “The relative ignorance of the child does not neces­sarily imply a lack of moral discern­ment. Nor were our first par­ents child­ren, ex­cept in the sense that both of them en­joyed an inte­gral and inno­cent nature . . .” (Hauret 112)
      2. J sees the couple as “capable of contemplating trans­gres­sions even on their own.” (Vawter 78-79)
      3. “the severe pen­alties . . . imply a se­rious culpability . . . and ac­cordingly a know­ledge of good and evil.” (Hauret 113)
2. **Gen 3 is a pro­jection into the past of puberty**. “Yesterday there was play, today work. Yesterday, enjoyment of life without bitterness, today, the thought of imminent death poisons his existence. Yesterday his senses were at peace, now he knows struggle within himself.” (Hauret 130)
3. **The sin was wanting to try everything**.
   1. “. . . in the Bible contraries are often op­posed to convey the idea of totali­ty. Exam­ples are not lacking in Genesis (cf. 24:50; 31:­24). To know good and evil, then, meant . . . “knowing every­thing.” . . . To know good and evil, therefore, would be to al­low oneself *every sort of ex­peri­ence.*” (Hauret 114)
   2. “By forbidding the tree of good and evil, God forbade man to “try every­thing once,” and obliged him to use his freedom only within the limits of divine law.” (Hauret 116)
4. **The sin was sexual**.
   1. Proof: many details have sexual import.
      1. 3:1: the snake may be a phallic symbol.
      2. 3:5: The snake uses “an equivocal word [“know”] mean­ing both intel­lec­tual knowl­edge and mari­tal rela­tions.” (Hauret 118) See, e. g., Gen 4:1, “Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she con­ceived and bore Cain . . .”
      3. 3:6: Eve seems to be a seductress; as Sir 25:24 says, “From a woman sin had its begin­ning, and because of her we all die.” But 3:6bc only says, “she took of its fruit and ate; and she also gave some to her hus­band, and he ate.” “It is not said that the woman actually en­ticed her husband to eat . . .” (Maher 43)
      4. 3:7: Disobedience made Adam and Eve aware of their naked­ness.
         1. “. . . why should the mere sense of guilt aris­ing from any other sin have caused the guilty pair to feel the need of covering their gen­i­tals? . . . the sense of nakedness [implies] a change in their rela­tions to each oth­er as man and wom­an.” (Hartman 34-35)
         2. objection: “Their disobedience upset the bal­ance of their na­ture and the dis­order found its echo in their bo­dies. Before their sin our first parents knew sex without being em­barrassed by it. . . . The sacred au­thor immedi­ately drew at­tention to [their sense of na­kedness], not nec­essar­ily to inform us on the na­ture of the transgression, but be­cause the unruli­ness of the senses was the first outward sign of the fall.” (Hauret 119)
      5. 3:16: The woman’s punishment is labor pains and sexual long­ing for man. (Hartman 33-34) “. . . in one instance at least the penalty for having eaten the forbid­den fruit has sexu­al overtones (3:­16); thus . . . the offense might have been sexual as well.” (Vawter 71)
      6. 3:19: The principal punishment is death, and sex has to do with the trans­mis­sion of life. (Hartman 33)
   2. objections
      1. When the pro­hibition of eating the fruit was introduced in 2:17, the woman did not exist yet; the prohibition cannot pertain to sexual relations with her. (Vawter 71) Sir 25:24 is a “misogyn­istic interpre­tation . . .” (Vawter 79)
      2. The view that the sin was sexual appealed to Clement of Al­exan­dria and to Am­brose, but Augus­tine said of the idea, “it is ridiculous.” (Hauret 118)
      3. “. . . the knowledge of good and bad which is prohibited to man is also—and not by the tempter’s “exegesis” alone (3:5) but by God’s as well (3:22)—a preroga­tive of the Deity. It can there­fore hardly stand for a moral failing.” (Vawter 72)
5. **Gen 3 is a polemic against fertility cults**.
   1. “. . . the Yahwist could have used his story to wage a polemics against the fertility cult of Ca­naan . . .” (Vawter 71)
   2. Proof: “the ser­pent . . . would stand for the fertility god Baal (who often enough was in fact associated with the ser­pent as fertil­ity symbol) . . .” (Vawter 71)
   3. objection: the snake “is merely another of God’s cre­a­tures . . . and is not, therefore, an imme­diately obvi­ous candidate to re­present a rival deity . . .” (Vawter 72)
   4. ““By showing us Eve talking to the serpent . . . he de­picts her forget­ting her Creator and being tempted to put her . . . conjugal life, under the . . . blessing of licentious pa­gan worship.” [Qtd. from Cop­pens, *Con­naissance* 25-26, 45] . . . The sin of pride . . . was, then, accompanied [121] by a sin against the sanc­tity or con­secration of mar­riage. Later on, . . . Eve will con­fess her thence­forth un­shake­able faith in the cre­ative power of Yahweh . . .” I. e., Gen 4:1, “I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord.” (Hauret 121-22)
6. **The sin was intellectual pride**.
   1. “The sin is moreover an act of *hybris,* [to] put him on a par with God.” (Hartman 32)
   2. “. . . man claimed to decide for himself that what he wants is good [and] what he does not want is bad.” (Scott 99)
   3. “God has indeed reserved to himself . . . knowl­edge to which man can aspire only by attempting to transcend his creature­hood . . .” (Vawter 78) The snake persuades man to seek “what he can only experience [as] an unrequited lust.” (Vawter 78)
   4. proofs
      1. 3:5, the snake’s understanding: “you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”
      2. 3:22, God’s understanding: “the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil.”
      3. “. . . the habitual cast of . . . Hebrew thought [was] anti-in­tel­lectual . . .” (Hauret 114)
7. **Gen 3 is a paradigm of human conduct in the face of temptation**.
   1. the theory
      1. ““The man” and “the woman” of the story repre­sent “Ev­ery­man” and “Every­wo­man” . . .” (Maher 48) “The man and the woman of Genesis 2-3 are in­tended to repre­sent everyman . . .” (Vawter 89) “This is the story of ‘Everyman’.” (Davidson 28)
      2. “. . . the self-will of man [is], for the narrator, . . . not ancient story but an ever pres­ent reality.” (Davidson 48)
   2. Proof: in Hebrew, ΄*adam* means simply *man.*
   3. Therefore, Gen 3 does not describe a fall.
      1. Gen 2-3 do not describe “a fall in the sense that man after has become anything else than man was before. . . . it is man’s nature to be prone to wrongdoing (cf. Genesis 8:21, J). . . . no explanation is given for this undoubted fact of life, either by the Yahwist or by the Priestly author.” (Vawter 79)
      2. “The doctrine affirms that man is born into a sinful world and into a sinful race, and that from both of these he stands in need of re­demp­tion.” (Vawter 88)
   4. objection: “While the sacred author may have pro­jected the pain­ful story of daily life back to the be­ginnings, at the same time he proposed to explain the unhap­py lot of human be­ings.” (Hauret 131)

## Official Roman Catholic Statements on Gen 1-3

1. **Pope Leo XIII**, ***Providentissimus Deus***, **1893**
   1. “There can never, indeed, be any real discrepancy between the theologian and the physicist . . . If dissension should arise between them, here is the rule also laid down by St. Augus­tine for the theologian: “Whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures . . .”” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 21-22)
   2. “The Catholic interpreter, although he should show that these facts of natural science which investigators affirm to be now quite certain are not contrary to the Scripture rightly explained, must, nevertheless, always bear in mind, that much which has been held and proved as certain has afterwards been called in question and rejected.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 23)
2. **Pope Pius XII**, ***Divino Afflante Spiritu***, **1943**
   1. “. . . when Our Predecessor published the Encyclical Letter *Provi­den­tissi­mus Deus* [fifty years prior, 1893], hardly a single place in Palestine had begun to be explored by means of relevant excava­tions. . . . discov­eries [in] archaeology or in ancient history or literature . . . make better known the mentality of the ancient writers . . .” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 87, 99)
   2. “. . . the ancient peoples of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech which we use today: but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. What those exactly were the commentator cannot deter­mine in advance, but only after a careful examina­tion of the ancient literature of the East.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 97-98)
   3. “. . . if the wished-for solution be slow in coming or does not satisfy us, since perhaps a successful conclusion may be reserved to posterity, let us not wax impatient . . . No wonder if to one or the other question no solution wholly satisfactory will ever be found . . .” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 101)
3. **Pontifical Biblical Commission** (**founded 1902**), ***On the Historical Charac­ter of the First Chap­ters of Genesis***, **1909**
   1. “Whether [Gen 1-3] do not contain the narrative of things which actually happened, a narrative which corresponds to objective reality and his­toric truth; and whether we may teach that these chapters contain fables derived from mythologies and cosmologies belonging to older na­tions, but purified of all polythe­istic error and accommodated to monotheistic teach­ing by the sacred author or that they contain allegories and sym­bols destitute of any founda­tion in objective reality but presented under the garb of history for the purpose of inculcating religious and philosophical truth; or, finally, that they contain legends partly [122] historical and partly ficti­tious, freely handled for the instruction and edifica­tion of souls. *Answer:* In the negative to each part.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 122-23)
   2. “Whether, in particular, we may call in question the literal and histori­cal meaning where there is question of facts narrated in these chapters which touch the fundamental teachings of the Chris­tian religion, as for example, the creation of all things which was accom­plished by God at the beginning of time, the special creation of man, the forma­tion of the first woman from man, the unity of the human race, the original happi­ness of our first parents in a state of justice, integrity, and immor­tality, the divine command laid upon man to prove his obedience, the transgres­sion of that divine command at the instigation of the devil under the form of a ser­pent, the fall of our first parents from their primitive state of innocence, and the promise of a future Redeemer. *Answer:* In the negative.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 123)
   3. “. . . it was not the intention of the sacred author, when writing the first chapter of Genesis, to teach us in a scientific manner the innermost nature of visible things, and to present the complete order of creation but rather to furnish his people with a popular account, such as the common parlance of that age allowed, one, namely, adapted to the senses and to man’s intelligence . . .” 124
4. **Pontifical Biblical Commission**, ***Response to Archbishop Suhard***, **1948**
   1. “. . . there is no one today who doubts the existence of . . . sources or refuses to admit a progressive development of the Mosaic Laws due to social and religious conditions of later times, a develop­ment which is also manifest in the historical narratives.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 151-52)
   2. “Therefore, we invite Catholic scholars to study these problems, without prepossession, in the light of sound criticism and of the findings of other sciences connected with the subject-matter.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 152)
   3. “The question of the literary forms of the first eleven Chapters of Genesis is [complex. One can] neither deny nor affirm their historici­ty, taken as a whole . . . The first duty here incumbent upon scientific exege­sis con­sists before all in the attentive study of all the literary, scientif­ic, histor­ical, cultural and religious problems connected with these chapters . . . in a word, one should collate without prejudice all the subject-matter of the palaeon­tol­ogical and historical, epigraphic and literary sciences.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 152)
   4. “. . . they [Gen 1-3] relate in simple and figurative language, adapted to the understand­ing of a less developed people, the fundamental truths presupposed for the economy of salvation . . .” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 152)
5. **Pius XII**, **Encyclical *Humani generis*** (**1950**) (*Catholic Desktop Library*)
   1. “There are those who contend that the so-called system of evolution, not yet irrefutably demonstrated within the scope of the natural sciences, and admitted imprudently and indiscreetly, extends to the origin of all things, and who boldly entertain the monistic and pantheistic theory that the whole world is subject to continuous evolution.” (§ 2305)
   2. “. . . the magisterium of the Church does not forbid that the teaching of “evolution” be treated in accord with the present status of human disciplines and of theology, by investigations and disputations by learned men in both fields; insofar, of course, as the inquiry is concerned with the origin of the human body arising from already existing and living matter . . . Yet some with daring boldness transgress this freedom of discussion, acting as if the origin of the human body from previously existing and living matter, were already certain and demonstrated from certain already discovered indications, and deduced by reasoning, and as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this thinking.” (§ 2327)
6. **Pontifical Biblical Commission**, ***On the Proper Way to Teach Scripture***, **1950**
   1. “The professor should not attenuate nor conceal the *difficulties* and *obscurities* not infre­quently encountered by the interpreter of the Books of the Old Testament. He should rather attempt to unravel the problem, as far as his powers permit, with the aid of various sciences, after a fair and honest exposition of the question.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 162)
   2. Speakers on biblical topics “should see to it that in the topics to be considered stress is placed more on a positive presentation of matter that is clear and well investigated than on diffi­culties and doubtful questions. Yet, if in the presence of this audience it seems a good thing to consider even difficulties and objections, then the problem should be fairly and honestly proposed, and a good answer, backed by scientific reasoning, be given.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 171)
7. **The Role of the Commission**’**s Statements**
   1. Pope Pius X (Motu Proprio, *Praestantia sacrae Scripturae*, 1907): “all are bound in conscience to submit to the decisions of the Biblical Commission, which have been given in the past and which shall be given in the future, in the same way as to the Decrees which apper­tain to doctrine, issued by the Sacred Congregations and approved by the Sovereign Pontiff . . .” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 41)
   2. Sec­re­tary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (*Decrees of the Biblical Commission: A Recent Clarification*,1956): “the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission have great sig­ni­fi­­cance. Howev­er, as long as these decrees propose views which are neither immediately nor mediately connected with truths of faith and morals, it goes without saying that the scholar may pursue his research, provided always that he defers to the supreme teaching authority of the Church. . . . many problems emerge in an entirely new light, so that it is easy enough to smile at the narrowness and constraint which prevailed fifty years ago.” (*Rome and the Study of Scripture* 175)
8. **John Paul II**,***Truth Cannot Contradict Truth*** (**address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences**) **1996**
   1. “. . . the theory of evolution [is] more than a hypothesis. It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of knowledge. The convergence . . . is in itself a significant argument in favor of this theory.” (§ 4)
   2. “The Church’s magisterium is directly concerned with the question of evolution, for it involves the conception of man: Revelation teaches us [Gen 1:26-27] that he was created in the image and likeness of God. . . . Pius XII stressed this essential point: If the human body take its origin from pre-existent living matter, the spiritual soul is immediately created by God [*Humani Generis* 36]. Consequently, theories of evolution which, in accordance with the philosophies inspiring them, consider the spirit as emerging from the forces of living matter or as a mere epiphenomenon of this matter, are incompatible with the truth about man. Nor are they able to ground the dignity of the person.” (§ 5)
   3. “. . . does not the posing of such ontological discontinuity run counter to that physical continuity which seems to be the main thread of research into evolution[?] . . . The sciences of observation describe and measure the multiple manifestations of life with increasing precision and correlate them with the time line. The moment of transition to the spiritual cannot be the object of this kind of observation, which nevertheless can discover at the experimental level a series of very valuable signs indicating what is specific to the human being. But the experience of metaphysical knowledge, of self-awareness and self-reflection, of moral conscience, freedom, or again of aesthetic and religious experience, falls within the competence of philosophical analysis and reflection, while theology brings out its ultimate meaning according to the Creator’s plans.” (§ 6)

## Original Sin in Gen 3

Paul Hahn

The story in Gen 3 seems straightforward. In the garden of Eden, the snake tempts Eve to eat a forbidden fruit. She does so, then Adam eats some. God discovers the transgression and pronounces punishments, then expels the pair from Eden.

How much of this story really happened? There is a spectrum of opinions, ranging from “none of it” on the left to “some of it” in the center to “all of it” on the right.

Unbelievers generally dismiss Gen 3 as unhistorical because they do not consider any of the Bible to be especially authoritative. But this is a rejecting of the narrative itself, not just of its historicity; and such a rejection places one outside the Christian faith. One cannot do theology without presupposing the faith, and that includes the authority of the Bible. Since we are doing theology, we must set aside the position that dismisses the narrative entirely.

It is still possible, however, for believers to see the narrative as entirely unhistorical: it is, they would say, a fictional narrative that nevertheless teaches important religious truths.

At the opposite end of the spectrum are those who maintain that every detail of Gen 3 really happened. This position is held by fundamentalists. Their attitude toward its historicity depend more on their understanding of the doctrines of inspiration and inerrancy as on the probabilities of the events themselves. The basic positions on inspiration and inerrancy are: fundamentalism (the dictation theory of inspiration and the theory of absolute inerrancy) and the subtle theory (the subtle theory of inspiration and the theory of limited inerrancy). Our arguments against fundamentalism need not be repeated here; but they show that it is not necessary to accept every detail of the fall narrative as actual occurrence. Given the nature of the narrative—a talking snake, a first human couple already with fully developed language, a God who waits to take a walk until the heat of the day has passed (3:8) or who needs to discover what has happened by interrogating the couple (3:11-13)—no one would want to argue that every detail is what actually happened, unless compelled by fundamentalism to do so.

Setting aside the two extremes of unbelief and fundamentalism, we still find most of the spectrum as possible. Generally speaking, should we see the narrative as primarily unhistorical (left half of the spectrum) or primarily historical (right half of the spectrum)?

A hundred years ago, the Pontifical Biblical Commission, founded by Pope Pius X in 1902, issued a statement, *On the Historical Charac­ter of the First Chap­ters of Genesis* (1909). By that time, the Church recognized that scientific statements in scripture were not necessarily inerrant. Hence the Commission was willing to say that

it was not the intention of the sacred author, when writing the first chapter of Genesis, to teach us in a scientific manner the innermost nature of visible things, and to present the complete order of creation but rather to furnish his people with a popular account, such as the common parlance of that age allowed, one, namely, adapted to the senses and to man’s intelligence. (Qtd. in *Rome* 124)

But at that stage the Church did not willingly acknowledge that historical statements in scripture, not just scientific statements, might be erroneous. Hence it affirmed that Gen 1-3 (the two creation accounts and the fall story) “contain the narrative of things which actually happened, a narrative which corresponds to objective reality and his­toric truth . . .” It denied that the chapters “contain allegories and sym­bols destitute of any founda­tion in objective reality but presented under the garb of history for the purpose of inculcating religious and philosophical truth; or that they contain legends partly historical and partly ficti­tious” (qtd. in *Rome* 122-23).

The Commission, however, like the rest of the Church, learned much in the next decades, particularly about the time-conditioned literary forms in the Bible and the principle of progressive revelation. Both of these insights appeared in the Commission’s *Response to Archbishop Suhard* (1948). Suhard had, in fact, asked specifically about the historicity of Gen 1-3. The Commission replied,

there is no one today who doubts the existence of . . . sources or refuses to admit a progressive development . . . in the historical narratives. . . . [Gen 1-3] relate in simple and figurative language, adapted to the understand­ing of a less developed people, the fundamental truths presupposed for the economy of salvation. (Qtd. in *Rome* 151-52)

Whereas in 1907 Pius X had said (in the motu proprio *Praestantia sacrae Scripturae*) that “all are bound in conscience to submit to the decisions of the Biblical Commission . . . in the same way as to the Decrees which apper­tain to doctrine, issued by the Sacred Congregations and approved by the Sovereign Pontiff” (qtd. in *Rome* 41), by 1956 the secretary of the Commission himself could say (in *Decrees of the Biblical Commission: A Recent Clarification*), “many problems emerge in an entirely new light, so that it is easy enough to smile at the narrowness and constraint which prevailed fifty years ago” (qtd. in *Rome* 175).

Granted that Catholics are free to doubt the total historicity of Gen 1-3, the question still remains, is Gen 3 primarily historical or unhistorical? In fact, “The Church has never thought it necessary to settle the question by her authori­ty” (Hauret 122). This is true, not just for Gen 3, but for all of the first eleven chapters of Genesis (the quasi-mythical stories of creation, Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Noah and the flood, and the tower of Babel). About these the Pontifical Biblical Commission said (*Response to Archbishop Suhard*, 1948) that one can “neither deny nor affirm their historici­ty, taken as a whole” (qtd. in *Rome* 152). So the answer is: we do not know exactly to what extent Gen 3, the fall narrative, is historical.

It is useful in such cases as this to remember the words of Pius XII on difficulties in biblical interpretation (*Divino Afflante Spiritu*, 1943): “if the wished-for solution be slow in coming or does not satisfy us, since perhaps a successful conclusion may be reserved to posterity, let us not wax impatient . . . No wonder if to one or the other question no solution wholly satisfactory will ever be found” (qtd. in *Rome* 101).

But even if we cannot know in general to what extent Gen 3 is historical, we can still inquire as to the probability of certain details. Which aspects of Gen 3 are more likely to be historical, and which are not? Which precise details probably refer directly to historical realities, and which can be seen as symbolic?

A list of aspects of Gen 3 that must be accepted as historical was presented in the old Pontifical Biblical Commission’s document, *On the Historical Charac­ter of the First Chap­ters of Genesis* (1909). Back then, the Commission listed several aspects of Gen 3 and said that one could not “call in question the literal and histori­cal meaning” of them:

the original happi­ness of our first parents in a state of justice, integrity, and immor­tality,

the divine command laid upon man to prove his obedience,

the transgres­sion of that divine command at the instigation of the devil under the form of a ser­pent,

the fall of our first parents from their primitive state of innocence,

and the promise of a future Redeemer. (Qtd. in *Rome* 123, line breaks added)

But this was before Pius XII in *Divinu Afflante Spiritu* (1943) pointed out the importance of considering literary forms.

. . . the ancient peoples of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech which we use today: but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. . . . discov­eries [in] archaeology or in ancient history or literature . . . make better known the mentality of the ancient writers (*Rome* 97-99).

Consequently, today, even among those who accept a middle position (some of the narrative is historical, some is not), stances vary widely.

. . . exegetes differ on the extent to which the imagery over­flows in­to history. For some it is enough to retain only a broad and general ob­jective connection between the figurative setting and the historical real­ity described in it. Others give some de­tails a value going beyond the image and repre­senting reality. Each case must be examined in it­self. (Hauret 124)

Hauret himself takes a relatively conservative stance. Here is a table, reproduced from his *Beginnings*: *Genesis and Modern Science*, in which he attempts “to distinguish the ‘imagery’ from the historical reality” (180; the table is 180-82).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| THE IMAGERY | ESSENTIAL TEACHING |
| Yahweh fashions a clay figure (2:7a). | The body of the man, which is material, was created in a spe­cial manner by God. |
| Yahweh breathes his own breath into man’s nostrils (2:7b). | The man’s soul, which is spiritu­al and immortal, is produced di­rectly by God. |
| Yahweh takes one of man’s ribs and builds of it a woman (2:21-22). | Eve is of the same nature as Ad­am; hus­band and wife form one being, and the woman depends on the man. [180] |
| Yahweh forms a man and builds a wo­man (2:7, 22). | Unity of the human race; primi­tive mo­nogamy. |
| Yahweh places the man in the Gar­den of Eden (2:15). | God elevates man to a state above his nature. |
| The Bible describes the garden as an ide­al one situated in an ideal region (2:8-14). | Our first parents enjoyed perfect happi­ness. |
| There grows the tree of life (2:9). | They could not die. |
| There Adam reviews the animals and gives them names befitting their natures (2:19-20). | By his understanding and power, man is master over the animal world. |
| Man converses familiarly with his Cre­ator (3:8 ff). | He is admitted to friendship with God. |
| There grows the tree of know­ledge, a forbidden tree (3:30). | This original happiness is depen­dent on obedience. |
| The serpent (3:1) enters into con­versation with the woman (3:1-3). | The devil tempts the woman. |
| Deceived by the serpent, the wom­an takes the forbidden fruit and eats of it (3:6). | The woman, led astray by the dev­il, yields to temptation and com­mits sin. |
| Yahweh drives our first parents from paradise (3:23). | Intimacy with God and the privi­leges of holiness and original justice are lost. [181] |
| The Cherubim and the flaming sword guard the entrance to the Garden of Eden (3:24). | This happy state is definitively lost to the human race. |
| But the “seed of the woman” will crush the head of the serpent (3:15). | But a Savior, the son of the wom­an, will take revenge on the dev­il. [182] |

A somewhat less conservative position is taken by Louis Hartman. He maintains that, “if the Fall of Man is a mere myth devoid of all historic truth, then Christ died in vain . . .” According to him, “The teaching of the Church on original sin is firmly based on that of the NT”; he cites Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:21-22; John 8:44; 1 Tim 2:13-14 (Hartman 28). But Hartman does not feel it necessary to find relatively literal equivalents for Hauret’s fifteen instances of “imagery.”

A less conservative reading will be given by believers who consider the truth of Gen 3 to be like that of a fictional narrative. A work of fiction may contain no historical facts but may still convey important truths; after all, not all truths are historical. In *Moby Dick*, for example, the white whale is, at least in part, a symbol of the impenetrable mystery and overwhelming power of existence (hence the repeated references to Ahab’s “blasphemy”). The novel is not historical (despite many historical details about the practice of nineteenth-century whaling), but it communicates a theological truth: existence is beyond our understanding and beyond our control. Perhaps Gen 3 is similarly unhistorical while containing theological truths.

Pope Benedict XVI (Joseph Ratzinger, former head of the Vatican’s Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) acknowledges in Gen 1-3 “the distinction between the image and what is intended to be expressed” (17). His attempt to distinguish imagery from historical reality results in a less conservative evaluation than Hauret’s (he is writing twenty-six years later). Benedict appeals to progressive revelation: “Scripture in its entirety was not written from beginning to end like a novel or a textbook. It is, rather, the echo of God’s history with his people” (18). Specifically concerning Gen 1-3, Ratzinger says: “In the Bible itself the images are free and they correct themselves ongoingly. In this way they show, by means of a gradual and interreactive process, that they are only images, which reveal something deeper and greater” (24-25). Thus one can deny, for example, that Gen 1 is an historical account of creation (exactly seven days, etc.) and still maintain that Gen 1 communicates important theological truths: that God is one; that God is creator of all; that he is omnipotent (creation by a mere word); that the universe is radically contingent upon God; that all creation is good; that humankind is made in God’s image; that humankind is the apex of creation; and so on.

Concerning Gen 3 specifically, there are some scholars, believers of good will, who are further to the left than Benedict. They hold that the fall narrative has no historical content. The truths of Gen 3 are fictional truths, like those of *Moby Dick* or those of Jesus’ parables. (As G. Ernest Wright once said, “the parabolic aim [of Gen 3] is so obvious that for a parallel one might turn to the parables of Jesus” [83].) Just as Jesus’ parables are completely fictional yet communicate theological truths, so Gen 3 is unhistorical but communicates theological truths. Bruce Vawter, for example, calls Gen 3 a myth, but not in a pejorative sense. For him a myth is not (as in popular usage) an untrue story; it is “a society’s at­tempt to dramatize its faith in its own identity and its insti­tu­tions” (64). Vawter would uphold the narrative’s theological truths but deny any historical claims.

Is an interpretation of Gen 3 that sees some history in it preferable to an interpretation that sees only myth (in the good sense)? I believe a middle position is preferable. The author of Gen 3 did, after all, seem to have some historical intention in writing. Gen 3 is *etiological*. An etiology is a story that intends to explain some aspect of present-day reality by narrating an event in the past that determined that aspect of reality. So, for example, Gen 3 is intended to explain why humans today are sinful. But this gets into the question of the nature of the first sin, and that is a topic for another time.

## Original Sin in Scripture

1. **original sin in the Old Testament**
   1. The general Hebrew word for “sin” (*het´* or *hattat´*) means “to miss the mark,” like an arrow falling short. (Urban 128; McKenzie 817)
   2. Gen 3 is the fall narrative.
   3. Gen 3 in later Old-Testament tradition
      1. “. . . earlier OT references [to Gen 3] are merely to Paradise as a luxuriant garden . . .” (Hartman 26)
         1. Gen 13:10, “Lot looked about him, and saw that the plain of the Jordan was well watered everywhere like the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, in the direction of Zoar; this was before the Lord had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.”
         2. Isa 51:3, “For the Lord will comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places, and will make her wilderness like Eden, her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness will be found in her, thanksgiving and the voice of song.”
         3. Ezek 31:8-9, “The cedars in the garden of God could not rival it, nor the fir trees equal its boughs; the plane trees were as nothing compared with its branches; no tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty. 9I made it beautiful with its mass of branches, the envy of all the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God.”
         4. Joel 2:3, “Fire devours in front of them [the army attacking Israel on the Day of the Lord], and behind them a flame burns. Before them the land is like the garden of Eden, but after them a desolate wilderness, and nothing escapes them.”
      2. “Only the last pre-Christian Sages of Israel make direct reference to the sin of our first parents . . .” (Hartman 26)
         1. c 450 bc: Job 15:7, “Are you the firstborn of the human race? Were you brought forth before the hills?”
         2. c 190 bc: Sir 25:24, “From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die.”
         3. c 100-50 bc: Wis 2:23-24, “God created us for incorruption, and made us in the image of his own eternity, 24but through the devil’s envy death entered the world, and those who belong to his company experience it.”
   4. The Old Testament speaks of “hard­ness of heart.”
   5. Ps 51:5, “I was born guilty, a sinner when my mother conceived me.”
   6. Usually “sin” means knowing something is wrong and deciding to do it anyway. But then how can original sin be called “sin,” since a tenden­cy is not a decision? But the Old Testament does not restrict “sin” to choosing evil; it also uses “sin” to refer to a state of being. (Urban 128)
2. **“sin” in intertestamental and rabbinic literature**: Adam had both an inclination to sin (*yetzer hara*, which caused Adam to sin) and an inclination to do good (*yet­zer tov*). (Urban 133, 136)
3. **a state of sin in Jesus’ sayings**
   1. Matt 15:19 (par. Mark 7:21-22), “out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander.”
   2. Mark 7:21-22, “it is from within, from the human heart, that evil intentions come: fornication, theft, murder, 22adultery, avarice, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, folly.”
   3. Luke 6:45, “The good person out of the good treasure of the heart produces good, and the evil person out of evil treasure produces evil; for it is out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaks.”
   4. Nowadays “heart” usually means “seat of emotions.” But in the Bible “heart” usually means the “soul” (including intellect and will).
4. **a state of sin in the Pauline letters**
   1. Paul uses the Adam-Christ typology in Rom 5:12-21 and 1 Cor 15:20-22, 45-48 (it is also implicit in the story of Jesus’ temptations). (See the separate handout, “The Adam-Christ Typology.”)
   2. 1 Tim 2:13-14, “For Adam was formed first, then Eve; 14and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.”

## The Adam-Christ Typology

1. **Rom 5:12-21**
   1. Rom 5:12-21, “just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned—13sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. 14Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come. 15But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died through the one man’s trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many. 16And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification. 17If, because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness exercise dominion in life through the one man, Jesus Christ. 18Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all. 19For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous. 20But law came in, with the result that the trespass multiplied; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, 21so that, just as sin exercised dominion in death, so grace might also exercise dominion through justification leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”
2. **1 Cor 15:20-22, 45-48**
   1. 1 Cor 15:20-22, 45-48, “Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have died. 21For since death came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; 22for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ. . . . 45Thus it is written, “The first man, Adam, became a living being”; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit. 46But it is not the spiritual that is first, but the physical, and then the spiritual. 47The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven. 48As was the man of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the man of heaven, so are those who are of heaven.”
3. **Jesus’ temptations**
   1. “The Messiah also appears as the “new Adam” in the story of the temptation of Jesus as a counterpart to the temptation in the Garden of Eden . . .” (Trooster 60)
   2. Matt 4:1-11, “Then Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. 2He fasted forty days and forty nights, and afterwards he was famished. 3The tempter came and said to him, “If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread.” 4But he answered, “It is written, ‘One does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.’” 5Then the devil took him to the holy city and placed him on the pinnacle of the temple, 6saying to him, “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down; for it is written, ‘He will command his angels concerning you,’ and ‘On their hands they will bear you up, so that you will not dash your foot against a stone.’” 7Jesus said to him, “Again it is written, ‘Do not put the Lord your God to the test.’” 8Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor; 9and he said to him, “All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me.” 10Jesus said to him, “Away with you, Satan! for it is written, ‘Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him.’” 11Then the devil left him, and suddenly angels came and waited on him.”
   3. Mark 1:12-13, “And the Spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness. 13He was in the wilderness forty days, tempted by Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels waited on him.”
   4. Luke 4:1-13, “Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness, 2where for forty days he was tempted by the devil. He ate nothing at all during those days, and when they were over, he was famished. 3The devil said to him, “If you are the Son of God, command this stone to become a loaf of bread.” 4Jesus answered him, “It is written, ‘One does not live by bread alone.’” 5Then the devil led him up and showed him in an instant all the kingdoms of the world. 6And the devil said to him, “To you I will give their glory and all this authority; for it has been given over to me, and I give it to anyone I please. 7If you, then, will worship me, it will all be yours.” 8Jesus answered him, “It is written, ‘Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him.’” 9Then the devil took him to Jerusalem, and placed him on the pinnacle of the temple, saying to him, “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down from here, 10for it is written, ‘He will command his angels concerning you, to protect you,’ 11and ‘On their hands they will bear you up, so that you will not dash your foot against a stone.’” 12Jesus answered him, “It is said, ‘Do not put the Lord your God to the test.’” 13When the devil had finished every test, he departed from him until an opportune time.”

## Original Sin in Rom 5:12-21

1. **original sin in Rom 5:12-21**
   1. introduction
      1. Paul probably got the ideas of Adam as the first sinner, later generations sinning through him, and phys­ical death as a punishment for sin from intertestamental literature. (Urban 135)
      2. But Paul does not specify whether the transmission is bio­logical or psychological/­so­ci­ol­o­gi­cal. (Urban 135, 138)
      3. “. . . there is a tendency to assume that in this passage [Rom 5:12-21] the Apostle has “historicized” motifs occurring in the story of paradise. This would mean that he incorrectly understood as historical those texts that were originally meant to convey doctrinal matters only. The later tradition of the Church unanimously considered Paul the most important witness to the scriptural revelation of the mystery of original sin. An erroneous position, however, in terms of the historicization issue would tend to cast doubt on the validity of this reputation. Could one even go so far as to admit that in his thought a misconception breaks through which renders the later ecclesiastical doctrine on this point incomprehensible and unacceptable?” (Trooster 75)
   2. Paul’s concept of original sin in the context of Romans
      1. Rom 5:12-21 is only the second half of ch. 5; the context shows that “the Apostle is certainly not concerned with an exclusive treatment of—let alone with proof for—the existence of original sin. On the contrary, . . . he makes use of the motif of Adam’s fall exclusively to illuminate once again the actual theme of the whole letter . . . The actual theme can be formulated in the following thesis: in Christ alone there is redemption and salvation for all; only a believing surrender to Christ and his work of salvation in us means victory over sin in man and justification . . .” (Trooster 77)
      2. “Actually Romans 5 reverts back to an idea that has already been treated extensively in the first three chapters of this letter: although the Gentiles possess . . . the natural law [Rom 2:12-16, 26-27], and although the Jews have had the Law of Moses [Rom 2:17-25, 27-3:2], neither has been able to live without sin and thus be righteous in the eyes of God [Rom 3:9-23].” (Trooster 77)
         1. After introductory material (Rom 1:1-15), there follows in Romans the passage, 1:16-3:31. A first thesis here is, “all have sinned” (3:23); this thesis in turn establishes a second thesis, that all need justification by faith. To prove the first thesis, Paul discusses, sometimes the sinfulness of the Jews (2:17-25; 3:1-9a, 19-20), sometimes the sinfulness of the Greeks (2:14-16, 2:26-29), and sometimes the sinfulness of both at once (1:16-17; 2:1-13, 28-29; 3:9b-18, 21-31). Here is a summary the passage.
         2. Rom 2:11-3:30, “God shows no partiality. 12All who have sinned apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. . . . 3:1Then what advantage has the Jew? . . . 9Are we any better off? No, not at all; for we have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin, 10as it is written: “There is no one who is righteous, not even one” . . . 21But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, 23since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; 24they are now justified by his grace as a gift . . . 28a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. 29Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, 30since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith.”
      3. “This same thought is reintroduced in Romans 5. . . . The reconciliatory effects of man’s faith in Christ are expressed first and foremost in those verses of chapter 5, which immediately precede the text on “original sin” . . .” (Trooster 78)
         1. Rom 5:1-11, “Therefore, since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, 2through whom we have obtained access to this grace in which we stand; and we boast in our hope of sharing the glory of God. 3And not only that, but we also boast in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, 4and endurance produces character, and character produces hope, 5and hope does not disappoint us, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us. 6For while we were still weak, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly. 7Indeed, rarely will anyone die for a righteous person—though perhaps for a good person someone might actually dare to die. 8But God proves his love for us in that while we still were sinners Christ died for us. 9Much more surely then, now that we have been justified by his blood, will we be saved through him from the wrath of God. 10For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life. 11But more than that, we even boast in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation.”
         2. In Rom 5 “universal sinfulness is reduced to its very root, the sin of Adam. This theme, however, is introduced exclusively to shed light upon the . . . redemptive merit of faith in Christ which eliminates all distinctions between Jews and Gentiles before God.” (Trooster 78)
      4. The principal theme of Romans is the “all-redemptive merits of the “reconciliation” obtained for man by Christ; merits that are still being continuously bestowed upon those who believe in him. [“Reconciliation”] identifies salvation in Christ as the restoration of the original state of blessedness as once intended and created by God. . . . It means here “to restore to the original peace and friendship” (vv. 10-11). It is this formulation that harmoniously introduces the subsequent arguments from the Old Testament account of Adam’s fall.” (Trooster 79)
      5. “. . . we are not dealing here with a direct treatment of the mystery of original sin; this becomes amply clear from the structure of the “passage on original sin” itself.” (Trooster 80)
         1. “. . . the comparison started in verse 12 with “Therefore as” is abruptly broken off, not to be taken up again until verse 19 where we then finally find the corresponding “so” . . .” (Trooster 80) Rom 5:12, 19, “Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned . . . 19. . . just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous.”
         2. “What lies in between are really more or less faltering approximations of the main theme intended to prepare us for a better understanding of its central message.” (Trooster 80)
            1. Rom 5:13-14 “stress once more the universality of the dominion of sin and death unleashed in the world by Adam . . .” (Trooster 80) Rom 5:13-14, “sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. 14Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.”
            2. Rom 5:15-17 “warn us that we must not see the comparison Adam-Christ as composed of two equally important issues . . . Surpassing by far Adam’s universal all-embracing guilt is the abundance of Christ’s grace.” (Trooster 80) Rom 5:15-17, “But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died through the one man’s trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many. 16And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification. 17If, because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness exercise dominion in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.”
            3. “Only then follow verses 18-19 with their concise Pauline formulation of “original sin” as the counterpart to our justification in Christ . . .” (Trooster 80) Rom 5:18-19, “Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all. 19For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous.”
         3. “. . . verses 20-21 lead this view back to the main theme of the letter to the Romans . . .” (Trooster 80) Rom 5:20-21, “But law came in, with the result that the trespass multiplied; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, 21so that, just as sin exercised dominion in death, so grace might also exercise dominion through justification leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”
   3. “. . . we would like to elucidate a number of words and concepts” in Rom 5:12-21. (Trooster 80)
      1. traditional treatment of Rom 5:12
         1. Rom 5:12, Greek: “death spread to all because [ἐφ’ ᾧ] all have sinned . . .”
         2. Rom 5:12, Old Latin: “death passed to all men in whom [*in quo*] all men sinned . . .”
         3. For Origen, Rom 5:12’s ἐφ’ ᾧ = “in whom.” Origen’s *Commentary on Romans* says the race was present in Adam’s loins. But ἐφ’ ᾧ as “in whom” may be an addition by Rufinus. (Kelly, *Early* 181)
         4. Ambrosiaster (an anonymous Roman theologian of the 300s ad) and Augustine (354-430) follow the Old Latin *in quo*.
         5. Theodoret (bishop of Cyprus, ad 423 on) expressly denies that ἐφ’ ᾧ means “in whom” and says it means “because.” Hence he wrote (*In Rom*. 5:12), “each of us undergoes the sentence of death because of his own sin, not because of the sin of our first parent.” (Kelly 373)
      2. Rom 5:12c (“Therefore, [a] just as sin came into the world through one man, [b] and death came through sin, [c] and so death spread to all because all have sinned . . .”)
         1. “The greatest difficulties . . . are caused by the last short statement of verse 12: “because all men sinned.”” (Trooster 81)
         2. “In the days of St. Augustine this sentence was translated from the Greek as follows: “in whom [Adam] all men sinned.” The intent was really: “in Adam all men are sinners.” As a defense against Pelagius and his followers, who only accepted personal sins but not original sin, it was hoped that every thought of personal sins could be suppressed in Paul’s text.” (Trooster 81)
         3. But “in whom” is incorrect: one should translate “because.” (Trooster 81)
         4. “. . . the phrase “because all men sinned” retained until recently the meaning “because all are [81] sinners”; and one can add to this: “in Adam.”” (Trooster 81-82)
         5. Yet Stanislas Lyonnet (“Le péché original et l’exégèse de Rm. 5:12,” *Recherches de sciences religieuses* 44 [1956]: 63-84) “has shown conclusively that the Greek word used actually does mean “to sin” in a real, active sense, and that the translation “all are sinners” is therefore incorrect. It is quite definite then that Paul speaks here about the personal sins of “all men,” so that this troublesome subordinate clause would have to be correctly rendered as follows: “given the fact that all men sinned (personally).”” (Trooster 82)
         6. “This rule of sin [5:12, 14, 17] has not come upon all of mankind as an inevitable fate, but it has been personally affirmed and realized by “all” in the fact that “all have sinned.” Hence the universal depravity of mankind does not constitute a being-determined because of one man’s sin; nay, man’s universal sinfulness prevails so universally precisely because each of us has affirmed and perpetuated it through his personal sins. Nevertheless these personal sins are a substantiation of the reign of sin as it took possession of man through Adam’s sin.” (Trooster 82)
      3. Rom 5:13-14 (“sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. 14Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.”)
         1. “The “classical” interpretation sees in verses 13-14 an *ad hominem* argument designed to prove that in man a state of sinfulness exists apart from his personal sins. It makes original sin all-important. According to this traditional view Paul supposedly reasons as follows: During the period between Adam and Moses there could be no question of personal sins, because there was really no Law and sin is transgression of God’s Law. Yet “sin indeed was in the world,” witness the undeniable fact that “death reigned from Adam to Moses”. Hence this death must have proclaimed our “being-sinners in Adam”, it must have revealed original sin in us.” (Trooster 82)
         2. “Lyonnet and his associates, however, consider this position [82] untenable. For it was especially in Paul’s time that the period from Adam to Moses was considered as an era in which human depravity was rampant. And so especially in his time apocryphal writings vividly portray as historical events themes such as those of the Flood and Sodom and Gomorrah. . . . [Rom 5:13-14] could be paraphrased as follows: during the era before Moses sin generally prevailed; proof of this is the reign of death. Now you Jews say “but sin is not counted where there is no law,” but I must remind you of the fact that “yet death reigned from Adam to Moses. . . .” Let us assume that at that time sin was not a formal transgression of the Law; nevertheless, the universal reign of death proves that even then “all men sinned.” And their sins were committed in the sense of verse 12: they were personal sins as affirmation of the rule of sin established by Adam in this world.” (Trooster 82-83)
      4. Rom 5:15-17 (“But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died through the one man’s trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many. 16And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification. 17If, because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness exercise dominion in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.”)
         1. In 15-17, “the antithesis to the reconciliation through Christ as described in verse 12 [“as sin came into the world through one man” and “because all have sinned”] is repeated [15, “if the many died through the one man’s trespass”; 16, “the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation”; 17, “because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one”] . . .” (Trooster 83)
         2. “But as a parallel to this we find just as literal a stress on the idea that: “the free gift following many trespasses brings justification” (v. 16), and “Law came in, to increase the trespass” (v. 20). Hence the following conclusion appears inescapable: the universal sinfulness of all men, from which the grace of Jesus Christ redeems us, is to Paul the reign of sin “through one man” affirmed and perpetuated through “many trespasses.”” (Trooster 83)
      5. Rom 5:19 (“For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous.”)
         1. “As a final noteworthy point we would like to refer to verse 19 which emphatically states that “by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners” and in this context this is indeed the only possible correct translation from the verb used in Greek.” (Trooster 84)
      6. summary: the relationship in 5:12 between “through one man” and “because all have sinned” “determines the entire thought-content of the text: verses 13-14 underscore once more the universality of sin; verses 15-17 again stress “through one man’s trespass” as the cause of death and “condemnation” for all, but at the same time they also specify [84] that the state of iniquity from which Christ saved us obtains its concrete reality from “many trespasses” (cf. also v. 20).” (Trooster 84-85)
   4. “Adam” in Rom 5
      1. In Rom 5:12-21 “several motifs from the Old Testament account of paradise have been more concisely and more concretely formulated.” (Trooster 84)
         1. “Adam, for instance, is visualized here much more distinctly as an (historically) individual person, “one man.”” (Trooster 84)
         2. “Furthermore, the reign of sin and death as universal tragic realities have been much more strongly emphasized: Paul writes “sin” and “death” in the sense of generic concepts, and for him they are well-nigh personified powers representing evil in mankind. They hold sway over “all men,” their rule enslaves all without exception. “Death” then is envisioned as a manifestation of “sin,” and it means the extinction of life in and through God. Thus the reign of death manifests the dominion of sin which “came into the world through one man.”” (Trooster 84)
         3. “Also this “transgression” on the part of this “one man” is described more concretely as that evil *fact* through which the power of “sin” and “death” were unleashed in the world.” (Trooster 84)
         4. “Finally the personal sins of “all men” are explicitly mentioned as many evil facts through which the dominion of sin, introduced “into the world through one man,” has been constantly strengthened and perpetuated.” (Trooster 84)
      2. historicization of Adam in Rom 5
         1. introduction
            1. “Contemporary theologians [assume Paul’s] “*historicization*” of the original ideas on the matter as found in Gen. 3. [Historicization] consists in the later evaluation as historical of texts that were originally only intended to convey doctrines. Paul is particularly supposed to have construed Adam as an historical, purely individual-personal human being. They propose that we should understand these texts once again as expressions of doctrinal thought and refrain from interpreting them as reflecting any historical reality whatsoever.” (Trooster 85)
            2. It is true that “historicization of the texts of the Old Testament . . . was common at the time of St. Paul.” (Trooster 85)

Example: the LXX “already uses the names “Adam” and “Eve” as proper names and without the article (whereas in Hebrew they did have the article).” (Trooster 85)

Example: “In apocryphal writings from the days of St. Paul we indeed find Adam and Eve portrayed purely as individual persons.” (Trooster 85)

* + - * 1. “. . . there is no reason why Paul should not speak about Adam in terms customary at his time.” (Trooster 85)
    1. But “Who is this “one man,” this Adam, that is being constantly referred to in Romans 5?” (Trooster 85)
       1. Rom 5:14 says “Adam . . . is a type of the one who was to come.”
       2. “In Paul’s thinking the nature of the “one man,” Adam, is completely determined by the “one man, Jesus Christ” . . .” (Trooster 85)
       3. So: Who was Christ for Paul?
          1. Christ “is the eschatological fulfillment and revelation of what was [85] protologically realized and revealed in Adam. In the “one man, Jesus Christ” is manifested who the “one man”, Adam, was.” [“For an excellent treatment of the typology Adam-Christ, *see* J. Danielou [*sic*], *Approches du Christ* (Paris, Grasset, 1960), pp. 96-101.” 86 n. 3] (Trooster 85-86)
          2. For Paul, Christ “is the one in whom was ultimately realized every aspect of mankind the way God had projected it into his original plan of creation.” (Trooster 86)

Col 1:15, “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation . . .”

* + - * 1. “In Christ, the glorified One, there was ultimately realized in all its fullness God’s original plan of creation and salvation . . .” (Trooster 86)

Gen 1:26-27, “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness . . . 27So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them . . .”

Col 1:17, “He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together.” This “means that in Him as a strictly individual-personal man all of creation and all mankind have attained to the life originally intended by the Creator for the world.” (Trooster 86)

“Being-man now evidently means “to be conformed to the image of his Son”” (Rom 8:29, nrsv). (Trooster 86)

1 Cor 15:49, “Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we will also bear the image of the man of heaven.”

2 Cor 3:18, “all of us . . . are being transformed into the same image [Christ’s] . . .”

1 Cor 3:21-23, “all things are yours, 22whether . . . the world or life or death or the present or the future—all belong to you, 23and you belong to Christ, and Christ belongs to God.” “Here too Christ is the ultimate, eschatological realization of being-man.” (Trooster 86)

texts on the mystical body of Christ

John 15:1-6, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinegrower. 2He removes every branch in me that bears no fruit. Every branch that bears fruit he prunes to make it bear more fruit. 3You have already been cleansed by the word that I have spoken to you. 4Abide in me as I abide in you. Just as the branch cannot bear fruit by itself unless it abides in the vine, neither can you unless you abide in me. 5I am the vine, you are the branches. Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing. 6Whoever does not abide in me is thrown away like a branch and withers; such branches are gathered, thrown into the fire, and burned.”

Acts 9:3-5, “Now as he was going along and approaching Damascus, suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him. 4He fell to the ground and heard a voice saying to him, “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?” 5He asked, “Who are you, Lord?” The reply came, “I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting.””

Rom 12:4-5, “For as in one body we have many members, and not all the members have the same function, 5so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another.”

1 Cor 6:15-19, “Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? . . . 17anyone united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him. 19your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God . . .”

1 Cor 10:16-17, “The bread that we break, is it not a sharing in the body of Christ? 17Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.”

1 Cor 12:12-27, “just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. 13For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and we were all made to drink of one Spirit. 14Indeed, the body does not consist of one member but of many. . . . 20there are many members, yet one body. . . . 27Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it.”

2 Cor 4:8, 10, “we are afflicted . . . 10always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be made visible in our bodies.”

Gal 3:28, “There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.” “. . . “one” is written as a singular masculine: “one, one man” . . .” (Trooster 86)

Eph 1:23, the church “is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all.”

Eph 3:6, “the Gentiles have become fellow heirs, members of the same body . . .”

Eph 4:4-25, “There is one body and one Spirit . . . 11The gifts he gave were that some would be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, 12to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, 13until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ. . . . 15we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, 16from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body’s growth in building itself up in love. . . . 25let all of us speak the truth to our neighbors, for we are members of one another.”

Eph 5:23, “. . . Christ is the head of the church, the body of which he is the Savior.”

Eph 5:29-30, “. . . Christ [cares] for the church, 30because we are members of his body.”

Col 1:18, “He is the head of the body, the church . . .”

Col 1:24, “his body, that is, the church.”

Col 2:19, one should be “holding fast to the head, from whom the whole body, nourished and held together by its ligaments and sinews, grows with a growth that is from God.”

Col 3:11, “there is no longer Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and free; but Christ is all and in all!”

Col 3:15, “you were called in the one body.”

“In Christ human existence culminates eschatologically according to God’s plan of salvation and creation. . . . Christ is eschatologically the “corporate personality” par excellence, i. e., a strictly individual man who at the same time, however, epitomizes in Himself and personifies all of mankind according to God’s ultimate intention, and He does this in the most real sense of the word.” (Trooster 86)

* + - 1. Thus also the “one man,” Adam, of Romans 5, as “a type of the one who was to come” [Rom 5:14 nrsv] indeed appears to transcend the merely chronologically first man standing at the beginning of the history of mankind. For in the light of the “one man Jesus Christ”, Paul must have certainly also seen him as “corporate personality” . . .” (Trooster 87)
         1. Adam is “a concretely individual man, a fact which is now indeed more distinctly expressed than in Gen. 2-3.” (Trooster 87)
         2. “However, as “corporate personality” this individual man, Adam, also represents and epitomizes in himself all of mankind, albeit now human existence insofar as it is overshadowed by the reign of sin.” (Trooster 87)
    1. “Admittedly, the Apostle historicized “Adam,” but in the typology Adam-Christ, Adam immediately transcends the purely chronologically first man, and becomes at least just as much in a protological sense the “first man” who, as in Gen. 3, represents all of mankind steeped in sin.” (Trooster 87)
       1. “In Paul’s terminology Adam could be best characterized by the concept “first-born”; “first-born”, in the specifically scriptural sense of the word, the “first man,” represents all his brethren before God.” (Trooster 87)
       2. “Of course, in this context Paul thinks of Adam as the “first man” in the sense of the sinful opposite of complete dedication to God. But for the rest the concept is altogether applicable, namely, as the one who initiates the long lineage of “brethren” and precisely in this he includes all before God. He is indeed an individual person, but one who, in his relationship with God, personifies the existence of all. In the typology Adam-Christ, Adam only then appears completely as “type of the one who was to come” when in an analogical sense he is as Christ “the first-born among many brethren” [Rom 8:29, “the firstborn within a large family”]. . . . [In Rom 5:12-21] he represents these “brethren” in their solidarity in rejecting God’s redemptive love, in their universal sinfulness which has unleashed and perpetuated the powers of “sin” in this world.
  1. conclusions
     1. “Thus “one man’s trespass” becomes protologically the “first” sin which in this very capacity includes all of humanity’s universal depravity. Hence the repeatedly established connection between “one man’s trespass” and the fact that “all men sinned.”” (Trooster 87)
     2. what Paul did not think
        1. “So Paul thinks of “one man’s trespass” not in terms of an event that allegedly had no further consequences for the subsequent course of man’s history of salvation and the evils that have tainted it.” (Trooster 87)
        2. “Nor does he think of it as a purely symbolic representation of all that actually lives in every man as good and evil and as salvation (as Brunner thought).” (Trooster 88)
        3. “But neither did Paul conceive of this “one man’s trespass” as the beginning of a contamination process in which every individual father supposedly transmits Adam’s sin to his children (as usually suggested by the traditional view of original sin).” (Trooster 88)
     3. “No, he is speaking about a factual (historical) solidarity-in-sin that affects the entire human race and each human being from the very first beginning, which is Adam. He is concerned with a *communio peccatorum*; “a communion of sinners” that has existed from the very first beginning, but a communion that has been redeemed by Christ to be a “communion of saints.” [See H. Koehnlein, quoted in Jean de Fraine, “Adam et son lignage” 127 n. 51: “Christ est mort pour tous les hommes, afin qu’ils ne soient plus une solidarité de pécheurs, la ‘peccatorum communio’, mais la ‘sanctorum communio’.” (Christ died for all men, so that they would no longer be a communion of sinners, the *peccatorum commnunio*, but the *sanctorum communio*.”) 88 n. 4] (Trooster 88)
     4. “Therefore, if one must insist on a later concretion by Paul and consider it a process of historicism, then there is nothing objectionable in this, *if* one remains within the strictly theological category of the history of salvation and of the opposing forces of evil. In this writer’s opinion, the Apostle’s view of the “one man,” Adam, in the light of the “one man Jesus Christ” makes impossible, at least in this text, historicization in the sense of a purely chronologically first man. Such a conclusion repeats once again the idea that the modern scientific views concerning the origins of the world and man and the theological interpretation as found in Holy Scripture approach this “beginning” from such totally different points of view that they cannot be in any way or ever mutually exclusive.” (Trooster 88)
     5. “Finally, it is remarkable that Paul does not have one single thing to say concerning a possible “original sin” in unbaptized children, but only finds its full realization in adults “because all men sinned.” Besides, he does not speak about an hereditary transmission of sin on the basis of Adam’s descent-through-procreation.” (Trooster 88)

## Romans 1-3 as the Context for Romans 5

The general thesis of Rom 1:16-3:20 seems to be, “all have sinned” (3:23). To prove this thesis, Paul discusses the sinfulness of the Jews, the sinfulness of the Greeks, and the sinfulness of both at once. To present the flow of Paul’s argument, here are the first three chapters of Romans, divided according to the group or groups discussed. (Rom 1:1-15, as introductory, is deleted. Rom 3:21-31, as a conclusion based on the thesis of 1:16-3:20, is included.)

1. *Jews and Greeks*: Rom 1:16-17, “I am not ashamed of the gospel; it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. 17For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.” 18For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of those who by their wickedness suppress the truth. 19For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. 20Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made. So they are without excuse; 21for though they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their senseless minds were darkened.” . . .
2. *Jews and Greeks*: Rom 2:1-13, “Therefore you have no excuse, whoever you are, when you judge others; for in passing judgment on another you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, are doing the very same things. 2You say, “We know that God’s judgment on those who do such things is in accordance with truth.” 3Do you imagine, whoever you are, that when you judge those who do such things and yet do them yourself, you will escape the judgment of God? 4Or do you despise the riches of his kindness and forbearance and patience? Do you not realize that God’s kindness is meant to lead you to repentance? 5But by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath, when God’s righteous judgment will be revealed. 6For he will repay according to each one’s deeds: 7to those who by patiently doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; 8while for those who are self-seeking and who obey not the truth but wickedness, there will be wrath and fury. 9There will be anguish and distress for everyone who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek, 10but glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek. 11For God shows no partiality. 12All who have sinned apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. 13For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous in God’s sight, but the doers of the law who will be justified.”
3. *Greeks*: Rom 2:14-16, “When Gentiles, who do not possess the law, do instinctively what the law requires, these, though not having the law, are a law to themselves. 15They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, to which their own conscience also bears witness; and their conflicting thoughts will accuse or perhaps excuse them 16on the day when, according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all.”
4. *Jews*: Rom 2:17-25, “But if you call yourself a Jew and rely on the law and boast of your relation to God 18and know his will and determine what is best because you are instructed in the law, 19and if you are sure that you are a guide to the blind, a light to those who are in darkness, 20a corrector of the foolish, a teacher of children, having in the law the embodiment of knowledge and truth, 21you, then, that teach others, will you not teach yourself? While you preach against stealing, do you steal? 22You that forbid adultery, do you commit adultery? You that abhor idols, do you rob temples? 23You that boast in the law, do you dishonor God by breaking the law? 24For, as it is written, “The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you.” 25Circumcision indeed is of value if you obey the law; but if you break the law, your circumcision has become uncircumcision.”
5. *Greeks*: Rom 2:26-29, “So, if those who are uncircumcised keep the requirements of the law, will not their uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision? 27Then those who are physically uncircumcised but keep the law will condemn you that have the written code and circumcision but break the law.
6. *Greeks and Jews*: Rom 2:28-29, “For a person is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical. 29Rather, a person is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart—it is spiritual and not literal. Such a person receives praise not from others but from God.”
7. *Jews*: Rom 3:1-9a, “Then what advantage has the Jew? Or what is the value of circumcision? 2Much, in every way. For in the first place the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God. 3What if some were unfaithful? Will their faithlessness nullify the faithfulness of God? 4By no means! Although everyone is a liar, let God be proved true, as it is written, “So that you may be justified in your words, and prevail in your judging.” 5But if our injustice serves to confirm the justice of God, what should we say? That God is unjust to inflict wrath on us? (I speak in a human way.) 6By no means! For then how could God judge the world? 7But if through my falsehood God’s truthfulness abounds to his glory, why am I still being condemned as a sinner? 8And why not say (as some people slander us by saying that we say), “Let us do evil so that good may come”? Their condemnation is deserved! 9What then? Are we any better off? No, not at all . . .”
8. *Jews and Greeks*: Rom 3:9b-18, “for we have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin, 10as it is written: “There is no one who is righteous, not even one; 11there is no one who has understanding, there is no one who seeks God. 12All have turned aside, together they have become worthless; there is no one who shows kindness, there is not even one.” 13“Their throats are opened graves; they use their tongues to deceive.” “The venom of vipers is under their lips.” 14“Their mouths are full of cursing and bitterness.” 15“Their feet are swift to shed blood; 16ruin and misery are in their paths, 17and the way of peace they have not known.” 18“There is no fear of God before their eyes.””
9. *Jews*: Rom 3:19-20, “Now we know that whatever the law says, it speaks to those who are under the law, so that every mouth may be silenced, and the whole world may be held accountable to God. 20For “no human being will be justified in his sight” by deeds prescribed by the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin.”
10. *Jews and Greeks*: Rom 3:21-31, “But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, 23since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; 24they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, 25whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; 26it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. 27Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. 29Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, 30since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith. 31Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.”

## The Patristic Development

## of the Doctrine of Original Sin

(Quotations are of Kelly’s words unless followed by a re­fer­ence to Hartman, Urban, or a Church Father.)

1. **the general development of sin doctrines in the patristic period**
   1. The Fathers’ presuppositions about the Bible made original sin and related problems historical rather than analytical.
   2. 100s ad
      1. Apostolic Fathers: they said men are sinful, but they do not attempt to explain why. The only re­fer­ence to Gen 3 is *Barnabas* 12:5: “the fall took place in Eve.”
      2. Apologists (defenders of Christianity c ad 125-175)
         1. Justin Martyr (c ad 155) is like the intertestamental litera­ture (nonbiblical Jewish writings c 200 bc-ad 100): Adam and Eve are not perfect beings but al­ready have the *yetzer hara.* (Urban 138)
         2. As in Paul, sin, death, and subjection to demons begin with Adam; but Adam’s sin is only a prototype.
      3. Free will is strongly emphasized (against popular culture [astrology], Stoicism, and Gnos­ticism).
      4. Before Irenaeus (c ad 180), there is no true conception of corporate sinfulness.
      5. Irenaeus: Adam and Eve were like children. (Urban 138)
      6. Before Tertullian, the fall’s effect is primarily death.
   3. 200s ad: a divergence between the East and the West begins.
      1. the East
         1. The Eastern Fathers generally had an optimistic estimate of man’s plight (a result of anti-Manichaeism).
         2. Gen 3 tends to be seen as allegory.
      2. the West (the center of doctrinal activity is North Africa)
         1. Gen 3 is literally true.
         2. God is more and more seen as the supreme lawgiver.
         3. The premise of original sin—physical solidarity with Adam—receives much fuller re­cognition in the West than in the East.
   4. 300s-400s ad
      1. In the West, these issues reach their climax with Augustine.
      2. In the East, Augustine has al­most no impact in subsequent centuries.
2. **Adam before the fall**
   1. “image”
      1. For Irenaeus, the image is our reason and will, the likeness is the Spirit.
      2. For Gregory of Nyssa, the image is the Androgyne, the likeness is the human race.
      3. For Chrysostom, the image is merely Adam’s rule over creation.
      4. For Cyril of Alexandria, the image is rationality and immortality.
   2. immortality
      1. Some said Adam and Eve were not immortal.
         1. For Theophilus, Adam and Eve were neither mortal nor immortal, but had to choose.
         2. For Caelestius, they were mortal.
         3. Some held they were mortal but became immortal.
            1. Athanasius (because contemplation ever re­news the likeness)
            2. Am­brosiaster (an anonymous Roman exegete contemporary with Ambrose)
            3. Augustine (through eating of the Tree of Life)
      2. Some said Adam and Eve were not immortal.
         1. Methodius of Olympus, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Council of Carthage
      3. So the Church Fathers generally taught immortality.
   3. other preternatural and supernatural gifts
      1. Athanasius: Adam and Eve’s contemplation (communion with the Word) caused supernatural knowledge (“original right­eousness and perfection in embryo”).
      2. Chrysostom: Adam and Eve had perfect knowledge and “angelic life.”
      3. Ambrose: Adam and Eve had integrity (passions controlled by reason), “heavenly being,” and no food (pro­bably a result of his “acquaintance with the Cappadocians”).
      4. Augustine: integrity, infused knowledge, justification, perseverance, inclina­tion to virtue ( = *libertas*; *posse non peccare*) (Augustine “carries to its highest pitch . . . or­i­ginal righteousness and perfection”)
         1. Adam’s *libertas* (freedom), the ability to do good, has been lost. We have *lib­erum arbitrium* (free choice), but “the sole use to which in our unregenerate state we put it is to do wrong.” (Kelly 365)
         2. “Freedom [*libertas*] is free will [*liberum arbitrium*] put to good use.” Man is free when free from temptation and sin; man is most free when most subject to God. Freedom begins with the *posse non peccare* (ability not to sin, which Adam had) and ends with the *non posse peccare* (inability to sin, which the blessed in heaven have). (Kelly 368)
      5. Cas­sian: knowledge of the good remained
   4. other theories
      1. Theophilus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria: Adam was a child
      2. Origen, Didymus the Blind, Priscillian, Victorinus: pre-cosmic fall
         1. There was a fixed number of identical rational essences.
         2. All except Christ followed the Devil in his fall.
         3. The essences became angels, men (bodies are punishment), or demons.
         4. Con­demned at the Council of Constantinople II, ad 553.
      3. Gregory of Nazianzus: The Garden of Eden is Plato’s realm of Ideas
3. **the nature of Adam’s sin**
   1. Tatian, Ambrosiaster: idolatry (worship of the devil)
   2. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria: disobedience (Clement: the disobedience was intercourse before God permitted it)
   3. Origen: weariness
   4. Athanasius: material things distracted from contemplation
   5. pride
      1. Ambrose: Adam and Eve wanted equality with God
      2. Ambrosiaster: they wanted to become God
      3. Augustine: they wanted to be own masters; their sin was the gravest sin because they were uniquely free
4. **effects of the fall**
   1. death
      1. Up to Tertullian (c ad 200), the fall’s effect is primarily death.
      2. In the East death is the principal effect.
         1. Eas­terners who attribute death to the fall are the Apologists, Clement of Alexandria, Methodius of Olympus, Athanasius (death of the body; the soul is still im­mortal), Gregory of Nyssa (“coats of skin” = death), Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodore.
      3. Westerners include Ambrose, Pelagius, and Augustine.
   2. concupiscence
      1. in the East
         1. Clement of Alexandria: reason and will weakened, subject to passions; dominance of the irrational, τὸ ἄλογον
         2. Methodius of Olympus: bias toward sensuality
         3. Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa: Christ’s humanity is “prone to sin”
         4. Chrysostom
         5. Cyril of Alexandria
         6. Theodore and Theodoret: bias toward sin
      2. in the West
         1. Tertullian: “the corruption of nature is second nature”
         2. Cyprian: the effects are “wounds” (*vulnera*)
         3. Ambrose
         4. Ambrosiaster: the “flesh” is corrupted; sin is lodged in the “body,” not the soul
         5. Pelagius rejected concupiscence; instead, he emphasized that we learn sinfulness from our environment.
         6. Augustine
            1. Concupiscence is any turn from God to material things.
            2. Since sexual desire is the most violent desire, for Augustine concupiscence practically equals sexual desire.

Augustine “seems ob­sessed” with it.

“According to him [Augustine], Adam and Eve had no natural inclination for conjugal relations before their sin . . . [God] at the proper time . . . would have ordered them to have relations and in some mysterious way enabled them to do so—without sexual pleasure, however, which Augus­tine considered to be solely the result of their sin.” (Hartman 35 n. 23)

The virgin birth was to avoid concupiscence.

* 1. effects on the intellect
     1. Athanasius, Augustine: knowledge was lost
     2. Augustine: our intellects were not completely vitiated
     3. Cyprian: knowledge of good was retained
  2. effects on the will
     1. The will is unhampered by the fall (this is said expressly or by implication): Jus­tin and the Apol­o­gists generally, Methodius, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Chrys­os­tom, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore and Theodoret (this Eastern emphasis is anti-Man­ichaean); Pelagius.
     2. Augustine
        1. *Libertas* (freedom, ability to do good) is lost.
        2. *Liberum arbitrium* (free choice) remains but always chooses evil.
  3. other effects
     1. prey to demons: Tatian, Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen
     2. diversity of creatures (angels, men, demons), diversity of conditions (blind, poor, etc.), and bodies (all results from the pre-cosmic fall): Ori­gen, Didymus the Blind, Priscillian, Victorinus
     3. lost likeness: Irenaeus, Athanasius
     4. Spirit withdrawn: Tatian
     5. habit of disobedience by example (environment): Justin, Pelagius
  4. transmitted guilt (*culpa*, culpability)
     1. Justin: no concept of corporate sin, but men’s sins cause the race to be under a curse.
     2. Tertullian (c. 200) was the first to say, “The evil that exists in the soul is derived from the fault of our origin . . .” (Urban 127-28)
     3. Origen († ad 254)
        1. For Origen the fall story in Gen 3 is an al­legory of a precos­mic fall. God created pure intelli­gen­ces; they all fell, becoming demons, human souls, or angels. (Urban 139)
        2. The idea of a pre-mundane fall excludes any corporate sinfulness (that the race was in Adam’s loins in Origen’s *Commentary on Romans* is probably an addition by Rufinus).
     4. For Athanasius (bp. c ad 325-373), Adam and Eve were created perfect, in the image of God; had they not sinned, they would have lived without pain and been as­sured of immortality. (Urban 140)
     5. Guilt is definitely *not* transmitted: Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore and Theo­doret; Tertullian, Ambrose (usually), Pelagius.
        1. For Pelagius (c ad 400), the human will can consistently choose rightly; there is no inherited defect from Adam. (Urban 125)
     6. Transmission of guilt is not hinted: Athanasius (never hinted), Cappadocians
     7. Chrysostom: “hardly a hint” of transmission of guilt. Rom 5:19 (“by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners”) means only that men were liable to punishment and death. [349] But the death imposed on men en­tails concupiscence. [351] (Kelly 349, 351)
     8. Ambrosiaster
        1. *In Rom*. 5:12: “‘In whom’, that is, in Adam, ‘all sinned’ . . . all men sinned in Adam as in a lump.” (Kelly 354)
        2. Men who sin like Adam, despising God, go to the lower hell; men who sin while res­pecting the divine majesty go to the upper hell, a place of refreshment (*refrigerium*). Hence we are punished only for personal sins. (Kelly 355)
     9. Ambrose (rarely), Pseudo-Ambrose
     10. Augustine
         1. The phrase “original sin” is not in scripture or the Fa­thers before Augustine. Augustine was the first to use *peccatum ori­gin­ale*.
         2. To combat Pelagianism, Augustine taught what has become the tra­di­tional explanation.
            1. The human race had only two ancestors. (Urban 125)
            2. They were perfect human beings in the Garden of Eden. (Urban 126)
            3. They were disobedient. Consequently:

Human nature is damaged; we cannot see the good clearly and will it unselfishly. (Urban 127)

A disposition to sin is biologically inherited. (Urban 1­25, 135)

We also inherit guilt from Adam; this guilt is re­moved by baptism. We share the guilt because “all were that one man . . .” (Urban 141)

* + 1. Council of Carthage (uses *pec­catum originale*)

1. **the manner of transmission**
   1. solidarity with Adam
      1. Apologists: sin and death enter with Adam
      2. Irenaeus: presupposes our “mystical solidarity,” but offers no explanation
      3. Clement and Origen: “physical solidarity with Adam” is “largely absent”
      4. Cappadocians: they just “take it for granted” that there is “mystical unity”
      5. Augustine: we already had “identity of nature” with Adam at the fall
   2. transmission through physical generation: Clement of Alexandria, Ambrose (Christ was sinless because of the vir­gin birth), Ambrosiaster, Augustine (the taint results from sexual passion at conception), the Council of Carthage
   3. the origin of the soul
      1. creationism (each soul is created at the moment of infusion in the body): “prevalent” among Greeks; also Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Pelagius
      2. traducianism (souls are generated from parents’ souls)
         1. Tertullian
            1. The soul is made of “refined matter” (Stoicism).
            2. All souls are part of the soul breathed into Adam.
            3. Paternal sperm is “charged with soul-stuff.”
            4. Adam’s seed was the “channel (*traducem*) ofdamnation” (Tertullian).
         2. There are “hints” of traducianism in Gregory of Nyssa.
         3. Augustine preferred traducianism as an explanation but admitted he was baffled.
2. **infant baptism**
   1. Barnabas, Clement of Alexandria, Theodoret, Caelestius: infants are sinless
   2. Theodoret, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius: infant baptism is only for immortality and to open heaven
   3. Origen, etc.: infant baptism is explained by personal sins before birth
   4. Infant baptism removes guilt.
      1. Tertullian
      2. Cyprian: but the guilt removed is “someone else’s”
      3. Ambrose: inherited guilt is removed by the rite of washing feet
      4. Au­gustine
      5. Council of Carthage
   5. Augustine: unbaptized infants go to hell but their punishment is light

## A Summary of the States of Nature

1. **real states**
   1. elevated nature
      1. sanctifying grace (this would have been hereditary)
      2. preternatural gifts (1-3 but not 4 would have been hereditary)
         1. bodily immortality (*posse non mori,* not *non posse mori*)
         2. freedom from concupiscence (integrity)
         3. freedom from suffering (impassibility)
         4. infused knowledge of natural and supernatural truths (Sir 17:7, “He filled them with knowledge”)
   2. fallen nature
      1. loss of sanctifying grace
      2. loss of preternatural gifts
      3. capabilities
         1. Fallen man can know God’s existence without grace (Vatican I).
         2. Fallen man can perform good works without grace (common teaching).
            1. Justin Martyr etc.: “Christ is the Logos . . . Those who live in accordance with Reason . . . are Christians, [e. g.,] Socrates . . . Abraham . . . Elijah . . . he who has lived according to Reason and still does so is a Christian, and need not be fearful or anxious.” (*Apology* 46)
            2. Augustine: many pagans “honor their parents. They neither murder nor steal. . . . [But] because they do all this without knowing to what end it is ordered, they do it in vain.” (*Comm. John* 45.2) “. . . they are content to lead a good life. To live a good life is the chief thing, they say. [But] No one can count on good works before faith. . . . What makes a work good is the end in view. Faith points out the end in view.” (*Comm. Psalms* 2.4)
            3. Augustine has “overlooked the fact that all men who really do good . . . are on their way to their final destiny, whether they know it or not.” (Schmaus 19-20)
   3. restored nature: two meanings
      1. justified humans on earth, who have sanctifying grace but not the preternatural gifts
         1. Justification is “a resumption and continuation, although in changed form, of the life which, according to Genesis, men could have had from the beginning of their history but had lost. True life is the life of immortality and fullness, the divine life. It is revealed, though still veiled, in Christ; hence he who surrenders himself to Christ not only sees that life but can enter into it . . .” (Schmaus 50)
         2. Eph 4:24, “clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.”
      2. beatified humans in heaven, who have sanctifying grace and the preternatural gifts
2. **merely possible states**
   1. pure nature
      1. The term was invented by Cajetan (c ad 1520) or in the Jansenius debate (c 1650). (Schmaus 48)
      2. It is human nature apart from both original sin and grace.
      3. “In history itself there is no *natura pura* . . .” (Schmaus 18)
         1. “. . . the whole of mankind is ordered to Christ . . . Men either live up to this vocation or reject it: there is no sphere of neutral activity.” (Schmaus 18)
         2. “. . . men have never been without grace.” (Schmaus 18)
   2. unimpeded nature: pure nature + preternatural gifts to help man reach his natural end

## “Preternatural”

1. **definition**: “That which surpasses nature . . .” (Parente 227)
2. **supernatural vs**. **preternatural**
   1. the *absolute supernatural*
      1. This “transcends all created nature . . .” (Parente 227)
      2. It is, “in the line of substance, God Himself . . .” (Parente 227)
      3. It is, “in the line of accidents, e. g., grace . . .” (Parente 227)
   2. the *relative supernatural*
      1. This “transcends only one sector of created nature . . .” (Parente 227)
      2. example: “infused knowledge . . . transcends human natural but is natural in the angels . . .” (Parente 227)
   3. the *preternatural*
      1. The preternatural, “although surpassing the natural conditions of a being, is only an extraordinary perfecting of it . . .” (Parente 227)
      2. example: “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.” (Parente 227)
3. **preternatural gifts**
   1. The state of original innocence included supernatural gifts and preternatural gifts.
      1. supernatural gifts
         1. sanctifying grace
         2. infused virtues
      2. preternatural gifts
         1. immunity from concupiscence
         2. bodily immortality
         3. infused knowledge
4. **other uses of** “**preternatural**”
   1. preternatural miracles
      1. “A miracle belongs to the supernatural world when the happening is miraculous in its *substance* . . .”
      2. But it belongs “to the preternatural world when it is miraculous only in the *mode* or *manner* in which it is performed.” (Parente 228)
   2. preternatural phenomena
      1. Here, *preternatural* means “that which cannot be explained by the commonly known laws of nature . . .” (Parente 228)
      2. example: “certain hypothetically diabolic phenomena, among them, according to some authors, spiritistic phenomena . . .” (Parente 228)

## Theses on Original Sin

1. **the personal sin of Adam and Eve**
   1. “Our first parents . . . sinned grievously . . .” (*de fide*) (Ott 106)
   2. “The root of the disobedience was pride.” (Ott 107)
   3. consequences (Ott 107)
      1. Adam and Eve lost sancti­fying grace. (*de fide*)
      2. They became subject to death. (*de fide*)
      3. They became subject to the devil. (*de fide*)
2. **the existence of original sin**
   1. Original sin “is inherited . . . by descent, not by imitation . . .” (Ott 108) Trent (*Decree on Original Sin*, ad 1547): original sin is transmitted “by propagation, not by imitation . . .” (Denzinger § 790)
   2. Original sin “cannot be proved by natural reason [but] is evidenced by . . . the frightful moral aberrations of humanity . . .” (Ott 110)
3. **nature of original sin**
   1. Catholicism: original sin “is a true and proper sin, that is, a guilt of sin.” (Ott 110)
      1. Trent (*Decree on Original Sin*): it is false that Adam lost sanctity and justice “for himself alone and not for us also . . .” (Denzinger § 789)
      2. Trent (*Decree on Original Sin*): the “sin of Adam, which is transmitted to all, is in each one as his own . . .” (Denzinger § 790)
      3. Trent (ibid.): “by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted . . .” (Denzinger § 792)
   2. Protestant Reformers: original sin consists in concupiscence, which remains a true sin after baptism but “is no longer reckoned for punishment.” (Ott 110)
      1. Trent (*Decree on Original Sin*): “the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin [is] taken away . . . there remains in the baptized concupiscence or an inclination [to sin] . . . although this is left to be wrestled with, it cannot harm those who do not consent, but manfully resist by the grace of Jesus Christ. . . . concupiscence, which at times the Apostle calls sin[[18]](#footnote-18) . . . the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin, as truly and properly sin in those born again, but because it is from sin and inclines to sin.” (Denzinger § 792)
      2. “That sin remains in man, even if it is not reckoned for punishment, is irreconcilable with the Pauline teaching of Justification as an inner transformation and renewal.” (Ott 110)
      3. “The justified man is saved from the danger of rejection because the ground for the rejection, the sin, is removed.” (Ott 110) Rom 8:1, “There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.”
      4. “As concupiscence, in consequence of the composition of human nature out of body and spirit would be present, as natural evil, even in the pure state of nature, it cannot be sinful in itself, for God has created everything well.” (Ott 110)
   3. probable solution: “Original sin consists in the deprivation of grace . . .” (*sen­ten­tia communis*) (Ott 110)
      1. scripture: “This flows from the Pauline contrast between sin proceeding from Adam and justice proceeding from Christ.” (Ott 110)
         1. E.g., Rom 5:19, “just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous.”
      2. tradition
         1. Church Fathers
            1. Augustine (*Op. imperf. c. Jul*. 1.71) “defines original sin as: an evil concupiscence with its state of guilt (concupiscentia cum suo reatu) and explains that the state of guilt (reatus) is removed by Baptism, while the concupiscence persists for a moral test (ad agonem), but not as a sin.” (Ott 111)
            2. But Anselm “sees in the nature of original sin only the lack of original justice . . .” (Ott 111)
            3. Aquinas was influenced by both Augustine and Anselm: original sin “consists formaliter in the lack of original justice, materialiter in the unregulated concupiscence. In every sin St. Thomas distinguishes between a formal and a material element, the turning away from God (aversio a Deo) and the turning towards the creature (conversio ad creaturam). As the turning towards the creature manifests itself above all in evil desire, St. Thomas with St. Augustine, sees in concupiscence, which itself is a consequence of original sin, the material element of original sin” (*ST* 1-2.82.3). (Ott 111)
         2. Trent
            1. Trent “defined Original Sin as the death of the soul [D 789]. The death of the soul is, however, the absence . . . of sanctifying grace.” (Ott 110)
            2. Trent said that “In Baptism Original Sin is eradicated through the infusion of sanctifying grace (D 792). It follows from this that Original Sin is a condition of being de­prived of grace.” (Ott 110)
            3. Trent said (*Decree on Justification*, ad 1547): “the unique formal cause [of justification] is the “justice of God, not that by which He Himself is just, but by which He makes us just,” that, namely, by which, when we are endowed with it by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind . . .” (Denzinger § 799) “As the justice bestowed by [110] Christ consists formally in sanctifying grace (D 799) so the sin inherited from Adam consists formally in the lack of sanctifying grace.” (Ott 110-11)
         3. after Trent: “Most of the post-Tridentine theologians do not regard concupiscence as an essential constituent part of original sin, but as its consequence.” (Ott 111)
      3. reason: “The lack of sanctifying grace, which, according to the will of God, should be present, establishes that the guilt of Original Sin signifies a turning away from God.” (Ott 111)
4. **transmission of original sin**
   1. “Original sin is transmitted by natural generation.” (*de fide*) (Ott 111)
      1. Original sin “is transmitted in the same way as human nature, through the natural act of generation. . . . human nature is communicated in a condition deprived of grace.” (Ott 111)
      2. Trent
         1. *Decree on Original Sin*: original sin is transmitted “by propagation, not by imitation . . .” (Denzinger § 790)
         2. *Decree on Justification* (ch. 3): “men . . . contract through him [Adam], in conception, injustice as their own . . .” (Denzinger § 795)
      3. It “is the natural act of [111] generation, which gives rise to the connection of the individual human being with the head of the race.” (Ott 111-12)
      4. “The actual concupiscence associated with the act of generation, the sexual pleasure (libido) is, contrary to the view of St. Augustine (De nuptiis et concup. I 23, 25; 24, 27), neither the cause nor the inescapable condition for the reproduction of original sin. It is only an accompanying phenomenon of the act of generation, which in itself alone is the instrumental cause of the transmission of original sin [see *ST* 1-2.82.4 ad 3].” (Ott 112)
5. **consequences of original sin**
   1. loss of sanctifying grace (*de fide*): as a turning away from God, the lack of sanctifying grace has “the character of guilt . . .” (Ott 112)
   2. loss of the preternatural gifts (*de fide* in regard to the gift of immortality): “The lack of the gifts of integrity results in man’s being subject to concupiscence, suffering and death.” (Ott 112)
   3. enslavement to the devil
      1. Jesus calls the devil “the ruler of this world” (John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11).
      2. Paul calls him “the god of this world” (2 Cor 4:4), “the ruler of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work among those who are disobedient” (Eph 2:2).
      3. Heb 2:14 calls him “the one who has the power of death . . .”
      4. See 2 Pet 2:19, “people are slaves to whatever masters them.”
   4. wounding of nature
      1. Protestant Reformers: “The wounding of human nature [is] the complete corruption of human nature.” (Ott 112)
      2. Catholicism
         1. Even in original sin, “man possesses the ability of knowing natural religious truths . . .” D 1785, 1806. (Ott 112)
            1. Rom 1:19-20, “For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. 20Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made.”
            2. Heb 11:6, “without faith it is impossible to please God, for whoever would approach him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who seek him.”
            3. Vatican Council I, *Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith* (ad 1870, Denzinger § 1785), God “can be known with certitude by the natural light of human reason from created things; “for the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made” [Rom 1:20] . . .”
            4. Vatican Council I, *Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith* canon 1 to chapter 2 (ad 1870, Denzinger § 1806), “If anyone shall have said that the one true God, our Creator and our Lord, cannot be known with certitude by those things which have been made, by the natural light of human reason: let him be anathema.”
         2. Even in original sin, “man possesses the ability . . . of performing natural morally good actions.” (Ott 112)
            1. Rom 2:14-16, “When Gentiles, who do not possess the law, do instinctively what the law requires, these, though not having the law, are a law to themselves. 15They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, to which their own conscience also bears witness; and their conflicting thoughts will accuse or perhaps excuse them 16on the day when, according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all.”
            2. Trent, *Decree on Justification* canon 5 (Denzinger § 815), “If anyone shall say that after the sin of Adam man’s free will was lost and destroyed, or that it is a thing in name only, indeed a title without a reality, a fiction, moreover, brought into the Church by Satan: let him be anathema.”
         3. “The wounding of nature extends to the body as well as to the soul.” (Ott 113)
            1. Council of Orange, ad 529 (Denzinger § 174): “by the offense of Adam’s transgression . . . the whole man, that is according to body and soul, was changed for the worse . . .”
      3. speculation
         1. Aquinas enumerated two wounds to the body and four to the soul. To the body: sensibility to suffering (caused by loss of the preternatural gift of impassibility), mortality (caused by loss of the preternatural gift of immortality). To the soul (caused by loss of the preternatural gift of integrity, which is freedom from concupiscence): “difficulty of knowing the truth . . . weakening of the power of the will . . . recoiling before difficulties in the struggle for the good . . . [and concupiscence,] desire for satisfaction of the senses against the judgment of reason . . .” (Ott 113)
         2. “There is a controversy as to whether the wounding of nature consists exclusively in the loss of the preternatural gifts, or whether human nature in addition is intrinsically weakened . . .” (Ott 113)
            1. “The former view, which is that adopted by St. Thomas and by most theologians, conceives the wounding of nature as relative only, i.e., by comparison with its primitive condition . . . a person who is born in original sin is to the human being in the pure state of nature as one stripped of his clothes is to the unclothed . . .” (Ott 113)
            2. “. . . the latter view conceives it [the wounding of nature] . . . as a worsening in comparison with the pure state of nature. . . . the person born in original sin is to the human being in the pure state of nature . . . as the sick person is to the healthy . . .” (Ott 113)
            3. assessment

“The former view is to be preferred, as the sinful act of Adam, which occurred once only, could, neither in his own nature nor in the nature of his posterity, effect an evil habit and with it, a weakening of the natural powers.” See *ST* 1-2.85.1. (Ott 113)

“However, it must be admitted that fallen human nature, in consequence of individual and social aberrations, has declined below the state of pure nature.” (Ott 113)

1. **the fate of those dying without baptism**
   1. dogma: “Souls who depart this life in the state of original sin are excluded from the Beatific Vision of God.” (*de fide*) (Ott 113)
      1. But see Pius IX (allocution, *Singular quadem*, ad 1854): “on the other hand, it is necessary to hold for certain that they who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if this ignorance is invincible, are not stained by any guilt in this matter in the eyes of God. Now, in truth, who would arrogate so much to himself as to mark the limits of such an ignorance, because of the nature and variety of peoples, regions, innate dispositions, and of so many other things?” (Denzinger § 1647)
      2. And see Innocent III (letter *Ex parte tua* to the Archbishop of Lyons, ad 1206): “God forbid that all children of whom daily so great a multitude die, would perish, but that also for these the merciful God who wishes no one to perish has procured some remedy unto salvation.” (Denzinger § 410)
   2. baptism by blood: “The spiritual re-birth of young infants can be achieved in an extra-sacramental manner through baptism by blood (cf. the baptism by blood of the children of Bethlehem).” (Ott 114)
   3. baptism of desire
      1. “In special circumstances, namely, in the case of invincible ignorance or of incapability, actual membership of the Church can be replaced by the desire (votum) for the same. This need not be expressly (explicite) present, but can also be included in the moral readiness faithfully to fulfil the will of God (votum implicitum). In this manner also those who are in fact outside the Catholic Church can achieve salvation.” (Ott 312)
      2. “That those who, in innocent ignorance, do not know the truth Church of Christ, but who are nevertheless ready to bow to the demands of the Divine Will, will not be cast out, springs from the Divine Justice, and from the doctrine of God’s general will of salvation, which is clearly proved in the Scriptures.” 1 Tim 2:4, God “desires everyone to be saved . . .” See Aquinas, *ST* 3.68.2. (Ott 312—for more see 356-57.)
   4. both: “The so-called Baptism by blood and Baptism of desire, it is true, replace Sacramental Baptism in so far as the communication of grace is concerned, but do not effect incorporation into the Church, as they do not bestow the sacramental character by which a person becomes attached formally to the Church.” (Ott 311)
   5. other theories: “Other emergency means of baptism for children dying without sacramental baptism, such as
      * 1. “prayer and desire of the parents or the Church (vicarious baptism of desire—Cajetan), or
        2. “the attainment of the use of reason in the moment of death, so that the dying child can decide for or against God (baptism of desire—H. Klee), or
        3. “suffering and death of the child as quasi-Sacrament (baptism of suffering—H. Schell),

“are indeed, possible, but their actuality cannot be proved from Revelation.” (Ott 114)

* 1. the unbaptized in hell
     1. Theologians distinguish two punishments in hell:
        1. the *poena damni*, “the exclusion from the Beatific Vision of God,” and
        2. the *poena sensus*, “caused by external means [and] felt by the senses even after the resurrection of the body.” (Ott 114)
           1. Augustine and many Latin Fathers taught that children dying in original sin suffer a *poena sensus*, “even if only a very mild one. . .” (Ott 114)
           2. Most Greek Fathers, Schoolmen, and recent theologians teach that they only suffer *poena damni*. (Ott 114) A statement by Innocent III (letter *Ex parte tua* to the Archbishop of Lyons, ad 1206) favors this teaching: “The punishment of original sin is deprivation of the vision of God, but the punishment of actual sin is the torments of everlasting hell.” (Denzinger § 410)
           3. “A condition of natural bliss is compatible with “poena damni.” (See Aquinas, *De malo* 5.3; *Sent*. IId.3q.2a.2.) (Ott 114)
     2. limbo
        1. “Theologians usually assume that there is a special place or state for children dying without baptism which they call limbus puerorum (children’s Limbo).” (Ott 114) *Limbus* in Latin means “border” or “edge.” (Whitaker)
        2. Pius VI lent the theory some support (errors of the Synod of Pistoia condemned in the constitution, *Auctorem fidei*, ad 1794): “The doctrine [is false] which rejects . . . that place of the lower regions (which the faithful generally designate by the name of the limbo of children) in which the souls of those departing with the sole guilt of original sin are punished with the punishment of the condemned, exclusive of the punishment of fire . . .” (Denzinger § 1526)
        3. Pelagians had suggested the existence of a “middle place and state free of guilt and of punishment between the kingdom of God and eternal damnation . . .” (Ibid.)

## Concupiscence
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Definitions

1. **etymology**
   1. From Latin *concupere*, “to long for.” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 55)
   2. “Middle English, from Old French, from Late Latin *concupìscentia*, from Latin *concupìscêns*, *concupìscent-*, present participle of *concupìscere*, inchoative of *concupere*, to desire strongly: *com-*, intensive pref. See com- + *cupere*, to desire.” (“Concupiscence” *American Heritage Dictionary*)
2. **definitions**
   1. “In moral theology the inordinate desire for temporal ends which has its seat in the senses.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
   2. “A strong desire, especially sexual desire; lust.” (“Concupiscence” *American Heritage Dictionary*)
   3. broad and narrow
      1. broad: “Concupiscence, in its wide sense, is the privation of rectitude in the sense appetite as a result of original sin.” (Cunningham 36)
      2. narrow: “In its strict sense, which we use in this context, it is *the desire of the sense appetite for a sensible good.*” (Cunningham 36)
   4. psychology and morality
      1. psychology: “a function of the sense appetite . . . [Sense appetite] is divided into
         1. *irascible* (with respect to good or bad, difficult to obtain), and
         2. *concupiscible* (with respect to good or bad, easy to obtain).
         3. In this sense, like all passions, concupiscence is a natural property good in itself, but which may be used for good or for bad.” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 55)
      2. morality
         1. “a disordered inclination to sense pleasures, against the direction of reason . . .” (“Concupiscence,” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 55)
         2. “. . . still more strictly, it is sensuality.” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 55)
         3. “. . . also called *fomes peccati* (that which *foments*, incites to sin).” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 55)
         4. Luther said “this concupiscence (of which St. Paul speaks, Rom. 7:18) [is] sinful in itself and invincible.” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 56)
         5. The Church says “concupiscence, though a consequence of original sin . . ., is not a sin in itself. Concupiscence only inclines to sin, and that not irresistibly, since with good will and God’s grace man can conquer it and in so doing can acquire merit for the struggle [D 792].” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 56)

concupiscence and original sin

1. **Paul**
   1. “The notion of concupiscence has its biblical foundations esp. in the teaching of St Paul (Rom. 7:7 ff., etc.) . . .” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
   2. Rom 7:7-8, “if it had not been for the law, I would not have known sin. I would not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, ‘You shall not covet.’ 8But sin, seizing an opportunity in the commandment, produced in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead.”
2. **Augustine**
   1. “The notion of concupiscence . . . was developed by St Augustine in his struggle against Pelagianism.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
   2. “Acc. to Augustine the cause of concupiscence is the Fall of Adam, who, having lost Original Righteousness, transmitted to us a nature in which the desires of the flesh are no longer subordinated to reason.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
3. **Thomas Aquinas**
   1. “Thomas Aquinas, elaborating the Augustinian teaching, regards it as the material (i. e. passive, because residing in the senses) element of Original Sin, the formal (active, residing in the will) element being loss of Original Righteousness.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
   2. “From the moral point of view it is *materia exercendae virtutis* [material for the exercise of virtue], for it provides reason and will with opportunities for resisting the disordered movements of the senses.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
4. **Protestantism**
   1. “Orthodox Protestant theology, on the other hand, both in its Lutheran and in its Calvinist forms, regards concupiscence itself as sin and its very existence as an offence against God . . .” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
   2. “. . . the Jansenists held a similar view.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
5. **Trent**
   1. The Council of Trent (*Decree on Original Sin*, 17 June 1546) followed St Thomas’s teaching against the Reformers, and in post-Tridentine theology it is usually regarded as a consequence of Original Sin rather than as part of it.” (“Concupiscence” *Oxford Dictionary* 393)
6. **concupiscence and original sin**
   1. Original sin is not the first sin that Adam committed (the biting of the fruit in Gen 3); it is “the basic ten­dency toward sin,” “the inclination to sin.” “Original” in “original sin” does not mean “first” but “source” or “origin” (within an individual). (Urban 127-28)
   2. “original guilt”
      1. “Original sin” means “an inherited ten­dency to sin,” but it is also used to mean “an in­herited guilt for sin.” (Urban 129)
      2. This latter is more properly called “origi­nal guilt.” (Urban 129)
   3. “A small number of theologians, under the influence of certain misinterpreted expressions of St. Augustine, believed that original sin consists in concupiscence.” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 56)
   4. According to Aquinas, “concupiscence enters into the constitution of original sin, not indeed as a *formal* element, but only as a *material* element.” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 56)
   5. “It remains even after baptism *ad agonem* (to make us fight for heaven; Council of Trent).” (“Concupiscence” *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* 56)
7. **types**
   1. “*Antecedent* concupiscence precedes the consent of the will and entices the will to pursue a sensible good. The aroma of a broiling steak may so stir the sense appetite that you order one for dinner.” (Cunningham 36)
   2. “*Consequent* concupiscence follows an act of the will; the sense appetite is deliberately aroused by the will. A man can, in anticipation, deliberately arouse his imagination and stir his appetite for a delectable dinner.” (Cunningham 36)
8. **concupiscence and voluntariness**
   1. antecedent concupiscence
      1. “Antecedent concupiscence increases the voluntariness of an action. The voluntary is intensified, at least on the part of the inclination of the will, because the will is more inclined to pursue a sensible object which is presented as more desirable. Concupiscence exaggerates the goodness of the sensible object and overlooks whatever is evil in it, thus making it more attractive and desirable.” (Cunningham 37)
      2. “Nevertheless—an important qualification—the freedom of the act is diminished, because the judgment of reason is clouded. And if concupiscence is so vehement that it takes away the use of reason, the action which it causes is neither voluntary nor involuntary, since it is not a human act at all.” (Cunningham 37)
   2. conseuqent concupiscence
      1. “Consequent concupiscence, it is obvious, increases the voluntary, because the will, by its own choice, intensifies its act by deliberately arousing the sense appetite.” (Cunningham 37)
   3. “Habit influences the voluntary in much the same way as intecedent [*sic*] concupiscence . . .” (Cunningham 37)

## The Weakness of the Fallen Will

1. **scripture**
   1. John 8:34, “everyone who commits sin is a slave to sin. 35The slave does not have a permanent place in the household; the son has a place there forever.”
   2. the “slavery” metaphor in Paul
2. Sometimes Paul uses slavery as a metaphor for being obliged to obey the Mosaic Law.
   1. Gal 4:22-23, “For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave woman and the other by a free woman. 23One, the child of the slave, was born according to the flesh; the other, the child of the free woman, was born through the promise. 24Now this is an allegory: these women are two covenants. One woman, in fact, is Hagar, from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery. 25Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. . . . 30But what does the scripture say? “Drive out the slave and her child; for the child of the slave will not share the inheritance with the child of the free woman.” 31So then, friends, we are children, not of the slave but of the free woman.”
   2. Gal 5:1, “For freedom Christ has set us free. Stand firm, therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery.”
3. Sometimes Paul uses slavery as a metaphor for our inclinations to sin before conversion.
   1. Rom 6:6, “We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin.”
   2. Rom 6:22, “you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God . . .”
   3. Rom 8:15, “you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption.”
   4. 1 Cor 7:22, “whoever was called in the Lord as a slave is a freed person belonging to the Lord, just as whoever was free when called is a slave of Christ.”
   5. Gal 4:3, “we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world.”
   6. Gal 4:7, “you are no longer a slave but a child . . .”
   7. Gal 4:8-9, “Formerly, when you did not know God, you were enslaved to beings that by nature are not gods. . . . 9How can you want to be enslaved to them again?”
4. Rarely, Paul uses slavery as a metaphor for humanity’s generally sinful condition, both before and after justification.
   1. Rom 7:14, “the law is spiritual; but I am of the flesh, sold into slavery under sin.”
   2. Rom 7:25, “with my mind I am a slave to the law of God, but with my flesh I am a slave to the law of sin.”
   3. Phil 2:7, Christ “emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness.”
   4. “Weakened by his inclination towards evil, the sinner chooses evil rather than the good: he is so much under the power of sin that he must be called the slave of sin . . .” (Schmaus 14)
   5. 2 Pet 2:19, “people are slaves to whatever masters them.”
5. **Augustine** (ad 354-430)
   1. “Augustine became the patron for the teaching of the Reformation that free will existed in name only, not in reality. Now Augustine had at times expressed himself this way, particularly against the Pelagians; but when they pressed him on the question . . ., he reaffirmed [free will].” (Pelikan 4: 141)
   2. Augustine affirmed that “free will did not perish in the sinner” (see *Pelag*. 1.2.5). So for him “the sinner committed his sin by his own free will, [not] by divine necessity.” (Pelikan 4: 141)
6. **the *Indiculus*** (between 435-42)
   1. “It is in the midst of the semi-Pelagian controversy that the *Indiculus* [“Catalog”] was composed. Redacted probably by Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390-460), a disciple of St Augustine and Cassian’s strongest opponent, this document is a summary of the doctrine of grace, based on papal pronouncements, the decrees of African Councils which had subsequently received papal approval, and the Church’s faith as expressed mainly in her liturgy. By the end of the fifth century it was already accepted as the standard exposition of the Church’s doctrine of grace, and gradually acquired great authority, due [546] mainly to its tacit approval by the universal Church.” (Neuner and Dupuis 546-47)
   2. Many theological texts of the ancient Church speak of “a loss of freedom due to sin. Thus, in the first chapter of the . . . *Indiculus* it says: “All men lost their ‘natural powers’ and their innocence in the sin of Adam. And no one is capable of rising from the depths of this loss by his own free will if the grace of the merciful God does not lift him up” (DS 239; cf. DS 243). In the course of the text a statement of Pope Innocent I is cited which says that the sinner would have been stripped of his freedom for eternity, and remained forever under the power of his fall, if the coming of Christ had not graciously lifted him up.” (Schmaus 17)
7. **early councils**
   1. the Synod of Arles (c. [ad] 475) (DS 330-342)
   2. the Synod of Orange (ad 529) (DS 378, 383)
   3. Quiercy (ad 853) (DS 621-624)
   4. and Valencia (ad 855) (DS 625-633)
   5. These four councils, “while emphasizing the loss of freedom due to sin, still pointed out the freedom which the sinner retained.” (Schmaus 15)
   6. “One might say that after Augustine there are faint glimmers of the distinction between the two forms of freedom [metaphysical and eschatological, see “Schmaus on weakened will” below] in the various synods of the primitive and the early medieval Church, but the distinc­tion is never clearly and explicitly made. Nonetheless it is permissible to interpret the conciliar texts with the help of such a distinction; indeed, it is only in this way that they are intelligible and free of contradictions.” (Schmaus 14)
8. **the Reformation**
   1. Luther’s early teaching
      1. September 1517: *Disputation against Scholastic Theology*
         1. Luther began his *Disputation* “with a spirited defense of Augustine, arguing (against the Manicheans) that the human will was not “evil by nature, that is, essentially evil” . . .” (Pelikan 4: 141)
         2. But he then went on “immediately to insist (against Scotus and Gabriel Biel) that it was “nevertheless innately and inevitably evil and corrupt” and therefore “not free to strive toward whatever is declared good.”” (Pelikan 4: 141)
      2. April 25, 1518: *Heidelberg Theses*
         1. Thesis 13: ““Free will” after the fall is nothing but a word, and so long as it does what is within it, it is committing deadly sin.” (Qtd. in Kittelson 111)
         2. The thesis means that “sin annihilates freedom . . .” (Schmaus 14)
   2. Leo X
      1. June 15, 1520: in the bull *Exsurge* *Domine*, Leo X said that Luther taught: “After sin, free will is a term without meaning; and when it does what is in its power, it sins mortally” (DS 1486; see also DS 2004, 2311, 2438.) Leo X rejected this thesis. (Schmaus 15, 17)
   3. the Luther-Erasmus debate
      1. the debate
         1. September 1524: Erasmus’s *On the Freedom of the Will* attacks Luther.
         2. December 1525: Luther’s *On the Bondage of the Will* attacks Erasmus.
      2. Erasmus’ teachings
         1. “For Erasmus, true religion was basically a matter of the inclination of the heart, the wisdom that filled the mind, and an attitude of love for one’s neighbor. True doctrine played little part in it. He despised Luther’s teachers, the scholastic theologians, not because they taught false doctrines but because they taught too many doctrines.” (Kittelson 204)
         2. Erasmus “began to look for an issue on which he could distance himself from Luther. . . . [Thomas More] suggested the freedom of the will, and [in] September 1524 he attacked Luther in a book he called *A Diatribe on the Freedom of the Will*.” (Kittelson 204)
         3. Erasmus sided with Catholic tradition: “Putting himself on the side of those “who ascribed something to free will, but the most to grace,” he noted that “those who are the furthest removed from the opinion of Pelagius attribute the most to grace, but almost nothing to free will, but they do not abolish it altogether” [*Liberum arbitrium* 4.16] . . .” (Pelikan 4: 140)
         4. According to Erasmus, “The Scriptures were unclear, so one had to have recourse to experience and reason. He concluded that because human beings made choices between good and evil, or between better and worse, and because they were commanded [204] to do so, they had to be *able* to do so. Therefore they had to have free will.” (Kittelson 204-5)
         5. “Erasmus claimed [that for] the unheard-of doctrine of Luther, [the] only precedent lay in Manicheism (which Luther sought to repudiate) and in the teachings of Wycliffe (which Luther had made his own).” (Pelikan 4: 140)
         6. Erasmus “was able to present his own doctrine of free will as a version of the Augustinian doctrine, since Augustine had, with more or less success, attempted to posit the freedom of the will after the fall.” (Pelikan 4: 140)
      3. Luther’s teachings
         1. “Erasmus had used more than 200 scriptural citations to demonstrate that there was no final answer to the question, but that it appeared that the human will could claim some measure of freedom. Luther replied to every citation in detail.” (Kittelson 205)
         2. Luther (*Servium arbitrium*, in *WA* 18:636), “we do everything by necessity and nothing by our free will, since the power of the free will is nothing and neither does the good nor is capable of it in the absence of grace . . .” (Pelikan 4: 141)
         3. Luther “confined free will to “natural matters, such as eating, drinking, procreating, governing” and the like.” (*Servium arbitrium*, in *WA* 18:752) (Pelikan 4: 141) “He granted that “free choice is allowed to man, [but] only with respect to what is beneath him, and not to what is above him.” [AE 33, 170 (WA 18, 636)] (Kittelson 205)
         4. “The human will could not “move toward the righteousness of God.” True freedom of the will was a divine attribute “that can no more justly be attributed to human beings than can divinity itself.” [AE 33, 68 (WA 18, 636)] He borrowed from Augustine to illustrate his meaning: “The human will is like a beast between [God and Satan]. If God sits on it, it wills and goes where [205] God wills to go. . . . If Satan sits on it, it wills and goes where Satan wills. Nor does it have the power to choose which rider it will go to or seek, but the riders struggle over which of them will have it or rule it.” [WA 18, 635 (AE 33, 65-66)] Not even the most faithful people had any choice in the matter.” (Kittelson 205-6)
         5. In the debate on free will, “Luther accused Erasmus of reviving the Pelagian heresy, in fact of going even beyond it, in his willingness to ascribe freedom to the fallen will of man . . .” (Pelikan 4: 140)
         6. Luther held “the doctrine that the role of the human will in conversion was “purely passive” . . .” (Pelikan 4: 142)
         7. Luther substituted “the image of the devil” for the “image of God” referred to in Gen 1:26-27 (*Lectures on Genesis* 1.26). “. . . the divine image was no longer . . . present, for “it was lost through sin in Paradise”” (*Lectures on Genesis* 1.26). He directed this doctrine “against the peril that the doctrine of the image of God and of the freedom of the will as part of the content of that image would glorify human powers at the expense of grace and thus jeopardize the doctrine that the role of the human will in conversion was “purely passive” . . .” (Pelikan 4: 142)
         8. For Luther there could be no Christianity without “staunchly holding your ground, stating your position, confessing it, defending it, and persevering in it unvanquished.” [WA 18, 603 (AE 33, 20)] . . . He fully intended the implication that Erasmus was not a Christian.” (Kittelson 206)
   4. total destruction of free will (total depravity)
      1. Lutheranism
         1. moderate interpretation
            1. “For the reformers, [the fallen] state of humanity is depicted in the Genesis story of the Fall—a story which they interpreted as histori­cal—and can be characterized as “total depravity.” Depravity, how­ever, does not mean terrible acts which some people commit. Depravity concerns one’s *acts* only as they reflect the broken character of one’s relation to God and fellow humans. It refers to the inability to institute a relation with God on the basis of human activity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 25)
            2. “The denial of freedom of the will (as well as the concept of total depravity) refers only to the inability of one as sinner to will oneself to faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
            3. “Depravity is consid­ered “total” because no aspect of life or activity is exempt from the corruptions of self.” (Dillenberger and Welch 25)

See Rabindranath Tagore, *Gitanjali*: “I came out alone on my way to my tryst. But who is this that follows me in the silent dark? I move aside to avoid his presence but I escape him not. He makes the dust rise from the earth with his swagger; he adds his loud voice to every word that I utter. He is my own little self, my lord, he knows no shame; but I am ashamed to come to thy door in his company.” (The self, on its way to meet God, is dogged by the ego.)

* + - * 1. “When Luther and Calvin denied freedom of the will, they were emphatically not interested in reducing the human will to a subpersonal object of mechanical determination.” (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
        2. “. . . neither the divine nor the human will does what it does, whether good or evil, under any compulsion, but from sheer pleasure or desire, as with true freedom; and yet the will of God is immutable and infallible, and it governs our mutable will . . . and our will, especially when it is evil, cannot of itself do good.” [See Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*, in *Luther’s Works* (Philadelphia: 1972), 33: 39.] (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
      1. severe interpretation
         1. “In the period of the Reformation itself the conviction that man’s power of choice had weakened reached its peak in the thesis that it had simply been destroyed.” (Schmaus 16)
         2. “The opinion was advanced at the time of the Reformation that as a result of original sin human nature was entirely depraved. According to the common interpretation, this theology teaches that the “original sinner” is enslaved to death, to the devil, and to sin. He is dead; his will is not free.” (Schmaus 57)
         3. “Flacius, one of the “extreme conservatives,” defined total depravity as the complete loss of everything which makes us human, including every capacity for good. Regeneration then meant the cre­ation of a new self, completely unrelated to the old self. In this analysis, one could only be said to be passive in respect to the activity of grace.” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
         4. “Flacius contended that he expressed Luther’s views and quoted nu­merous passages in support. But . . . Luther’s statements on total depravity, one’s inability to determine one’s relation to God, and his accent upon the directing activity of the Spirit even in faith, reflect [experience.] . . . it is doubtful that [he intended] his statements to be understood as a doctrine simply of human nature, either before or in faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
    1. Calvinism
       1. the *Belgic Confession of Faith* (1561)
          1. Article 14: Adam “corrupted his whole nature; whereby he made himself . . . wicked, perverse, and corrupt in all his ways . . .” (Brês)
          2. Article 14: “. . . man is but a slave to sin; and has nothing of himself, unless it is given from heaven. . . . For there is no will nor understanding, conformable to the divine will and understanding, but what Christ hath wrought in man . . .” (Brês)
          3. Article 15: original sin “is a corruption of the whole nature . . . it is sufficient to condemn all mankind.” (Brês)
          4. “. . . without it [justifying faith] they [human beings] would never do anything out of love to God, but only out of self-love or fear of damnation.” (art. 24) (Brês)
       2. Synod of Dort, *Canons of Dort* (1619), “Third and Fourth Heads of Doctrine. The Corruption of Man, His Conversion to God, and the Manner Thereof, Article 4”
          1. “There remain, however, in man since the fall, the glimmerings of natural light, whereby he retains some knowledge of God, or natural things, and of the difference between good and evil, and shows some regard for virtue and for good outward behavior. But so far is this light of nature from being sufficient to bring him to a saving knowledge of God and to true conversion that he is incapable of using it aright even in things natural and civil. Nay further, this light, such as it is, man in various ways renders wholly polluted, and hinders in unrighteousness, by doing which he becomes inexcusable before God.” (Synod of Dort)

1. **Trent**
   1. free will remains
      1. “Having cited the scriptural text to the effect that man without Christ is a slave of sin [Rom 6:20, “When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness,” DS 1419], the Council of Trent went on to point out that freedom has not been simply annihilated although it has been weakened.” (Schmaus 14)
      2. Trent said (*Decree on Justification* ch. 6) that in spite of the enslavement of the patriarchs to sin, “their free will, though weakened and unsteady, was by no means destroyed.” (Schmaus 15)
      3. Trent said (*Canons on Justification* 5, DS 815/1555): “If anyone says that after Adam’s sin man’s free will was destroyed and lost, or that there is question about a term only, indeed, that the term has no real foundation; and that the fictitious notion was even introduced into the Church by Satan: let him be anathema.” (Schmaus 15)
   2. “The Council of Trent does not describe the exact extent of the injury inflicted on the will by sin.” (Schmaus 16)
      1. “As a result considerable differences have arisen in theology over the extent of the will’s weakness.” (Schmaus 16)
2. **Schmaus on weakened will**
   1. In an attempt to reconcile the Catholic and Lutheran positions on weakened will during the Reformation, Schmaus argues that each side was using a different meaning of “freedom”: “different notions of freedom [were] held by the Reformers and by the council [of Trent] . . .” (Schmaus 57)
      1. Catholicism
         1. “When the council speaks of an enduring freedom, it has in mind a metaphysical, psycholo­gical freedom of choice.” (Schmaus 57)
         2. By “freedom” Catholicism meant “metaphysical-psychological freedom”: this is “freedom of choice,” “the power to choose between objects . . .” (Schmaus 13)
      2. Lutheranism
         1. “When the Reformers speak of the freedom lost through sin, they have in mind an existential freedom.” (Schmaus 57)
         2. By “freedom” Lutherans meant “eschatological freedom” (only called “existential freedom” once, in the preceding quotation): this is “freedom from sin, from the law, from death, and from Satan . . .” (Schmaus 14)
   2. According to Schmaus, because in the Reformation Catholics and Lutherans were talking past one another, each was right about the freedom to which it referred.
      1. “The failure to distinguish between the different forms of freedom has led to serious mis­un­der­standings in the course of history, and when in the history of theology we are confronted with the thesis that sin annihilates freedom we must ask what kind of freedom is meant.” (Schmaus 14)
      2. The “difference between the thinking in metaphysical terms and the thinking in existen­tial terms has been the occasion of innumerable misunderstandings.” (Schmaus 57)
      3. “Actually the two concepts of freedom are so inter­woven that it is not always easy to separate and distinguish one from the other.” (Schmaus 57)
   3. Luther was right about eschatological freedom.
      1. “. . . it must be admitted that he [Luther] himself did not advocate it [the belief that free will is destroyed]. . . . If he speaks of an enslaved will, this does not mean a formal denial of man’s power of choice. As a conse­quence of his fundamentally existential theological orientation Luther is not interested in the metaphysical question of man’s power of choice, but only in the question of salvific action on man’s part. In his view man’s freedom of choice would in fact be activated in vain, it would simply be wasted energy—indeed, it would ripen into evil and rotten fruit—if it did not, with the aid of grace, raise man towards God. The use of man’s power of choice is only worthwhile and meaningful when, as the result of divine grace, man ascends towards God.” (Schmaus 17)
   4. Trent was right about metaphysical freedom.
      1. Trent “rejected this doctrine of the loss of freedom due to sin. . . . the council maintained its own meaning of free­dom, because the Reformers’ thesis concerning the loss of freedom did not make the concept clear and hence could be understood of meta­physical freedom.” (Schmaus 57)
      2. Trent defined “that freedom of choice remains although eschatolo­gical freedom has been lost.” (Schmaus 15)
      3. “In spite of the enslavement of the sinful will, the metaphysical free­dom taught by the Council of Trent has a profound significance. As a consequence of his metaphysical freedom the man moved by God is not pushed about like some lifeless thing but, on the basis of the divine motion, moves himself. Indeed, once man’s power of choice is released he can even reject the grace of God, for he is not simply swept along by grace as though by an overpowering heavenly desire (cf. the rejection of some of the propositions of Jansenius [ad 1585-1538] in 1653, DS 2001-2007).” (Schmaus 17)
      4. Trent had “a twofold concern: on the one hand, to defend the human dignity which the sinner retains; on the other, to emphasize the absolute necessity of the divine initiative. Even the sinner remains a man, and this means that even in his sinful state he remains a free agent: with this thesis the council is faithful both to Christian tradition and to the spirit of the times. The Renaissance proclaimed and extolled the dignity of the human person; yet, at the same time, it was able to accommodate the sentiment which found expression in the Reformation phrase “Glory to God alone.” This it did without denying to the creature the dignity intrinsic, and therefore inalienable, to his created being itself. The council rejected every form of naturalistic optimism when it combined its defense of the freedom of choice retained by the [15] sinner with the thesis that the will’s freedom had been weakened and impaired.” (Schmaus 15-16)
      5. “. . . freedom of choice remains although eschatolo­gical freedom has been lost.” (Schmaus 13-15)
      6. Yet for Trent, even “freedom of choice has been weakened: the sinner does not have the same metaphysical-psychological freedom as one who is free from sin.” (Schmaus 15)
   5. Schmaus’s conclusions
      1. “Sin is productive of a kind of frozen immobility in the will; or, to use a mechanical image, the free operation of the will becomes blocked. Although the metaphysical possibility of free activity remains, de facto the will can no longer bring itself to make a truly free decision. Hence it becomes the plaything of the passions.” (Schmaus 16)
      2. “If the metaphysical and psycholo­gical potentiality for freedom which the will retains is to be realized, the will must first be healed of its weakness.” It is actual grace that does this. (Schmaus 16)

## Good Acts Without Grace

### The Catholic Position

1. “The Catholic doctrine of grace . . . defends man’s natural capacity to act in the sphere of religion and morals without grace. . . . Catholic Theology distinguishes sharply between a natural and a supernatural order, between a natural and a supernatural religion and morality.” (Ott 233)
2. “For the performance of a morally good action Sanctifying Grace is not required.” [*de fide*] (Ott 234)
   1. restatement: “all works of the person in mortal sin are not sins.” (Ott 234)
   2. scripture
      1. “Holy Scripture enjoins the sinner to prepare himself for justification by works of penance. . . . It is inconceivable that actions enjoined by God and intended to prepare for justification could be sinful.” (Ott 234)
         1. Ps 51:17, “The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise.”
         2. Ezek 18:30, “Repent and turn from all your transgressions; otherwise iniquity will be your ruin.”
         3. Zech 1:3, “Return to me, says the Lord of hosts, and I will return to you, says the Lord of hosts.”
         4. Matt 3:2, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near.”
         5. “The words of Mt. 7, 18: “A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit,” no more denies the possibility of a morally good work to the sinner, than the parallel words: “a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit,” denies the possibility of sinning to the justified.” (Ott 234)
   3. tradition
      1. Church Fathers: “St. Augustine teaches that even the life of the worst man is hardly without some good works [*De spiritu et litt*. 28.48] . . .” (Ott 234)
      2. doctrinal declarations
         1. Council of Sens (ad 1140 or 1141), “The Errors of Peter Abelard”: “6. That free will is sufficient in itself for any good.” (Denzinger § 373)
         2. Trent (*Canons on Justification*, 1546): it is false that “all works that are done before justification . . . are truly sins or deserving of the hatred of God, or that the more earnestly anyone strives to dispose himself for grace, so much the more grievously does he sin . . .” (Denzinger § 817)
         3. Pius V (errors of Michael du Bay condemned in the bull *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, 1567): “Every action which a sinner, or a slave of sin performs is a sin.” (Denzinger § 1035)
         4. Pius V (errors of Michael du Bay condemned in the bull *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, 1567): “In all his actions a sinner serves his ruling passion.” (Denzinger § 1040)
         5. Clement XI (errors of Paschasius Quesnel condemned in the dogmatic constitution *Unigenitus*, 1713): “As there is no sin without love of ourselves, so there is no good work without love of God.” (Denzinger § 1399)
   4. reason
      1. “The Church’s penitential and catechumenical practice would be meaningless, if all works performed without grace of justification were sins.” (Ott 234)
3. “The Grace of Faith is not necessary for the performance of a morally good action.” [*sententia certa*] (Ott 234)
   1. scripture
      1. Matt 5:47, “if you greet only your brothers and sisters, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same?”
      2. Rom 2:14, “When Gentiles, who do not possess the law, do instinctively what the law requires, these, though not having the law, are a law to themselves.” “According to Rom. 2, 14 pagans are by nature able to fulfil the prescriptions of the moral law.” (Ott 234)
      3. Rom 14:23, “those who have doubts are condemned if they eat, because they do not act from faith; for whatever does not proceed from faith is sin.” This passage “does not refer to the Christian Faith as such, but to the conscience (πίστις = firm conviction, judgment of the conscience).” (Ott 235)
   2. tradition
      1. Church Fathers
         1. “The Fathers unreservedly admit the ability of infidels to perform morally good works.” (Ott 235)
         2. “St. Augustine praises the temperance, selflessness and incorruptibility of his friend Alypius, who, at that time, was not yet a Christian [*Conf*. 6.7.10] . . . and the civic virtues of the ancient Romans [*Ep*. 138.3.17].” (Ott 235)
         3. “When we find in his writings many sentences which are almost word for word in agreement with Baius in which he appears to depict the good works and virtues of pagans as sins and evils [*De Spir. et lit*. 3.5], these are to be explained by his polemic attitude towards Pelagian naturalism, according to which he admits as truly good and as truly virtuous only that which bears on the supernatural end of man.” See *Contra Julianum* 4.3.17, 21, 25. (Ott 235)
      2. doctrinal declarations
         1. Pius V (errors of Michael du Bay condemned in the bull *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, 1567): “All works of infidels are sins, and the virtues of philosophers are vices.” (Denzinger § 1025)
         2. Alexander VIII (errors of the Jansenists condemned in a decree of the Holy Office, 1690): “Of necessity, an infidel sins in every act.”
4. “Actual Grace is not necessary for the performance of a morally good action.” [*sententia certa*]
   1. scripture: “The necessity of actual co-operating grace for all morally good works cannot be proved from Scripture . . .” (Ott 235)
   2. tradition
      1. Church Fathers: Augustine: “Opponents wrongly invoked St. Augustine. When the latter repeatedly declares that without the grace of God no work free from sin is possible, it must be observed that he calls everything sin, which does not bear on man’s supernatural final end using the word sin therefore in a special sense.” (Ott 235)
      2. doctrinal declarations: “In this sense, also, can. 22 of the Second Council of Orange must be understood . . .” (Ott 235) Council of Orange II (canon 22, ad 529): “No one has anything of his own except lying and sin. But if man has any truth and justice, it is from that fountain for which we ought to thirst in this desert, that bedewed by some drops of water from it, we may not falter on the way.” (From Augustine’s *In Ioan. tr*. 5.1.) (Denzinger § 195)
   3. reason
      1. “Fallen man can perform good works without help of Divine grace, by his natural powers alone. Therefore not all works which are achieved without grace are sins.” (Ott 235)
      2. A sinner “can still perform . . ., with the help of actual grace, even supernaturally good (though not meritorious) works . . .” (Ott 234)
5. “In the condition of fallen nature it is morally impossible for man without restoring grace (gratia sanans) to fulfil the entire moral law and to overcome all serious temptations for any considerable period of time.” [*sententia certa*] (Ott 236)
   1. scripture
      1. Rom 7:14-25, “the law is spiritual; but I am of the flesh, sold into slavery under sin. 15I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. 16Now if I do what I do not want, I agree that the law is good. 17But in fact it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me. 18For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. 19For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. 20Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me. 21So I find it to be a law that when I want to do what is good, evil lies close at hand. 22For I delight in the law of God in my inmost self, 23but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind, making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members. 24Wretched man that I am! Who will rescue me from this body of death? 25Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, with my mind I am a slave to the law of God, but with my flesh I am a slave to the law of sin.” This passage “describes the weakness of fallen nature by reason of concupiscence, against the assaults of temptations, and stresses the necessity of Divine help in order to overcome them.” (Ott 236)
   2. tradition
      1. Trent (*Decree On Justification* canon 22, 1547): “he who is justified [cannot] persevere in the justice received without the special assistance of God . . .” (Denzinger § 832)
   3. reason
      1. Since the justified require a special help from God, “that is, an actual assistance of grace, in order permanently to avoid all serious sin, and thus to preserve the state of grace . . . all the more . . . the non-justified man without the actual help of grace, cannot avoid all serious sins for any considerable time . . .” (Ott 236)
      2. Nevertheless, “. . . in virtue of his natural freedom, he is able to avoid individual sins, and to fulfil individual commandments.” (Ott 236)

### Protestant Positions

1. **Calvinism**
   1. According to Calvin, “all men are lost in Adam and hence incapable of performing any good works . . .” (Klooster 38)
   2. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians* (on Eph 1:4, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love”): “in the nature of corrupt men, . . . nothing can be seen [i.e., foreseen, by God] but materials for destruction. . . . We are all lost in Adam; and therefore, had not God rescued us from perishing by His own election, there was nothing [i.e., no good works] to be forseen [*sic*].” (Klooster 38-39)

## Sin (and God’s Anger) in the Old Testament

1. **sin**
   1. the primitive concept of sin (mechanical guilt)
      1. The primitive concept of guilt was of a material infection, contracted even by the innocent. Motive is unimportant; punishment is caused by the act.
         1. Gen 6-8: all humankind perishes in the flood.
         2. Josh 7:1-26, “Achan . . . took some of the devoted things [booty consecrated to God after a battle]; and the anger of the Lord burned against the Israelites. . . . 10The Lord said to Joshua, . . . 15“the one who is taken as having the devoted things shall be burned with fire, together with all that he has . . .” [Having determined that Achan was the thief,] 24Joshua and all Israel with him took Achan . . ., with his sons and daughters, with his oxen, donkeys, and sheep, and his tent and all that he had; and they brought them up to the Valley of Achor. 25. . . And all Israel stoned him to death; they burned them with fire, cast stones on them, 26and raised over him a great heap of stones that remains to this day. Then the Lord turned from his burning anger. Therefore that place to this day is called the Valley of Achor.”
      2. The primitive conception of guilt obscures Yahweh’s moral will.
      3. But “the idea illustrates the profound Israelite belief in the reality of guilt and of its power to wreak harm far beyond the individual person who com­mits the sin.” (McKenzie 1306)
   2. ethical guilt (especially in the prophets)
      1. Sin is a deliberate choice, made with full knowl­edge.
      2. Sin ruptures personal relations with Yahweh.
      3. It is contempt of Yahweh, profanation of his holiness, denial of his divinity.
      4. Ezek 18:2-20, “What do you mean by repeating this proverb concerning the land of Israel, “The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge”? 3As I live, says the Lord God, this proverb shall no more be used by you in Israel. 4Know that . . . it is only the person who sins that shall die. 5If a man is righteous and does what is lawful and right . . . 9such a one is righteous; he shall surely live, says the Lord God. 10If he has a son who is violent, a shedder of blood, . . . 13shall he then live? He shall not. . . . his blood shall be upon himself. 14But if this man has a son who sees all the sins that his father has done, considers, and does not do likewise, . . . 17he shall surely live. . . . 20A child shall not suffer for the iniquity of a parent, nor a parent suffer for the iniquity of a child; the righteousness of the righteous shall be his own, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be his own.”
   3. guilt and anger
      1. The prophets emphasized Yahweh’s personal response: when he punishes, he is personally involved.
      2. “The anger of Yahweh is a concept totally opposed to the mechanical conception of guilt and punishment. When Yahweh punishes sin, he is personally involved. His anger is not blind rage; it is directed by judgment, and the judgments of Yahweh are not impersonal.” (McKenzie 1306)
2. **God’s anger**
   1. divine anger in the ancient Near East
      1. Nature is diverse, therefore full of conflicting personages.
      2. So divine anger had an element of caprice:
         1. the gods’ reasons for anger escaped understanding;
         2. the gods’ anger must often be irrational, unmotivated.
   2. divine anger in Israel
      1. metaphors for God’s anger in the OT
         1. blazing fire
         2. furious storm
         3. liquid that can be poured out
         4. bitter, poisonous drink that makes men stagger
      2. apparently irrational instances of God’s anger
         1. Yahweh’s at­tack on Jacob: Gen 32:24-30, “Jacob was left alone; and a man wrestled with him until daybreak. 25When the man saw that he did not prevail against Jacob, he struck him on the hip socket; and Jacob’s hip was put out of joint as he wrestled with him. 26Then he said, “Let me go, for the day is breaking.” But Jacob said, “I will not let you go, unless you bless me.” 27So he said to him, . . . 28“You shall no longer be called Jacob, but Israel, for you have striven with God and with humans, and have prevailed.” 29And there he blessed him. 30So Jacob called the place Peniel, saying, “For I have seen God face to face, and yet my life is preserved.””
         2. Yahweh’s at­tack on Moses: Exod 4:24-26, “On the way, at a place where they spent the night, the Lord met him and tried to kill him. 25But Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son’s foreskin, and touched Moses’ feet with it, and said, “Truly you are a bridegroom of blood to me!” 26So he let him alone.”
         3. touching a sacred object: 1 Sam 6:6-7, “Uzzah reached out his hand to the ark of God and took hold of it, for the oxen shook it. 7The anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God struck him there because he reached out his hand to the ark; and he died there beside the ark of God.”
         4. failing to rejoice: 1 Sam 6:19, “The descendants of Jeconiah did not rejoice with the people of Beth-shemesh when they greeted the ark of the Lord; and he killed seventy men of them.”
         5. too near an approach to Yahweh: Exod 19:9-25, “12set limits for the people all around, saying, ‘Be careful not to go up the mountain or to touch the edge of it. Any who touch the mountain shall be put to death. 13No hand shall touch them, but they shall be stoned or shot with arrows; whether animal or human being, they shall not live.’ . . . 21warn the people not to break through to the Lord to look; otherwise many of them will perish. 22Even the priests who approach the Lord must consecrate themselves or the Lord will break out against them.”
         6. the sight of God
            1. Exod 33:20 (God to Moses), “you cannot see my face; for no one shall see me and live.”
            2. Judg 13:22, “Manoah said to his wife, “We shall surely die, for we have seen God.””
      3. ethically motivated instances of God’s anger
         1. Israel rejected caprice as an explanation of God’s anger; sin causes anger.
            1. Isa 6:5 (Isaiah says), “Woe is me! I am lost, for I am a man of unclean lips, and I live among a people of unclean lips; yet my eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts!”
            2. Isa 58:5-7 (God says), “Is the fast that I choose . . . to bow down the head like a bulrush, and to lie in sackcloth and ashes? . . . 6Is not this the fast that I choose: . . . 7Is it not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked, to cover them, and not to hide yourself from your own kin?”
            3. Yahweh’s anger is always associated with his righteousness, judgments, holiness, covenant.
      4. Even God’s ethically motivated anger is ultimately incomprehensible.
         1. Because sin causes anger, one presumes a connection between God’s punishment and sin, even if not perceived.
         2. Divine anger is more pro­found than human anger and is elicited where human anger would not be. If this happens, the righteous judg­ment of Yahweh must be accepted.
            1. Isa 28:29, “he is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in wisdom.”
            2. Isa 55:8-9, “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways my ways, says the Lord. 9For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.”
            3. Job 42:2-6, “I know that you can do all things, and that no purpose of yours can be thwarted. 3. . . I have uttered what I did not understand, things too wonderful for me, which I did not know. . . . 5I had heard of you by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees you; 6therefore I . . . repent in dust and ashes.”
         3. “To make Yahweh com­prehensible would be to reduce him to the level of creatures . . . Before this mystery the only proper position is submission, for the manifestation of Yahweh makes human self-assertion ridiculous.” (McKenzie 1302)
      5. anger as justice
         1. “Anger in the OT occupies the place that justice occupies in modern thinking about the deity. The differ­ence between the two approaches is the difference between the personal and the impersonal.” (McKenzie 1301)
         2. “Although it is easier for us to think of God as the author and defender of a juridical order, in Israelite thought Yahweh is personally offended by breaches of the covenant, and he responds not only with authority and power but also with a personal revulsion . . .” (McKenzie 1301)
      6. Yahweh usually shows loving-kindness; anger is the exception. (See “loving-kind­ness” below.)
      7. God’s anger is the most difficult anthropomorphism.
         1. Nevertheless, it is a reality that must not be omitted from the divine nature.
         2. If not angered by sin, Yahweh would not take it seriously.

## Some Principles of Morality

1. **definition of a** “**sin**”
   1. A sin is knowing an act is wrong and doing it anyway.
      1. “The classical prophets all dwell on the fact that sin is a deliberate choice made with full knowledge . . .” (McKenzie 1306)
      2. “According to the Church, in order for something to be sinful, the individual must be aware that it is a sin and fully assent to doing it anyway.” (Cavanaugh 218)
   2. Both intellect and will are involved in sin.
      1. intellect: knowing that an act is wrong
      2. will: doing it anyway
2. **imputable and non-imputable acts**
   1. example of an imputable act: deliberately changing gears
   2. example of a non-imputable act: automatically changing gears
3. **sin vs. evil**
   1. evil: a bad act
   2. sin: an intended bad act
4. **commission and omission**; **thought**, **word**, **and deed**
   1. omission: James 4:17, “Anyone, then, who knows the right thing to do and fails to do it, commits sin.”
5. **elements of an imputable act** (the traditional three “fonts” [sources] of morality)
   1. the act itself (e.g., stealing)
   2. the motive (why the action is performed: e.g., a dare, kleptomania, starving children)
   3. circumstances (factors of time and place: who, where, when, how, how much, effects)
   4. Must all three elements be good for an act to be good?
      1. The traditional answer was “yes”: the act itself was considered the most important element (“it was the deed itself that made an act moral or immoral”). A conse­quence was that “the gravity of the matter” was used to distin­guish mortal from venial sin. This is incorrect, most moral theologians now agree. (O’Connell 80)
      2. Act and circumstances refer to objective morality, whereas motive is “a term describing the meaning that an action has for its agent. . . . [Actions] do not have motives; they only have ends or results. Agents have motives . . .” (O’Connell 79)
      3. According to O’Connell, “motive is the *only* determinant of the morality. For morality . . . is not a quality of deeds but a quality of persons. It is a term that describes the sense of obligation, the accountability, which is characteristic of persons.” (O’Connell 79)
6. **limits on imputability**
   1. degrees of intention
   2. ignorance (vincible, invincible)
   3. strong emotion
   4. fear
   5. force
   6. habit
   7. other factors (sickness, sleepiness, pain, alcohol, neurosis, psychosis)
   8. Even a per­son whose external behavior is deficient but who is not responsible because the de­fi­ci­ent behavior results from “temperament, heredity, bad upbringing, or his uncon­scious me­chanical re­actions,” can, so long as “the minimum of freedom neces­sary to cling to God” remains, have grace and therefore eternal life. (Daujat 105-106)

## Fundamental Stance and Fundamental Option;

## Mortal and Venial Sin

1. **fundamental stance and fundamental option**
   1. fundamental option
      1. definition: “the moment in which the stance [for or against God] is assumed or emphatically re­newed.” (O’Connell 64)
      2. “The option may be a reaffirmation of a stance already adopted, or it may involve a reversal.” (O’Connell 65)
      3. “. . . a fundamental option is not a once-and-for-all reality. . . . [But] life periodically pres­ents us with critical turning points, moments in which the making of a particular cat­egorical behavioral choice also challenges us . . .” (O’Connell 65)
      4. Persons are more likely to perform fundamental options in acts that are grave. (O’Connell 80)
   2. fundamental stance
      1. definition: “a position toward the world that expresses and creates the person we have chosen to be.” [64] “The fundamental stance that gives us . . . identity [is] in­car­nated in the behavior by which we build our lives.” (O’Connell 64-65)
      2. “. . . sin and virtue are more profoundly viewed as states than acts. They are the states of alienation from and relationship to God . . .” [70] “. . . fundamental stance is nothing but a philosophic synonym for the religious realities of . . . “the state of sin” and the “state of grace.”” (O’Connell 70-71)
      3. “. . . the right ordering of our life and conduct depends upon the deep-seated energy of the will which determines the interior orientation of our whole being towards its last end . . .” (Daujat 96)
   3. impediments to good acts
      1. If I have a fundamental stance toward God, why is it that not every act is good?
      2. Christian tradition speaks of “the *effects of original sin*,” which include “darkening of the intellect” and “concupiscence.” These are impediments to consistently good actions. (O’Connell 75)
2. **mortal and venial sin**
   1. mortal sin
      1. 1 John 5:16, “If you see your brother or sister committing what is not a mortal sin, you will ask, and God will give life to such a one—to those whose sin is not mortal. There is sin that is mortal; I do not say that you should pray about that. 17All wrongdoing is sin, but there is sin that is not mortal.”
      2. James 1:14-15, “one is tempted by one’s own desire, being lured and enticed by it; 15then, when that desire has conceived, it gives birth to sin, and that sin, when it is fully grown, gives birth to death.”
      3. The religious term for an act through which a bad fundamental option is made is *mortal sin*. “. . . mortal sin is not pre­cisely the doing of any particular categorical act. Rather it is the act of self-dis­position oc­curring *through* and *in* that concrete categorical act.” (O’Connell 71)
      4. Mortal sin cannot be done by accident. (O’Connell 72)
   2. venial sin
      1. definition: “In venial sin there is a genuine decision to do this or that action. But there is no decision to become this or that sort of person.” (O’Connell 77)
      2. One cannot simply look within to determine whether a given sin is venial or mortal, because “the self-awareness characteristic of our core being is a nonreflexive awareness. . . . Once again we are driven to the virtue of hope as the only reasonable (and Christian) way to deal with ourselves.” (O’Connell 78)
3. **summary**
   1. A fundamental option is an act; it is momentary. It turns one toward or away from God; it establishes or breaks one’s personal relationship with God. If it establishes one’s relationship, then it is conversion; if it breaks one’s relationship, then it is mortal sin (lesser sins are venial).
   2. The state resulting from a fundamental option is a fundamental stance. It is the state of grace or the state of (mortal) sin.

## Catholic Moral Systems

1. **tutiorism** (also “rigorism”; Jansenists; based on *Augustinus*, ad 1640; condemned, 1690): absolute certainty is necessary for a moral act to be licit. (Eberhardt 327-28)
2. **probabiliorism** (Dominicans, c 1660): “it is not lawful to act on the less safe opinion unless it is more probable than the safe opinion.” (Harty) Look up in Dict Christian Church.
3. **equi-probabilism** (Alphonsus Liguori)
   1. 1767: in an edition of his *Theologia Moralis*, Liguori said that dissent from the law is acceptable only when the conflicting opinions are “almost equally probable.” (Eberhardt 330)
   2. “This was virtually the basis of the Aequi-Probabilism to which he adhered in later life.” (Eberhardt 330)
   3. “. . . his view, “when a less sage opinion is equally or almost equally probable, one may licitly follow it,” was sufficient to tip the scales against Probabiliorism.” (Eberhardt 330)
4. **probabilism** (Jesuits, Redemptorists): a less probable opinion can be followed, if it is held by wise men and supported with first-class arguments. (Eberhardt 326-27)
   1. definition: “it is permissible to follow a solidly probable opinion in favour of liberty even though the opposing view is more probable.” (Harty)
   2. Jesuits
      1. Probabilism “had served as an implicit principle for the solution of moral cases by the Fathers and Scholastics . . .” (Eberhardt 329)
      2. 1572: Bartolomé Medina (1527-1581) first explicitly formulated probabilism in his commentary on Aquinas’ *Summa Theologiae*. (Eberhardt 326-27)
      3. A later advocate was Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). (Eberhardt 327)
   3. Alphonsus Liguori (1696-1787)
      1. 1748-1779: eight editions of *Theologia Moralis* (Eberhardt 329)
      2. “He had been educated in the prevailing probabiliorist principles . . . [But] during his prime he was definitely a Probabilist. [329] . . . he certainly deserted Probabiliorism.” (Eberhardt 329-30)
      3. He defended the principle, *lex dubia non obligat* (a doubtful law does not obligate one to follow it). (Eberhardt 329)
      4. 1749: he wrote, “Even in the presence of a more probable opinion, it is permissible to follow a probable opinion, if this rests on a serious reason or authority.” (Eberhardt 329)
      5. 1755: he added, “provided that the difference of probability is not enormous between the two opinions.” (Eberhardt 330)
5. **laxism** (condemned, ad 1665, 1679)
   1. Even tenuously probable opinions, if truly probable, can be followed. (Eberhardt 327)
   2. “. . . a slightly probable opinion in favour of liberty could safely be followed.” (Harty)
6. **present positions**
   1. “Probabiliorism has to a great extent disappeared . . .” (Harty)
   2. “Since the time of St. Alphonsus the prevailing moral systems have been Probabilism and Æquiprobabilism.” (Harty)
   3. “. . . the Probabilist thesis . . . has been accepted during the nineteenth century by the vast majority of theologians.” (Harty)

# Providence and Predestination

## Providence I

1. **introduction**
   1. “Basically, there are two possible forms of belief”: fate or providence. (van Baaren)
2. **fate**
   1. Fate is “a more or less impersonal principle of cosmic order as instituted and maintained by a divine being . . .” (van Baaren)
   2. Whereas “A personal god may . . . be moved by prayer and sacrifice to give or to prevent events,” a cosmic order, even if benevolent, precludes a personal relationship. (van Baaren)
   3. examples
      1. In Egyptian religion, the goddess “Maat represents truth and order; . . . not only the order of nature, but also the social and ethical orders.” (van Baaren)
      2. In Zoroastrian religion, Asha is natural and ethical cosmic order. (van Baaren)
      3. In Hinduism, *rita* “forms the Indian counterpart of Asha.” (van Baaren)
      4. In Chinese religion, Tao “represents the cosmic order, but is also . . . the primeval power that forms the foundation of all that is . . .” (van Baaren)
      5. “The Greek Moira . . . is comparable to Asha and *rta* . . .” (van Baaren)
         1. For Stoics, “a controlling power exists, but, as everything happens according to a benevolent divine plan, they preferred to call this power Providence.” (van Baaren)
         2. For Epicureans, Epicurus had denied providence. (van Baaren)
      6. All of these concepts are “to a high degree impersonal.” (van Baaren)
   4. determinism
      1. “. . . Providence may lose its aspect of benevolence and become inexorable fate or fickle chance.” (van Baaren)
      2. Cosmic order “may become inexorable and thus lead to fatalism, the belief in an impersonal destiny against which man is powerless.” (van Baaren)
      3. “In the Greco-Roman world, fatalistic belief was strong . . . it found a popular expression in astrology . . .” (van Baaren)
      4. “There is probably no religion that acknowledges an all-embracing world order without any exceptions at all.” (van Baaren)
         1. Usually “the cosmic order is valid for everything of a more general character, but as a rule the divine will or the free will of man . . . operates on the level of the common occurrences and daily life of the individual.” (van Baaren)
3. **providence**
   1. definition
      1. etymology
         1. Greek *pronoia* (*πρόνoια*) became Latin *providentia*, which became English “providence.”
         2. Hellenistic writers used *pronoia* “almost as a synonym for [God], exactly as “Providence” may be used in English.” (Moule 940)
         3. “Latin *providentia* “exactly mirror[ed] . . . its Greek equivalent, *pronoia.*” (van Baaren)
         4. *Providentia* “primarily means foresight or foreknowledge but also forethought and Providence in the religious sense . . .” (van Baaren)
         5. “Indeed, the appropriation of it [πρόνoια] by pagan philosophers and moralists may be part of the explanation of the rarity of its biblical occurrences, and of the preference in the Bible for other terms [like “election,” “foreknowledge,” “predestination,” and “vocation”].” (Moule 940)
      2. Providence is “the divine watchful care for the benefit of mankind . . .” (van Baar­en)
         1. The historian Xenophon and the biographer Plutarch “used the word for the watchful care of the gods over mankind and the world.” (van Baaren)
   2. Usually, “man believes in more or less divine beings that are responsible for the world generally and for the welfare of man specifically.” (van Baaren)
   3. “In monotheistic religions Providence is a quality of the one divinity . . .” (van Baaren)
   4. “. . . in polytheistic religions it [providence] may be either a quality of one or more gods or it may be conceived as an impersonal world order on which the gods, too, more or less depend.” (van Baaren)
   5. “Most religions show a certain ambivalence; for fate and Providence do not always form a clear-cut contradiction.” (van Baaren)
4. “**the relation of the Creator to the world after creation**” (van Baaren)
   1. Fate: “God created the world and the cosmic order in such a manner that to a great extent the course of the world is fixed from the first beginning and he is no longer involved in it.” E.g., deism (1600s-1700s ad). (van Baaren)
   2. Providence: “. . . God will not abandon the world he has created . . .” (van Baaren)
      1. The act of creation implies concern on the creator’s part.
      2. “The fact of creation helps man to believe in Providence because it would be inconsistent for the creator god or gods not to care for the further existence of the created world.” (van Baaren)
5. **particular objects of providence**
   1. “Although cosmic order is necessarily a general idea comprising the whole of the world and all that exists in it, the concept of Providence may be more particular: the benevolent aspect of Providence may be confined to a special group of people . . . or a number of patron gods or saints may watch over some specific activity or smaller group.” (van Baaren)
   2. “This accounts for the idea of a chosen people watched over and led by a just and loving God. The ancient people of Israel is, perhaps, the best known example; the concept, however, is widespread.” (van Baaren)
   3. Providence “may also be experienced as personal guidance.” (van Baaren)
      1. “In other cultures and religions, personal guidance is often a prerogative of some person or persons singled out for some reason by God or the gods.” E.g., shamanism. (van Baaren)
      2. Personal guidance “is common [among] the Plains Indians of North America and in some forms of Protestantism in which generally each person is expected to have a private experience of divine guidance.” (van Baaren)
6. **some scripture references to providence**
   1. Old Testament
      1. 2 Kgs 19:21-28, “This is the word that the Lord has spoken concerning him [King Sennacherib of Assyria]: . . . 22Against whom have you raised your voice and haughtily lifted your eyes? Against the Holy One of Israel! . . . 25Have you not heard that I determined it long ago? I planned from days of old what now I bring to pass, that you should make fortified cities crash into heaps of ruins, 26while their inhabitants, shorn of strength, are dismayed and confounded . . . 27But I know your rising and your sitting, your going out and coming in, and your raging against me. 28Because you have raged against me and your arrogance has come to my ears, I will put my hook in your nose and my bit in your mouth; I will turn you back on the way by which you came.””
      2. Ps 121, “I lift up my eyes to the hills—from where will my help come? 2My help comes from the Lord, who made heaven and earth. 3He will not let your foot be moved; he who keeps you will not slumber. 4He who keeps Israel will neither slumber nor sleep. 5The Lord is your keeper; the Lord is your shade at your right hand. 6The sun shall not strike you by day, nor the moon by night. 7The Lord will keep you from all evil; he will keep your life. 8The Lord will keep your going out and your coming in from this time on and forevermore.”
      3. Ps 10:33-36, “He turns rivers into a desert, springs of water into thirsty ground, 34a fruitful land into a salty waste, because of the wickedness of its inhabitants. 35He turns a desert into pools of water, a parched land into springs of water. 36And there he lets the hungry live, and they establish a town to live in . . .”
      4. Wis 14:3 (see 3-6), “it is your providence [*pronoia*, πρόνoια], O Father, that steers its [a ship’s] course, because you have given it a path in the sea, and a safe way through the waves, 4showing that you can save from every danger, so that even a person who lacks skill may put to sea. 5It is your will that works of your wisdom should not be without effect . . . 6the hope of the world took refuge on a raft [Noah’s ark], and guided by your hand left to the world the seed of a new generation.”
      5. Wis 17:2, For when lawless people supposed that they held the holy nation in their power, they themselves lay as captives of darkness and prisoners of long night, shut in under their roofs, exiles from eternal providence.
         1. In the two passages from Wisdom, “πρόνoια is used, in a manner familiar in Hellenistic writers of the time, . . . almost as a synonym for [God], exactly as “Providence” may be used in English.” (Moule 940)
         2. In Wis 14:3, providence “is attributed to God, in an address to him as Father.” (Moule 940)
   2. providential care in daily details
      1. Matt 5:44-45, “Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45so that you may be children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous.”
      2. Matt 6:25-34, “I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or what you will drink, or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing? 26Look at the birds of the air; they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they? 27And can any of you by worrying add a single hour to your span of life? 28And why do you worry about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they neither toil nor spin, 29yet I tell you, even Solomon in all his glory was not clothed like one of these. 30But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which is alive today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will he not much more clothe you—you of little faith? 31Therefore do not worry, saying, ‘What will we eat?’ or ‘What will we drink?’ or ‘What will we wear?’ 32For it is the Gentiles who strive for all these things; and indeed your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. 33But strive first for the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well. 34So do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will bring worries of its own. Today’s trouble is enough for today.”
      3. Matt 10:29-31, “Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father. 30And even the hairs of your head are all counted. 31So do not be afraid; you are of more value than many sparrows.”
   3. miracles
      1. Matt 17:24-27, “When they reached Capernaum, the collectors of the temple tax came to Peter and said, “Does your teacher not pay the temple tax?” 25He said, “Yes, he does.” And when he came home, Jesus spoke of it first, asking, “What do you think, Simon? From whom do kings of the earth take toll or tribute? From their children or from others?” 26When Peter said, “From others,” Jesus said to him, “Then the children are free. 27However, so that we do not give offense to them, go to the sea and cast a hook; take the first fish that comes up; and when you open its mouth, you will find a coin; take that and give it to them for you and me.”
7. **problem**: **providence and free will**
   1. See the handout, “Free Will,” with notes on free will and determinism from: Pontifex, Mark. *Freedom and Providence*. Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism 22. New York: Hawthorn, 1960.
8. **problem**: **providence and the problem of evil**
   * 1. “Perhaps the most difficult problem connected with the notion of Providence is the existence of evil; men have perennially coped with the question of how to reconcile the idea of a provident God or gods with the evident existence of evil in the world.” (van Baaren)
     2. Stoic Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius: “. . . God wills everything that happens to man, and for that reason nothing that occurs can be considered evil.” (Qtd. in van Baaren)
     3. God as source of evil
        1. Job 1:21, “Naked I came from my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return there; the Lord gave, and the Lord has taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.”
        2. Job 2:10, “Shall we receive the good at the hand of God, and not receive the bad?”
     4. But God is love.
        1. 1 John 4:8, 16, “God is love.”
9. **providence and prayer**
   1. some scripture references
      1. Matt 7:7-11, “Ask, and it will be given you; search, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened for you. 8For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who searches finds, and for everyone who knocks, the door will be opened. 9Is there anyone among you who, if your child asks for bread, will give a stone? 10Or if the child asks for a fish, will give a snake? 11If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good things to those who ask him!”
      2. Matt 18:19, “if two of you agree on earth about anything you ask, it will be done for you by my Father in heaven.”
      3. Matt 21:22, “Whatever you ask for in prayer with faith, you will receive.”
   2. solution: incomprehensibility
      1. Isa 55:9, “For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.”
      2. Job 38:1-14, 42:2-6, God says to Job, “Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind: 2“Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge? 3Gird up your loins like a man, I will question you, and you shall declare to me. 4Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me, if you have understanding. 5Who determined its measurements—surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? 6On what were its bases sunk, or who laid its cornerstone 7when the morning stars sang together and all the heavenly beings shouted for joy? 8“Or who shut in the sea with doors when it burst out from the womb?—9when I made the clouds its garment, and thick darkness its swaddling band, 10and prescribed bounds for it, and set bars and doors, 11and said, ‘Thus far shall you come, and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stopped’? 12Have you commanded the morning since your days began, and caused the dawn to know its place, 13so that it might take hold of the skirts of the earth, and the wicked be shaken out of it? 14It is changed like clay under the seal, and it is dyed like a garment.” . . . [Job replies,] 42:2“I know that you can do all things, and that no purpose of yours can be thwarted. 3. . . Therefore I have uttered what I did not understand, things too wonderful for me, which I did not know. . . . 5I had heard of you by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees you; 6therefore I despise myself, and repent in dust and ashes.”

## Providence II

(See also articles in the *Interpreter*’*s Dictionary of the Bible* on: election; foreknowledge; God, NT [especially § 7]; God, OT; love; predestination; vocation. Moule 940)

1. **non-Jewish Greek writers** (outside the Bible)
   1. ““The divine providence” was a common enough periphrasis for “God” in Greek writers . . .” (Moule 940)
   2. For the Greeks, providence “tended to be cosmic and impersonal . . .” (Moule 940)
      * 1. Seneca, *On Kindness* 6.23.5: “Nature conceived us in thought before she made us.” (Moule 940)
        2. Cicero (*On the Nature of the Gods* 2 §§ 58, 73) uses πρόνoια, “providence.” (Moule 940)
2. **in the Old Testament**
   1. the Greek nouns *heimarmenē*, *moira*, and *tuchē* (εἱμαρμένη, μoῖρα, and τύχη)
      1. “The Greek words which are closely related to the idea of a fixed, impersonal destiny, εἱμαρμένη and μoῖρα, are naturally absent from the Greek Bible . . .” (Moule 940)
      2. Τύχη, “fortune,” occurs only 3 times in the LXX. (Moule 940)
         1. Gen 30:11, “And Leah said, “Good fortune!” so she named him Gad.” Here τύχη is used in a “play on the name “Gad” . . .” (Moule 940)
         2. Isa 65:11, “But you who forsake the Lord, who forget my holy mountain, who set a table for Fortune and fill cups of mixed wine for Destiny; 12I will destine you to the sword . . .” Here τύχη is used in the “castigation of a pagan cult . . .” (Moule 940)
         3. 2 Macc 7:37, “I, like my brothers, give up body and life for the laws of our ancestors, appealing to God to show mercy soon to our nation and by trials and plagues to make you confess that he alone is God . . .” Here τύχη is used as a “variant of ψυχή [“psyche”], “soul” . . .” [Ψυχή = “life” in the above quotation?—Hahn] (Moule 940)
   2. *problepō* and *prooraō* (πρoβλέπω and πρooράω, Greek verbs)
      1. πρoβλέπω and πρooράω (both meaning “foresee”) occur in the LXX.
      2. No nouns derived from these verbs occur in the LXX.
      3. The Latin noun *providentia* (literally “foresight”) derived from and exactly corresponds to the nouns derived from the verbs πρoβλέπω and πρooράω. English “providence” is from Latin *providentia*. (Moule 940)
   3. *pronoeō* (πρoνoέω, Greek verb) occurs 11 times in the LXX.
      1. 10 times it refers to “human vision or provision . . ., meaning “provide,” “provision” . . .” These are unimportant for divine providence. (Moule 940)
      2. Once it refers to divine providence: Wis 6:7,

For the Lord of all will not stand in awe of anyone,

or show deference to greatness;

because he himself made both small and great,

and he takes thought [προνoέω] for all alike.

* 1. *pronoia* (πρόνoια, Greek noun) occurs ? times in the LXX (Moule does not say).
     1. An example is 2 Macc 4:6 (“he [Onias] saw that without the king’s attention [πρόνoια] public affairs could not again reach a peaceful settlement”).
     2. 2 times it refers to divine providence: Wis 14:3, 17:2.
        1. “πρόνoια is [here] used, in a manner familiar in Hellenistic writers of the time, in connection with, and almost as a synonym for, God, exactly as “Providence” may be used in English.” (Moule 940)
        2. Wis 14:3 (see 3-6)

3but it is your providence, O Father, that steers its [a ship’s] course,

because you have given it a path in the sea,

and a safe way through the waves,

4showing that you can save from every danger,

so that even a person who lacks skill may put to sea.

5It is your will that works of your wisdom should not be without effect;

therefore people trust their lives even to the smallest piece of wood,

and passing through the billows on a raft they come safely to land.

6For even in the beginning, when arrogant giants were perishing,

the hope of the world took refuge on a raft,

and guided by your hand left to the world the seed of a new generation.

Here providence “is attributed to God, in an address to him as Father.” (Moule 940)

* + - 1. Wis 17:2

For when lawless people supposed that they held the holy nation in their power,

they themselves lay as captives of darkness and prisoners of long night,

shut in under their roofs, exiles from eternal providence.

Here “eternal providence” is “virtually . . . a synonym for “God” . . .” (Moule 940)

1. **intertestamental literature**
   1. “. . . for the Hebrew thinker it [πρόνoια, providence] needed to be closely associated with the plan and election of a personal God.” (Moule 940)
   2. In 3 Macc 4:21 and 5:30, πρόνoια “is used with a genitive following, as an attribute of God.” (Moule 940) (I.e., πρόνoια τοῦ θεοῦ, “providence of God.”)
   3. In 4 Macc 13:19 and 17:22, “the divine providence” is a periphrasis for “God,” as in non-biblical Greek writers. (Moule 940)
   4. In 4 Macc 9:24 “our just ancestral providence” is “a variant of the same.” (Moule 940)
   5. Philo
      1. Philo wrote a treatise called περὶ πρoνoίας (*peri pronoias*, “On Providence”), according to Eusebius (*History of the Church* 11.18.6; *Preparation for the Gospel* 7.20.9, 8.13.7). (Moule 940)
      2. “Indeed, the appropriation of it [πρόνoια] by pagan philosophers and moralists may be part of the explanation of the rarity of its biblical occurrences, and of the preference in the Bible for other terms [like “election,” “foreknowledge,” “predestination,” and “vocation”].” (Moule 940)
2. **in the New Testament**
   1. πρoνoέω occurs 2 times but refers only to “human vision or provision . . .” (Moule 940)
      1. Rom 13:14, “make no provision for the flesh, to gratify its desires.”
      2. (Moule does not give the other NT instance of προνoέω.)
   2. πρόνoια occurs 1 time but refers only to “human vision or provision . . .” (Moule 940)
      1. Acts 24:2 (Ananias’ lawyer Tertullus to Felix the governor), “reforms have been made for this people because of your foresight.”

## Providence in World Religions

1. **etymology**
   1. Greek *pronoia* became Latin *providentia*, which became English “providence.”
   2. “The several meanings of the Latin word *providentia* exactly mirror those of its Greek equivalent, *pronoia.*” (van Baaren)
   3. *Providentia* “primarily means foresight or foreknowledge but also forethought and Providence in the religious sense . . .” (van Baaren)
2. **general concepts**
   1. definition: “. . . Providence [is] the divine watchful care for the benefit of mankind . . .” (van Baaren)
   2. “. . . in all religions Divine Providence or its equivalent is an element of some importance. . . . the concept of Providence by its central position in many religions is connected with numerous other aspects of religion.” (van Baaren)
   3. The concept of fate or divine will may conflict with the concept of human free will. “In some religions the benevolent aspect of Providence appears as grace, and a discussion may arise about the relationship between free will and grace.” (van Baaren)
   4. “Perhaps the most difficult problem connected with the notion of Providence is the existence of evil; men have perennially coped with the question of how to reconcile the idea of a provident God or gods with the evident existence of evil in the world.” (van Baaren)
   5. “Basically, there are two possible forms of belief in Providence.” (van Baaren)
      1. “In the first, man believes in more or less divine beings that are responsible for the world generally and for the welfare of man specifically.” (van Baaren)
         1. “In monotheistic religions Providence is a quality of the one divinity . . .” (van Baaren)
         2. “. . . in polytheistic religions it may be either a quality of one or more gods or it may be conceived as an impersonal world order on which the gods, too, more or less depend.” (van Baaren)
      2. “In the second form, man believes in a cosmic order in which the welfare of man has its appointed place.” (van Baaren)
         1. “In the latter case, Providence may lose its aspect of benevolence and become inexorable fate or fickle chance. Most religions show a certain ambivalence; for fate and Providence do not always form a clear-cut contradiction.” (van Baaren)
3. **first form: deity or deities**
   1. “The concept of Providence is rooted in the belief in the existence of a benevolent, wise, and powerful deity or [deities] . . . Benevolence is the primary requirement. . . . The three attributes, however, are all essential for the concept of Providence: the divine being or beings must be well intentioned toward man, must have the necessary wisdom to know what is good for mankind, and must have the power to act on this intention and insight. Benevolence does not exclude the possibility of punishment in cases of transgression.” (van Baaren)
   2. Providence may operate through intermediary beings: angels, spirits, ancestors. “. . . the introduction of intermediary beings brings no essential change in the idea of Providence . . .” (van Baaren)
   3. Christianity
      1. Old Testament
         1. Gen 22:8, Abraham tells Isaac, “God himself will provide the lamb for a burnt offering, my son.”
         2. Hebrew “lacks a proper word to express the notion of Providence, but the concept is well known in the Old Testament.” (van Baaren)
      2. New Testament
         1. *Pronoia* is rare and “never used in the later Christian sense of Providence.” But the concept of providence is common in the New Testament. (van Baaren)
         2. Matt 10:29-31, “Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father. 30And even the hairs of your head are all counted. 31So do not be afraid; you are of more value than many sparrows.”
      3. “Providence as used in Christianity is thus a dogmatic term rather than a biblical term; it indicates that God not only created the world but also governs it and cares for its welfare.” (van Baaren)
   4. predestination
      1. “Another possibility for combining the idea of a personal divine will with a fixed course of events is the concept of predestination best known from Islam and some forms of Calvinism . . . and also important in the theology of Augustine . . .” (van Baaren)
      2. “Although predestination essentially is concerned with salvation—the question of whether a certain individual will be saved or damned—it is a concept that easily lends itself to a more general application.” (van Baaren)
      3. “In a few religions the idea that the individual chooses his own destiny before birth is encountered; *e.g*., the Batak of Sumatra and some West African tribes. In this conception free will and predestination merge.” (van Baaren)
4. **second form: cosmic order**
   1. Providence “may be implicit in and expressed by a fixed world order, a cosmic order that makes human life possible [and] guarantees its existence in the future. Thus, Providence may become a more or less impersonal principle of cosmic order as instituted and maintained by a divine being . . .” (van Baaren)
   2. some examples of cosmic order
      1. Maat
         1. “The cosmic order can appear in a personalized form, as, for example, the Egyptian goddess Maat; but this personification of the cosmic order is not general: the Iranian Asha, the Indian *rta*, and the Chinese Tao are all to a high degree impersonal.” (van Baaren)
         2. “Maat represents truth and order; her domain includes not only the order of the nature, but also the social and ethical orders. She plays an important role in the judgment of the dead: the heart of the deceased is weighed against the truth of Maat. She is often called the daughter of Re. In this case, Re is the creator god who not only created the world but also founded the cosmic order as represented by Maat. Her importance is also apparent in the conception of the Maat sacrifice. In Egypt sacrifice is not so much a gift of men to the gods as a sacral technique that enables man to contribute to the maintenance and, if necessary, the restoration of harmony and order in the world. Not only must man live according to Maat but also the gods must live by her truth and order; according to Egyptian texts, the goddess Maat is the food by which the gods live.” (van Baaren)
      2. Zoroastrian Asha
         1. A natural and ethical cosmic order “is an important concept in the Persian religion of Zoroastrianism (also called Mazdaism and, in India, Parsiism) founded [c 600 bc] by Zoroaster (Zarathustra).” (van Baaren)
         2. “This idea is called Asha and is the counterpart of Drug, which represents evil and deceit and the disorder connected with these. Asha is connected with the sacred element fire.” (van Baaren)
      3. Hindu Rita
         1. “The Indian concept of *rta* forms the Indian counterpart of Asha. . . . The gods are generally benevolent and friendly toward men who follow *rta*, and they punish their own enemies and those of the world order . . .” (van Baaren)
         2. “. . . in India, too, [cosmic order] embraces the social ethical rules.” (van Baaren)
         3. “The gods, especially the Adityas, protect the world against chaos and ignorance and maintain the world order, which, however, exists independently from the gods.” (van Baaren)
         4. “Although the power of *rta* operates according to its own principles and laws, man is able, provided he knows the right methods, to manipulate this power to some extent for his own benefit. The proper means for this manipulation is found especially in older Hindu sacrifice.” (van Baaren)
      4. Chinese Tao
         1. “The concept of Tao is of great importance in Chinese religion, especially in Taoism, founded by Lao-tzu [in the 500s bc]. Lao-tzu is the author of the *Tao-te Ching* (“Classic of the Way and Its Power”) in which he expounds this concept in a manner that is more mystical than philosophical. . . . [The *Tao-te Ching* illustrates] the essence of the Tao . . . in many parables and metaphors because it cannot be expressed rationally.” (van Baaren)
         2. “Tao, literally translated “road,” . . . represents the cosmic order, but [it] is also the concept that gives existence meaning; it is the primeval power that forms the foundation of all that is; and, in some cases, it is even used to designate some kind of high god.” (van Baaren)
      5. Greek Moira
         1. “The Greek Moira . . . is comparable to Asha and *rta*; it lacks, however, the mystic overtones of Tao. The Moira in classical Greek religion is not yet fate as this idea was found in Greco-Roman times.” (van Baaren)
      6. Leibniz’s “pre-established harmony”
         1. The concept of cosmic order may function . . . in a philosophic context; *e.g*., the pre-established harmony (*harmonia praestabilita*) in the philosophy of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, a German Rationalist, is the cosmic order that holds together and unifies the innumerable individual units, called monads by Leibniz.” (van Baaren)
   3. “The cosmic order is often clearly contrasted with the disorder of chaos.” (van Baaren)
   4. Even if the cosmic order is benevolent and reassuring, it precludes a personal relationship. “A personal god may, perhaps, be moved by prayer and sacrifice to give or to prevent events . . .” (van Baaren)
   5. “There is probably no religion that acknowledges an all-embracing world order without any exceptions at all.” (van Baaren)
      1. “. . . the cosmic order is valid for everything of a more general character, but as a rule the divine will or the free will of man . . . operates on the level of the common occurrences and daily life of the individual.” (van Baaren)
      2. “In some cases even uncertainty and chance have their proper place within a determined order. In Yoruba religion (Nigeria), for example, the god Eshu represents the principle of chance . . .” (van Baaren)
   6. ethics
      1. “. . . man is expected to work with the cosmos, to insert himself into the cosmic order. Man’s behaviour in all fields is governed by a set of rules that are all based on the same principle: to act and to be in harmony with the order of the world, which is natural and divine at the same time.” (van Baaren)
      2. “The cosmic order . . . comprises not only all natural things but also social and ethical rules. . . . ethics is considered as one function of the total cosmic order . . . The rules of ethics depend on and are derived from the more general rules that govern the cosmos . . .” (van Baaren)
         1. “. . . in the Greek hymns in praise of the goddess Isis . . . she divided the earth from the heaven, showed the stars their paths, and ordered the course of the sun and the moon. But the same hymn says that she ordained that children should love their parents, that she taught men to honour the images of the gods, and that she made justice stronger than gold and silver.” (van Baaren)
   7. “the relation of the Creator to the world after creation” (van Baaren)
      1. “. . . God will not abandon the world he has created . . .” (van Baaren)
      2. Or: “God created the world and the cosmic order in such a manner that to a great extent the course of the world is fixed from the first beginning and he is no longer involved in it.” E.g., deism (1600s-1700s ad). (van Baaren)
      3. The act of creation implies concern on the creator’s part. “The fact of creation helps man to believe in Providence because it would be inconsistent for the creator god or gods not to care for the further existence of the created world.” (van Baaren)
   8. Greeks and Romans
      1. The historian Herodotus (400s bc) “was the first Greek author to use the word in a religious sense when he mentioned Divine Providence as the source of the wisdom that keeps nature in balance . . .” (van Baaren)
      2. The historian Xenophon and the biographer Plutarch “used the word for the watchful care of the gods over mankind and the world.” (van Baaren)
      3. Epicurus denied providence. (van Baaren)
      4. Stoicism
         1. “. . . a controlling power exists, but, as everything happens according to a benevolent divine plan, they preferred to call this power Providence.” (van Baaren)
         2. the Stoic Cleanthes’ “Hymn to Zeus” (c 300 bc):

“. . . this whole vast cosmos, wheeling round

The earth, obeys [thee], and where thou leadest

It follows, ruled willingly by thee.” (van Baaren)

* + - 1. Roman Stoic Seneca: man should believe “that Providence rules the world and that God cares for us.” (Qtd. in van Baaren)
      2. Stoic Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius: “. . . God wills everything that happens to man, and for that reason nothing that occurs can be considered evil.” (Qtd. in van Baaren)
    1. The Neoplatonist Macrobius (who wrote in defense of paganism about ad 400) personified Providence as an actual goddess.
  1. fate
     1. The Talmud “teaches that Israel is subject to no star but only to God.” (van Baaren)
     2. But if a benevolent divine being is lost sight of or denied, providence becomes fate.
     3. Greek and Roman fatalism
        1. “The belief in the existence of a blind and inexorable fate can lead to a conflict with the belief in a benevolent Providence.” (van Baaren)
        2. In the second possible form of belief in Providence “man believes in a cosmic order . . . the order, however, may become inexorable and thus lead to fatalism, the belief in an impersonal destiny against which man is powerless.” (van Baaren)
        3. “In the Greco-Roman world, fatalistic belief was strong . . . it found a popular expression in astrology, the belief that the whole world, but particularly man, is governed by the stars . . .” (van Baaren)
        4. In the philosopher and rhetorician Apuleius’ novel *The Golden Ass* (100s ad), Hellenistic mystery cults “taught a faith that liberated man from the power of the stars. In the novel the hero is converted to the goddess Isis; then, the priest of the goddess addresses him: . . . “you have endured and performed many labours and withstood the buffetings of all the winds of ill luck. Now at last you have put into the harbour of peace and stand before the altar of loving-kindness. . . . blind Fortune, after tossing you maliciously about from peril to peril has somehow, without thinking what she was doing, landed you here in religious felicity. Let her begone now and fume furiously wherever she pleases, let her find some other plaything for her cruel hands. She has no power to hurt those who devote their lives to the honour and service of our Goddess’s majesty.” (van Baaren)

1. **particular objects of providence**
   1. “Although cosmic order is necessarily a general idea comprising the whole of the world and all that exists in it, the concept of Providence may be more particular: the benevolent aspect of Providence may be confined to a special group of people . . . or a number of patron gods or saints may watch over some specific activity or smaller group.” (van Baaren)
   2. “This accounts for the idea of a chosen people watched over and led by a just and loving God. The ancient people of Israel is, perhaps, the best known example; the concept, however, is widespread.” (van Baaren)
   3. “Patron gods and patron saints who are particularly charged with caring for some small group, craft, or activity or who operate in special circumstances, such as during illness or war, occur in most religions . . .” (van Baaren)
   4. Providence “may also be experienced as personal guidance.” (van Baaren)
      1. “This latter phenomenon is common [among] the Plains Indians of North America and in some forms of Protestantism in which generally each person is expected to have a private experience of divine guidance.” (van Baaren)
      2. “In other cultures and religions, personal guidance is often a prerogative of some person or persons singled out for some reason by God or the gods.” (van Baaren)
2. **providence and the ultimate end of the world**
   1. Since, by creating, God or the gods must to some extent care about the world, “Only persistent disobedience and open rebellion can . . . furnish a reason for the Creator to abandon or destroy the world. This situation is expressed in the myths of a great flood or some other form of destruction sent as a punishment. There is, however, never a total destruction of the world in these myths, although this final solution may be threatened for the eschatological (ultimate end) future. It may also be promised, if the eschatological events are construed as the definitive institution of a world order that is perfect for all eternity and will never deteriorate.” (van Baaren)

## Predestination, Grace, and Free Will in the Synoptic Gospels

1. **introduction**
   1. “The indications of the divine providential plan which we find in the Old Testament are more clearly expressed in the New Testament with reference to the eternal destiny of the individual.” (Farrelly 46)
2. **providence and** “**kingdom of God**”
   1. God’s providential plan for the individual “is expressed by the Synoptics in relation to their doctrine of the kingdom of God.” (Farrelly 46)
   2. “For an analysis of the doctrine of grace in the Synoptics in relation to the kingdom of God, see” (Farrelly 46 n. 28):
      1. Bonnetain, P. “Grâce.” *Supplement du dictionnaire de la Bible*. Vol. 3. 1938. 950-73.
      2. Bonsirven, J. *Le règne de Dieu*. Aubier, 1957.
      3. Feuillet, A. “Le Règne de Dieu, la personne de Jésus d’après les Evangiles synoptiques.” *Introduction à la Bible*. Ed. A. Robert and A. Feuillet. Tournai, 1959. 2.771-818.
   3. “It is those who enter the kingdom of God who are the privileged ones among men.” (Farrelly 46)
      1. Matt 13:44-46: “it is of such absolute value that a man will sell all that he has to purchase it, like a treasure in a field or a pearl of great price.” (Farrelly 46)
      2. Matt 5:3, 10: “It is the reward promised to those who fulfill the beatitudes.” (Farrelly 46)
      3. “This kingdom has an external character, for Christ appoints ministers of his kingdom which he calls his Church, and he gives to these ministers the administration of spiritual goods, of baptism, the Eucharist, and the forgiveness of sins. Being external and temporal, it thus has a history during which it will grow, as the mustard seed, which is the smallest of seeds, grows to be the largest of herbs.” See Matt 10:1-4; 13:31-2; 16:18-19; 28:19-20; Luke 22:19. (Farrelly 46)
      4. “While the kingdom is external and temporal, entrance into it assures eternal life, for it gives salvation [Luke 10:20]; it is the ultimate gift that the judge at the end of the world will give the good [Matt 25:21, 23, 34]; . . . and Christ [46] says to the ministers of this kingdom: *Rejoice in this, that your names are written in heaven* . . .” (Matt 19:25) (Farrelly 47)
      5. “Hence in the Synoptics generally there is no sharp distinction between the kingdom in its temporal phase, and the kingdom as union with God in heaven. Entrance into the former is spoken of as entrance into the latter.” (Farrelly 47)
      6. This entrance into the kingdom is received by man simply as a gift from God . . .” Mark 10:15, *Whoever does not accept the kingdom of God as a little child will not enter into it*. (Farrelly 47)
      7. “Men cannot gain it of themselves, for with reference to this gift they are like captives to be liberated, debtors who are insolvent, blind who are given sight, and the dead who are raised to life. (Farrelly 47) (See Luke 4:18 ff.; Matt. 18:23 ff.; Luke 15:14; 15:24-32.)
      8. It comes to a person solely because, as Luke 12:32 says, *It has pleased the Father to give you the kingdom*. (Farrelly 47)
      9. Luke 15:11-32: “God brings men into it with the loving solicitude of the father in the parable of the prodigal son . . .” (Farrelly 47)
      10. Matt 9:13: Christ says, *I have come to call not the just but sinners*. (Farrelly 47)
   4. “But God . . . makes its [the kingdom’s] eternal fulfillment conditioned upon man’s response.” (Farrelly 47)
      1. texts that show fulfillment is conditioned
         1. Matt. 25:32: “It is only those who have treated men in need as Christ himself, those who have accepted Christ’s words in faith and who have had a filial confidence in him that will enter heaven.” (Farrelly 47)
         2. Mark 1:15: “It is only those . . . who have accepted Christ’s words in faith . . . that will enter heaven.” (Farrelly 47)
         3. Matt. 6:25-34: “It is only those . . . who have had a filial confidence in him that will enter heaven.” (Farrelly 47)
         4. See J. Bonsirven, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1951), pp. 131-3, 149-59. (Farrelly 47 n. 37)
      2. texts that might suggest fulfillment is not conditioned
         1. Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43, 47-50: “the kingdom of God in its earthly stage is like a field that holds both wheat and chaff, a net with good and bad fish.” This does not mean “that those whom God with a special love brings into his kingdom in its earthly stage can, but in fact will not, defect, because they are sustained by God’s infallible decree . . .” (Farrelly 47)
         2. Luke 14:23 (great supper), “Go out into the roads and lanes, and compel people to come in, so that my house may be filled,” “has been interpreted as an absolute divine decree. But this interpretation is now rejected. See L. Marchal, “Evangile selon s. Luc,” in *La Sainte Bible* [loc. cit.]; M.-J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon s. Luc* (8. ed., Paris, 1948), pp. 402-8.” (Farrelly 48 n. 38)
         3. “Neither does [Luke 10:20, “rejoice that your names are written in heaven,”] refer to such a decree, since these words of Christ seem to have included Judas. Moreover they refer to the doctrine of the Book of Life which in the Old Testament indicates a conditional assurance of God’s friendship . . .” (Farrelly 48 n. 38)
         4. Luke 21:31-32: “The one phrase that may indicate an absolute divine decree of a free created act in the Synoptics is contained in Christ’s prayer that Peter’s *faith* not defect . . ., and that he confirm his brethren in the faith. This was essential for the Church Christ founded and was fulfilled without the preservation of Peter himself from grave sin.” (Farrelly 48 n. 38)
      3. “What truth can harmonize these various statements concerning the kingdom other than the fact that while entrance into the kingdom on earth contains God’s promise of eternal life, the fulfillment of this promise is simply conditioned on man’s subjective response? If he denies his submission, the promise will not be fulfilled.” (Farrelly 48)
   5. “What then of those who have not been brought into the kingdom of God?” (Farrelly 48)
      1. “Does this mean that God has antecedently rejected them by the fact that he has freely chosen others for his kingdom?” (Farrelly 48)
      2. “. . . but it is clear that Christ meant to exclude no one from his kingdom.” (Farrelly 48)
         1. Matt 28:19: “He sent the messengers of the gospel into the world to make disciples of all nations.”
         2. Matt 18:14: “he affirms in the parable of the lost sheep: *Even so, it is not the will of your Father in heaven that a single one of these little ones should perish*.” (Farrelly 48)
         3. Matt 22:1-14: “The parable of the wedding feast in which the men who, because of their preoccupation with their own pursuits, rejected the invitation and were therefore destroyed, indicates that it is only man’s antecedent bad will that is the cause of his consequent rejection by God.” (Farrelly 48)
            1. On Matt 22:14, “For many are called but few are chosen,” see:

Lagrange, M.-J. *Evangile selon s. Matthieu*. 8th ed. Paris: 1948. 425. (Farrelly 48 n. 41)

Sutcliffe, E. “Many Are Called but Few Are Chosen.” *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 28 (1981): 126-31. (Farrelly 48 n. 41)

* + - 1. Matt 23:37-38: “The opposite teaching, namely, that there is in God an intention not to sustain man in doing good before the individual’s resistance to God, seems wholly alien to God’s mercy shown in Christ who wept over Jerusalem [48] and lamented: *How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathers her young under her wings, but thou wouldst not! Behold your house is left to you desolate*.” (Farrelly 48-49)

1. **Acts**
   1. See also Acts 13:48, “as many [Gentiles] as had been destined for eternal life became believers.”
2. “The problem raised by the obduracy of the Jews we will treat particularly in our account of Paul’s teaching. On the synoptic teaching in this matter, see J. Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6:9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (Munich, 1961). (Farrelly 49 n. 42)

## Predestination, Grace, and Free Will in John

1. John’s teaching on “God’s relation to man in bringing him to his eternal beatitude is the same as that of the Synoptics, but it gives evidence of a deeper penetration into the designs of God and the nature of the gift he offers.” (Farrelly 49)
   1. John 3:15: “St. John sums up his message in the words” of John 3:14-15: “the Son of man must be lifted up, 15that whoever believes in him may have eternal life.” See 1 John 4:10, “In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins.” (Farrelly 49)
   2. John 5:24: “This life that God gives is such that, as Christ says, *he who hears my word, and believes him who sent me, has life everlasting.*” (Farrelly 49) See also:
      1. John 6:54, “Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood have eternal life, and I will raise them up on the last day . . .”
      2. John 11:25-26, “Jesus said to her, “I am the resurrection and the life. Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live, 26and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die.”
      3. Lagrange, M.-J. *Evangile selon s. Jean*. 8th ed. Paris: 1948. Pp. CLXV-VI. (Farrelly 49 n. 46)
   3. John 6:37, 39, “All that the Father gives me will come to me. . . . And this is the will of him who sent me, that I shall lose none of all that he has given me . . .”
   4. John 6:44: “Only God’s love freely given is the source of this gift of life everlasting. It cannot be won by acts that owe their initiative to man.” (See: Braun, F. M. “Evangile selon s. Jean.” *La Sainte Bible*. Ed. L. Pirot. 3rd ed. Paris: 1950. P. 363.) (Farrelly 49 n. 44)
   5. John 15:1-11 (vine and branches): “Man can do nothing of himself; in this order of things, his acts depend upon Christ, as the life and fruitfulness of the branches depend upon the life of the vine that courses through them.” (Farrelly 49)
   6. John 10:27-29
      1. John 10:27-29, “My sheep hear my voice. I know them, and they follow me. 28I give them eternal life, and they will never perish. No one will snatch them out of my hand. 29What my Father has given me is greater than all else, and no one can snatch it out of the Father's hand.”
      2. “The Jews to whom Christ spoke thought that the good man would gain everlasting life after he departed this temporal life, but Christ taught them that the one who believed in his words already had this everlasting life even in this world. . . . [Evidently] this eternal life [has] already begun, not in its ultimate stage of growth, but in God’s assurance and in its seed that is already in the believer.” See also John 8:37-39. (Farrelly 49)
      3. Lagrange and Braun “reject deductions of predestination and reprobation in the ordinary sense from this text.” (Farrelly 50 n. 47)
         1. Lagrange, M.-J. *Evangile selon s. Jean*. 8th ed. Paris: 1948. 179-181. (Farrelly 50 n. 47)
         2. Braun, F. M. “Evangile selon s. Jean.” *La Sainte Bible*. Ed. L. Pirot. 3rd ed. Paris: 1950. 363-65. (Farrelly 50 n. 47)
2. “The achievement of this fulfillment in the next life, however, is dependent upon the dispositions and acts of the believers in Christ. There is needed not only the initial faith, rebirth, trust, love of God, and the obedience to God’s commands that flows from these inner dispositions. There is also needed a perseverance in this till death.” (Farrelly 50)
   1. 1 John 2:24-25
      1. 1 John 2:24-25, “Let what you heard from the beginning abide in you. If what you heard from the beginning abides in you, then you will abide in the Son and in the Father. 25And this is what he has promised us, eternal life.”
      2. According to I. de la Potterie, John teaches “that the Christian is impeccable and that this is conditioned on his fidelity, e.g., in 1 Joh. 3:8-9 . . .” (Farrelly 50 n. 48)
         1. 1 John 3:8-9, “Everyone who commits sin is a child of the devil; for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The Son of God was revealed for this purpose, to destroy the works of the devil. 9Those who have been born of God do not sin, because God’s seed abides in them; they cannot sin, because they have been born of God.”
         2. de la Potterie, I. “L’impeccabilité du chrétienne d’après 1 Joh., 3, 6-9.” *L’Evangile de Jean, études et problèmes*. Bruges: 1958. 161-77. (Farrelly 50 n. 48)
   2. “How is this statement to be harmonized with those we have just quoted that affirm that the believer already has eternal life and shall never perish? Does it mean that in the choice for heaven of the believers antecedent to their merits, God has an absolute intention to see that man does fulfill the conditions required? Or does it mean that man in this life really retains the ability to defect and thus lose eternal life, so that God’s choice and grace as antecedent are objectively effective insofar as they depend on God, but are still frustrable by man’s resistance? It can only mean the latter, since the assurance that they already have eternal life is given to all who believe and give themselves to Christ. And yet Christ knew that some of these would not reach heaven. Only if Christ’s assurance of heaven to all those who followed him was both objectively absolute and yet conditioned on the subjective response of man, can the various elements of St. John’s teaching be harmonized. It would be incompatible with elements of that teaching to say that God has toward some who now have that life an intention antecedent to their resistance not to sustain them in fidelity to himself. And with other elements of John’s teaching it is impossible to harmonize an absolute and unconditional infallibility of God’s antecedent intention to bring those chosen ones to eternal life.” (Farrelly 50)
3. “What of those who do not receive [50] the gift of faith in Christ through which eternal life is gained? If God’s gift is wholly free, do men lack that gift because God has not given it?” (Farrelly 50-51)
   1. “Some passages in St. John seem to suggest this.” (Farrelly 51)
      1. John 6:36, 44, “But I said to you that you have seen me and yet do not believe. . . . 44No one can come to me unless drawn by the Father who sent me; and I will raise that person up on the last day.”
      2. John 10:26, “you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep.”
      3. John 12:39-40 (quoting Isa 6:9), “they could not believe, because Isaiah also said, 40”He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn-- and I would heal them.”“
      4. “. . . these passages have been used in the past as evidence of God’s antecedent reprobation . . .” (Farrelly 51)
   2. But “no exegete would do so today because . . . John’s teaching on the universality of Christ’s saving mission is too clear.” (Farrelly 51)
      1. John 1:9, 12, “The true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world. . . . 12But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God . . .”
      2. John 5:38, 40, “you do not have his word abiding in you, because you do not believe him whom he has sent. . . . 40Yet you refuse to come to me to have life.” “Christ’s whole public ministry was an attempt to bring the Jews to belief in his mission, but he told them [John 5:38, 40].” (Farrelly 51)
      3. 1 John 2:2, “he is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world.”
      4. Rev 3:20, “I am standing at the door, knocking; if you hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to you and eat with you, and you with me.”
   3. the “unwillingness of the Jews to believe” (Farrelly 51)
      1. See: Charue, A. *L’incrédulité des Juifs dans le Nouveau Testament*. Paris, 1929. (Farrelly 51 n. 54)
      2. John 10:26, “you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep.” (See: Braun, F. M. “Evangile selon s. Jean.” *La Sainte Bible*. 399.) (Farrelly 51 n. 54)
      3. Acts 7:51 (“Stephen’s rebuke to the Jews . . .” Farrelly 51 n. 53), “You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you are forever opposing the Holy Spirit, just as your ancestors used to do.”
      4. “This unwillingness of the Jews to believe, to submit themselves to Christ in the concrete historical context in which he presented himself to them, was the reason for their lack of belief . . .” (Farrelly 51)
      5. John 12:39-40
         1. “John’s quotation from Isaias [6:9] is an answer to the scandal that may arise in the hearts of some from the seeming frustration of Christ’s mission by the Jews’ unbelief, a frustration that seems to reflect upon the divine omnipotence. His Hebraic expression does not mean that God’s hardening of the Jews’ hearts was the cause of their disbelief; Christ, like Isaias, was sent for the very purpose that they may believe. But it does show that those who rejected Christ did not escape the [51] sovereignty of God since, because of their bad dispositions, the mission of mercy through the fact of its rejection resulted in a greater blindness and hardening of their hearts, and God used their very rejection to bring about his designs.” (Farrelly 51-52)
         2. See F.M. Braun, “Evangile selon s. Jean,” in *La Sainte Bible* 415-416, “for an excellent commentary on John 12:37-43.” (Farrelly 52 n. 55)
4. See also John 13:18a, “I am not speaking of all of you; I know whom I have chosen.”

## Paul and Predestination

Paul has two sets of texts on predestination. In the first (1 Thess 5:9; Rom 8:28-30; 2 Thess 2:13-14), predestination is merely mentioned to increase readers’ hope. In the second (Eph 1:3-14, ), which represents a later stage in Paul’s thinking, predestination is mentioned in connection with the idea that the center of God’s plan is the universal primacy of Christ.

Whenever Paul mentions the eternal conception of God’s plan, he also recalls to his readers how this divine plan has already directed their lives. Their “call” was the proclamation of the gospel. Their “glory” as sons of God is anticipated here on Earth, by means of the baptism by which they are already “justified.”

Other texts on predestination in Paul are 1 Tim 1:9 and 1 Tim 1:19.

1. **an outline of Rom 1-11**
   1. The purpose of Rom 1-11 is stated in Rom 1:16: “the gospel [is] the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.”
   2. Rom 5-11: “The justification effected through [Christ’s passion] assures eternal salvation to all Christians . . .” (Farrelly 53)
      1. Rom 5: “The death of Christ and the superabundant grace he ahs gained for us assure us of this . . .” (Farrelly 53)
      2. Rom 6: “This union with Christ that effects this justification is a definitive break with sin . . .” (Farrelly 53)
      3. Rom 7: “union with Christ [is] a liberation from the old law that could never save . . .” (Farrelly 53)
      4. Rom 8
         1. 8:1-17: “The law of the Christians is the Spirit, and those who walk by the Spirit rather than by the flesh will not b e condemned, but saved . . .” (Farrelly 53)
         2. 8:18-27: “we who [53] are animated by the Spirit from whom comes charity are destined for glory.” (Farrelly 53-54)
         3. 8:28-30: “. . . God’s purpose is to bring to glory those who love him . . .” (Farrelly 54)
         4. 8:31-38: “if God is for us, nothing can defeat us (8:31-38).” (Farrelly 54)
      5. Rom 9-11: “To the objection . . . that God’s promise failed the chosen people of the old dispensation, the next three chapters (c. 9-11) are the answer.: (Farrelly 54)
2. **Rom 8:28-30**
   1. Rom 8:28-30, “We know that all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his purpose. 29For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family. 30And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified.”
   2. There is a temporal sequence in the verbs: foreknow → predestine → call → justify → glorify.
   3. context (outline of Rom 8)
      1. 8:1-17: “The law of the Christians is the Spirit, and those who walk by the Spirit rather than by the flesh will not be condemned, but saved . . .” (Farrelly 53)
      2. 8:18-27: “we who [53] are animated by the Spirit from whom comes charity are destined for glory.” (Farrelly 53-54)
      3. 8:28-30: “. . . God’s purpose is to bring to glory those who love him . . .” (Farrelly 54)
      4. 8:31-38: “if God is for us, nothing can defeat us . . .” (Farrelly 54)
   4. “. . . in the context of this passage St. Paul is presenting to the Christians of Rome different reasons that show them the certainty of their eternal salvation. In fact, this particular text [8:28-30] is the culminating argument for the certainty of their salvation. And within this text, vv. 29, 30 are offered by St. Paul as a proof of v. 28 . . .” (Farrelly 54)
   5. Rom 8:28
      1. God works “in all things for the [54] welfare of those who love him . . .” (Farrelly 54-55)
      2. “purpose” (πρόθεσις)
         1. “The Greek Fathers interpreted this purpose as man’s and not God’s purpose. Thus they taught that God called man according to his good intentions which God foreknew antecedent to man’s predestination.” (Farrelly 56)
         2. “Modern exegetes, as well as the Latin Fathers, understand this purpose to be God’s purpose, not man’s, in accord with the other uses of the word by St. Paul and his intent in the present passage to show the Christians their motives for hope, based on God’s firm purpose of making all things cooperate for their good.” (Farrelly 56)
         3. “St. Augustine distinguished in St. Paul those called according to God’s purpose and those simply called, a distinction he modeled upon the distinction in the parable of the king’s marriage feast between the chosen and the called [Matt 22:14, “For many are called, but few are chosen”]. So he held that God has predestined only that select group of Christians that was called according to his purpose, not the other Christians who have been simply called. Exegetes in general reject this distinction in St. Paul for, as they point out, the words *called* and *chosen* do not have the difference of meaning for him that they have in St. Matthew. For Paul, the *called* are those who now stand in the faith and are on the way to eternal salvation.” (Farrelly 56)
         4. “It is clear that the word πρόθεσις means a “plan, purpose, resolve, will” [Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich p. 713] in the places where St. Paul applies it to God [Rom 8:28; 9:11; Eph 1:11; 3:11; 2 Tim 1:9 (58 n. 71)] . . .” (Farrelly 58)
         5. Sanday and Headlam (*Critical and Exegetical Commentary on . . . Romans* [7th ed.] 216): “purpose” in 8:28 means “the comprehensive plan or design in accordance with which God directs the destinies of men.” (Farrelly 59 n. 72)
   6. Rom 8:29
      1. “St. Paul introduces the fact that God has predestined those whom he has foreknown to prove the foregoing verse.” (Farrelly 55)
      2. “foreknowledge” (πρoέγνω)
         1. “Some, following the general teaching of the Greek Fathers, understand it to mean a speculative knowledge by which God has a vision of the good men do. These whom God has foreknown in this way, he then predestines.” (Farrelly 57)
            1. “Others however . . . point out that the Greek Fathers’ interpretation of God’s foreknowledge here in this sense depended upon their understanding of the purpose in the previous verse as referring to man’s dispositions; since that is not now an acceptable interpretation, one cannot hold that the foreknowledge mentioned in the passage is a speculative knowledge of man’s merits that precedes predestination.” (Farrelly 57)
            2. “Moreover, when the biblical expression *to know* has God as its subject and men chosen by him as its object, it means not a merely speculative knowledge but a loving, practical, approving knowledge distinguishing one person from another.” (Farrelly 57)

Amos 3:2, “You only have I known of all the families of the earth . . .”

Matt 7:23, “I never knew you; go away from me, you evildoers.”

Gal 4:9, “Now, however, that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits?”

* + - 1. Because of the biblical meaning of “to know,” those who interpret Romans like Augustine “have appealed to this passage to prove their concept of God’s causative knowledge and their doctrine of predestination antecedent to God’s foreknowledge of man’s merits.” (Farrelly 57)
         1. “To this, however, we must say that the scriptural understanding of God’s knowledge as choice [of a person, i.e., commitment to a person] does not imply an *unconditioned* choice of a man and thus does not sustain the Thomistic understanding of God’s causative knowledge.” (Farrelly 57)
         2. “Moreover, [if the Augustinian interpretation were right, then] Paul would be asserting that God has predestined only some of the Christians at Rome. And this could scarcely be a motive of hope for all of them, or assure all of them of the certainty of eternal salvation.” (Farrelly 58)
      2. “Hence, Huby follows Lagrange in presenting another interpretation: “He [Paul] considers not the faithful individually but the assembly of Christians, ‘the new community of the children of God destined for glory,’ let us say the Church.” In other words, St. Paul is not stating that God has predestined any individual to heaven; he is simply saying that he has predestined the Church to glory.” (Farrelly 58)
         1. “This interpretation, however, does not fit into the purpose St. Paul had here. He was proving to the Christian [*sic*, sc. “Christians”] at Rome the certainty of their personal salvation, and such an assertion about the Church would be irrelevant. Moreover, all the words Paul uses in the context and text refer to Christians and not to the Church (e.g., *those who love God*), so the predestination must also refer to them.” (Farrelly 58)
         2. “These difficulties of interpretation come from the assumption by the authors that for St. Paul, God’s purpose and his predestination are not conditional but infallibly efficacious . . . If this is so, Paul cannot be telling the Christians at Rome that all of them have been predestined, because all exegetes admit that the fact of being justified does not of itself preclude the possibility of defection and reprobation. But the question is: does God’s purpose and predestination in St. Paul’s meaning preclude the possibility of man’s resistance and reprobation?” (Farrelly 58)
    1. “All agree that the word for predestined (πρoώρισεν) adds something to foreknowledge, namely, an act of the divine will, which, as the aorist [past tense] in the context indicates, has already carried its object to the purpose indicated, namely, the image of his Son.” (Farrelly 55)
    2. “Some understand by this image that which the Christian has through grace.” [55] But even Prat [*Theology of St. Paul* 1.244-245], “while holding that grace is the direct object of predestination, holds that Paul considers eternal glory as the natural development of grace.” [55 n. 62] (Farrelly 55, 55 n. 62)
    3. “But the context, in which Paul is assuring Christians of the certainty of their salvation, seems incompatible with such a restriction of its meaning [i.e., predestination to grace, rather than to glory]. Such a restricted meaning would not prove Paul’s point [since those predestined to grace can still fall away]. Hence it must refer mainly to conformity with Christ in his glory, the interpretation given to it by the majority of modern exegetes.” (Farrelly 55)
    4. “. . . God works for the welfare of those whom he has called according to his purpose [verse 28] precisely by showing that God has predestined them to heaven, has already called, justified, and glorified them [verses 29-30]. From the relation between these verses and v. 28, it seems that God’s predestination is contained within his purpose. Hence, the purpose indicated refers to the eternal salvation, and not only to the justification that has already been realized by the Christian.” (Farrelly 59)
  1. Rom 8:30
     1. “This interpretation is corroborated by the next section of the passage, where Paul indicates the acts through which God gains the end to which he has predestined man. Those whom he has predestined, God has called, justified, and glorified. This verse expresses the order of execution of the divine act of predestination affirmed in the previous verse. Moreover, these acts that are the successive acts through which the term of predestination is gained, namely, eternal glory, are by their position shown to be the effects of God’s predestination. They are also expressed in the aorist which, in the context, affirms that they in some way have already come about.” (Farrelly 55)
        1. The scholastics argued that “. . . Paul was speaking to men who had in fact [58] been converted to Christianity, and he said they were called according to God’s purpose. So God’s purpose in calling them was effective or efficacious. I grant this, but that in no way proves that it was antecedently effective in the sense of the scholastics, since God’s purpose may well have been completely conditioned upon man’s lack of resistance, of which man was fully capable when he was given the prevenient grace of faith.” (Farrelly 58-59)
           1. “Moreover, the argument . . . is based on the interpretation of v. 28 [“all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his purpose”] as referring to God’s purpose as restricted to man’s justification, or as not including his achievement of his eternal glory. This, however, is not tenable.” (Farrelly 59)
           2. “. . . Paul is asserting that God has predestined to eternal glory all those who love him; i.e., all the justified, all those who have been united with Christ in the Church, in short, all the Christians to whom he is writing and whom he supposes to be animated by the Spirit. . . . this interpretation [is] the only one that is in accord with the context . . . Paul cannot be telling all Christians that they are predestined. Hence the . . . one satisfactory interpretation is that based on accepting the predestination taught by St. Paul as one whose fulfillment is conditioned and frustrable.” (Farrelly 59)

1. **Rom 9-11**
   1. Rom 9:3-33, “my own people . . . 4are Israelites, and to them belong the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises . . . 6It is not as though the word of God had failed. For not all Israelites truly belong to Israel, 7and not all of Abraham’s children are his true descendants; but “It is through Isaac that descendants shall be named for you.” [Gen 21:12] 8This means that it is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted as descendants. 9For this is what the promise said, “About this time I will return and Sarah shall have a son.” [Gen 18:10] 10Nor is that all; something similar happened to Rebecca when she had conceived children by one husband, our ancestor Isaac. 11Even before they had been born or had done anything good or bad (so that God’s purpose of election might continue, 12not by works but by his call) she was told, “The elder shall serve the younger.” [Gen 25:23] 13As it is written, “I have loved Jacob, but I have hated Esau.” [Mal 1:2-3] 14What then are we to say? Is there injustice on God’s part? By no means! 15For he says to Moses, “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.” [Exod 33:19] 16So it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God who shows mercy. 17For the scripture says to Pharaoh, “I have raised you up for the very purpose of showing my power in you, so that my name may be proclaimed in all the earth.” [Exod 9:16] 18So then he has mercy on whomever he chooses, and he hardens the heart of whomever he chooses. 19You will say to me then, “Why then does he still find fault? For who can resist his will?” 20But who indeed are you, a human being, to argue with God? Will what is molded say to the one who molds it, “Why have you made me like this?” [Isa 29:16] 21Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one object for special use and another for ordinary use? 22What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the objects of wrath that are made for destruction; 23and what if he has done so in order to make known the riches of his glory for the objects of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory—24including us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles? 25As indeed he says in Hosea, “Those who were not my people I will call ‘my people,’ and her who was not beloved I will call ‘beloved.’” [Hos 2:25] 26“And in the very place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ there they shall be called children of the living God.” [Hos 2:1] 27And Isaiah cries out concerning Israel, “Though the number of the children of Israel were like the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved; 28for the Lord will execute his sentence on the earth quickly and decisively.” [Isa 10:22-23] 29And as Isaiah predicted, “If the Lord of hosts had not left survivors to us, we would have fared like Sodom and been made like Gomorrah.” [Isa 1:9] 30What then are we to say? Gentiles, who did not strive for righteousness, have attained it, that is, righteousness through faith; 31but Israel, who did strive for the righteousness that is based on the law, did not succeed in fulfilling that law. 32Why not? Because they did not strive for it on the basis of faith, but as if it were based on works. They have stumbled over the stumbling stone, 33as it is written, “See, I am laying in Zion a stone that will make people stumble, a rock that will make them fall, and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame.” [Isa 8:14, 28:16]”
   2. context of Rom 9-11 (outline of Rom 1-11)
      1. The purpose of Rom 1-11 is stated in Rom 1:16: “the gospel [is] the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.”
      2. Rom 5-11: “The justification effected through [Christ’s passion] assures eternal salvation to all Christians . . .” (Farrelly 53)
         1. Rom 5: “The death of Christ and the superabundant grace he has gained for us assure us of this . . .” (Farrelly 53)
         2. Rom 6: “The union with Christ that effects this justification is a definitive break with sin . . .” (Farrelly 53)
         3. Rom 7: “union with Christ [is] a liberation from the old law that could never save . . .” (Farrelly 53)
         4. Rom 8: God gives to Christians the Spirit, to bring them to glory.
         5. Rom 9-11: these chapters answer “the objection . . . that God’s promise failed the chosen people of the old dispensation . . .” (Farrelly 54)
      3. “. . . after teaching the certainty of the salvation of Christians in chapter 8, St. Paul expresses his great sorrow for the condition into which the Jews had fallen. God rejected the Jews to whom he had given such great promises. This fact (besides being related to the central theme of Romans) raises a crucial problem for St. Paul’s doctrine concerning the certainty of the salvation of the Christians because of the divine intention in their regard. Was God unfaithful to his promises to the Jews? Or did the Jews frustrate the fulfillment of his plan? If this is the case, if God is either unfaithful or unable to fulfill his plan, then what strength can Christian hope have? Paul’s answer is [Rom 9:6, “It is not as though the word of God had failed. For not all Israelites truly belong to Israel”], and he develops his answer to the problem through the next three chapters. This section is relevant to our study of the biblical doctrine on the effectiveness of God’s predestination and grace, and on the relation of his rejection or reprobation to man’s sins.” (Farrelly 63)
      4. “. . . whether God was faithful to his promise, whether he rejected the Jews antecedent to their sins, and whether God’s purpose was effective. . . . Paul answers these three questions in turn. He shows that on God’s part there was no infidelity to his promise correctly understood (c. 9); that the Jews were rejected because of and after their refusal to submit themselves to God’s way of salvation through belief (c. 10); and that God’s purpose to save the world has not been frustrated by their resistance (c. 11). In the interpretation of parts within this passage, it is of primary importance to give to Paul’s texts a meaning strictly within the limits of the question he is immediately answering. If one extends their meaning beyond their context, he will attribute to St. Paul doctrines that are contradictory to his [64] teaching in other passages where he *ex professo* treats the subject concerned.” (Farrelly 64-65)
   3. introduction
      1. “Chapter 9 [63] in particular has seemed to a great number of exegetes to teach the absolute effectiveness of God’s predestination and, even more definitely, an antecedent reprobation. For God is said to have preferred Jacob to Esau before either had done good or evil, and to have hated Esau. He is said to have hardened Pharaoh . . .” (Farrelly 63-64)
      2. “To this, all contemporary commentators answer that Paul is directly discussing God’s providence toward the Jews and the Gentiles as groups, and not the predestination or reprobation of the individual with reference to eternal salvation. The rejection of the Jews that raises the problem is the rejection of them in the historical mission envisaged for them in the Old Testament as the means through which God would save the world; St. Paul does not affirm that the eternal lot of all of those so rejected is one of damnation.” (Farrelly 64)
      3. “And the individuals he mentions, such as Essau [*sic*] and Pharaoh, are types of the Jews who are rejected, not treated for their own sakes with reference to their eternal lot. This answer, however, to the foregoing interpretation of the passage is not adequate, for the passage has in St. Paul’s intention a relation to the predestination of the individual Christian. Their security rests on God’s promise of salvation, and God’s treatment of the Jews raises the question of how effective God’s promise is. Will the Christian be disowned by God, as it seems the Jews have been? Hence the importance of this passage for us . . .” (Farrelly 64)
   4. exegesis of Rom 9
      1. Rom 9:9-13
         1. Rom 9:9-13, “For this is what the promise said, “About this time I will return and Sarah shall have a son.” 10Nor is that all; something similar happened to Rebecca when she had conceived children by one husband, our ancestor Isaac. 11Even before they had been born or had done anything good or bad (so that God’s purpose of election might continue, 12not by works but by his call) she was told, “The elder shall serve the younger.” 13As it is written, “I have loved Jacob, but I have hated Esau.”“
         2. In Rom 9 “. . . Paul shows that God was not at fault in the Jews’ rejection. God’s promise (vv. 9-13) did not extend to all the offspring of Abraham in the first place. God showed this from the beginning in giving the promise to Isaac rather than to Ismael [*sic*], to the younger Jacob over the older Esau. Indeed, he chose Jacob over Esau before either was born or did anything good or evil, *that the purpose of God might remain one of choice, not depending on works but upon him who calls* [Farrelly’s translation of Rom 9:11].” (Farrelly 65)

Digression: Esau in the Old Testament

1. **texts**
   1. Gen 25:21-26, “Isaac prayed to the Lord for his wife, because she was barren; and the Lord granted his prayer, and his wife Rebekah conceived. 22The children struggled together within her; and she said, “If it is to be this way, why do I live?” So she went to inquire of the Lord. 23And the Lord said to her, “Two nations are in your womb, and two peoples born of you shall be divided; the one shall be stronger than the other, the elder shall serve the younger.” 24When her time to give birth was at hand, there were twins in her womb. 25The first came out red, all his body like a hairy mantle; so they named him Esau. 26Afterward his brother came out, with his hand gripping Esau’s heel; so he was named Jacob. Isaac was sixty years old when she bore them.”
   2. Mal 1:2c-3a, “I have loved Jacob 3but I have hated Esau . . .”
2. **discussion**
   1. Esau is the ultimate ancestor of the Edomites and represents the nation of Edom.
   2. “God, who had promised Abraham that in his offspring all nations would be blessed, was free to choose among his offspring the one who would receive the promise. This choice of the younger Jacob simply illustrates the freedom of God’s choice.” (Farrelly 44)
   3. “. . . the fact that Esau did not receive the promise given to Abraham in no way means that he was denied eternal salvation. Before the birth of Esau and Jacob, the Lord had stated simply that [“the elder shall serve the younger,” Gen 25:23].” (Farrelly 44)
   4. Mal 1:2-3 “refers not to Esau personally but to the people who came from him, the Edomites; moreover, it expresses not God’s antecedent denial of eternal salvation to this people, but the rigor with which he punished their sins compared with the mercy he showed to the Israelites after their offenses.” (Farrelly 44)
   5. “. . . God’s dealings with Israel show an antecedent choice of them . . . [But God’s dealings with the Edomites (Esau)] do not . . . show an antecedent rejection . . .” (Farrelly 43)
      1. “. . . the unique gift which God gave to Israel, namely, to make it the nation that was to be the [43] channel of God’s blessings to the rest of the earth, was . . . a special and singular gift which God could confer upon the people of his will without thereby being unjust to other nations.” (Farrelly 43-44)
         1. Exod 33:19, “I will make all my goodness pass before you, and will proclaim before you the name, ‘The Lord’; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.” See Rom 9:15, “For he says to Moses, “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.”
      2. “. . . one cannot identify the gift God gave to the Israelites with salvation to the extent that other nations, by not receiving this gift, were denied eternal salvation.” (Farrelly 44)
         1. “Melchisedech, Job, and the people of Nineveh [in Jonah] were not Israelites, and yet they were the objects of God’s mercy and were pleasing to God.” (Farrelly 44)

(End of digression.)

* + 1. Rom 9:14-18
       1. Rom 9:14-18, “What then are we to say? Is there injustice on God’s part? By no means! 15For he says to Moses, “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.” 16So it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God who shows mercy. 17For the scripture says to Pharaoh, “I have raised you up for the very purpose of showing my power in you, so that my name may be proclaimed in all the earth. 18he has mercy on whomever he chooses, and he hardens the heart of whomever he chooses.”
       2. “But is not this unjust of God? (vv. 14-24) Is it not an arbitrary exercise of his power? No, Paul says, because what God was giving was purely a gift not owed to any man, and he has sovereign freedom to dispose of his gifts as he wills. This is proved both by the case of Moses on whom he had mercy, and by that of Pharaoh in whom he showed his power.” (Farrelly 65)

Digression: Pharaoh in the Old Testament

1. **texts**
   1. God hardens Pharaoh’s heart (or the officials’ hearts, or the Egyptians’): Exod 4:21, “I will harden his heart” (10 times: also 7:3, 9:12, 10:1, 10:20, 10:27, 11:10, 14:4, 14:8, 14:17).
   2. Pharaoh hardens his own heart: Exod 8:15, “when Pharaoh saw that there was a respite, he hardened his heart, and would not listen to them” (4 times: also 8:32, 9:34-35, 1 Sam 6:6).
   3. ambiguous (because the verb is passive): Exod 7:13, “Pharaoh’s heart was hardened” (5 times: also 7:14, 7:22, 8:19, 9:7).
2. **discussion**
   1. “It is true that God is said to harden Pharaoh’s heart, but this results from the Jewish tendency to pass up secondary causes and reduce all events to the causality to God. In other passages, Pharaoh is simply said to have become stubborn.” (Farrelly 44)
   2. “They [the Egyptians] refused to glorify God through submitting themselves to him, but their resistance did not prevent God from fulfilling his purposes in freeing the Israelites. In fact, God used the very resistance he had tried in his mercy to overcome to manifest his power over the opposition of men, his wrath toward sin, and his mercy toward the chosen people whom he saved in the midst of such obstacles.” (Farrelly 45) Wis 19:1-2, 4-5, “But the ungodly were assailed to the end by pitiless anger, for God knew in advance even their future actions: 2how, through they themselves had permitted your people to depart and hastily sent them out, they would change their minds and pursue them. . . . 4For the fate they deserved drew them on to this end, and made them forget what had happened, in order that they might fill up the punishment that their torments still lacked, 5and that your people might experience an incredible journey, but they themselves might meet a strange death.”
3. **conclusions**
   1. “. . . God leaves those whom he chooses for eternal salvation free to resist him, and . . . his lack of choice of men for eternal salvation is only after man’s continued resistance to him . . .” (Farrelly 45)
   2. “It is true that God is all powerful and no one can resist his will, but in the actual order of his providence God does not exercise this omnipotence by making infallibly certain the fulfillment of his antecedent intention for those individuals he loves, or by antecedently reprobating those who lose eternal life. He shows his omnipotence in overcoming all obstacles placed in the way of his chosen ones who do not reject him, in punishing those who resist his merciful designs, and in turning their very resistance to further his own purposes of mercy toward his chosen ones.” (Farrelly 45)
   3. “Hence the texts that express God’s *power* to move the will as he desires [Ezek 11:19-20; Esth 13:11, 15:8; 1 Cor 4:7] do not prove that as a matter of fact God makes use of antecedently infallibly effective decrees and graces to move men’s wills in the present order. The doctrine of the Old Testament seems to us to be contrary to a normal use of such decrees and graces by God to move free will to good. The Old Testament evidence of such decrees seems to be restricted [mostly] to events which God will bring about either with the cooperation of men or over their opposition (e. g., liberation of Israelites from Egypt and the fulfillment of his promise to Abraham).” (Farrelly 46 n. 27)
   4. “. . . Ecclesiasticus makes clear this respect or tolerance of man’s freedom that is a part of God’s plan . . .” (Farrelly 45) Sir 15:11, 14, 17, “Do not say, “It was the Lord’s doing that I fell away”; for he does not do what he hates. . . . 14It was he who created humankind in the beginning, and he left them in the power of their free choice. . . . 17Before each person are life and death, and whichever one chooses will be given.”

(End of digression.)

* + 1. Rom 9:19-24
       1. “But such an answer seems simply to deepen the mystery, for man depends upon God’s gift. If he does not receive it, how can man be blamed? After all, who can resist the will of God? [9:19] To such a questioning of God’s ways, St. Paul quickly points out the inappropriateness of the creature questioning the ways of his maker. Cannot a potter make from the same mass of clay one vessel for an honorable use and another for a common use? [9:20-21] Then Paul gives in brief his answer to the question of God’s justice and man’s responsibility [9:22-24], an answer he will develop through the next two chapters.” (Farrelly 65)
          1. Rom 9:19, “You will say to me then, “Why then does he still find fault? For who can resist his will?”“
          2. Rom 9:20-21, “But who indeed are you, a human being, to argue with God? Will what is molded say to the one who molds it, “Why have you made me like this?” 21Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one object for special use and another for ordinary use?”
          3. Rom 9:22-24, “What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the objects of wrath that are made for destruction; 23and what if he has done so in order to make known the riches of his glory for the objects of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory—24including us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles?”
       2. “One can see in this highly compact answer [Rom 9:22-24] the total initiative of the Jews as the cause through their sins of their rejection, only if [65] he interprets it in view of Paul’s larger thought. Paul multiplies indications of this blameworthiness of the Jews here.” (Farrelly 65-66)
          1. “The teaching of the passage is clearly reminiscent of the doctrine of the Book of Wisdom on God’s punishment of Pharaoh and the Egyptians; and . . . that explanation locates the total initiative for the evil that resulted in their punishment in the resistance by the Egyptians to God’s merciful approaches [pp. 44-45 above].” (Farrelly 66)
          2. “He speaks of the rejected Jews as *vessels of wrath*; and . . . for Paul, God’s wrath was simply a response to man’s sins [p. 53 above].” (Farrelly 66)
          3. “He calls them *ready for destruction*, as opposed to the vessels of mercy which are *prepared for glory*, to remove any implication of God’s authorship of their sin.” (Farrelly 66)
          4. “And he affirms that God endured them with much patience even when their sin had advanced so far that they were ready for destruction, and . . . the purpose of God’s patience with sinners is their conversion.” [66] “Another reason for God’s patience with the Jews was the conversion of the Gentiles. (Farrelly 66 n. 89)
    2. Rom 10:1-21
       1. “In brief, Paul affirms here [Rom 9:22-24] what he develops in the next chapter . . .” (Farrelly 66)
          1. Paul “asks why the Jews failed to attain the justice that is from faith (10:1-4), and answers [in 10:3] that they have not submitted to the justice of God.” (Farrelly 66) Rom 10:3, “being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish their own, they have not submitted to God’s righteousness.”
       2. “. . . Paul is denying that God induced the Jews to the disbelief that merited for them their rejection. He is teaching that God’s will toward their disbelief was simply one of tolerance or permission. . . . It is simply that tolerance or permission implied by the Old Testament doctrine that God’s choice of the Jews and the consequent means that he gave them to fulfill the conditions necessary to receive what he had promised them were in the case of any particular individual or group among [66] the Jews contingent upon their free fulfillment of his will in faith. God’s choice and helps could be rejected by those whom he loved.” (Farrelly 66-67)
       3. But “to stop there would leave the impression that God’s purpose with the Jews has been frustrated. The question remains then: why did God tolerate the Jews’ disbelief? In other words, why were those whom he had chosen not helped by God by an aid that was antecedently infallibly effective in gaining their belief? God’s toleration of the evil of their resistance was not due to his weakness or inability to use such an antecedently effective means to gain their cooperation with his designs. Therefore there must be some greater good than the concrete value of the Jews’ acceptance of Christ that justifies God’s tolerance of such an immense evil.” (Farrelly 67)
          1. “. . . God endured the Jews’ resistance to his antecedent desire that they be the instruments of the extension of his kingdom among the Gentiles. Paul answers in effect that God did not need the Jews’ acceptance of Christ to fulfill the historic mission he had mercifully given to them, as he had not needed Pharaoh’s willing cooperation to free the Jews from Egypt. God is so powerful that he [67] could raise up other agents to fulfill the mission refused by the Jews. In fact, if they resisted him, God would use their very resistance to manifest his transcendence or the fact that he did not need their cooperation, and to fulfill his purpose in a manner that would show his power even more dramatically, as he had in the case of the liberation of the Jews from Egypt over the resistance of Pharaoh.” (Farrelly 67-68)
          2. “. . . though they did not willingly take the historic mission of being the intermediaries of God’s mercy with the Gentiles, God would use their very resistance to further his plans of mercy toward the Gentiles, as he had used Pharaoh’s resistance to give greater evidence of his merciful care in liberating the Jews from Egypt. This is developed by Paul in chapter eleven . . .” (Farrelly 68)
    3. “. . . God’s choice and the means which he gives to men to respond to that choice are not antecedently infallibly [68] efficacious. In fact, Paul makes this point explicitly when he warns the Christians to learn from God’s dispensation with the Jews . . .” (Farrelly 68-69) Rom 11:22, “Note then the kindness and the severity of God: severity toward those who have fallen, but God’s kindness toward you, provided you continue in his kindness; otherwise you also will be cut off.”
    4. “God allowed the Jews, whom he had chosen, to resist his mercy and to fall into disbelief; and in spite of his previous love, he was severe with them. So, too, God allows the Christians to refuse to believe; but if they do so refuse, the promises of God will not be fulfilled in them, and they will in their turn experience the severity of God. Thus St. Paul does not defend the power of God by any theory of antecedently infallibly efficacious decrees and grace where it concerns the salvation of the individual. He does so through showing that those who continually resist God fall under his wrath. Nor does he conclude from the gratuity and the antecedence of God’s choice and grace the antecedence of his rejection. Though his explanation of the mystery of evil does not explain everything, it is clear that God’s rejection of his chosen ones is only consequent upon their refusal to submit to him.” (Farrelly 68-69)

1. **Eph 1:4-14**
   1. Eph 1:4-14, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love. 5He destined us for adoption as his children through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, 6to the praise of his glorious grace that he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved. 7In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace 8that he lavished on us. With all wisdom and insight 9he has made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure that he set forth in Christ, 10as a plan for the fullness of time, to gather up all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth. 11In Christ we have also obtained an inheritance, having been destined according to the purpose of him who accomplishes all things according to his counsel and will, 12so that we, who were the first to set our hope on Christ, might live for the praise of his glory. 13In him you also, when you had heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, and had believed in him, were marked with the seal of the promised Holy Spirit; 14this is the pledge of our inheritance toward redemption as God’s own people, to the praise of his glory.”
   2. “Some interpreters understand the object of this predestination to be the state of grace, which is expressed by the adoption as sons.” (Farrelly 60)
      1. “. . . this is an understandable interpretation; it follows their interpretation that St. Paul understood by God’s purpose and predestination an absolute, infrustrable decree concerning the human will, for St. Paul could only assert such a decree of some effect of God’s purpose that has already taken place, such as the conversion of the Christians at Ephesus.” (Farrelly 60)
      2. “However, the context of these verses seems to militate against the interpretation of this predestination as being directed simply to grace. The gift of grace for St. Paul was the assurance of heaven, for if grace makes us sons, it makes us heirs of heaven, and thus possessors of heaven in hope, and sharers of the Holy Spirit *who is the pledge of our inheritance* [Eph 1:14]. . . . So for St. Paul the fact that God has justified us shows [60] us that he has predestined us to heaven. His firm, deliberate purpose is to bring us to heaven.” (Farrelly 60-61)
   3. Many interpreters of Eph 1:5-6 interpret it as referring to God’s antecedent and absolutely efficacious will. (Farrelly 61)
   4. But Paul is not excluding human resistance to God’s decree.
      1. “. . . Paul is using strong words to indicate a deliberate, divine decision that firmly intends to bring Christians to heaven. But he does not mean that this divine will for this purpose is infrustrable by the resistance of the human will, or that . . . ultimate reprobation is incompatible with this will of God.” (Farrelly 61)
         1. “The fact that St. Paul says that God has this will for the eternal salvation of all Christians who are in the Spirit [proves this].” (Farrelly 61)
         2. “. . . the larger context in which Paul shows so clearly the possibility of the Christian’s defection and reprobation, seem to us to prove this conclusively.” (Farrelly 61)
   5. objections
      1. Theologians “generally apply to God’s grace the same kind of efficacy they ascribe to the divine decree.” (Farrelly 62)
      2. “Moreover, St. Paul shows that man so owes his good acts . . . to God that man has nothing to be proud of in them . . .
         1. 1 Cor 4:7, “What do you have that you did not receive? And if you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?”
         2. Phil 2:13, “it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”

“If man’s work is totally due to God, many argue, man is not adding anything to God’s causality to make it effective; it is effective before man’s response, either intrinsically or extrinsically effective. Otherwise the gift of grace that a good man accepts would not be a greater gift than the grace that another rejects. And man would, by adding his response to God’s call, separate himself from unbelievers; it would not be wholly God’s work. Hence, it seems to them, grace and God’s decree must be absolutely effective antecedent to man’s response.” (Farrelly 62)

* 1. rebuttal to objections
     1. “St. Paul, however, knew that one who was justified could reject God’s intention for his salvation, or his predestination. Hence, too, he could reject the [grace] that was the effect of this predestination.” (Farrelly 62)
     2. Therefore, “the gratuity of God’s choice and grace [62] . . . are not contradictory to the fact that man can frustrate God’s will and his grace in their purpose to bring him to heaven or a particular salutary act.” (Farrelly 62-63)

## God’s Universal Salvific Will: 1 Tim 2:4

1. **1 Tim 2:4**
   1. 1 Tim 2:4, God “desires everyone to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.”
   2. Compare Ezek 33:10-11: “Thus have you said: ‘Our transgressions and our sins are upon us, and we waste away because of them; how then can we live?’ Say to them, As I live, says the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn back, turn back from your evil ways . . .”
2. **Augustine on 1 Tim 2:4**
   1. Augustine restricted God’s universal salvific will: “in God’s salvific plan itself, according to all of Augustine’s later attempts to explain Paul’s statements concerning this, there is some limitation or restriction.” [93] Augustine made a variety of attempts to restrict “this divine will to save.” [69] (Farrelly 69, 93)
   2. “It [1 Tim 2:4] means that God wants to save all those who actually are saved . . .” (*Epistolae* 217.6, 19) (Farrelly 69)
   3. It means “men from every nation and walk of life . . .” (*Enchiridion* 103) (Farrelly 69, Kelly 369)
   4. ad 427: It means “that he wants his servants on earth to desire and seek [69] the salvation of all.” (*De correptione et gratia* 15.47) (Farrelly 69-70)
   5. “Such interpretations are accepted by no recent exegete, since the whole passage stresses the universality of God’s will to save.” (Farrelly 70)
3. **why Augustine restricted God’s universal salvific will**
   1. A.-M. Jacquin (“La prédestination d’aprês saint Augustin,” *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 [Rome: 1931] 868) “and some others say that Augustine taught this restriction of God’s salvific will because he did not know of the distinction between God’s antecedent and consequent will.” (Farrelly 93 n. 84)
   2. “However, if this distinction is taken in the sense of St. John Damascene, namely, that the factor because of which God reprobates a man in [*sic*, sc. “is”] his evil life, this is not Augustine’s explanation of reprobation of men in the fallen state.” (Farrelly 93 n. 84)
   3. John Damascene (675?-749) (*De fide orthodoxa* 2.29): “. . . God antecedently wishes all to be saved and to partake of his kingdom. For he did not make us to punish us but, since he is good, that we may be sharers of his goodness. However he wishes sinners to be punished since he is just. Therefore the first, antecedent will is called also good pleasure, being from him. But the second, consequent will is also called permission, having its origin from us.” (Farrelly 70)

## Augustine on Predestination, Grace, and Free Will

1. **Pelagianism**
   1. Pelagius
      1. Grace is offered equally to all: God is no “acceptor of persons” (*De cast*. 13). (Kelly 360)
      2. God predestines only those whom He foresees will advance in holiness by merit. (Kelly 360)
   2. Julian of Eclanum: his major emphasis is God’s goodness. (Kelly 361)
2. **Augustine**
   1. *in general*: His theories of man, sin, grace, and predestination preceded the Pelagian con­tro­versy [361]: in *Ad Simplicianum* (ad 396), mankind is a “lump of sin” [357], a *massa damnata*. [363] (Kelly 357, 361, 363)
   2. *predestination*
      1. Since all men form a *massa damnata* and grace takes the initiative, God de­cides, from all eternity, who shall be saved. (Kelly 368)
      2. God’s choice is not based on men’s merits, for meritorious acts are the effect of grace. His choice is based on “inscrutable justice” (*Ad Simplic*. 1:2:14-16). [369] This is not favoritism: since all men are justly destined for damnation, to save any is merciful. [366] (Kelly 366, 369)
      3. Usually Augustine says the saints are predestined to deliverance (before they are born they cannot perish). But sometimes he says also that the others are pre­des­tined to damnation (including some baptized Christians who lack the grace of per­sev­erance). (Kelly 369)
3. **semi-Pelagianism**
   1. John Cassian: God wills all men to be saved. The damned perish against God’s will. Therefore God predestines in light of men’s foreseen actions (*post praevisa merita*). (Kelly 371)
   2. Prosper of Aquitaine and Hilary of Aquitaine, followers of Augustine, opposed Cassian but tempered Augustine’s harshness.
      1. Augustine’s predestinationism “paralyzed moral effort and verged on fat­alism, not to say Manichaeism.” (Kelly 370)
      2. 1 Tim 2:4 means that God wills the salvation of *all* men. (Kelly 370)
   3. the Council of Orange (ad 529): no one is predestined to evil. (Kelly 372)
4. ***On Various Questions for Simplici­anus* book 1 q**. **2** (ad 397)
   1. “The source of Augustine’s later thought is, as he himself stated thirty years later, clear from this section of his work in reply to the questions of Simplicianus. For him the purpose of St. Paul in the ninth chapter of Romans was to show that grace and eternal life are given to men through no merits of their own, but through God’s mercy alone. Paul uses the case of Jacob and Esau to prove this gratuity of grace, and he means by God’s choice of the one and the rejection of the other eternal salvation and eternal damnation. Jacob was chosen for eternal life according to God’s effective purpose before he did anything good and without reference to his future acts. From this Augustine concludes, as indeed the Apostle states, that Esau was, before he had done anything evil and without reference to his future acts, not chosen to be saved from eternal damnation. To state otherwise would jeopardize the gratuity of the grace given to Jacob. From the fact that eternal salvation is not from man’s will and running, but from God’s mercy, Augustine deduces his conclusion that God’s mercy effectively brings about man’s change of heart and is frustrated by no one.” (Farrelly 89)
   2. “But the question of the justice of God’s treatment of Esau remains. The ultimate reason why justice remains in God’s withdrawing mercy from him previous to any evil he did is the fact of original sin, which makes all men debtors of God. The reason why God rejects and makes vessels of perdition is for the manifestation [89] of his power to punish sinners and the mercy he has given the just in making them just. As one can see, this does contain in germ Augustine’s later doctrine on the gratuity and necessity of grace, predestination, the insuperable efficacy of . . . grace to save those he has chosen, the nature of perseverance, the restricted character of God’s salvific will, and the lot of the condemned.” (Farrelly 89-90)
5. **grace is not merited but predestined**
   1. The saved do not merit grace and salvation (the end of grace) as a reward for their efforts. They receive it through God’s predestination or eternal plan and its effects.
   2. *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 17.34: “they have been chosen before the creation of the world by that predestination in which God has foreknown his own future deeds; they have been chosen from the world by that call by which God fulfills what he has predestined.” (Farrelly 90)
6. **God’s foreknowledge**
   1. *De dono perseverantiae* 14.35: predestination to heaven is simply “the foreknowledge and preparation of the benefits by which they are most certainly liberated . . .” (Farrelly 90)
   2. *De dono perseverantiae* 18.47: “to have predestined is to have foreknown what he himself would do.” Farrelly comments, “Since God has predestined man, he, of course, foreknows his activity by which he makes them holy . . .” (Farrelly 91)
   3. “. . . Augustine does not seem to have realized the metaphysical problems about divine knowledge that his theory raised . . .” (Farrelly 91 n. 69)
      1. “. . . the divine knowledge of predestination does seem to follow an absolute divine decree not influenced by man’s works. In his use of his knowledge, God can convert whomever he chooses because he knows the circumstances and graces that will bring about the conversion . . .” (Farrelly 91 n. 69)
      2. “J. Saint-Martin [“Prédestination, S. Augustin,” *DTC* 12.2 (1935), cols. 2850-2852] tends to see in the kind of knowledge Augustine attributes to God a causative knowledge that follows an infallibly and intrinsically efficacious divine decree.” (Farrelly 91 n. 69)
      3. *Ad Simplicianum* 1.2.13: “God has mercy on none in vain; the one on whom he has mercy he [86] calls in such a way as he knows is fitting for him, so that he will not reject him who calls.” (Farrelly 87)
      4. *Ad Simplicianum* 1.2.21: “when those things delight us by which we advance towards God, this is inspired and granted by the grace of God . . .” (Farrelly 89)
      5. Augustine “seems to imply that in his [Adam’s] case God’s knowledge of his sin was not certain antecedent to Adam’s actual sin.” (Farrelly 91 n. 69)
7. **efficacious grace**
   1. “. . . God’s predestination of a man to his eternal salvation is infallibly efficacious in achieving its effect. . . . No one can frustrate the mercy of God or resist the will of God.” (Farrelly 91)
   2. The above quotations [*De praedestinatione sanctorum* 17.34; *De dono perseverantiae* 14.35, 18.47] already show this. (Farrelly 91)
   3. *De correptione et gratia* 7.14 (on Rom 8:28-29, “all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his purpose. 29For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son”): “If anyone of these [the predestined and foreknown of Rom 8:2] perish, God is deceived; but none of them do perish . . .” (Farrelly 91)
      1. So, for Augustine, “those whom God chooses from the descendants of Adam will with [91] certainty hear the gospel, believe it, and persevere in love until the end of their life or return to this after a lapse from grace. The call given to them is different from that given to those who will not accept, or having accepted, not persevere; that given to the elect is what the Apostle describes as a call according to God’s plan or purpose.” (Farrelly 91-92)
   4. *De correptione et gratia* 14.45: “human wills cannot resist the will of God . . . so as to prevent his doing what he wills since he does even concerning the very wills of men what he wills . . . [He has] the most omnipotent power of inclining the hearts of men whither it should please him.” (Farrelly 91)
   5. *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 16.32: “we act when we act, but he brings about our act through giving to the will most efficacious powers.” (Farrelly 92)
   6. *De correptione et gratia* 12.38: “there has been aid given to the weakness of the human will so that under divine grace it might act unchangeably and invincibly and, therefore, though weak, would still not fail nor be overcome by any adversity.” Grace, therefore, “gives to the will, not only the strength to act well, but the act itself. For if God gave man weakened by original sin simply the power to do well, he would be overcome by his own weakness and fall away from God.” (Farrelly 92)
      1. “Augustine goes further than the Council [the Second Council of Orange, ad 529] and sees the grace given to fallen man as infallibly efficacious.” (Farrelly 92 n. 75)
      2. The grace given Adam (and the angels) was an *adiutorium sine quo*, “one by which he had the power to persevere and indeed did what good he did do, but one from which he could also fall away.” But the grace given fallen men is an *adiutorium quo*, “an aid that effects man’s very act . . .” (*De correptione et gratia* 11.31-32) (Farrelly 92)
   7. Grace does not contravene free will.
      1. “Augustine was completely confident that such a grace as is given to fallen man is not contrary to his freedom and he wrote a book, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, in which he proved from Scripture that freedom does remain though God’s grace brings about the works of man.” (Farrelly 92)
      2. “Man’s weakness in the fallen state demands such a grace, and hence grace through freeing him from [92] the flesh and sin is not only not contrary to true freedom, but perfective of it.” (*De correptione et gratia* 8.17) (Farrelly 92-93)
8. **the reprobate**
   1. ad 427: Those “who do not reach heaven were never separated from the mass of sinners [the *massa damnata*, “lump of sin,” Kelly 363] by God’s predestination and foreknowledge and thus were not called according to his purpose, chosen, or given perseverance to the end. ” (*De correptione et gratia* 7.16) (Farrelly 93)
   2. ad 397: According to *Ad Simplicianus*, God’s mercy is “not withdrawn from men because of his foreknowledge of their future sins or refusal to believe. He thought this would involve God’s choice of Jacob because of his future merits or belief. Also he found it against the nature of God’s mercy which gave to fallen men who acted well not only the power to act well but the actual acts. The case of the death of unbaptized infants seems to confirm this view that God withdraws his mercy justly, and not because of man’s sins that are foreknown.” (Farrelly 93)
   3. ad 427: “In his later writings, Augustine at times states simply that he does not know why God has withdrawn his mercy from those who do not persevere until the end . . .” (*De correptione et gratia* 8.17) (Farrelly 93)
   4. ad 427: “. . . but he also adds in the same book that they are most justly judged since when they die they either lie under the bondage of original sin or have added through their own free will their own sins to this.” (*De correptione et gratia* 13.42) (Farrelly 93)
   5. “At times he seems to place the initiative in God for their failure in some duty in this life.” (Farrelly 93)
      1. ad 427: “. . . these are not called according to God’s purpose or plan . . .” (*De correptione et gratia* 7.14) (Farrelly 93)
      2. ad 428-29: “. . . it was not given to Tyre and Sidon to believe . . .” (*De dono perseverantiae* 14.35) (Farrelly 93)
      3. ad 428-29: “. . . if there is not perseverance to the end, perseverance has not been given.” (*De dono perseverantiae* 6.10; see *Epistolae* 217, 6.19) (Farrelly 93)
      4. ad 427: “But if God does not have mercy on all of fallen humanity, he is not unjust; to that Augustine always returns.” (See *De correptione et gratia* 10.28.) (Farrelly 94)
9. **reconciling contradictions in Augustine**
   1. Augustine contradicts scripture.
      1. “. . . an absolute unconditioned predestination and grace as the normal providence of God and an antecedent reprobation of the moral adult [rests upon] an incorrect interpretation of the admittedly tortuous passages of St. Paul whose doctrine, in fact, is quite opposed to this.” (Farrelly 106)
      2. Antecedent reprobation is “not sustained by the scriptural passages advanced by Augustine, and Scripture’s concrete doctrine on the Christian life supposed an understanding of the divine will for man’s salvation that seems different from that of Augustine.” (Farrelly 95)
      3. Augustine “based his doctrine on the ninth chapter of St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans. For him, St. Paul in this chapter was trying to prove the gratuity of grace and used Jacob and Esau as symbols to express and prove this gratuity. [But Paul’s purpose] was to prove that God was not unfaithful to his promises to the Jews. And the chapter does not prove either an antecedent reprobation from eternal salvation or an antecedent absolute predestination.” (Farrelly 105)
         1. “. . . Paul is directly discussing God’s providence toward the Jews and the Gentiles as groups, and not the predestination or reprobation of the individual with reference to eternal salvation. The rejection of the Jews that raises the problem is the rejection of them in the historical mission envisaged for them in the Old Testament as the means through which God would save the world; St. Paul does not affirm that the eternal lot of all of those so rejected is one of damnation.” (Farrelly 64)
         2. “And the individuals he mentions, such as Essau [*sic*] and Pharaoh, are types of the Jews who are rejected, not treated for their own sakes with reference to their eternal lot. This answer, however, to the foregoing interpretation of the passage is not adequate, for the passage has in St. Paul’s intention a relation to the predestination of the individual Christian. Their security rests on God’s promise of salvation, and God’s treatment of the Jews raises the question of how effective God’s promise is. Will the Christian be disowned by God, as it seems the Jews have been?” (Farrelly 64)
         3. “Romans 9-11 cannot be cited in favor of [a limited salvific will in God, i.e., does only wills some to be saved]. These chapters are concerned with who will be the bearer of revelation, not with the question of eternal salvation or damnation.” (Schmaus 7)
      4. “Paul teaches elsewhere a conditional predestination and grace, objectively antecedent to man’s acts, wholly gratuitous, and objectively effective, but conditioned on the non-refusal by man of this gift. This is the normal manner of God’s providence. So Augustine’s exegesis is, in our opinion, contrary to the intention and teaching of St. Paul, and hence is not probative. And our interpretation of St. Paul is not opposed to the teaching of the Fathers as this teaching is a witness to the belief of Christians.” (Farrelly 106)
   2. Augustine’s severe teachings on predestination contradict his mild ones.
      1. “How does one explain that Augustine at one time holds that all [94] Adam’s offspring who fail to reach heaven have been reprobated by God antecedent to his knowledge of their personal sins and at another time gives practical directions for the Christian life that seem to indicate that all can reach heaven?” (Farrelly 94-95)
      2. “Some say that there is no contradiction between these elements of his teaching.” (Farrelly 95)
      3. “Others say that Augustine’s works on grace must be interpreted in the light of his doctrine in other works.” (Farrelly 95)
         1. However, in his last work on predestination and grace [*De dono perseverantiae* 22.57-62, ad 428-29], “he said [that] predestination should not be taught to the simple people in all the clarity with which he had expressed it. . . . But in the same book, [he affirms]: “no one can without error dispute against this predestination which we defend according to Holy Scriptures.” [*De dono perseverantiae* 19.48] Since Augustine continued to hold all the elements of his explanation of this mystery, but dissuaded priests from preaching it to the people as it stood, one can scarcely take Augustine’s sermons as indications that he did not really hold what he taught in works dedicated specifically to the subject.” (Farrelly 94)
         2. “. . . objectivity seems to demand that we accept his works on grace for what they say, and his other works for what they say, and then recognize a certain disunity within his thought on this matter.” (Farrelly 95)
      4. We should “distinguish Augustine’s faith from his explanation of that faith in the matter of grace.” (Farrelly 95)
         1. “In his *explanation* or theory of grace, he associated an antecedent reprobation, an absolute antecedent predestination, and an infrustrable grace with St. Paul’s doctrine of the efficacy and the gratuity of grace.” (Farrelly 95)
         2. “His *faith* was that of the simple people of his day. [95] . . . he held the faith of the simple people of his day more deeply than the explanation that he advanced to illuminate that faith.” (Farrelly 95-96)
         3. “His explanation of the mystery of grace which he held by faith was not completely free from fault and did not do justice to all the facts of Christian life.” (Farrelly 95)
   3. Augustine contradicts later Church teaching.
      1. “. . . in the opposition to the Semipelagians after his death the Church deliberately and consciously abstained from accepting these aspects of his teaching. [“These aspects” refers to: “antecedently infallible grace, of an absolute predestination and gift of perseverance unconditioned by man’s response, and an antecedent reprobation.” 105] In fact, the teaching on the universal salvific will of God in Prosper, the teaching that all the baptized can and ought to fulfill with Christ’s help the things necessary for salvation, and the condemnation of a predestination to evil in the II Council of Orange mark the Church’s resistance to these teachings of Augustine which he deduced from the gratuity of grace as taught by St. Paul. His doctrines on the restricted character of God’s salvific will, on the difference between those called ‘according to God’s purpose’ and those not so called, on the antecedent reprobation of Esau and those for whom he is a type were not sustained by the Church.” (Farrelly 105)
10. **Second Council of Orange** (ad 529)
    1. Council of Orange II: “We . . . do not believe that some have been truly predestined to evil by divine power . . .” (Denzinger § 199)
11. **Augustine’s later influence**
    1. “. . . in the later history of Christian reflection on the mystery of predestination and grace, many will follow Augustine’s interpretation of St. Paul that attributes to him the doctrine of an infallibly efficacious antecedent predestination and grace and of an antecedent reprobration [*sic*].” (Farrelly 106)
    2. “Some of these later appearances of St. Augustine’s interpretation will be grotesque caricatures of his thought; and they will not be modified as Augustine’s was through a fuller perspective of Christian teaching and life that corrected his views in writings where he was not developing a theory of grace.” (Farrelly 106)
    3. “Others will be much more conscious of God’s mercy and in their very attempt to preserve this mercy will show a repugnance for this doctrine of antecedent reprobation as unworthy of God.” (Farrelly 106)
    4. “The marvel, from a human point of view, is not that this doctrine under the influence of St. Augustine has been so long lived, but rather that the Church in her official teaching has never accepted the complete doctrine of Augustine on this subject of grace, a doctrine that through his genius and sanctity imposed itself so widely in later ages.” (Farrelly 106)

## Predestination

Need these bib entries: McIntire, Godfrey, *Random House Encyclopedia*.

1. **God**’**s universal salvific will**
   1. scripture
      1. “God’s salvific will leaves no one out, it is directed towards every in­dividual.” (Schmaus 4)
         1. 1 Tim 2:4, God “desires everyone to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.”
         2. 1 Tim 4:10, “we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all people, especially of those who believe.”
   2. “God’s universal salvific will has its foundation in that love which led him at the beginning to create a realm of reality distinct from himself.” (Schmaus 4)
   3. “Since every being derives its existence from the absolutely gratui­tous love of God, it would be a contradiction if God willed not [4] well-being but ultimate disaster for even one single creature (indeed, it would amount to attributing demonic traits to God, the ultimate ground of the world).” (Schmaus 4-5)
   4. “. . . although according to the testimony of both the Old and New Testa­ments it is towards the human community that God turns, nevertheless he holds every individual in the focus of his love, not as an isolated individual but as essentially a member of the community . . .” [4] “The New Testament gives a comprehensive idea of grace when it refers not just to the individual’s right relationship with God but to the totality of God’s merciful gift to mankind. The right relationship of the individual to God, personal salvation, is a constituent part of general salvation.” (Schmaus 4, 45)
   5. The aim of “God’s eternal salvific will for the individual . . . is the future fulfillment of the individual in his encounter with God and in his entrance, in love, into the perfect human community.” (Schmaus 4)
   6. “The universality of God’s salvific will coincides with the universality of his redemptive will [seen in] the universal efficacy of Jesus Christ’s life and saving actions . . .” (Schmaus 4)
2. **the concept of predestination**
   1. “God’s eternal salvific will for the individual is called predestina­tion. It represents a special form of divine providence . . .” (Schmaus 4)
   2. “Predestination” is “the doctrine that God has eternally chosen those whom he intends to save.” (“Predestination”)
3. **overview**
   1. “Three types of predestination doctrine . . . have developed.” (“Predestination”)
   2. *post praevisa merita*
      1. “One theory (associated with Semi-Pelagianism, some forms of nominalism, and Arminianism) makes foreknowledge the ground of predestination and teaches that God predestined to salvation those whose future faith and merits he foreknew.” (“Predestination”)
      2. Around ad 425, “Cassian . . . contended that predestination in the sense of grace was *post praevisa merita*, that is God first explored what man would do with grace and conceded it in view of man’s future merits. This is Molinism . . .” (Eberhardt 239)
   3. *ante praevisa merita*
      1. double predestination
         1. “At the opposite extreme is the doctrine of double predestination, commonly identified with John Calvin but more correctly associated with the Synod of Dort, and appearing also in some of the writings of St. Augustine and Martin Luther and in the thought of the Jansenists. According to this doctrine, God has determined from eternity whom he will save and whom he will damn, regardless of their faith, love, or merit, or lack thereof.” (“Predestination”)
         2. Not all theories of *ante praevisa merita* concede God’s positive will to damnation.
      2. Catholic doctrine: “A third doctrine was set forth in other writings of St. Augustine and Luther, in the decrees of the second Council of Orange (529), and in the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. It ascribes the salvation of man to the unmerited grace of God and thus to predestination, but it attributes divine reprobation to man’s sin and guilt.” (“Predestination”)
4. **the erroneous theory of a particular salvific will in God** (Schmaus 5)
   1. John: some texts, especially in John, “seem to attribute to God a particular salvific will—indeed, even a certain arbitrariness in the choice of the men destined for eternal happiness . . .” (Schmaus 5) “Particular salvific will” means God wills only some (particular) people to be saved; he may not will others to be damned, but he is at best indifferent to their fate.
      1. John 6:44, “No one can come to me unless drawn by the Father . . .”
      2. John 6:65, “no one can come to me unless it is granted by the Father.”
      3. John 8:44, 47, “You are from your father the devil . . . 47Whoever is from God hears the words of God. The reason you do not hear them is that you are not from God.”
      4. John 12:39-40, “And so they could not believe, because Isaiah also said, 40“He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn—and I would heal them.””
      5. John 13:18, “I am not speaking of all of you; I know whom I have chosen. But it is to fulfill the scripture, ‘The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me.’”
      6. John 15:25, “It was to fulfill the word that is written in their law, ‘They hated me without a cause.’”

But these texts refer to man’s freedom. “God’s saving will is directed to all men, but salvation is forced on no one. Man is free.” Other texts show that “The divine will to save man is a challenge to the individual, presenting him with the necessity of deciding whether he will find his ultimate mode of existence in dialogue with God and his brothers and sisters, or in proud isolation . . .” (Schmaus 5)

* + 1. John 3:19, “And this is the judgment, that the light has come into the world, and people loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil.”
    2. John 5:40, “you refuse to come to me to have life.”
    3. John 6:29, “This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent.”
    4. John 9:41, “If you were blind, you would not have sin. But now that you say, ‘We see,’ your sin remains.”
    5. John 12:43, “they loved human glory more than the glory that comes from God.”
    6. John 12:47, “I do not judge anyone who hears my words and does not keep them, for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.”
  1. Augustine: “in his struggle against Pelagianism, Augustine seems to have been forced into the position of conceiving of a particular salvific will on God’s part. Hence he failed to stress the universality of God’s saving will and the sufficiency of grace for all and had to interpret 1 Timothy 2,4 in a very artificial manner. [1 Tim 2:4 (God “desires everyone to be saved”) means only that men of every race and type will be saved. (Kelly 369)] The Church has passed over this teaching of Augustine’s in silence.” (Schmaus 5)
  2. Gottschalk: “Later, in the ninth century, the monk Gottschalk, too, advo­cated a view of the matter which is perhaps excessively harsh (DS 621 ff.).” (Schmaus 5)
  3. Calvin went further and advocated an unconditional, positive will to damnation (see Schmaus’s comments below, under “Calvinism”).

1. **reprobation**
   1. Reprobation is “God’s eternal decree of rejection . . .” (Schmaus 7)
   2. Calvinism
      1. Calvin’s teachings on predestination were influenced by Wyclif and Hus. (Schmaus 7)
      2. Calvinism asserts “a positive, unconditional reprobation without any divine foreknowledge of human sin,” and Catholicism holds that to be “erroneous.” (Schmaus 7)
      3. Synod of Dort
         1. The Arminian *Remonstrance* (see below, “Arminianism”) asserted five points:
            1. “election (and condemnation on the day of judgment) was conditioned by the rational faith or nonfaith of man;
            2. “the Atonement, while qualitatively adequate for all men, was efficacious only for the man of faith [here is the distinction between objective and subjective redemption!—Hahn];
            3. “unaided by the Holy Spirit, no person is able to respond to God’s will;
            4. “grace is not irresistible; and
            5. “believers are able to resist sin but are not beyond the possibility of falling from grace.

“The crux of Remonstrant Arminianism lay in the assertion that human dignity requires an unimpaired freedom of the will.” (“Predestination”)

* + - 1. the issues
         1. predestination theories

*Calvin*

Calvin “had a deterministic understanding of the operation of God in relation to predestination. But he intended only one thing: the exclusion of works.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84) [But double predestination was, even by 1600, the “traditional view”: in the early 1600s in Holland, Arminius “became convinced that the traditional view must be rejected.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 82)]

“By the final edition of the Institutes (1559), however, he defines predestination expansively to include double predestination: “By predestination we mean the eternal decree of God, by which he determined with himself whatever he wished to happen with regard to every person. All are not created on equal terms, but some are preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation.”” (McIntire 428)

“. . . Calvin clearly teaches eternal reprobation . . .” *Institutes* 3.22.11, 3.23.1.3. (Godfrey 394 n. 61)

*supralapsarianism:* pre­destination was before creation, but with no reference to the fall, and it was the motive of creation. (This was the conservative Gomar’s position.) (Dillenberger and Welch 83) Predestination to hell is unconditional, i.e., independent of divine foreknowledge of the fall. (Schmaus 7)

*infralap­sarianism*: predestination was before creation, but with reference to the fall. “This view provided a rationale for assigning individuals to hell and put creation in a better light.” There were “two types of infralapsarian think­ers.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 83) Predestination to hell is conditional, i. e., based on God’s foreknowledge of the fall. (Schmaus 7)

*double predestination*: “God had directly willed both the salvation of elect individuals and the damnation of all others.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 83)

*single predestination*: “God had decided who should be saved but had made no decision concerning those who did not belong to the pre­destined. For all practical purposes, the latter were left to their own devices (which was hardly more tolerable than to be among the damned).” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 83)

The “lapsarian theories . . . safeguard the priority of God’s activity by ascribing all events and happenings to God. They lost the experiential character [83] of faith and accepted a form of determinism as the basis of faith. . . . Whereas faith [in Calvin was] the foundation of predestination, now predestina­tion was the basis of faith, a view already expressed previously by John Farel [a leader in Geneva with Calvin].” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 83-84)

*Arminianism*

According to Arminianism, “the idea of a decree . . . means no more than that God has declared that whoever ac­cepts Christ will be saved and whoever does not will be ex­cluded.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 83)

“The Arminians anchored the concept of predestination in faith and experience, but they reduced the decision of faith simply to a human, rational possibility.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 83)

*Synod of Dort*

The Synod was lapsarian (“God’s decree [was] before the foun­da­tion of the world”), though “neither clearly supra nor in­fra­lap­sarian . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84)

It affirmed single predestination: “God had not specifically ordained any­one for damnation.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84)

Most think the Synod was infralapsarian, but that is be­cause single predestination has been “as­so­ci­at­ed only with the infralapsarian position.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84 n. 2)

“In subsequent devel­opments, double predestination was reaffirmed in spite of the Synod of Dort.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84)

* + - * 1. whether Christ died for all or only for the elect

*Arminianism*: “Christ had died for all and obtained forgiveness for all, though forgiveness could be effective only as one accepted Christ.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84)

*Synod of Dort*: since “whatever happens is determined by God, [Christ] died only for the faithful. Otherwise God would be frustrated since what God intended did not happen.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84)

* + - * 1. faith in relation to rejecting God’s grace

*both*

“Both Arminians [84] and orthodox agreed that there is no salvation apart from faith.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 84-85)

Both “defined faith as a decision . . . [though] it is clear that the conserva­tives should have disagreed with the Ar­min­ians on the nature of faith.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85)

*Arminians*

If one could not reject God’s grace, then “one was no more than a puppet.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85)

*Synod of Dort*

“The orthodox refused to distinguish between God’s will to redeem and one’s acceptance. If God willed faith for anyone, it happened.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85)

God “produces both the will to believe and the act of believing also.” [Quotation from Synod of Dort.] “This statement . . . makes one into an object maneuvered by God.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85)

* + - * 1. losing grace

*Arminians*: yes, one can lose grace (“This was in accord with their concern for the vo­litional nature of the self”). (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85)

*Synod of Dort*: “Just as one could not resist grace, so one could not lose it. To say that one could, would mean that God was defeated in specific instances.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85)

*authors’ opinion*: “No one deliberately departs from grace, and the one who stands under its power can reasonably expect to remain under it. But this hope is based in the sustaining and trustworthy [85] activity of God. This was the truth in the orthodox [Calvinist] system, though distorted by a deterministic view of God’s nature and activity. Neverthe­less, it does happen that individuals do not remain in the state of grace. This was the truth of the other side, in which the activity of God and of human beings were not simply identified.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 85-86)

* + - * 1. So the Synod of Dort consistently held “that what God wills and what happens were virtually identified. Only the Fall as such was excluded from the divine decree; all else, including the results of the Fall for human life and destiny, was the outworking of God’s immutable will.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 86)
    1. Calvinism after Dort
       1. Though the Synod of Dort affirmed single predestination, the subsequent theological development emphasized double pre­des­tin­a­tion. This was because of “an increas­ing emphasis upon the glory, majesty, and honor of God. Others before, including Calvin, had stressed the majesty of God, but as grounded always in God’s justifying activity. In the later tradition, God’s honor and glory *per se* become the dominant motif . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 86)
       2. “. . . the Calvinistic tradition [has always emphasized] the inscrutability of God’s ways and the radical corruption of the world.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 178)
  1. Arminianism
     1. In Holland in the early 1600s, a pious Christian named Koornheert was troubled “that God damned individuals from all eternity. Arminius, who had been asked to refute Koorn­heert, instead became convinced that the traditional view must be rejected.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 82)
     2. Arminius
        1. Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609) was “a Dutch Reformed theologian of the University of Leiden (1603-09) . . .” (“Predestination”)
        2. “He had earlier affirmed the Calvinist view of predestination, which held that those elected for salvation were chosen prior to Adam’s fall [this is just lapsarian—neither supra nor infra], but he gradually came to have doubts.” (“Predestination”)
        3. “To him predestination . . . did not allow human decision a role in the achieving of sal­vation. Hence Arminius came to assert a conditional election, according to which God elects to life those who will respond in faith to the divine offer of salvation. In so doing, he meant to place greater emphasis on God’s mercy.” (“Predestination”)
        4. Unlike Calvinism, Arminianism “asserted that God’s sovereignty and man’s free will are compatible.” (“Predestination”)
        5. “For Arminius, God’s will as unceasing love was the determinative initiator and arbiter of human destiny.” (“Predestination”)
     3. Arminianism (in the narrow sense)
        1. “. . . Arminianism, however, tended to be more liberal than Arminius.” (“Predestination”) Arminianism is a heresy: good works alone remit our sins and make us pleas­ing to God. (Dau­jat 67)
        2. “The brunt of the controversy was borne by a disciple of Arminius named Bisschop. Another important supporter was the well-known jurist, Hugo Grotius.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 82)
        3. “After his death some of his followers gave support to his views by signing the *Remonstrance* . . . in 1610.” (“Predestination”)
           1. “Dutch Arminianism was originally articulated in the *Remonstrance* (1610), a theological statement signed by 45 ministers . . .” (“Predestination”)
           2. It was a series of articles. A *Counter-Remonstrance* was largely by Gomar. (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 82-83)
        4. The states general of Holland called the Synod of Dort (or Dordrecht), 1618-19, as an assembly of the Dutch Reformed Church “to pass upon the *Remonstrance*. . . . the Arminians present were expelled, and many others suffered persecution.” (“Predestination”) See the section, “Synod of Dort,” below.
        5. By 1630 “the Remonstrant Bro­ther­hood had achieved legal toleration. . . . They have continued to assert effective liberalizing tendencies in Dutch Protestant theology.” (“Predestination”)
     4. Methodism
        1. “A contributory cause of decline [of Puritanism in America] was the Arminian influence which had also penetrated to America. It was part of a general tendency to stress reason above all else in matters of religious doctrine.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 111) So the ground was already prepared for Methodism when it arrived.
        2. John Wesley (1703-1791) “differed from contemporary Anglicans not in doctrines but in emphases: he claimed to have reinstated the biblical doctrines
           1. “that a man may be assured of his salvation and
           2. “that, by the power of the Holy Spirit, he is capable of attaining perfect love for God and his fellows in this life.” (“Predestination”)
           3. “Wesley’s Evangelical Arminianism” prompted him to preach “an extremely emotional personal sense of Christ’s saving grace.” (*Random House Encyclopedia* q. v. “Wesley”)
        3. “In its emphasis on the grace of God, Arminianism influenced the development of Methodism in England and the United States.” (“Predestination”)
        4. Wesley “was influenced by Arminianism. In *The Arminian Magazine*, edited by him, he stated that “God willeth all men to be saved, by speaking the truth in love.” Arminianism was an important influence in Methodism . . .” (“Predestination”)
     5. Unitarianism: “A still more liberal version of Arminianism went into the making of American Unitarianism.” (“Predestination”)

1. **predestination and free will**
   1. “Scripture does not lift the veil from the encounter between the divine call and the human response.” (Schmaus 5)
   2. total and partial predestination (think “successful” and “unsuccessful”—Hahn)
      1. “. . . the divine predestination to salvation does not exclude man’s free will, but [de­crees] happiness only for those men who do not reject it.” (Schmaus 5)
      2. “The post-Tridentine theologians tried to clarify this distinction within the divine salvific will terminologically by the expressions “total” and “partial” predestination.” (Schmaus 5)
         1. “If as the result of a man’s flight from God the divine predestination to salvation does not reach its intended goal, it remains “partial.”” (Schmaus 5)
         2. “Only if it is not hindered from reaching its goal is predestination “total.”” (Schmaus 5)
      3. Being divine, “the divine decree of salvation for men . . . is eternal and immutable. But its immu­tability does not weigh upon men like inexorable fate, for man’s free de­cision is incorporated into total predestination: God wills both the free act and its freedom.” (Schmaus 5)
   3. divine fore­knowledge of free choices
      1. How predestination and freedom are to be reconciled involves an a priori problem: “how we are to account for the divine fore­knowledge of the free activity of creatures.” (Schmaus 5)
      2. “In post-Tridentine theology two schools of opinion developed, the Thomist and the Molinist.” (Schmaus 5)
         1. the Thomist school
            1. the position

God decrees our “ultimate perfection . . . without any anticipation of human merit (*ante* *praevisa* *merita*) . . .” (Schmaus 5)

“. . . without regarding the merit of a man God decrees blessedness for him.” (Schmaus 5)

This is “the doctrine of a predestination for heaven independent of God’s foreknowledge of a man’s merit . . .” (Schmaus 7)

“By an unconditional decision of his will [“an unconditional decree of salvation”], God decrees for the man whose perfec­tion he has in view those graces which infallibly lead to perfection.” (Schmaus 5)

“The efficacy of those graces is variously explained.” (Schmaus 5)

* + - * 1. proponents

Whether “The Thomist thesis . . . can be assigned to Aquinas is debatable . . .” (Schmaus 5)

It “is clearly expressed by John Duns Scotus.” (Schmaus 5)

“It received its final form at the hands of the Dominican Banez.” (Schmaus 5)

* + - 1. the Molinist school
         1. the position

Predestination is *post praevisa merita*: “the total predestination of a man to ultimate perfection [is] based on his foreseen merits. . . . God knows what every intelligent creature could do, and in fact will freely do, in every situation crucial to his salvation.” (Schmaus 6)

“How God knows this is explained differently . . .” (Schmaus 6)

“In an unfathomable decision God chooses from among the possible ways in which we could achieve blessedness the concrete order in which we live. This order provides every rational creature with the opportunity for salvation.” (Schmaus 6)

God “desires the everlasting happiness of all. However, he knows whether the individual man will use the opportunity offered him for sal­vation. The decree by which he chooses the concrete order of sal­vation includes the decision to condemn to eternal dam­nation ev­ery man who rejects the call to salvation.” (Schmaus 6)

* + - * 1. proponents: Molinism “is probably advocated by the majority of theologians today . . .” (Schmaus 6)
      1. the Thomist-Molinist controversy
         1. “No solution could be found to the famous controversy regarding grace (1582-1610).” (Schmaus 6)
         2. “Both Thomists and Molinists could invoke Scripture in defense of their thesis [but] this only goes to show that the appeal to Scripture is unavailing: the scriptural statements concerning God’s universal salvific will are not concerned with this problem.” (Schmaus 6)
         3. “Both schools include distin­guished representatives in their ranks, and among the Thomists there are important theologians who are Molinists on other questions.” (Schmaus 6)
         4. “The Church has neither accepted nor condemned either theory.” (Schmaus 6)
         5. “. . . it is more difficult to bring the Thomistic theory into agree­ment with the overall view which Scripture presents of God. Its advantage is systematic consistency, which raises the question whether it is not more a nominal than a real theological solution.” (Schmaus 6)
  1. conclusions
     1. “. . . the incorporation of human freedom into divine predestination [i. e., “how total predestination and the human rejection of salvation . . . are to be explained”] involves a problem which even to this day has resisted any satisfactory solution . . .” (Schmaus 5)
     2. “Ultimately, predestination belongs to the impenetrable mystery of God and hence is hidden from men (see the Council of Trent, DS 1540, 1565f.). It is not subject to calculation like a problem of physics or chemistry or mathematics but is woven into the relationship of love and trust . . .” (Schmaus 5)
        1. 1 Pet 5:6-10, “Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, so that he may exalt you in due time. 7Cast all your anxiety on him, because he cares for you. 8Discipline yourselves, keep alert. Like a roaring lion your adversary the devil prowls around, looking for someone to devour. 9Resist him, steadfast in your faith, for you know that your brothers and sisters in all the world are undergoing the same kinds of suffering. 10And after you have suffered for a little while, the God of all grace, who has called you to his eternal glory in Christ, will himself restore, support, strengthen, and establish you.”
        2. 2 Pet 1:10, “be all the more eager to confirm your call and election, for if you do this, you will never stumble.”

## Calvin on Predestination

1. **providence and predestination**
   1. Calvin’s determinism
      1. *Institutes* 1.16.3: “there is no erratic power, or action, or motion in creatures, [but] they are governed by God’s secret plan in such a way that nothing happens [33] except what is knowingly and willingly decreed by him.” (qtd. in Klooster 34)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.6: God’s foreknowledge rests on “the fact that he decreed that they take place . . . the disposition of all things is in God’s hand. . . . it is clear that all things take place . . . by his determination and bidding.” (qtd. in Klooster 74)
   2. *Institutes* 1.18.2: “since God’s will is said to be the cause of all things, I have made his providence the determinative principle for all human plans and works . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 34)
   3. Predestination “is related to the counsel of God that is executed through His providential direction and government of all things.” (Klooster 33)
2. **double predestination**
   1. “. . . Calvin held to double predestination, that is, to both election and reprobation.” (Klooster 27)
   2. *Institutes* 3.21.5: “We call predestination God’s eternal decree, by which he determined with himself what he willed to become of each man. For all are not created in equal condition; rather, eternal life is foreordained for some, eternal damnation for others. Therefore, as any man has been created to one or the other of these ends, we speak of him as predestined to life or death.” (qtd. in Klooster 25)
      1. “. . . Calvin used the term *election* as equivalent to *predestination.*” (Klooster 16)
   3. *Institutes* 3.21.7: “God once established by his eternal and unchangeable plan those whom he long before determined once for all to receive into salvation, and those whom, on the other hand, he would devote to destruction. We assert that, with respect to the elect, this plan was founded upon his freely given mercy, without regard to human worth; but by his just and irreprehensible but incomprehensible judgment he has barred the door of life to those whom he has given over to damnation.” (qtd. in Klooster 25)
   4. *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*: “the eternal predestination of God, by which before the fall of Adam He decreed what should take place concerning the whole human race and every individual, was fixed and determined.” (qtd. in Klooster 26)
   5. *Institutes* 3.22.6: “Jacob, therefore, is chosen and distinguished from the rejected Esau by God’s predestination, while not differing from him in merits.” (qtd. in Klooster 56-57)
   6. *Institutes* 3.24.13: we should “not be ashamed to say with Augustine: ‘God could . . . turn the will of evil men to good because he is almighty. Obviously he could. Why, then, does he not? Because he wills otherwise. Why he wills otherwise rests with him.’” (qtd. in Klooster 84)
   7. *Institutes* 3.23.6: “Since the disposition of all things is in God’s hand, since the decision of salvation or of death rests in his power, he so ordains by his plan and will that among men some are born destined for certain death from the womb . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 62)
   8. Reprobation, like election, “concerns specific individuals . . . The decree of reprobation does not refer to a general intention of God . . .” (Klooster 59)
   9. *Institutes* 2.1.8: “infants bring their own damnation with them from their mothers’ wombs; the moment they are born their natures are odious and abominable to God.” (Oakes)
   10. Klooster (a Calvinist) comments: “When the reprobate finally receive the eternal punishment that awaits them, they receive precisely what they deserve. But when the elect receive the eternal salvation that awaits them, they receive what they do not deserve. The elect receive graciously, though also justly, the continued favor and undeserved mercy of God through Jesus Christ.” (Klooster 79)
3. **Why did God elect some persons and reprobate others**?
   1. The cause is not good works or sins.
   2. The cause is not God’s foreknowledge of good works or sins.
      1. *Institutes* 3.23.6: “since he foresees future events only by reason of the fact that he decreed that they take place, they vainly raise a quarrel over foreknowledge, when it is clear that all things take place rather by his determination and [61] bidding.” (qtd. in Klooster 61-62)
      2. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians* (on Eph 1:4): the argument that God foresaw what the reprobate would do “has no force . . . [for] in the nature of corrupt men, . . . nothing can be seen but materials for destruction. . . . there was nothing to be forseen [*sic*].” (qtd. in Klooster 38-39)
   3. The cause is simply: the good pleasure of God’s will.
      1. *Institutes* 3.23.2: “his will is . . . the cause of all things that are.” (qtd. in Klooster 40)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.2: “whatever he wills, by the very fact that he wills it, must be considered righteous. When, therefore, one asks why God has so done, we must reply: because he has willed it. But if you proceed further to ask why he so willed, you are seeking something greater and higher than God’s will, which cannot be found. Let men’s rashness, then, restrain itself, and not seek what does not exist . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 64)
      3. *Sermons on the Epistles of S. Paule to Timothie and Titus* (on 2 Tim 1:8-9): “The everlasting decree of God . . . hath no causes whatsoever. . . . his bare will [should] suffice us for all reasons. . . . It is wisdom in us to do whatever God appointed and never ask why.” (qtd. in Klooster 40)
4. **objections**
   1. objection: predestination to retribution promotes laxity; it frees the sinner from responsibility; it removes all incentive to do good deeds
      1. “Sadoleto was one who charged that Calvin’s doctrine of predestination led to indolence . . .” (Klooster 48) In *Reply to Sadoleto* (in *Tracts and Treatises* 1:43-44), Calvin wrote: “Christ regenerates to a blessed life those whom he justifies, and . . . transforms them . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 48)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.12: “If election has as its goal holiness of life [Eph 1:4, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love”], it ought rather to arouse and goad us eagerly to set our mind upon it than to serve as a pretext for doing nothing.” (qtd. in Klooster 48)
   2. objection: since God causes sins, he should not condemn sinners
      1. *Institutes* 3.23.2: “Foolish men [ask] by what right the Lord becomes angry at his creatures who have not provoked him by any previous offense; for to devote to destruction whomever he pleases is more like the caprice of a tyrant than the lawful sentence of a judge. It therefore seems to them that men have reason to expostulate with God if they are predestined to eternal death solely by his decision, apart from their own merit.” (qtd. in Klooster 63)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.5: “. . . the Lord has created those whom he unquestionably foreknew would go to destruction. This has happened because he has so willed it. But why he so willed it is not for our reason to inquire, for we cannot comprehend it.” (qtd. in Klooster 65)

Holy Willie’s Prayer (Excerpt)

Robert Burns, 1785

(modernized by Paul Hahn)

O You, who in the heavens dwells,

Who, as it pleases best Yourself,

Sends one to heaven and ten to hell,

All for Your glory,

And not for any good or ill

They’ve done before You!

I bless and praise Your matchless might,

When thousands You have left in night,

That I am here before Your sight,

For gifts and grace

A burning and a shining light

To all this place.

What was I, or my generation,

That I should get such exaltation,

I who deserve most just damnation

For broken laws,

Five thousand years before my creation,

Through Adam’s cause?

When from my mother’s womb I fell,

You might have plunged me into hell,

To gnash my gums, to weep and wail,

In burning lakes,

Where damned devils roar and yell,

Chained to their stakes.

Yet I am here a chosen sample,

To show Your grace is great and ample;

I’m here a pillar of Your temple,

Strong as a rock,

A guide, a buckler, and example,

To all Your flock.

O Lord, You know what zeal I bear,

When drinkers drink, and swearers swear,

And singing there, and dancing here,

With great and small;

For I am kept by Your fear

Free from them all.

But yet, O Lord! confess I must,

At times I’m bothered by fleshly lust:

And sometimes, too, in worldly trust,

Vile self gets in:

But You remember we are dust,

Defiled with sin.

O Lord! yesterday, You know, with Meg—

Your pardon I sincerely beg,

O! may it never be a living plague

To my dishonour,

And I’ll never lift a lawless leg

Again upon her.

## The Number of the Saved

1. **the number of the saved**
   1. Scripture gives “no information on the number of men God has destined for perfection.” (Schmaus 8)
   2. Matt 19-22 “cannot . . . be used to answer this question.” (Schmaus 8)
      1. Matt 19:23-24, “it will be hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven. 24Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God.”
      2. Matt 20:16, “So the last will be first, and the first will be last.”
      3. Matt 22:14, “For many are called, but few are chosen.”
      4. [But see also Matt 7:13-14, “Enter through the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the road is easy that leads to destruction, and there are many who take it. 14For the gate is narrow and the road is hard that leads to life, and there are few who find it.”—Hahn]
      5. Luke 13:23-27, “Someone asked him, “Lord, will only a few be saved?” He said to them, 24“Strive to enter through the narrow door; for many, I tell you, will try to enter and will not be able. 25When once the owner of the house has got up and shut the door, and you begin to stand outside and to knock at the door, saying, ‘Lord, open to us,’ then in reply he will say to you, ‘I do not know where you come from.’ 26Then you will begin to say, ‘We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets.’ 27But he will say, ‘I do not know where you come from; go away from me, all you evildoers!’””
2. “**The Number of Those Saved**” (URL: http://www.ewtn.com/elctnum.txt, 9/21/96)

“Matt 7:13-14: If we compare this passage with the parallel in Luke 13:22-27, Luke’s version is much fuller, and includes a setting which makes clear the question is about final salvation. In Matthew that seems to be the case, but some have taken it to refer to entering the Church—speaking of the difficulties it involved. Because Luke’s version is fuller, we will use it for our discussion. A person asks Jesus point-blank whether many or few are saved. (Here the word saved means reaching final salvation—often it means entering the Church.) Luke 13:22-27, “Jesus went through one town and village after another, teaching as he made his way to Jerusalem. 23Someone asked him, “Lord, will only a few be saved?” He said to them, 24”Strive to enter through the narrow door; for many, I tell you, will try to enter and will not be able. 25When once the owner of the house has got up and shut the door, and you begin to stand outside and to knock at the door, saying, ‘Lord, open to us,’ then in reply he will say to you, ‘I do not know where you come from.’ 26Then you will begin to say, ‘We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets.’ 27But he will say, ‘I do not know where you come from; go away from me, all you evildoers!’”

“It is important to know that that very question was much discussed among the Jews at that time. We gather this clearly from some of their intertestamental writings, that is, works that are not part of Scripture. The Fourth Book of Ezra, according to the opinion of the editor of that section, B. M. Metzger (in James H. Charlesworth, general editor, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* Doubleday, 1983), comes from late first century A. D. In 8.1-3: “The Most High made the world for the sake of the many, but the world to come for the sake of the few.” In 8.14-16: “There are more who perish than those who will be saved.” This is the background of the thought in 7:46: “It would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam.” The same thought occurs also in 2 Baruch 48. 42 (dated between 1st and 2nd decades of second century, A. D.) and elsewhere. These texts of course do not mean all rabbis held such ideas—there was no central teaching authority in Judaism. But their gloomy remarks applied to our race in general. As to the Jews, nearly all would be saved. So “Talmud, Sanhedrin” 1.10 says: “All Israel has a part in the age to come.” It does list a few exceptions to that for the very worst kinds of sinners.

“It is against this background that we must look at the passages in Luke and probably also Matthew. First, is it inherently likely Jesus would reveal the truth on the matter? Hardly. To say most are saved could lead to laxity. To say most are lost could easily bring despair.

“So, what He seems to mean is this: You people think you have it made because Abraham is your Father. But you do not. Do not rest on that, get going and work out your salvation.

“Further, there were two Scriptural passages whose seeming sense led so many Fathers to take pessimistic view. One is our present passage about the narrow way, the other is that of the banquet in Mt. 22:1-14 and Luke 14:15-24. The version in Matthew ends with “Many are called but few are chosen.” Jesus seems to have in mind at last primarily the Jews, and not all persons.—The word “many” almost certainly reflects Hebrew “rabbim,” which means the all who are many. So it means all Jews were invited to the messianic kingdom—few were entering. So the path is narrow.

“The Fathers of the Church generally took that parable to refer to both God’s call to be part of the chosen People, and to refer to final salvation. That was unfortunate, for the two are quite different. One can be saved without formally entering the Church, and some who do formally enter will not be saved.

“Are we obliged to accept the Patristic interpretation? No, for there is no sign they are passing on a teaching from the beginning. Rather, they are on their own, and telescope two things that greatly need to be kept distinct, as we said.

“The old Congregation of the Index in more recent times condemned two writings. One by P. Gravina, which held that by far the greater number are saved, was condemned on May 22, 1772. However, some of his arguments were foolish and he used apocryphal revelations. The general idea of the greater number of persons saved was also held earlier by Venerable Joseph of St. Benedict. As part of the process, 40 theologians were appointed to examine his writings along with other doctors elsewhere. None objected to his thesis. On the other hand, on July 30, 1708 a work under the pen name of Amelincourt—actually it was written by Abbe Olivier Debors-Desdoires—which held that most persons are lost, was condemned.

“From these opposite condemnations and the approval of Venerable Joseph we gather that the Church simply does not profess to know whether the saved are few or many. This also confirms our judgment that even though so many Fathers are pessimistic, their views do not derive from a tradition handed down from the beginning, but from a misinterpretation especially of the parable of the banquet.”

# Grace in Scripture

## The God of the Old Testament

1. **myth and anthropomorphism**
   1. “myth”
      1. For cultures with undeveloped discursive thought, myth gives form to transcendent realities:
         1. the nature of deity,
         2. the origin of the world and of society,
         3. the ground of moral principles,
         4. the purpose of human life.
      2. Even in philosophical cultures, myth “remains the most apt form for the expression of transcendental reality, too large and too profound for scientific observation and philosophi­cal analysis. . . . In expelling myth we run the risk of expelling the divine also.” (McKenzie 1290)
   2. anthropomorphism
      1. In giving form to transcendent realities, myth finds the easiest symbol to be personal activity.
         1. Yahweh has a face, eyes, ears, mouth, nostrils, hands, feet.
         2. He speaks, hears, smells, laughs, hisses, whistles, strikes, writes, walks.
         3. He feels delight, joy, anger, hatred, love, disgust, regret, compassion.
         4. “The OT never speaks of Yahweh without attrib­uting human traits to him.” (Mc­Kenzie 1288)
      2. But the Bible also says that God is unlike any creature. So there are restraints on anthropomorphism.
         1. He is “holy”; there can be no images of him.
         2. Yahweh is *elohim* (divine), not human
         3. Yahweh is spirit, not flesh (not so elsewhere in the ancient Near East [hereafter “ANE”])
         4. Yahweh has unchange­able purpose (Num 23:19, “God is not a human being, that he should lie, or a mortal, that he should change his mind.”)
         5. So Israel knew anthropomorphism was figurative.
      3. Anthropomorphism emphasizes Yahweh’s personality.
         1. Israel’s election, the covenant, and other saving acts derive from his personal benevolence.
         2. The Torah externalizes his personal will.
         3. Yahweh responds to love with love, to disobedience with anger.
         4. Personality requires personal response, not formalism. Total demands require total surrender.
      4. Anthropomorphism risks humanizing God, but avoids Yahweh as impersonal force.
2. **analogies for the God-Israel relationship**
   1. covenant (an analogy!)
      1. The exodus traditions associate Yahweh with the origin of the covenant.
      2. The analogy of covenant is key to other analogies.
   2. kinsman (*gō´ēl*)
      1. Yahweh is Israel’s avenger. (The usual English translation is “redeemer.”)
      2. In the custom of blood revenge, the next of kin must at any risk
         1. defend his kinsman’s life or property, and
         2. punish the aggressor.
      3. Yahweh freely assumes avenger obligations.
   3. king-subject
      1. King-subject is implied in “Lord” (Heb. *adonai*).
      2. It is implied in the covenant.
      3. It has less intimacy than images of God as father or husband. But anyone could approach an Israelite king (see Saul and David).
      4. Kingship emphasizes Yahweh’s power and his will to save.
   4. marriage
      1. Yahweh ini­tiates the relation (males chose wives).
      2. In Hosea and Jeremiah, Israel’s fidelity shows love, but Israel’s infidelity is a personal offense to Yahweh.
         1. Hosea 2:16-20, “On that day, says the Lord, you will call me, “My husband,” and no longer will you call me, “My Baal.” . . . 19And I will take you for my wife forever; I will take you for my wife in righteousness and in justice, in steadfast love, and in mercy. 20I will take you for my wife in faithfulness; and you shall know the Lord.”
         2. Jer 2:2, “Thus says the Lord: I remember the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride, how you followed me in the wilderness, in a land not sown.”
         3. Jer 31:3-4 (Yahweh to Israel), “I have loved you with an everlasting love; therefore I have continued my faithfulness to you. 4Again I will build you, and you shall be built, O virgin Israel! Again you shall take your tambourines, and go forth in the dance of the merrymakers.”
         4. Jer 31:31-34, “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 32It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, though I was their *husband*, says the Lord. 33But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. 34No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, “Know the Lord,” for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.”
   5. shepherd and flock
      1. This analogy is less common than those of parent-child and of marriage.
      2. A shepherd was devo­ted to his flock, and sheep were confident in their shepherd (Yahweh is Israel’s protector).
      3. OT: God as shepherd: E.g., Ps 23 (italics show the extended metaphor), “The Lord is my *shepherd*, I shall not want. 2He *makes me lie down* in *green pastures*; he *leads* me beside *still waters*; 3he restores my soul. He *leads* me in right *paths* for his name’s sake. 4Even though I walk through the darkest *valley*, I fear no evil; for you [switch to second person] are with me; your *rod* and your *staff*—they comfort me.”
      4. NT: God as shepherd: Luke 15:4-7, “Which one of you, having a hundred sheep and losing one of them, does not leave the ninety-nine in the wilderness and go after the one that is lost until he finds it? 5When he has found it, he lays it on his shoulders and rejoices. 6And when he comes home, he calls together his friends and neighbors, saying to them, ‘Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep that was lost.’ 7Just so, I tell you, there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance.” (par. Mat 18:12-14)
      5. NT: Jesus as shepherd
         1. Mark 6:34, “As he went ashore, he saw a great crowd; and he had compassion for them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and he began to teach them many things.” (par. Matt 18:14)
         2. John 10:1-16 (Jesus is called “shepherd” five times in these verses): “11I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.”
   6. mother-child
      1. *rahamîm*
         1. *Rahamîm* is the “emotion a woman feels for her children.” (Léon-Dufour 328)
         2. Ps 25:6, “Be mindful of your mercy [*rahamîm*], O Lord, and of your steadfast love, for they have been from of old.”
         3. Ps 116:5, “Gracious is the Lord, and righteous; our God is merciful [*rahamîm*].”
      2. the mother-child analogy in Isaiah
         1. Isa 49:15, “Can a woman forget her nursing child, or show no compassion for the child of her womb? Even these may forget, yet I will not forget you.”
         2. Isa 66:13, “As a mother comforts her child, so I will comfort you; you shall be comforted in Jerusalem.”
      3. God’s Wisdom “relates to his children as a mother.” (Léon-Dufour 328)
         1. Prov 8:1, 20, 32-35, “Does not wisdom call, and does not understanding raise her voice? . . . 20I walk in the way of righteousness, along the paths of justice, 21endowing with wealth those who love me, and filling their treasuries. . . . 32And now, my children, listen to me: happy are those who keep my ways. 33Hear instruction and be wise, and do not neglect it. 34Happy is the one who listens to me, watching daily at my gates, waiting beside my doors. 35For whoever finds me finds life and obtains favor from the Lord.”
         2. Prov 9:1-6, “Wisdom has built her house, she has hewn her seven pillars. 2She has slaughtered her animals, she has mixed her wine, she has also set her table. 3She has sent out her servant girls, she calls from the highest places in the town, 4“You that are simple, turn in here!” To those without sense she says, 5“Come, eat of my bread and drink of the wine I have mixed. 6Lay aside immaturity, and live, and walk in the way of insight.””
         3. Sir 15:2-3, “She [wisdom] will come to meet him like a mother, and like a young bride she will welcome him. 3She will feed him with the bread of learning, and give him the water of wisdom to drink.”
   7. father-son
      1. Yahweh is not the physical progenitor of Israel: Israel’s sonship is adoptive, not natural.
      2. The analogy implies male gender; but God has no sexual characteristics or func­tions.
      3. The appropriate attitudes of a son are love, devotion, and obedience.
      4. examples from the Torah
         1. Gen 2:7, “the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being.”
         2. Deut 32:6, “Is he not your father, who created you, who made you and established you?”
         3. Deut 32:18, “you forgot the God who gave you birth.”
      5. examples from the prophets
         1. Isa 63:16, “you, O Lord, are our father; our Redeemer from of old is your name.”
         2. Jer 3:19 (God speaks), “I thought how I would set you among my children, and give you a pleasant land, the most beautiful heritage of all the nations. And I thought you would call me, My Father, and would not turn from following me.”
         3. Jer 31:20 (God speaks), “Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he the child I delight in? As often as I speak against him, I still remember him. Therefore I am deeply moved for him; I will surely have mercy on him, says the Lord.”
         4. motive of ethical action: Mal 2:10, “Have we not all one father? Has not one God created us? Why then are we faithless to one another, profaning the covenant of our ancestors?”
      6. examples from the wisdom literature
         1. Ps 103:13, “As a father has compassion for his children, so the Lord has compassion for those who fear him.”
         2. Prov 3:12, “the Lord reproves the one he loves, as a father the son in whom he delights.”
3. **loving-kindness** (***hesed***)
   1. introduction
      1. The traditional translation of *hesed* is “mercy,” since the Greek and Latin Bibles translated it thus.
      2. “Loving-kindness” is better but still inadequate.
      3. common meanings
         1. kinship love (loving-kindness to kin). *Hesed*’s proper place is within a group, even if temporary (e.g., host and guest).
         2. a normal part of good human relations. *Hesed* is kindness above and beyond minimum duties (good relations require more than minimum duties).
   2. words *hesed* is often associated with
      1. “faithfulness” (*΄emet* or *΄muna*)
         1. “Faithfulness” is Yahweh’s attribute that fulfills his promises and the covenant.
         2. *Sedaqa* (righteousness) + *΄emet* is the frequent “steadfast love” (172 times in the OT).
         3. Loving-kindness, faithfulness, and righteousness are attributes of
            1. the ideal ruler (Isa 16:5) and
            2. the ideal husband (Hos 2:19).
            3. Together, they produce the will to save.
      2. “salvation” (frequently associated with *΄emet*)
      3. “judgment”: loving-kindness in the judge is his readiness to save
      4. “covenant” (most frequently)
         1. God’s *hesed* prompted the formation of the covenant (Isa 55:3).
         2. *Hesed* is also the fruit of the covenant (Exod 20:6; 34:6).
         3. A breach of the covenant is a reason for Yahweh to withdraw his *hesed*, but it would be out of character for him to do so.
         4. His loving-kindness is more enduring than human good will. It is a forgiv­ing attitude to which Israel can appeal when it sins.
   3. forgiveness
      1. Community with Yahweh is life itself.
      2. If you sin, Yahweh’s anger must be appeased.
      3. Humans cannot restore community with Yahweh. “As the community was a free gift of grace in the first instance, so the restoration of community cannot be achieved by merit. People must commit themselves to the mercy and the forgiveness of Yahweh.”
      4. Yahweh’s forgiving character
         1. Exod 34:6-8, “The Lord passed before him, and proclaimed, “The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, 7keeping steadfast love for the thousandth generation, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, yet by no means clearing the guilty, but visiting the iniquity of the parents upon the children and the children’s children, to the third and the fourth generation.” 8And Moses quickly bowed his head toward the earth, and worshiped.”
         2. Ps 30:6, “his anger is but for a moment; his favor is for a lifetime. Weeping may linger for the night, but joy comes with the morning.”
         3. Ps 78:38, “he, being compassionate, forgave their iniquity, and did not destroy them; often he restrained his anger, and did not stir up all his wrath.”
         4. Ps 103:8-12, “The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love. 9He will not always accuse, nor will he keep his anger forever. 10He does not deal with us according to our sins, nor repay us according to our iniquities. 11For as the heavens are high above the earth, so great is his steadfast love toward those who fear him; 12as far as the east is from the west, so far he removes our transgressions from us.”
         5. Ezek 18:23, “Have I any pleasure in the death of the wicked, says the Lord God, and not rather that they should turn from their ways and live?”
         6. Hos 14:4, “I will heal their disloyalty; I will love them freely, for my anger has turned from them.”
   4. *Hesed* is “the movement of the will of Yahweh that initiates and continues the history of Israel . . . the encounter of Israel with Yahweh—and this is the history of Israel—can be summed up as one act of covenant love [i.e., *hesed*].” (McKenzie 1301)
   5. *Hesed* is “the dominating motive of the acts of Yahweh; it gives singleness of purpose and ulti­mate intelligibility to his dealings, including anger and judgment. More than any other attribute, this love is the attribute that gives Yahweh personal identity; it is the key to understanding his character.” (McKenzie 1301)
4. **righteousness** (***sedaqa***)
   1. *sedaqa* as “justice”
      1. *Sedaqa* often is attributed to Yahweh as a judge or is attributed to a human judge.
      2. But *sedaqa* does not mean mere “justice.” “Justice” presupposes objective, universal justice; there is no such idea in OT.
   2. *sedaqa* as “righteous” or “righteousness” (the usual translation)
      1. primary meaning: one declared innocent in court (or who has a claim vindicated)
      2. secondary meanings deriving from the primary meaning
         1. an early use: a “righteous” claim is simply my claim, so a “righteous” judge is one who favors me.
         2. “righteous” judge: one who awards the verdict to the righteous litigant.
         3. “righteous” person: one who is innocent (or has a just claim)
         4. “righteousness”: not a mere extrinsic denomi­nation, but real innocence is present
         5. “righteous” paths: paths that lead in the right direction (Ps 23:3)
         6. “righteous” sacrifices: those with correct ritual prescriptions (Deut 33:19)
         7. “righteous” weights: those which are accurate (Lev 19:36)
   3. Yahweh’s righteousness
      1. early sense (covenant only)
         1. e.g., Song of Deborah (Judg 5:11, “they repeat the triumphs of the Lord, the triumphs of his peasantry in Israel.”)
            1. Yahweh’s “righteous acts” are his acts that save Israel.
            2. Yahweh is righteous because he sides with Israel.
            3. Yahweh’s righteousness is (mainly) a saving attribute: salvation.
         2. Here, righteous­ness is only the fulfillment of covenant stipulations.
      2. later sense (universal)
         1. A more objective concept of justice
            1. developed because Israel was condemned, and
            2. developed because Israel sees Yahweh’s righteousness as rooted in the divine reality itself.
         2. Yahweh cannot act unrighteously. If he could, there would be no genuine righteousness at all.
         3. So righteous­ness is not only covenant stipulations; it characterizes all of Yahweh’s actions.
   4. morality
      1. ANE
         1. The gods are guardians of morality.
         2. But the gods are not the source of morality.
         3. The gods are not moral persons.
         4. So morality is convention, and obligation is mere social pressure.
         5. Only the gods have freedom from moral restraint.
      2. Yahweh
         1. Yahweh is not bound by a higher law: all morality is imposed by him.
         2. Yahweh does not indulge in vice: Yahweh abides by the same morality that he puts on us, and to a supreme degree.
      3. Yahweh’s morality was reflected in Israel’s.
         1. Yahweh’s will in morals is expressed in the covenant, which became a special Israelite way of life.
         2. The Israelites’ observance became holiness (the essence of divinity itself).
         3. *dignity* of the human person (not found in the ANE)
            1. “This respect [for the human person] appears in the treatment of slaves,
            2. “in the rarity of the capital penalty,
            3. “in the absence of torture and mutilation as penalties,
            4. “and in insistence on the equal legal rights of all members of the community.
            5. “Humanity is extended also to foreigners resident in Israel.”
            6. Respect for human dignity results from “Israelite belief about [1304] human nature and relations with Yahweh.”
         4. *interiority* (the “heart”)
            1. Israel emphasized the heart as the principle of morality (an emphasis not found in the ANE).
            2. The heart is not the emotions, but the mind and will.

Insistence on the heart means that morality must be in­terior, must be rooted in conviction and desire. Genuine morality is not exterior demeanor nor conformity to social manners. See the contrast in Isa 29:13, “these people draw near with their mouths and honor me with their lips, while their hearts are far from me, and their worship of me is a human commandment learned by rote.”

The OT does not reach the idea that morality is itself something interior; for the idea remains that actions and words, not thoughts and desires, determine moral character. But it is recognized that words and actions are not honest unless they come from the heart.

1. **weakness**
   1. OT: two astonishingly beautiful passages
      1. 1 Kgs 19:1-13, Elijah “1had killed all the prophets with the sword. . . . 3Then he was afraid; he got up and fled for his life, and came . . . to Horeb the mount of God. 9At that place he came to a cave, and spent the night there. Then the word of the Lord came to him, saying, . . . 11“Go out and stand on the mountain before the Lord, for the Lord is about to pass by.” Now there was a great wind, so strong that it was splitting mountains and breaking rocks in pieces before the Lord, but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake; 12and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a sound of sheer silence. 13When Elijah heard it, he wrapped his face in his mantle . . .”
      2. Hos 11:1-9, “When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son. 2The more I called them, the more they went from me; they kept sacrificing to the Baals, and offering incense to idols. 3Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk, I took them up in my arms; but they did not know that I healed them. 4I led them with cords of human kindness, with bands of love. I was to them like those who lift infants to their cheeks. I bent down to them and fed them. 5They shall return to the land of Egypt, and Assyria shall be their king, because they have refused to return to me. 6The sword rages in their cities, it consumes their oracle-priests, and devours because of their schemes. 7My people are bent on turning away from me. To the Most High they call, but he does not raise them up at all. 8How can I give you up, Ephraim? How can I hand you over, O Israel? How can I make you like Admah? How can I treat you like Zeboiim? My heart recoils within me; my compassion grows warm and tender. 9I will not execute my fierce anger; I will not again destroy Ephraim; for I am God and no mortal, the Holy One in your midst, and I will not come in wrath.”
         1. God here has no ego (I am God and no mortal”). He is like the father in the parable of the prodigal son.
   2. NT
      1. 1 Cor 1:25, 27, “God’s weakness is stronger than human strength. . . . God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong . . .”
      2. 2 Cor 12:9, “he [the Lord] said to me, “My grace is sufficient for you, for power is made perfect in weakness.” . . . 10for whenever I am weak, then I am strong.
      3. 2 Cor 13:4, “he was crucified in weakness, but lives by the power of God. . . . 9For we rejoice when we are weak and you are strong.”
   3. T.S. Eliot (“Preludes” [1917] lines 50-51): God is “The notion of some infinitely gentle / infinitely suffering thing.”
2. **conclusion**
   1. In the OT, Yahweh reveals *himself* (and not just propositions). There is evolution of doctrine in his self-revelation: the revelation of a person is a develop­ing process (no one is known in one encounter).
   2. The proper response to revelation is “faith.”
      1. Faith is a kind of knowledge.
      2. But it is not speculative knowledge: it is an experience of another person (a complex of sensations, emotions, and ideas).
   3. Raymond Brown: “The unity of the plan and of the history of salvation does imply a unity of the basic theological themes of OT and NT. . . . there is scarcely one [OT theme] that does not find its development in the NT. It is a misunder­standing to consider the themes in the NT as if they had [1314] no origin and growth in the OT from which the NT writers themselves took their point of departure. . . . The heresy of Marcion in the 2d cent. ad denied the relevance of the OT for Christian revelation, and in particular, the unity of the concept of God in OT and NT. . . . But when Jesus spoke of his Father, he meant the God of whom all Jews knew, the Yahweh whose encounter with Israel is related in the OT. He could speak to them of Yahweh as one who was revealed to them in their history, and ex­pound for them the fullness of the revelation of that Yahweh. . . . The character of Yahweh, his attributes, his providence, and his government of history could be rec­ognized in the proclamation of Jesus.” (Qtd. in McKenzie 1314-15)

## The State of Justification: Some Scriptural Images

1. **new era**
   1. “Transformation is expressed through the concept of new­ness. [48] . . . a new era in human history is ushered in with Christ, but one not discontinuous with what has gone before.” (Schmaus 48-49) (See Schmaus 50: “a new order . . .”)
   2. newness
      1. Rev 21:5, “And the one who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.””
      2. Isa 43:19, “I am about to do a new thing; now it springs forth, do you not perceive it? I will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert.”
   3. new covenant
      1. Jer 31:31-40, “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 32 It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. 33 But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”
      2. Luke 22:20, “And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.””
      3. 1 Cor 11:25, “In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood.””
      4. 2 Cor 3:6, God “has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.”
      5. 2 Cor 3:14, “their minds were hardened. Indeed, to this very day, when they hear the reading of the old covenant, that same veil is still there, since only in Christ is it set aside.”
      6. Heb 8:8, 13, “God finds fault with them when he says: “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah . . . 13In speaking of “a new covenant,” he has made the first one obsolete.”
      7. Heb 9:15, “he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, because a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions under the first covenant.”
      8. Heb 12:24, Jesus is “the mediator of a new covenant . . .”
   4. new song
      1. Rev 5:9, “They will sing a new song: “You are worthy to take the scroll and to open its seals, for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation” . . .”
      2. Rev 14:3, “they sing a new song before the throne and before the four living creatures and before the elders. No one could learn that song except the one hundred forty-four thousand who have been redeemed from the earth.”
   5. new Jerusalem
      1. Rev 3:12, “I will write on you the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem that comes down from my God out of heaven, and my own new name.”
      2. Rev 21:2, “I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.”
      3. “The new order will achieve its final shape at the termination of worldly history . . .” (Schmaus 49)
2. **new persons**
   1. new self
      1. Eph 4:22-24, “You were taught to put away your former way of life, your old self, corrupt and deluded by its lusts, 23 and to be renewed in the spirit of your minds, 24 and to clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.” (Compare Rom 6:6, “our old self was crucified with him . . .”)
      2. Col 3:3, “you have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God.”
   2. new spirit
      1. Joel 3:1-2 (Protestant Bibles, 2:28-29), “Then afterward I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions. 29 Even on the male and female slaves, in those days, I will pour out my spirit.”
      2. Acts 2:16-21, “this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel: 17 ‘In the last days it will be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. 18 Even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.’”
      3. Rom 7:6, “But now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we are slaves not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit.”
   3. new nature
      1. 2 Cor 4:16, “Even though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed day by day.”
   4. new creation
      1. 2 Cor 5:17, “if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!”
      2. Gal 6:15, “neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything; but a new creation is everything!”
      3. Eph 2:10, “we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life.”
      4. Eph 4:23-24, “be renewed in the spirit of your minds, 24 [and] clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.”
   5. old yeast, new batch
      1. 1 Cor 5:7-8, “Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new batch, as you really are unleavened. For our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed. 8 Therefore, let us celebrate the festival, not with the old yeast, the yeast of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”
3. **new life**
   1. “Since Christ is the Head of the whole of mankind and the Church, it is he who will lead men into the new life fashioned in his resurrection (Acts 3,15; Heb. 2,10). This is the reason for his coming, that all might attain to life and have it in its fullness (Jn. 3,5; 10,10; 14,19). Indeed the whole gospel of John is a saving message of life (Jn. 20,31). For Paul, too, the message of Jesus Christ is the word of life (Col. 3,3f.). All those who are united to Christ in faith are transferred from death to life (Rom. 6,1ff.; Jn. 3,15f.; 3,36).” (Schmaus 50)
      1. John 1:14, “And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father’s only son, full of grace and truth.”
      2. 1 John 1:2, “this life was revealed, and we have seen it and testify to it, and declare to you the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed to us . . .”
      3. John 3:5, “no one can enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit.”
      4. John 3:15-16, “whoever believes in him may have eternal life. 16 For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”
      5. John 3:36, “Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life; whoever disobeys the Son will not see life, but must endure God’s wrath.”
      6. John 10:10, “The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.”
      7. John 14:6, “I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.”
      8. John 14:19, “In a little while the world will no longer see me, but you will see me; because I live, you also will live.”
      9. John 20:31, “these are written so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name.”
      10. Acts 3:15, “you killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses.”
      11. Rom 6:3-23, “Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? 4 Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. 5 For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. 6 We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7 For whoever has died is freed from sin. 8 But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him. . . . 11 So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. . . . 13 present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life . . . 21 what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death. 22 But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
      12. Rom 7:6, “we are slaves not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit.”
      13. Col 3:3-4, “for you have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God. 4 When Christ who is your life is revealed, then you also will be revealed with him in glory.”
      14. 1 Pet 1:23, “You have been born anew, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, through the living and enduring word of God.”
      15. Heb 2:10, “It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”
   2. “. . . through faith in Christ man receives the capacity to live his life with great interior willingness as a gift surrendered to God and to the service of his brothers and sisters; and furthermore, by submission to God’s will, to integrate the process of death itself into the totality of his human self.” (Schmaus 50)
4. **friendship with God**
   1. References “to those chosen by God as his friends are more frequent in the Old Testament than in the New . . .” (Schmaus 81)
      1. Exod 33:11, “Thus the Lord used to speak to Moses face to face, as one speaks to a friend.”
      2. Wis 7:14, “those who get it [wisdom] obtain friendship with God . . .”
   2. “Christ addressed his apostles as friends, but the word friendship as he used it has an ethical rather than a metaphysical connotation.” (Schmaus 81)
      1. John 15:13-15, “No one has greater love than this, to lay down one’s life for one’s friends. 14 You are my friends if you do what I command you. 15 I do not call you servants any longer, because the servant does not know what the master is doing; but I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father.”
      2. See Eph 2:19, “you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God . . .”
      3. See James 2:23, “Thus the scripture was fulfilled that says, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness,” and he was called the friend of God.”
   3. “In the fourteenth century there were mystics, both religious and lay, called Friends of God (Suso, Tauler, Eckhart, and in the twelfth-century Aelred of Rievaulx)—to be distinguished from the heretics (Beghards, Waldensians) also called by that name.” (Schmaus 81)
5. **incorporation into Christ’s “one body”**
   1. Rom 12:4-5, “For as in one body we have many members, and not all the members have the same function, 5 so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another.”
   2. 1 Cor 6:16, “Do you not know that whoever is united to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For it is said, “The two shall be one flesh.””
   3. 1 Cor 10:17, “Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.”
   4. 1 Cor 12:12-13, “For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. 13 For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and we were all made to drink of one Spirit.”
   5. 1 Cor 12:20, “As it is, there are many members, yet one body.”
   6. Eph 2:10-15, “we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life. 11 So then, remember that at one time you Gentiles by birth . . . 13 who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. 14 For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. 15 He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of the two, thus making peace, 16 and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it.”
   7. Eph 3:6, “the Gentiles have become fellow heirs, members of the same body . . .”
   8. Eph 4:4, “There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling . . .”
   9. Col 3:15, “let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in the one body. And be thankful.”
   10. the Church as Christ’s “body”: Rom 12:4-5, 1 Cor 10:17; 1 Cor 12:12-27; Eph 1:22-23; 3:6; 4:4, 15; 5:23; Col 1:18; 2:19; 3:15.
   11. the Church as Christ’s “temple”: 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:19-21.
6. **God**’**s** “**indwelling**”
   1. “In the teaching on grace it [the “structure of the existence of the justified person”] is presented with the words “indwelling” of the tripersonal God.” (Schmaus 51)
   2. scripture
      1. Matt 6:9, “Our Father in heaven, hallowed by your name.”
      2. Luke 11:13, “If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!”
      3. John 4:23, “the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father seeks such as these to worship him.”
      4. John 14:23, “Those who love me will keep my word, and my Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them.”
      5. John 15:1-5, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinegrower. . . . 4 Abide in me as I abide in you. Just as the branch cannot bear fruit by itself unless it abides in the vine, neither can you unless you abide in me. 5 I am the vine, you are the branches. Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing.”
      6. Rom 8:9, 11, “the Spirit of God dwells in you. . . . 11 If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.”
      7. Rom 8:15-16, “you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!” 16 it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God . . .”
      8. Rom 8:23, “we ourselves . . . have the firstfruits of the Spirit . . .”
      9. 1 Cor 2:10-16, “these things God has revealed to us through the Spirit; for the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God. 11 For what human being knows what is truly human except the human spirit that is within? So also no one comprehends what is truly God’s except the Spirit of God. 12 Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God, so that we may understand the gifts bestowed on us by God. 13 And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual. 14 Those who are unspiritual do not receive the gifts of God’s Spirit, for they are foolishness to them, and they are unable to understand them because they are spiritually discerned. 15 Those who are spiritual discern all things, and they are themselves subject to no one else’s scrutiny. 16 “For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?” But we have the mind of Christ.”
      10. 1 Cor 3:16, “Do you not know that you are God’s temple and that God’s Spirit dwells in you?”
      11. 1 Cor 12:3, “no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says “Let Jesus be cursed!” and no one can say “Jesus is Lord” except by the Holy Spirit.”
      12. 1 Cor 14:25, “After the secrets of the unbeliever’s heart are disclosed, that person will bow down before God and worship him, declaring, “God is really among you.””
      13. 2 Cor 12:9, “I will boast all the more gladly of my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may dwell in me . . .”
      14. Gal 4:6, “because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!””
      15. Eph 3:16-17, “I pray that . . . he may grant that you may be strengthened in your inner being with power through his Spirit, 17 and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith . . .”
      16. the seal of the Holy Spirit
          1. 2 Cor 1:21-22, “But it is God who establishes us with you in Christ and has anointed us, 22by putting his seal on us and giving us his Spirit in our hearts as a first installment.”
          2. Eph 1:13, “In him you . . . were marked with the seal of the promised Holy Spirit . . .”
          3. Eph 4:30, “do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, with which you were marked with a seal for the day of redemption.”
          4. Rev 7:2-3, “I saw another angel ascending from the rising of the sun, having the seal of the living God, and he called with a loud voice to the four angels who had been given power to damage earth and sea, 3 saying, “Do not damage the earth or the sea or the trees, until we have marked the servants of our God with a seal on their foreheads.””
          5. Rev 9:4, “They were told not to damage the grass of the earth or any green growth or any tree, but only those people who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads.”
   3. “Hence the man who has not been enlightened by the Spirit does not know the true name of God, nor can he speak the language God hears. The Spirit, who knows the innermost recesses of man’s spirit, alone knows the language of God: he tells us the words we must say if God is to hear us. They are the same words with which Christ converses with the Father: everything Christ says to God is summed up in the one word “Father.” . . . only he whose speech is formed by the Holy Spirit can call God “Father.” . . . only one who is enlightened by the Holy Spirit can call Jesus the Christ . . .” (Schmaus 21)
   4. “. . . we carry with us and possess God in such a manner that through charity, loving God for himself by means of God who is within us, we give God to God, and thus the eternal life of the Holy Spirit is accomplished in us.” (Daujat 76-78)
   5. Living in relationships is essential to human life, and grace’s intensification of life intensifies “the transcendental inclination of man towards God. First, man grasps Jesus Christ in faith. Christ gives the Holy Spirit to the one who is thus bound to him. The person united with Christ stands in a right relationship to God, and this creates a right relationship to the rest of creation, especially to other men.” (Schmaus 51)
   6. “. . . this personal element in justification, despite . . . the complete equality of the divine persons, is expressed by both Greek and Latin Fathers, as well as in the formula of the Roman liturgy: through Christ in the Holy Spirit to the Father.” (Schmaus 51)
   7. “The presence of the tripersonal God in the justified man cannot, of course, be understood as a local presence, but only as personal presence. This is a presence in which God turns to man and reveals himself, grasps him and takes him up into his own life.” (Schmaus 51)
   8. “This explanation of the “personal” presence of the divine persons becomes clearer if we recall briefly what has been said on this subject [51] earlier in this work.” (Schmaus 51-52)
      1. Schmaus, Michael. *God* *and* *Creation*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1977. Vol. 2 of *Dogma*. Trans. Ann Laeuchli et al. 6 vols. 1968-77.
      2. Schmaus, Michael. *God and His* *Christ*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1977. Vol. 3 of *Dogma*. Trans. Ann Laeuchli et al. 6 vols. 1968-77.
   9. “It is true that the activity of the three divine persons by way of efficient causality in regard to the world constitutes one single and simple act. However, the divine missions are a matter of formal causality. They function therefore in a different realm.” (Schmaus 52)
      1. “. . . the idea is common in the New Testament of one divine person “sending” another. Typically, it is never said of the Father that he is sent. The Son is sent by the Father. The Holy Spirit is also sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son, sometimes by the Father through the Son. These “sendings” or “missions” are the ways in which God communicates himself to his creation.” (Schmaus 52)
      2. “God exists as Father by the fact that he generates a Son in an act of knowledge and communicates himself to him; and he brings forth the Holy Spirit in an act of love with the Son, and again gives himself to him with the Son. Likewise the personhood of the Word is identical with the fact of his being generated by the Father. When the Father sends the Son to the man Jesus and in this way communicates himself to Jesus, Jesus’ personhood becomes identical with that of the Eternal Word. Thus the Father of the Eternal Word is at the same time the Father of the man Jesus. Despite its immanent character, therefore, God’s eternal father­hood is directed towards historical fatherhood.” (Schmaus 52)
      3. “If it is true that the Father is in this way the ultimate principle of Jesus, then we must say that the Father’s sending of the Son reaches its culmination only in the risen Christ. It is only in the transformation that accompanies the resurrection that the sending of the Son, the Word, reaches its goal.” (Schmaus 52)
      4. “However, we cannot isolate Jesus from the rest of mankind, and this leads to the sending of the Holy Spirit. On the basis of Jesus’ transforma­tion the Holy Spirit is sent to mankind, both to the community of the Church and, through the Church, to the rest of mankind. It is he who leads men to unity with one another, since he is the love which unites Father and Son. Because of him Jesus and mankind form a “We.” The personhood of the Holy Spirit consists in the fact of his going forth from the Father and the Son. Those who live in his influence, therefore, are brought, if only in an analogous way, into the relation­ship of the Spirit to the man Jesus, whose spirit is one of total devotion to the Father.” (Schmaus 52)
      5. “The idea of “mission,” then, represents the movement of salvation [52] from God through the risen Christ in the Holy Spirit to men; and then a return movement of the men thus grasped by the Spirit, through the Son to the Father. Correspondingly, the missions have an eschatological character: the movement of the world towards its consummation represents a continuation externally of the inner life of God. They have as their goal the absolute future, of which Paul says that then God will be all in all (1 Cor. 15,23).” (Schmaus 52-53)
      6. “In this presentation of the indwelling of the three divine persons it does not seem necessary to apply the idea of “appropriation” to the role of the Holy Spirit in man’s sanctification. It is a doctrine which belongs to the teaching of Western theology on the trinity, whereas the foregoing view is more readily clarified in terms of Greek concepts.” (Schmaus 53)
   10. “When we characterize the encounter with God the Father which occurs through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit as an element of justifica­tion, we must beware of giving it a static interpretation. The very meaning and essence of this encounter make it a dynamic element. It is constantly taking place, for God is ceaselessly active. The state of justification consists in this, that it is always in the process of being created: God gives himself to man through Christ in the Spirit in an uninterrupted act. God’s giving of grace to the person is a continuous act analogous to his continuing act of creation.” (Schmaus 53)
   11. “In this act, the everlasting generation of the Spirit by the Father and Son has as its term the sending of the Spirit into the justified man and his working in man, just as the generation of the Son has its term in the incarnation, his becoming man. These missions are not the same, but they are alike. The self-communication of the tripersonal God has as its end fulfillment in the eternal dialogue of man with God. Thus it is a way to God. The man endowed with grace is a pilgrim through history on his way to God. God is for him at the same time present and coming.” (Schmaus 53)
   12. God “by consolidating His initial indwelling in us makes our heart ready for the complete actualization of the indwelling in sanctifying grace.” (Fransen, *New Life* 227)
7. **sonship**: see the next section, “The State of Justification as Sonship.”

## The State of Justification as Sonship

1. **Christ the brother of all**
   1. scripture
      1. “In the Old Testament the members of the people of God are called brothers . . .” (Schmaus 76)
      2. “In classical Latin, fellow countrymen or friends are called brothers.” (Schmaus 76)
      3. “In Graeco-Roman usage it [“brother”] is often, like the word “sister,” a title of honor. Stoic philosophy widened and deepened its usage, calling all men brothers since all are children of the one God.” (Schmaus 76)
      4. “In Scripture, Christ is repeatedly called the brother of men, and men are called his brothers. . . .” (Schmaus 76)
         1. Matt 6:9, “Pray then in this way: Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name.”
         2. Matt 18:15, “If another member of the church [Greek, “your brother”] sins against you, go and point out the fault when the two of you are alone. If the member listens to you, you have regained that one [Greek, “your brother”].”
         3. Matt 18:21, “Then Peter came and said to him, “Lord, if another member of the church sins against me, how often should I forgive? As many as seven times?””
         4. Matt 25:35-40, “I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, 36 I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me. . . . 40 just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me.”
         5. Mark 3:34-35, “Here are my mother and my brothers! 35 Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother.””
         6. Luke 8:21, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.”
         7. Rom 8:29, “For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
         8. Rom 9:3, “I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my own people, my kindred according to the flesh.”
         9. Heb 2:10-17, “It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings. 11 For the one who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one Father. For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers and sisters, 12 saying, “I will proclaim your name to my brothers and sisters, in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.” 13 And again, “I will put my trust in him.” And again, “Here am I and the children whom God has given me.” 14 Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil, 15 and free those who all their lives were held in slavery by the fear of death. 16 For it is clear that he did not come to help angels, but the descendants of Abraham. 17 Therefore he had to become like his brothers and sisters in every respect, so that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people.”
      5. “Here we find stated the reason why those who believe in Christ are his brothers. It lies in the fact that both the Saviour and the saved come from the one God, though in different ways. Paul expresses this even more clearly in the Letter to the Romans (Rom. 8,29) . . . Men are brothers of one another because the Son of God become man is brother of all. He is the personal point of reference for all brotherhood (cf. Mt. 25,34-40).” (Schmaus 77)
         1. Matt 25:35-40, “I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, 36I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me. . . . 40just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me.”
         2. Rom 8:29, “For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
   2. participation in the sonship of Christ
      1. “Brotherhood with the incarnate Son of God means that the justified man is admitted into the son relationship of Jesus to the Father.” (Schmaus 77)
         1. “God has only one eternal Son: Christ is the only-begotten . . .” (Schmaus 77)
            1. John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”
            2. Heb 1:6, “when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, “Let all God’s angels worship him.””
         2. “Through the incarnation this only-begotten becomes at the same time the firstborn of the whole creation (Heb. 1,6; Col. 1,15), the firstborn among many brothers (Rom. 8,19-29), the first to return from the dead (Col. 1,18).” (Schmaus 77)
            1. Matt 6:9, “Pray then in this way: Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name.”
            2. Rom 8:19-30, “the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the children of God . . . 21 the creation itself . . . will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God. . . . 29 For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
            3. Col 1:15, “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation . . .”
            4. Col 1:18, “He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that he might come to have first place in everything.”
         3. “. . . but the sonship of these is different from the sonship of the eternal Son of God—it could be called an “analogous” sonship. Union and resemblance with Jesus is the basis for the participa­tion in that relationship in which Jesus Christ himself stands to God, the heavenly Father (Jn. 1,14).” (Schmaus 77)
         4. “This is the goal and end of the incarnation of Jesus Christ.” (Schmaus 77)
            1. See Rom 8:26-30 above.
            2. 2 Cor 3:18, “all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.”
            3. Gal 3:26-27, “in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith. 27 As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.”
            4. Eph 1:4-6, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love. 5 He destined us for adoption as his children through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, 6to the praise of his glorious grace that he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.”
         5. “Participation in the sonship of the one eternal Son comes about inas­much as many share in his eternal Spirit, so that he is one with them in the Spirit . . .” (Schmaus 77)
            1. Rom 8:14-17, “all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. 15 For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!” 16 it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17 and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ . . .”
            2. Gal 4:1-7, “My point is this: heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves, though they are the owners of all the property; 2but they remain under guardians and trustees until the date set by the father. 3 So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world. 4 But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, 5 in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children. 6 And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” 7 So you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God.”
            3. Heb 2:10-14, “It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings. 11 For the one who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one Father. For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers and sisters, 12 saying, “I will proclaim your name to my brothers and sisters, in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.” 13 And again, “I will put my trust in him.” And again, “Here am I and the children whom God has given me.” 14 Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil . . .”
            4. Heb 3:6, Christ “was faithful over God’s house as a son, and we are his house if we hold firm the confidence and the pride that belong to hope.”
         6. “The essential difference between the sonship of the eternal Logos and the sonship of the justified consists in the fact that the latter is a free gift of God. The just are received by God as his children . . .” (Schmaus 78)
            1. Gal 4:5, “in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children.”
         7. “However, this acceptance into the state of children of God is essentially different from adoption in any earthly sense. In the human realm adoption occurs on the juridical level and is restricted to the com­munication of external things, while the acceptance on the part of God is a divine action through which man is changed in his very interior . . .” (Schmaus 78)
            1. Heb 4:12-13, “the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart. 13 And before him no creature is hidden, but all are naked and laid bare to the eyes of the one to whom we must render an account.”
         8. In John “men are brought from a state of slavery to the world into the condition of sons of God.” (Schmaus 78)
            1. 1 John 2:29-3:10, “If you know that he is righteous, you may be sure that everyone who does right has been born of him. 3:1 See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and that is what we are. The reason the world does not know us is that it did not know him. 2 Beloved, we are God’s children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is. 3 And all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure. 4 Everyone who commits sin is guilty of lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. 5 You know that he was revealed to take away sins, and in him there is no sin. 6 No one who abides in him sins; no one who sins has either seen him or known him. 7 Little children, let no one deceive you. Everyone who does what is right is righteous, just as he is righteous. 8 Everyone who commits sin is a child of the devil; for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The Son of God was revealed for this purpose, to destroy the works of the devil. 9 Those who have been born of God do not sin, because God’s seed abides in them; they cannot sin, because they have been born of God. 10 The children of God and the children of the devil are revealed in this way: all who do not do what is right are not from God, nor are those who do not love their brothers and sisters.”
         9. “The divine sonship establishes a commonality and a likeness which means more than all the differences and makes even the hierarchical differences within the structure of the people of God of secondary importance.” (Schmaus 79)
         10. “Revelation has taught us that the inner life of God is a Trinity of Persons . . . Grace establishes us in a personal relation of knowledge and love with the Three divine Persons, in whose company we live as with living persons.” [76] “Our adoption as children of God communicates to us through grace the sonship which God the Son possesses by nature, so that it is truly in him, assimilated to him, that we are children begotten with him and in him by the Father. . . . Thus we are loved by God with the same love wherewith God the Father and God the Son love and embrace each other eter­nally, in that “eternal kiss” and mutual gift which is the Holy Spirit.” (Daujat 77)
2. **son as heir**
   1. “He who is the son of God is also his heir. Man becomes heir of God in being co-heir with Christ . . .” (Schmaus 79)
      1. Rom 8:17, “and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ . . .”
      2. Rom 8:29, “those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
      3. Gal 4:1-7, “My point is this: heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves, though they are the owners of all the property; 2but they remain under guardians and trustees until the date set by the father. 3 So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world. 4 But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, 5 in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children. 6 And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” 7 So you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God.”
      4. Titus 3:7, “so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”
   2. “The inheritance which is given to the son of God refers to the final fulfillment, to the perfect dialogue with God in the absolute future in the communion of all the brothers and sisters who have died. The inheritance is not merely promised, a deposit is paid on it. In this sense the sonship has an eschatological character (see Rom. 8,20-23). [79] Whoever is the son of God is justified in having an unconditional hope and expecting a future of fullness of life. This hope, founded on the divine promise, will not be disappointed.” (Schmaus 79-80) Rom 8:20-23, “for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope 21that the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God. 22We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains until now; 23and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies.”
   3. “The assurance of the inheritance and the guarantee of a deposit on the realized fulfillment marks the life of a son of God as a life of love, of confidence, and of freedom from the fear of death. Sons of God are not children, but rather free men . . . Paul reproaches the Corinthians because they have behaved like infants (1 Cor. 3,1; cf. 13,11). It was the greatest act of love on the part of Jesus Christ that he freed us from the conditions of minors (Gal. 4,lff.; cf. Eph. 4,14; Rom. 8,15f.).” (Schmaus 80)
      1. Rom 8:15-16, “For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!” 16it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God . . .”
      2. 1 Cor 3:1, “I could not speak to you as spiritual people, but rather as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ.”
      3. 1 Cor 13:11, “When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became an adult, I put an end to childish ways.”
      4. Gal 4, “heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves, though they are the owners of all the property; 2 but they remain under guardians and trustees until the date set by the father. 3 So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world. 4 But . . . God sent his Son . . . 5 so that we might receive adoption as children. 6 And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” 7 So you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God. 8 Formerly, when you did not know God, you were enslaved to beings that by nature are not gods. 9 Now, however, that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits? How can you want to be enslaved to them again? 10 You are observing special days, and months, and seasons, and years. . . . 19 My little children, for whom I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you, 20 I wish I were present with you now and could change my tone, for I am perplexed about you.”
      5. Eph 4:14, “We must no longer be children, tossed to and fro and blown about by every wind of doctrine, by people's trickery, by their craftiness in deceitful scheming.”
      6. Titus 3:7, “so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”
   4. “The adulthood conferred by God himself gives to every justified man both the right and the duty of responsible, independent action within the norms set up for the governance of the community, not only in the sphere or [*sic*] religion and the Church but also in the separate but corresponding secular order. . . . The sons of God can likewise trust God when he sends them suffering. The more they surrender themselves to him in knowledge and love, the more they share in his own freedom and the closer they come to him. For the cross is always a step towards God; indeed it is the only way to him.” (Schmaus 80)
3. **son of the Father**, **not of the Trinity**
   1. Since “all the works of God in the creation issue from the three divine persons as from one principle, the question can be posed whether the justified man is the son of the three-personed God or of the first divine person.” (Schmaus 80)
      1. Though “the transformation of the man in grace is the work of the three divine persons, [nevertheless] the justified man is the son, through Jesus Christ, of the first divine person.” [80] “Cf. *Dogma* *3:* *God* *and* *His* *Christ* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1971), pp. 242-244.” See also, in the present book, the discussion of the “indwelling” of God” above). (Schmaus 80, 80 n. 2)
   2. “Inasmuch as the sonship of the man in grace is founded on participation in the sonship of the incarnate Logos, it would be contrary to Scripture to call the justified man a son of the Trinity on [80] the basis of the principle referred to above [“all the works of God in the creation issue from the three divine persons as from one principle”]. The solution of a possible difficulty here lies in the distinction between efficient and formal cause.” (Schmaus 80-81)
   3. “The Fathers do not hesitate to stress on occasion that the just, accepted as sons by God, form with the only-begotten, eternal Son of God only one single Son of the heavenly Father.” (Schmaus 81)
      1. “According to Cyril of Alexandria, the Spirit whom Christ sent transforms us all, in the unity of the love of Christ, into one heavenly man, Jesus Christ.” (Schmaus 81)
      2. “Maximos the Confessor (ca. 580-662) characterizes the epoch introduced by Christ as the time wherein humanity is gathered together and deified in the Logos.” (Schmaus 81)

## Sanctifying and Actual Grace

1. **actual grace**
   1. Actual grace is “a passing divine impulse towards a salvific action.” (Schmaus 9)
   2. “This use of the word actual differs from our ordinary usage, in which [“actual” means] an action or interpretation corresponding to a definite situation . . .” (Schmaus 9)
   3. “God sets sinful man in motion towards his salvation . . . The moving force is what is called *actual* (“acting”) grace. Of course, all grace is actual in the sense of active, but the­ol­ogians have developed the idiom which makes a distinc­tion between actual grace and the *state* *of* *grace*.” (Schmaus 9)
2. **sanctifying grace**
   1. Sanctifying grace is “a quality whereby man is pleasing to God . . .” (Daujat 16)
   2. Sanctifying grace is “an enduring union with God . . .” (Schmaus 9)
   3. Sanctifying grace is “the state of a right relation­ship to God . . .” (Schmaus 47)
   4. Sanctifying grace is also called “the state of grace” and “habitual grace.” (Schmaus 9, 47)
3. “**supernatural life**”
   1. “Super­natural life” means the same as “ sanctifying grace,” but it emphasizes that the gift is un­merited and God’s generosity. (Daujat 17)
   2. A human’s “spiritual” nature (soul + intellect and will) is often con­fused with his or her “super­nat­ural” nature, which is gratuitous. (Daujat 61)
   3. The *substantially* supernatural is the divine nature itself. (Daujat 57)
   4. The *modally* supernatural is something caused by God but not divine by nature, i.e., a miracle (the loaves and fishes were supernatural but not divine) or a grace (my right relationship with God results from God’s presence, but the relationship is not God himself). (Daujat 57)
   5. So how do we differ from the Son?
      1. The Son is substantially God; is *necessarily* God, he cannot be otherwise. (Daujat 58)
      2. We are substantially creature; we are God-*like* because of gener­os­ity. (Daujat 58-59)
   6. God gives us “all that he is as God so that we may possess all that he is . . .” [70] Our reason for existing is “to possess that absolute, infinite and per­fect joy that is himself . . .” [71] We possess this joy because grace gives us knowledge and love of God in his own nature, knowledge and love because he is present to our intellects and wills, not as the creator and loved for his gifts, but as he himself knows and loves himself. [72-73] We don’t become God substantially, but “only in the order of knowl­edge [intellect] and love [will].” [74] (Daujat 70-74)
   7. 1 John 3:1 says that we are “children of God . . .” A carpenter’s table is his work; a carpenter’s child is his son; the latter is begotten, not made, because it is of the same nature. The wording of 1 John 3:1 (the whole verse) proves that John uses no figure of speech (as a carpen­ter might call his tables his “sons”). (Daujat 55)
      1. 1 John 3:1-2, “See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and that is what we are. The reason the world does not know us is that it did not know him.”
      2. Cf. 2 Peter 1:4, we “become participants of the di­vine nature.”

## The Distinction Between Sanctifying

## and Actual Grace in Paul’s Letters

Sanctifying grace is a quasi-permanent intervention by God in our souls that makes us more holy, resulting in a state of friendship with God.

Actual grace is a momentary (or at least temporary) intervention by God in our souls to help us for a particular need—receiving faith as a non-believer, performing a good act, resisting a temptation, increasing sanctifying grace, or restoring sanctifying grace when it has been lost through mortal sin.

*sanctifying grace*

Rom 6:6-7 “. . . our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7For whoever has died is freed from sin.”

Rom 6:13-14 “. . . yield yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life, and present your members to God as instruments of righteousness. 14For sin will have no do­min­ion over you, since you are not under law but under grace.”

Rom 6:17 “. . . thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteous­ness. 19. . . so now present your members as slaves to righ­t­eousness for sanctifi­cation.”

Rom 8:1-2 “There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. 2For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and death.”

Rom 8:4 We “walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.”

Rom 8:9-10 “. . . you are not in the flesh; you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you. . . . 10But if Christ is in you, . . . the Spirit is life because of righ­teous­ness.”

Rom 8:11 “. . . the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you . . . his Spirit . . . dwells in you.”

1 Cor 15:45 Christ “became a life-giving spirit.”

2 Cor 5:17-19 “. . . if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new! 18All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ . . . 19that is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespass­es against them . . .”

Gal 2:19-20 “I have been crucified with Christ; 20and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.”

Gal 3:5 “God suppl[ies] you with the Spirit . . .”

Gal 3:27 “For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.”

Gal 4:6 “And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!””

Gal 5:4-6 “You who want to be justified by the law have cut yourselves off from Christ; you have fallen away from grace. 5For through the Spirit, by faith, we eagerly wait for the hope of righteous­ness. 6For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love.”

Gal 5:22-23 “. . . the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithful­ness, 23gentleness, and self‑control. There is no law against such things.”

Gal 6:15 “For neither circumcision nor uncircumci­sion is anything; but a new cre­ation is everything!”

Col 2:10-13 “. . . you have come to fulness in him . . . 11In him also you were circumcised with a spiritual circumcision, by putting off the body of the flesh in the circumci­sion of Christ; 12when you were buried with him in baptism, you were also raised with him through faith in the power of God, who raised him from the dead. 13And when you were dead in tresspasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made you alive together with him, when he forgave us all our tress­passes . . .”

*actual grace*

Rom 8:13 “. . . if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live.”

1 Cor 3:6 “I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth.”

2 Cor 3:5-6 “Not that we are competent of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our competence is from God, 6who has made us competent to be ministers . . .”

Phil 2:12b-13 “. . . work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”

Phil 4:13 “I can do all things through him who strengthens me.”

Col 1:29 “For this I toil and struggle with all the energy that he powerfully inspires within me.”

Col 2:19 “. . . hold . . . fast to the Head, from whom the whole body, nourished and held together by its ligaments and sinews, grows with a growth that is from God.”

Col 3:11-16 “Christ is all and in all! . . . 15let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in the one body. And be thankful. 16Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly . . .”

Col 4:3 “. . . pray for us as well that God will open to us a door for the word, . . . 4that I may reveal it clearly, as I should.”

1 Thess 2:13 “God’s word [is] at work in you believers.”

1 Thess 3:12 “. . . may the Lord make you increase and abound in love for one another and for all . . .”

*both sanctifying and actual grace*

2 Cor 3:18 “. . . all of us . . . are being transformed into the same image [Christ’s] from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.”

2 Cor 4:16 “Even though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed day by day.”

Phil 1:6 “. . . the one who began a good work among you will bring it to completion by the day of Jesus Christ.”

Phil 1:10-11 “And this is my prayer, that your love may overflow more and more . . ., so that in the day of Christ you may be pure and blameless, 11having produced the harvest of righteousness that comes through Jesus Christ . . .”

Col 2:6-7 “As you therefore have received Christ Jesus the Lord, continue to live your lives in him, rooted and built up in him and established in the faith, just as you were taught, abounding in thanksgiv­ing.”

Col 3:9-10 “. . . you have stripped off the old self with its practices 10and have clothed yourselves with the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge according to the image of its creator.”

# Doctrines of Grace in the Patristic Period

## Augustine on Grace and Predestination

1. **Augustine**
   1. Augustine’s seven main writings on grace and predestination

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year | English title | Latin title |
| 393-396 | *Explanation of Some Questions from Romans* | *Expositio quarumdam propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos* 60-64 |
| 397 | *On Various Questions for Simplici­anus* | *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum* bk. 1, q. 2 |
| 418 | *Letter 194 to Sixtus* | *Epistola 194 ad Sixtum romanum presbyterum* (*et postea Pontificem*) |
| 426 or 7 | *On Grace and Freedom of Choice* | *De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Valentinum et cum illo monachos* |
| 427 | On Punishment and Grace | *De correptione et gratia ad eumdem Valentinum et cum illo monachos adrumetinos* |
| 428-429 | *On the Predestination of the Saints* | *De praedestinatione sanctorum ad Prosperum et Hilarium* |
| 428-429 | *On the Gift of Perseverance* | *De dono perseverantiae ad Prosperum et Hilarium* |

1. **on freedom**
   1. With Augustine “we encounter a sudden change in the doctrine concerning freedom.” (Schmaus 11)
   2. “In the controversy with Pelagianism . . ., Augustine places all the emphasis on grace. (. . . debaters of the Reformation would cite him as the *doctor* *gratiae*.) Augustine had to confess that his theological predecessors had been able to speak more carelessly about [11] freedom than he could since in their time the real struggle over grace had not yet begun.” (Schmaus 11-12)
   3. “The tension between the doctrine of freedom of the Greek Fathers and Augustine’s doctrine of grace, both relying for their defense on Scripture, pointed the way for future theologians.” (Schmaus 12)
2. **necessity of grace**
   1. “Against the naturalistic ethic of the Pelagians not only Augustine but also a series of North African synods (especially the Synod of Carthage in 418, which was endorsed by the then reigning Pope Zosimus) taught the necessity of grace (DS 225-230).” (Schmaus 13)
   2. “. . . in opposition to the Irish monk Pelagius [Augustine] treated the necessity of grace for salvation chiefly in the con­text of his thesis about original sin, and in this connection introduced the terms gratia *praecedens*, *subsequens*, *operans*, and *cooperans* which were to be so significant for later theology.” (Schmaus 47)
3. **predestination**
   1. “He drew up a definitive doctrine concerning predestination and perseverance.” (Schmaus 47)

## Pelagianism

*A*. *Pelagian Origins*

(1) Proponents

[Around ad 400,] **Pelagius**, or the “man of the sea” as the British monk Morgan was called by the Romans, must have been born about the middle of the fourth century, probably in Roman Britain or Brittany. He seems to have been Christian from infancy, though little is certainly known of his early history. From St. Jerome’s statement that at Rome he knew a man who later became an heresiarch, it is supposed that Pelagius was already in the capital before 384, though this remark could refer to Rufinus of Syria, who collaborated with Pelagius and later gave him asylum in Palestine. Pelagius was a giant of a man, renowned for austere virtue. As spiritual director, he became tired of hearing men excuse themselves for sin and tepidity on the plea of human frailty. To such alibis he gradually developed the retort that these were but excuses for indolence, that repeated prayers for grace argued to personal inertia, and that on the contrary, every man is quite capable of perfection by his own efforts provided that he only applied them to action. By such advice Pelagius probably thought himself combating the Manichaean philosophy of despair prevalent in the declining Roman Empire with a stern exhortation to be manly and courageous: Stoic “masters of one’s fate, captains of one’s soul.” Such teaching could easily proceed from a “self-taught” lay theologian, such as opponents describe Pelagius. Between 395 and 405 he composed a *Commentary on St. Paul*, and a work, *On the Trinity*, is attributed to him. Yet Pelagius was not the chief publicist of Pelagianism.

**Caelestius**, one of Pelagius’s early disciples at Rome, served as the founder’s press agent among Roman devotees of the ascetical life. He was a lawyer, able, earnest, daring, loquacious, and apparently none too scrupulous in regard to truth. In simplifying Pelagius’s doctrines for popular consumption, he pushed his master’s counsels to a practical denial of both original sin and its remedy, grace. Early in the fifth century he preached the new doctrine in public. He was not always faithful to his master’s teaching, and long safeguarded it from censure by verbal tergiversation. From 411 to 431 it is Caelestius who chiefly looms in the public eye during the Pelagian Controversy. After their condemnation at Ephesus in 431, both he and Pelagius disappear from history to die in obscurity.

**Julian**, Bishop of Eclanum [in Italy], the modern Mirabella near Benevento, is the third prominent name in Pelagian ranks. He came to the fore after the retirement of Pelagius and Caelestius, though he had been gained for the Pelagian cause some time before 417. He gave the sect [231] authority among the clergy and long remained its chief defender against the Catholic champion, St. Augustine, who composed two treatises against Julian. Excommunicated and deposed for nonacceptance of the papal condemnation of Pelagianism in 418, Julian died in exile about 454. With him Pelagianism had passed its peak as a general movement, though scattered Pelagian groups continued to survive.

(2) Pelagian Teaching

**General tenor**. Pelagianism essentially consisted in a virtual denial of the supernatural order and a corresponding overstress of the powers of a supposedly unvitiated natural order. Man is thus obligated to God only for his natural faculties, the power of eliciting his acts. Without any divine help, he can both will and do good. Such teaching presupposed philosophic denial of divine premotion and theological repudiation of original sin and its effect on man. Grace for Pelagians was not necessary for salvation; at most, it made it easier. Confronted with the need of adopting a stand on the efficacy of baptism, Pelagius declared that it was not necessary for eternal life, but only for entering the kingdom of heaven; by this evasion he avoided a blunt repudiation of the sacrament.

**A summary** of Pelagian teaching reveals the following tenets [line breaks have been added]:

(1) The human will is morally omnipotent; hence man can be sinless and perfect if he chooses.

(2) Original sin is nonexistent; hence the preternatural gifts, especially freedom from death and concupiscence, are also denied.

(3) Baptism is unnecessary for removing original sin and therefore one can gain eternal life without it. It is, however, to be regarded as an external sign of initiation into Christ’s kingdom and the communion of the faithful.

(4) Sanctifying grace is not the principle of super­natural life, but a remedy for actual sin. [See the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, ad 418: it is false that grace “is only effectual for forgiveness of sins already committed, but does not avail to avoid sin in the future . . .”] It is not absolutely necessary even for this, but a mere ornament or help.

(5) Actual graces are merely external; that is, instruction and example; no internal grace can directly influence the human will.

(6) Christ’s redemptive mission, consequently, was designed not to free men from sin, but merely to give them good example and counsel toward their own unaided use of perfectly competent natural powers. [Cayré, Fulbert. *Manual of Patrology*. Belgium: Desclée, 1936. 1: 391.]

**Moral instruction**. Any analysis of the precise method in which Pelagius presented his doctrines on morality is rendered difficult by reason of the fact that his own works have in large part perished. It is probable that his writings received a guarded circulation. From what survives of them, it can be seen that his is a doctrine of moral activity based on Scripture, interpreted by Pelagius, and sustained by threat of [232] eternal sanctions: sinners will receive no mercy at judgment but will be consigned to hell. Nothing short of complete sanctity would enable a man to escape this retribution. Positive precepts of virtue no more admit of exception than negative prohibitions of vice. With the precepts, the evangelical counsels were associated on almost the same plane: there is a strict duty to practice poverty and chastity. If a man wished, he could be entirely without sin; if he but worked at it, he could become practically immune to sin. Though Pelagius may have addressed his doctrine of “Christian valorism” to all, he seems to have aimed chiefly at developing a small group of the elite, of the perfect.

*B*. *Pelagian Controversy* (*411-18*)

(1) Presentation (411-14)

**At Rome**, Pelagius and Caelestius long maintained themselves in honor with the support of the widow Melania and the prestige of several members of the distinguished Gens Probus. Pelagius was considered a stern but sure spiritual guide, and Timasius and Jarnes, wealthy patricians, gave up their riches in response to his exhortations. Caelestius and Julian were attracted by the rationalist clarity of the system, and they and other disciples were known as “Pelagians” as early as 414. Pelagianism had spread to Gaul before Alaric’s invasion sent the prophet of self-sufficiency into flight, first to Sicily, and then to Africa.

Africa did not retain Pelagius himself for long; he went on to Palestine with Melania’s recommendations. But Caelestius, freed from the older man’s caution, established himself at Carthage. When he was challenged by St. Augustine of Hippo, he returned the attack boldly by insisting on mortality as a concomitant of man’s nature and not as a result of original sin. In particular, he decried infant baptism. During 411, Deacon Paulinus of Milan, a disciple of St. Ambrose, cited Caelestius before Bishop Aurelius of Carthage. A Carthaginian council then asserted that “Adam, established in paradise, created immortal, became mortal after his disobedience.” When Caelestius openly denied the very existence of original sin, he was condemned and excommunicated. “Condemned but not corrected”—the words are Augustine’s (Letter 157)—he then joined Pelagius in Palestine.

(2) Oriental Inquest (414-16)

**Paul Orosius**, a young Spanish priest, was sent by St. Augustine to co-operate with St. Jerome in combating Pelagianism in Palestine. During 415, Orosius accused Pelagius before Bishop John II of Jerusalem, alleging St. Augustine’s authority. Pelagius sneered, “What is Augustine to me?” and the local ordinary, touched to the quick, assured him, [233] “Here, I am Augustine.” Refusing to condemn Pelagius on the word of a Latin who knew no Greek, Bishop John advised that the case be referred to Rome.

**Council of Diospolis**. Meanwhile Caelestius had gone on to Ephesus where he was ordained to the priesthood. Together with Pelagius, he was denounced by Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, two exiled Gallic bishops. Archbishop Eulogius of Caesarea called fourteen bishops to a meeting at Diospolis or Lydda, December, 415. The nonappearance of the plaintiffs enabled Pelagius, who was present, to explain away any untoward expressions. He declared that Caelestius was sometimes carried away by rhetoric, but that he himself anathematized willingly all teachings opposed to Catholic dogma. The Council took him at his generic profession of faith, and adjudged him worthy of communion. Pelagius then distributed his own version of the acts of the council, boasting that he had been freely and easily vindicated. Both of the heresiarchs remained in good standing in the East, though St. Jerome termed the council “wretched” and St. Augustine regarded its members as “dupes.”

(3) Occidental Prosecution (416-17)

**St. Augustine**, on being informed of the unsatisfactory result of this council, inspired two new African synods at Carthage and Milevis during 416. The former under Bishop Aurelius’s leadership and the latter under his own passed new censures, in particular stigmatizing the Pelagian doctrine of the inutility of grace and baptism for salvation. St. Augustine sent the report of the joint condemnation to Pope Innocent I.

**Pope Innocent** received the African appeals during the latter part of 416, and ratified their decisions on January 27, 417. He commended the African hierarchy for its vigilance and sanctioned the condemnation of both the doctrines and persons of the Pelagian leaders. Then it was that St. Augustine paid his famous tribute to Roman primacy: “About this affair two councils have been sent to the Apostolic See. The replies have arrived. The case is ended; may the error be likewise” (Sermon 131:10). That all was not over was hinted by the pope’s remark that at Rome thus far no reliable information about Pelagius and Caelestius had been received. The pope died on March 12, 417, and Bishop John of Jerusalem during the same year.

**Pope Zosimus**, elected on March 18, 417, was a Greek and at first seemed more in accord with the Oriental attitude toward the Pelagian leaders. His doubts seemed to have been confirmed when the new Bishop Prailus of Jerusalem forwarded an apology of Pelagius, and when one of the latter’s accusers, Heros of Arles, was painted in the blackest of colors. Caelestius now hastened to Rome to defend [234] the Pelagian cause and to request an annulment of the Carthaginian censures. He seems to have impressed the pope, for the latter remonstrated with the African bishops for what appeared to have been a hasty condemnation. He warned that Caelestius would be absolved and the Carthaginian censures revoked unless proof to the contrary were forthcoming.

*C*. *Pelagian Condemnation* (*418-31*)

(1) Carthaginian Condemnation [Council of Carthage XVI]

**A plenary council of Carthage**, sixteenth at that see, opened under the presidency of Bishop Aurelius of Carthage on May 1, 418. Guided by St. Augustine, 214 bishops from Proconsular Africa and Numidia joined in pronouncing what proved to be the definitive condemnation of Pelagianism. Among canons pertinent to the heresy are the following [line breaks have been added]:

(1) “If any man says that Adam, the first man, was created mortal, so that whether he sinned or not he would have died, not as the wages of sin, but through necessity of nature, let him be anathema.”[[19]](#footnote-19)

(2) “If any man says that new-born children need not be baptized . . . let him be anathema because according to Romans (5:12), Adam’s sin has passed upon all.”

(3) “If any man says that the grace of God, by which man is justified through Jesus Christ, is only effectual for forgiveness of sins already committed, but does not avail to avoid sin in the future, a.s.”

(4) “If any man says that this grace merely helps us not to sin . . . but does not also give the power to do gladly and fulfill what we have seen to be good, a.s.”

(5) “If any man says that the grace of justification was given us that we might more easily fulfill what we are bound to do by power of free will, so that even without grace we could, only not so easily, fulfill divine commands, a.s.”

Canons 6, 7, and 8 asserted that various Scriptural references to human sinfulness are literally true, and not mere protestations of humility.

(2) Papal Condemnation

**Epistula Tractoria**. While the African bishops were drawing up this indictment, the pope had reopened the case at Rome. Instead of maintaining silence while his case was pending, Caelestius had continued to engage in debate. Cited for a new trial in 418, he fled from Rome: he may have received news of Honorius’s edict of April 30, 418, demanding arrest of the heresiarchs. These developments and the arrival of the acts of the Carthaginian Council put an end to the pope’s hesitation. During the summer of 418 he issued a long circular letter, known as the Epistula Tractoria, in which Pelagius and Caelestius, together with their doctrines, were denounced to the Catholic hierarchy. Only fragments of this encyclical survive in St. Augustine’s works, but it is known that [235] it embodied the canons of Sixteenth Carthage, and probably some of the earlier condemnations as well. The Roman clergy, headed by Archdeacon Sixtus, who seems to have hitherto been well disposed to the Pelagian leaders, promptly subscribed to the papal condemnation.

(*3*) *Ecumenical Condemnation*

**Eclanian Schism**. Julian of Eclanum, however, headed a group of eighteen Italian bishops who refused to subscribe to the Epistula. All were excommunicated, deposed, and exiled. Other bishops, led by Archbishop Augustine of Aquileia, disapproved of this summary condemnation of the recalcitrants and urged convocation of a general council. This Manifesto of Aquileia heralded a period of disaffection in the Adriatic see, though it did not withdraw from communion. Julian engaged in literary controversy with St. Augustine of Hippo and tried to stir up opposition to the papal letter in the East, where Patriarch Nestorius of Constantinople, simultaneously concocting his own Christological heresy, gave asylum to the Pelagian leaders.

**The Council of Ephesus**, summoned in 431 to condemn Nestorius, accordingly also dealt with Pelagianism. This general council will be considered later in detail; here it is enough to note that Pelagianism was once more condemned and severe censures laid on any members of the hierarchy who should continue to protect the Pelagian leaders. Just a year after St. Augustine’s death, then, the Catholic world united in unmistakable repudiation of the heresy which he had detected. The Pelagian leaders lost their refuge; Pelagius himself is believed to have died in an Egyptian monastery. As an organized movement Pelagianism, in Pope St. Celestine’s words, expired “under united blows of West and East.”

**Pelagian echoes** are heard, however, for about a century longer. In 442 Pope St. Leo rebuked the bishop of Aquileia for permitting Pelagian propaganda, and some fifty years later Pope Gelasius had a similar complaint against certain Dalmatian bishops. In 447 Bishop St. Germanus of Auxerre visited Roman Britain to combat Pelagianism, and as late as 519 an anti-Pelagian synod in Wales is heard of. But probably the majority of unregenerate Pelagians so modified their views as to coincide with the Semi-Pelagian errors presently to be noted. [236]

## Semi-Pelagianism

1. **scripture on God’s initiation of justification**
   1. “The very first step on the way to salvation is grace . . .” (Schmaus 11)
   2. Acts 16:14, “A certain woman named Lydia, a worshiper of God, was listening to us . . . The Lord opened her heart to listen eagerly to what was said by Paul.”
   3. Phil 1:29, God “has graciously granted you the privilege not only of believing in Christ, but of suffering for him as well . . .”
   4. Phil 2:13, “it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”
   5. John 6:44, “No one can come to me unless drawn by the Father who sent me; and I will raise that person up on the last day.”
2. **Augustine**
   1. Some passages in Augustine seemed to make all depend on God and nothing on human freedom.
   2. Augustine’s letter 194 said: “Sin must necessarily of its very nature work the ruin of all mankind, but God has nevertheless in the abundance of His mercy chosen out of this multitude destined to destruction a few elect on whom He has bestowed His grace and granted the gift of perseverance. These are called and in fact are the children of God; if for a time they stray from the way of righteousness, they will by a law of necessity again return to it and die in grace. They are chosen, not indeed because God forsees [*sic*] that they will correspond with the action of grace by an unconstrained act of their free will, not because they have merit of themselves, but because of His gracious pleasure He has seen fit to set them apart and predestine them to eternal life. Again, there are others abandoned of God whom He visits with His justice. These are necessarily lost, not because they could not work out their salvation if they would, but because they place their happiness and joy in evildoing.” (Eberhardt 238)
   3. Opposition to this gave rise to Semi-Pelagianism.
   4. ad 427: at the Hadrumetum monastery in North Africa, one monk “concluded that God does all and man nothing—a conclusion reached a thousand years later by Martin Luther.” (Eberhardt 238). This agitated other monks.
   5. Augustine reassured the monks with *De Gratia et Libero Arbitro* and *De Gratia et Correptione*. These said, in effect, “He who created you without your co-operation will not save you without your co-operation” (Sermon 169). (Eberhardt 238)
3. **semi-Pelagianism**
   1. John Cassian, abbot of St. Victor’s Abbey at Marseilles, France, was from the Christian East and, like Pelagius, a spiritual director. His *On the Protection of God* (c 420-426) said:
      1. God expects us on our own to begin the work of our salvation by prayer; God later confers “the grace necessary to complete the work of salvation.” (Eberhardt 238)
      2. There is no predestination: we can use grace to obtain final perseverance or ignore it.
      3. “. . . Predestination in the sense of grace was *post praevisa merita*, that is God first explored what man would do with grace and conceded it in view of man’s future merits. This is Molinism: uncensored but hotly contested theological opinion.” (Eberhardt 238)
   2. c 429: Prosper of Aquitaine, a layman, told Augustine of Cassian’s views. Augustine replied with *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum* and *De Dono Perseverantiae*.
      1. *De Praedestintione Sanctorum* attributed to God “the beginning of salvation and the desire for good, and asserted that predestination is *ante praevisa merita*.” (Eberhardt 239)
      2. *De Dono Perseverantiae* “proved that perseverance is a special gift of God.” (Eberhardt 239)
      3. Prosper’s controversy with Vincent of Lérins and other monks confused faith and theological opinion. Prosper equally defended
         1. Church teaching on grace,
         2. the Augustinian-Thomistic theory of predestination *ante praevisa merita*, and
         3. some vague or rash Augustinian expressions. (Eberhardt 239)
      4. From Sixtus III (432-40) there survives an unpromulgated document.
         1. It denies that men can pray and desire good without grace.
         2. It sets aside “questions of predestination and efficacy of grace as inexpedient for immediate decision.” (Eberhardt 240)
         3. “It may be that the author of this document was St. Leo, then deacon, future pope. Though it lacks dogmatic value, it may serve to show that the Roman clergy “off the record” were in substantial agreement with St. Augustine.” (Eberhardt 240)
4. ***Indiculus*** (c ad 450)
   1. “. . . a cata­logue (*indiculus*) of the Church’s statements assembled by Prosper of Aqui­taine appeared. It includes the statements of the popes up to that time, the decisions of the African synods approved by Rome, and the confessions of faith expressed in the liturgy. Thus it provides a classic presentation of Catholic teaching on grace without being a definitive document (DS 240-248).” (Schmaus 13)
5. **predestination disputes**
   1. Rigid views on predestination attributed to Augustine gave rise to Predestinarianism.
   2. c 473: Lucidus of Riez, priest of Gaul, espouses Predestinarianism: men are simply predestined to heaven or hell no matter what they do. This was “scarcely orthodox.” (Eberhardt 240)
   3. 474: Faustus of Riez, Lucidus’ bishop, former abbot of Lérins, and of Cassian’s circle, at a council of Arles “laid six anathemas on Predestinarianism. Lucidus apparently submitted. The Council of Arles and another of Lyons commissioned Faustus to set forth the orthodox teaching. He wrote *De Gratia Libri Duo*.
      1. Faustus denied “that grace is unnecessary for the beginning of salvation, but attributed to man’s free will the ability to desire, hope, and will good effectively and to reject evil.” (Eberhardt 240)
      2. Scythian monks in their abbey at Constantinople disputed Faustus.
   4. 520: Pope Hormisdas (514-23) replied “that though Faustus did not speak for the Church, his works [240] were not forbidden.” (Eberhardt 241)
   5. 523: The Scythians turned to African bishops for a condemnation of Faustus, and St. Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe (462-527 or 467-533), a rigid disciple of St. Augustine, roundly condemned him.
6. **the Second Council of Orange**
   1. The First Council of Orange (ad 441), “under the presidency of St. Hilary of Arles, dealt mainly with disciplinary matters.” It does not concern semi-Pelagianism. (“Council of Orange”)
   2. Caesarius of Arles
      1. While a monk at the largely semi-Pelagian abbey of St. Honorat in Lérins, Caesarius was influenced at Arles by Julius Pomerius, a disciple of Augustine’s.
      2. 528: as bishop of Arles (502-42), Caesarius became aware of how semi-Pelagian the hierarchy of Gaul was (many were graduates of St. Victor’s at Marseilles or of St. Honorat at Lérins).
      3. Caesarius sent 19 theses from Augustine to Pope Felix III (526-30). The pope retained eight, added sixteen from Prosper, and sent back the revised schema.
   3. the council itself
      1. 529: Caesarius, papal legate to Gaul, used a gathering of 13 bishops for the consecration of a church at Orange to clarify the Church’s teaching on grace. He submitted the revised schema with a canon of his own added. All 25 canons were approved by the bishops. They also “adopted a supplementary statement reaffirming the Augustinian doctrines of corruption, human inability, prevenient grace, and baptismal regeneration.” (“Council of Orange”)
   4. The council’s main points were:
      1. *original sin*: Adam’s sin changed both man’s soul and body for the worse, passing with its punishment death to posterity (canons 1 and 2). The council here did not contemplate the hypothetical state of pure nature, but simply stated that in comparison with man’s supernatural and preternatural endowment in Eden, he is now worse off.
      2. *first grace is wholly gratuitous*: From grace, before justification, there proceed prayer (canon 3); holy desires (canon 4); the inclination to and beginning of faith (canon 5); every effort to acquire faith (“believe, will, desire, try, labor, pray, watch, study, seek, ask, urge,” Denzinger § 179) (canon 6); and every salutary act (canon 7). Hence the grace of baptism is entirely the result of God’s mercy (canon 8).
      3. *gratuity of grace*: “As often as we do good, God works in us and with us that we may work” (canon 9). “God loves us as we [241] shall be by His gift and not as we are by our merit” (canon 12). “God does many good things in man which man does not do, but man does nothing good which God does not enable him to do” (canon 20).
      4. The Council of Orange II treated predestination in an attached profession of faith. It affirmed that “all the baptized, with Christ’s help and co-operation, can, if they wish, labor faithfully, and fulfill whatever is necessary for salvation.” Hence all receive freedom and sufficient grace.
   5. condemnation of Semipelagianism
      1. The council “rejects the Semipelagians’ theory of the goodness of nature left after original sin that would allow some to strive to be good or to believe and thus anticipate the grace of God, or that would make of God’s grace simply the accompaniment of man’s own efforts.” (See the “Recapitulation” after the last canon.) (Farrelly 101)
      2. “. . . through original sin, free will has been so weakened “that no one thereafter can either love God as is necessary, or believe in God, or do for God what is good, unless the grace of the divine mercy has anticipated him.”” (Denzinger § 199) (Farrelly 101)
      3. “. . . grace anticipates all acts that are of value for eternal salvation, even those in the beginning of faith . . . Grace not only anticipates man’s good acts; it causes them, and these acts are therefore God’s gifts. These two aspects are the essentials which Orange takes from Augustine: all acts profitable to salvation in fallen humanity are *anticipated* by the grace of God and are caused by the grace of God.” (Farrelly 101)
   6. acceptance of moderate Augustinianism
      1. “. . . the recapitulation after the last canon . . . goes on to teach against predestinationism that all the baptized can and ought with the help of Christ to fulfill those things necessary for the salvation of their soul.” (Farrelly 102)
      2. “It anathemizes those who would say that “some are predestined to evil by the divine power.” (Denzinger § 200) (Farrelly 102)
      3. “It is in these last two doctrines above all (as well as in what the Council did *not* associate with the gratuity of grace) that the moderation of the Augustinian theory on grace accepted at Orange is apparent.” (Farrelly 102)
   7. 531: in the letter *Per Filium Nostrum*, Boniface II declared Orange’s canons “conformable to the Catholic rules of the fathers.” Thus the decrees of this local council, like those of Sixteenth Carthage against Pelagianism, enjoy a specific approbation of the Holy See. Acceptance of the papal definition seems to have been total, so that semi-Pelagianism was laid to rest.

Here add: what Orange II did *not* affirm from Augustine (in newest trans.—Cath U of America—of Augustine’s anti-Pelagian writings, “Intro.”).

## The Grace of Perseverance

1. **Augustine and perseverance**
   1. Usually Augustine says the saints are predestined to deliverance (before they are born they cannot perish). But sometimes he says also that the others are pre­des­tined to damnation (including some baptized Christians who lack the grace of per­sev­erance). (Kelly 369)
   2. “Augustine explains final perseverance, the most precious of all graces, [as a] providential action which makes death coincide with the state of grace.” (Portalié 204)
   3. Justified human beings “cannot persevere by their own continuing ratification of their relation to God; their changeable wills need to be sustained by a special divine assistance which gives not merely the *possibility* but the *actuality* of persever­ance. But in what does this gift of perseverance consist? *Caritas*, love for God, which gives man a *delectatio victrix*, a delight in the good which is victorious over all inducements toward a basic rebellion against God.” (TeSelle 328)
2. **propositions**
   1. “The justified person is not able for his whole life long to avoid all sins, even venial sins, without the special privilege of the grace of God. (*De fide*.)” (Ott )
   2. “Without the special help of God the justified cannot persevere to the end in justification. (*De fide*.)” (Ott )
3. “**We may distinguish** . . .
   1. “Potentia perseverandi (posse perseverare), i.e., the ability to persevere, and
   2. “perseverantia actualis (actu perseverare), i.e., perseverance in fact.” (Ott )
   3. “While the ability to persevere is, on the ground of God’s universal desire for salvation, the prerogative of all the justified, actual perseverance is the lot of the predestined only.” (Ott )
4. “**We may distinguish** . . .
   1. “perseverantia temporalis or imperfecta, i.e., transient perseverance, and
   2. “perseverentia finalis or perfecta, i.e., perseverance to the end of life.” (Ott )
   3. Aquinas seems to have both in mind (or had not yet distinguished the two) when he writes, “after anyone has been justified by grace, he still needs to beseech God for the . . . gift of perseverance, that he may be kept from evil till the end of his life. For to many grace is given to whom perseverance in grace is not given” (*ST* 109.10 corpus). I.e., one reaches *perseveantia finalis* through *perseverantia temporalis*.
5. “**We may distinguish** . . .
   1. “Perseverantia (finalis) passiva, i.e., the coincidence of death with the state of grace, and
   2. “perseverantia (finalis) activa, i.e., the constant co-operation of the justified with grace.” (Ott )
   3. Hahn’s definition of active final perseverance: a series of actual graces that continually preserve a person from sin. Compare Ott: “The “special help of God” necessary for final perseverance, consists in a number of actual graces.” (Ott )
   4. Journet on passive final perseverance: “final perseverance . . . is the coincidence of the state of grace with the instant of death . . . I can and must hope that God will keep me in grace at the moment of death; and I know that this grace will not be taken from me unless I reject it myself. Whenever we say the Hail Mary, we ask for the grace of perseverance: ‘Pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death’. A similar petition . . . is contained in the last petition of the Our Father, when we ask to be delivered from evil.” (Journet 63)

# Doctrines of Grace in the Medieval Period

## Overview of Catholicism, Orthodoxy,

## and Protestantism on Grace

1. “. . . all Christian confessions grant that God truly gives Himself to man, and that He alone can do this, be­cause His creature is in this respect utterly powerless . . .” (Moeller and Philips 10)

1. “Deification, created grace, extrinsic grace: these three terms are charac­teristic of the respective points of view of Orthodoxy, Catholicism, and the Reforma­tion on justification and sanctifica­tion.” (Moeller and Philips 7)

1. “. . . any theology of grace must insist both on the primacy of God, who justifies and sanctifies man, and at the same time on the reality of regeneration. [10] . . . The three theologies of grace [11] . . . safeguard” the primacy of God. (Moeller and Philips 10-12)
2. “. . . the argument is principally between Catholics and Protestants, the Orthodox and the Catholics being on this point [the reality of regeneration] fundamentally in agree­ment.” (Moeller and Philips 11)

## Deification in Orthodox Christianity

1. **concept**
   1. *Deification* is the charac­teristic view of Eastern Orthodoxy “on justification and sanctifica­tion.” [7] “. . . the Orthodox seem to possess a theology of grace best described by the expres­sion ‘deifi­ca­tion’ . . .” (Moeller and Philips 7, 9)
   2. By sharing God’s very nature, we are raised infinitely above the most perfect angelic nature: “the grace of a single man is a higher good than the natural perfection of the whole universe.” [See *ST* 1-2.113.9.] (Daujat)
   3. “The starting point for the theology of deification is *the real and deifying presence of Christ in the world and in the Church*. One of the principal arguments advanced against Arian­ism was the soteriological one; salvation cannot be certain if Christ is not God; for, if He were a ‘lower god’ how could He save, that is, deify, mankind?” (Moeller and Philips 13) The Word must “be God in order to be able to deify us by grace . . .” (Daujat 21) The same can be said of the Holy Spirit.
   4. “. . . salvation appears as the assimilation of human nature to God; to be saved, man must cease to belong to himself.” (Moeller and Philips 13)
   5. “If this radical transformation of a man’s humanity is to be a real one, it requires that the soul should be utterly dispossessed and laid open to the direct influence of the power that deifies it.” (Moeller and Philips 13)
2. **deification in scripture**
   1. The pre-eminent text for deification is 2 Pet 1:4: we “become participants of the divine nature.”
   2. Secondarily, “scriptural texts concerning the only-begotten Son of God (Jn. 1,14) [and] the firstborn among many brothers [46] (Rom. 8,29; Col. 1,15) . . . became the foundation of the deification theory.” (Schmaus 46-47)
   3. John 1:14, “the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father’s only son, full of grace and truth.”
   4. Rom 8:29, “those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
   5. Col 1:15, Christ “is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation . . .”
   6. For texts on “incorporation” (Christians becoming part of Christ’s “body”), see the handout above, “The State of Justification: Some Scriptural Images,” the section “incorporation into Christ’s ‘one body.’” Pg. 170 mid
   7. To a lesser extent, texts on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit influenced the deification theory. (Schmaus 47) Pg. 170 bot
      1. E.g., Rom 8:9, “the Spirit of God dwells in you.”
      2. For 20 more texts on indwelling, see the handout above, “The State of Justification: Some Scriptural Images,” the section “God’s indwelling.”
3. **deification in the Church Fathers**
   1. in general
      1. “From the fourth century onwards, the Fathers speak of the interior transformation of the justified man in such strong phrases as “deifica­tion” or “becoming godlike.” According to many of the Fathers, God became man so that man might become God.” (Schmaus 70)
      2. “In the teaching of the Fathers, man does not cast off his created nature through his participation in the divine nature: the difference between God and man is not eradicated through man’s deification, but on the contrary is set forth in its full clarity. The Fathers’ meaning becomes clear in a comparison they frequently made: as iron placed in a fire takes on the nature of fire and becomes firelike, so the justified man takes on the nature of God and becomes godlike. The justified are called God-bearers because they are permeated with the holiness of God. The Fathers likewise compare grace with the sun, which illuminates bodies (Basil), or with perfume diffusing itself among the clothes in a closet (Cyril of Alexandria).” (Schmaus 70)
   2. Clement of Alexandria
      1. “Clement of Alexandria developed the doctrine of the divine sonship in connection with 2 Peter 1,4.” (Schmaus 46) 2 Pet 1:4, we “become participants of the divine nature.”
      2. Clement of Alexandria (*Protrepticus* 11): “The complete man—if one may use the phrase, the total Christ—is not divided. He is neither barbarian, nor Jew, nor Greek, neither male not female, but the New Man, completely transformed in the Spirit.” (qtd. in Schmaus 49)
   3. Maximos the Confessor (*Capitula* *theologica* 11.27): “He who is formed by the Spirit in the image of God puts on, totally, the New Man.” (qtd. in Schmaus 49)
   4. “According to Cyril of Alexandria, the errant children of man find the way to the heavenly Father only when they unite themselves to a unique body, to the New Man, whose head is Jesus Christ (e. g., *In* *Ps*. 45,19).” (Schmaus 49)
   5. Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen
      1. “Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen developed the doctrine of the “deifica­tion” of man, which still today forms the core of the Eastern Church’s concept of grace.” (Schmaus 46)
      2. Their teaching was “the translation of Platonic ideas to the realm of Christian teaching on salvation . . .” [46] “. . . the reality itself was received by the Fathers from sacred tradition . . . [But] Neoplatonic and gnostic influences contributed to this manner of speaking . . . In gnostic and Neoplatonic teaching, deification was the result of man’s ascent into the divine sphere. In the teaching of the Fathers, it was the result of God’s descent in the historical Christ who was crucified and glorified.” (Schmaus 46, 70)
   6. Macedonianism: “In the conflict with the Arians, the Holy Spirit was declared by the Fathers to be the principle of human holiness: thus, his divinity was established by the fact that he made men holy.” (Schmaus 11)
   7. Augustine
      1. “God the Son, remaining in his own nature, became a sharer in our nature, so that remaining in our own nature we might be made sharers in his (*Letter* 140,10).” (Daujat)
4. **Palamism**
   1. “The most char­acteristic version of this theology of deification is Pal­am­ism.” (Moeller and Philips 9)
   2. *Palamism* is the doctrine of Gregory Palamas (c 1296-1359, monk of Mt. Athos, arch­bishop of Thessalonica from 1347, canonized by the patriarch of Constantinople c 1369). (Prokurat and Golitzin 147-148)
   3. “The Palamite doctrine . . . holds a central place in present-day Orthodoxy . . .” (Moeller and Philips 13)
   4. “Gregory’s greatest work, *The Triads in Defense of the Holy Hesychasts*, [argued] that the claims to a direct experience of God by saints past and present were evidence of a dis­tinc­tion in God between the divine essence and activities, or energies.” (Prokurat and Gol­it­zin 148)
   5. “The essence/energies distinction has subsequently been ac­cept­ed as the official teaching of the Orthodox Church.” (Prokurat and Golitzin 148)
   6. Palamism was “a *theological* reaction to neo-platonism, sup­ple­menting the mysticism of the Hesychasts. It is too little realized that opposition to neo-platonism is as important in the East as that to Pelagianism in the West.” [13] “Opposition to neo-platonism . . . has played the same part as opposition to Pelagianism in the West.” (Moeller and Philips 13, 17)
   7. the basic Palamite doctrine
      1. A “magnificent passage of Palamas”: “Since the Son of God, in His ineffable love for mankind, has not only united His divine hypostasis to our nature, and taking a body with a rational soul, has appeared on earth and lived among men; but, more than this—Oh how splendid a miracle!—He unites Himself to the human hypostases themselves, and mingling Himself with every believer by the communion of His holy Body, becomes one body with us and makes us into a temple of the whole Godhead; for the fullness of the Godhead dwells cor­poreally in Him [Col 2:9]; how then should He not enlighten the souls [42] of those who partake worthily, surrounding them with light through the divine splendour of His Body which is in us . . .” (Moeller and Philips 42-43)
      2. A summary of the above passage: “The Son of God has united His hypostasis to our nature; He unites Himself to the hypostasis of every believer by the Eucharist; He becomes ‘one body with us’ [“one body”: Rom 12:4-5; 1 Cor 6:16, 10:17, 12:12-13, 12:20; Eph 2:16, 4:4; Col 3:15]; for in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead corporeally [Col 2:9, “For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily”]; He must, therefore, enlighten the souls of those that are united to Him.” (Moeller and Philips 14)
      3. “It is Christ, God and man, who is present in the being of the redeemed man; it is the mysterious uncreated energies which become as it were the ‘soul’ of the Christian’s life; the ‘natural’ man is here totally dispossessed and taken over by a life coming from elsewhere, and which always continues to come from elsewhere.” (Moeller and Philips 17)
   8. Palamas contrasted with Barlaam
      1. Barlaam “argued that the ‘negative theol­ogy’ so dear to Eastern the­ologians was in practice a form of agnosticism before the being of God, who is un­knowable and therefore unknown . . .” (Moeller and Philips 14)
      2. Against Barlaam, Palamas argued that God is the agent revealing himself in theology; hence theology is “an objective and positive mode of cognisance . . . Palamas wants to reconcile the impossibility of knowing God, who is beyond all being, . . . with the fact that He is communicated in the ‘divine energies’ . . .” (Moeller and Philips 14)
   9. Palamas contrasted with hesychasm
      1. In “the Hesychast method of prayer,” “cer­tain attitudes of the body, but above all the practice of the ‘Jesus prayer’ in time with the breathing, are held to bring about the transformation of a man’s whole being.” (Moeller and Philips 14)
      2. “. . . the Hesychast is not seeking a psychological state, but Christ living in him. Natural knowledge, therefore, and mystical knowledge, are es­sentially different.” (Moeller and Philips 14)
   10. “the Palamite theory of the uncreated energies” (Moeller and Philips 15)
       1. “The gulf between the creature and the Creator makes it neces­sary that the divine energies through which we see God should not themselves belong to the creation.” (Moeller and Philips 15)
       2. “. . . Palamas states that the life of . . . a person . . . takes on an uncreated charac­ter; in one sense, when Paul [for example] lives God’s life, ‘he becomes un­created by grace.’ Palamas ob­viously makes it clear that it is not his nature that takes on this uncreated character; he explains that we are contemplating the substance of the saint not in itself but in the divine hypostasis. (This is the curious doctrine of the ‘enhypostatos,’ developed by Leontius of Byzantium and here extended to the mystical life of deification.)” (Moeller and Philips 15)
       3. “Of course, the es­sence of God remains in itself unknowable, for only the three divine hypostases share in it. There is simply a total participa­tion in the divine energy, that is, in that mysterious mode of God’s presence by which He reveals Himself and acts in the be­liever.” (Moeller and Philips 15)
       4. “The difficult Palamite doctrine of the ἐνεργείαι [*energeiai*, “energies”], at once distinct from God, and yet uncreated, is a systematic way of expressing a simple truth: that the divine life is really given to us. The choice of the term ‘uncreated energies’ emphasizes first that God reveals Himself by acting, which excludes any idea of ‘pas­sion’ in God, and secondly, that since the communication of the [15] divine life is ‘uncreated,’ there can never be any question of mak­ing it, by any means whatsoever, the reward of human ‘merit.’” [“Cf. J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l’étude de Grégoire Palamas*, Paris, 1959,” 16 n. 2] (Moeller and Philips 15-16)
       5. God’s primacy: “This theology of mystical deification, because of its absolute denial of all forms of neo-platonic mysticism, can never be accused of reducing the primacy of God acting in grace. . . . This is a point worth remembering: Only God can give God.” (Moeller and Philips 17)
   11. Protestant attitudes toward Palamism
       1. Protestants “grant that the doctrine of deification preserves entire the absolute primacy of God, and it is even the case that, as far as Palamas’ idea of uncreated energies resembles the thought of Peter Lom­bard, they would have much sympathy with that approach, for Luther said he liked Lombard’s doctrine . . .” (Moeller and Philips 17)
       2. But “they would be ill at ease with the theology of the ‘participation’ by man in the divine life.” (Moeller and Philips 17)
       3. “They would be even more likely to hesitate about the part played by the sacraments in this mystical process of deification.” (Moeller and Philips 17)
   12. Catholic attitudes toward Palamism
       1. “. . . Palamism is not irreconcilable with Catholic orthodoxy . . .” (Moeller and Philips 16)
       2. Palamism lacks “our idea of *fides obscura* or even of any faith based on authority, for even though these aspects of justification are not denied . . . they are not made to bear any weight. Our Protestant brethren, on the other hand, are very attached to [16] them—to the former, *fides obscura*, in particular.” (Moeller and Philips 16-17)
5. **Orthodoxy and Catholicism contrasted**
   1. theology of grace from above or from below
      1. Eastern theology “is chiefly preoccupied with finding out what, *in God*, makes Him able to give Himself [8] . . . what it is in God that makes it possible for Him to give Himself . . .” (Moeller and Philips 16)
      2. Western theology “is concerned particularly with what it is, *in man*, which allows him to receive God. [8] [It is] concerned . . . with what it is in man that makes it possible for him to receive and take to himself God and His divine life. . . . [The] doctrine of created grace is explained by their dif­ferent point of view . . .” (Moeller and Philips 16)
      3. The East “has never attempted a philosophical explanation of de­ifi­ca­tion . . .” (Moeller and Philips 16)
      4. “. . . if it were satisfactorily de­scribed, the doctrine of the *habitus* would probably be less unac­ceptable to them . . .” [16] After all, in the West’s doctrine of *habitus* as in the East’s doctrine of participation, “union . . . is founded in an active presence.” [37] (Moel­ler and Phillips 16, 37)
      5. In the West, “Catholic theologians, anxious to explain as much as possible about the recipient of divine life, obviously do not deny the ‘uncreated’ character of the life itself; they merely introduce distinctions that are useful to them, but which the East has always mistrusted, especially when they are taken from the philosophy of Aristotle.” (Moeller and Philips 16)
   2. “It is not irrelevant to set the debate in a wider context, that of Christology and pneu­ma­tology.” (Moeller and Philips 8)
      1. Eastern theology bases its theology of grace in Christology.
         1. “. . . the first tendencies in Christology seem to have emphasized in Christ’s human nature His *flesh*, as of one Risen from the dead, and its deification, without formally and directly discussing His soul (though, of course, its existence was not denied).” (Moeller and Philips 8)
         2. This tendency “seems to be latent in East­ern theology, for it holds, in fact, that in the case not of Christ [8] alone, but of every Christian, the perfected work of sacramental grace results in the transfiguration not only of the soul, but also, and perhaps above all, of *the body*. . . . the trans­figuration of the body being particularly referred to by the words ‘deifying trans­formation.’” (Moeller and Philips 8-9)
         3. “. . . medieval Latin thinkers are less concerned than the Greeks with the bodily part of our nature in sanctification . . . ” (Moeller and Philips 7)
      2. Western theology bases its theology of grace in pneumatology.
         1. “There is another approach to the theology of grace, in terms of *pneuma­tology*, starting from ‘the gift of the Spirit.’ Western theology is much more ready to adopt this approach . . .” (Moeller and Philips 9)
         2. It can be “summed up by the words *Spiritus in anima*, the Spirit pres­ent to (or in) the soul of regenerate man.” (Moeller and Philips 9)
   3. “Our Orthodox brethren consider that this doctrine of uncre­ated energies excludes any idea of something both supernatural and created, and therefore of created grace, of a *hab­itus*. [But] the distinction between uncreated and created energies can be expressed in West­ern terminology by the distinction between the natural and the supernatural.” (Moeller and Philips 16)
6. **conclusions**
   1. “If the scholastics laid less emphasis than the Greek Fathers on our participation in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, they do show more fully the extent of the ontological change in man; grace . . . brings about an ability, created in man; which is only to express in philosophical terms the ‘new creature’ in regenerate man.” (Moeller and Philips 33)
   2. “. . . do they [the Orthodox] not pay too little attention to the battle justified man must fight against Satan and against sin, which has left so deep a mark at the very heart of human nature?” (Moeller and Philips 11)

## Created Grace

1. “**supernatural**”
   1. “. . . the word “supernatural” became current . . . in the circle of Neoplatonic the­ol­ogians around the year 500 [to] express the transcendence of God . . .” (Schmaus x)
   2. “The medieval theologians coined the term “supernatural” grace [x] . . . the act by which God the Father turns in grace to men united with his Son in the Holy Spirit, and the transforma­tion of men into the likeness of the tripersonal God.” (Schmaus x-xi)
2. **history of** “**created grace**”
   1. “The expression *gratia creata* does not appear before the thir­teenth century, but the ideas it expresses . . . begin with St. Augustine.” (Moeller and Philips 18)
   2. Augustine (ad 354-430)
      1. “St. Augustine is still very close to the Fathers of the Eastern Churches: for example, in his *De Trinitate* he often speaks of the image of God in man, of regeneration and the indwelling of God in us.” [18] “. . . ‘indwelling’ (uncreated grace) is an essential aspect of the Catholic doctrine . . .” (Moeller and Philips 18, 43)
      2. “One particular nuance, however, is distinctive. He often stresses the neces­sity of proving by works that one is a child of God, especially in his ser­mons, which are meant to lead those who heard them to practical applica­tions. This nuance came to have a powerful influence in the West in the Middle Ages.” (Moeller and Philips 18)
      3. “. . . we can talk of ‘uncreated grace’ [though not the term] in the thought of Augus­tine.” (Moeller and Philips 19)
         1. “Augustine explains that charity means we must love God and our neighbour *de Deo*, [18] in the sense that it is the Holy Spirit who ‘loves in us.’” (Moeller and Philips 18-19)
         2. “God causes us to believe and hope through the virtues of faith and hope; but He makes us love ‘through God’; it is God in us who loves our neighbour.” [*De Trinitate* 15.17.27. See: *Serm*. 34.2.3; *Serm*. 169.14; *Serm*. 923; etc.] (Moeller and Philips 18-19)
      4. Infant baptism prompted “the first appearance of the notion of the *habitus*” (though not the term or the full-blown concept); it also raised the question of “the grace of justification . . .”” (Moeller and Philips 19)
         1. “Augustine says first that infants, being incapable of faith, are justified by the Church’s faith.” [*Epistola* 98.10, ad 408] (Moeller and Philips 19)
         2. “In 412, he explains that God justifies infants by a hidden grace, not yet manifested in works.” [*Pecc. Mer. Rem*. 1.9.10] (Moeller and Philips 19)
         3. “In 417, he [says] that the divine indwelling is always related to some know­ledge or experience; consequently one must say of baptized infants that the Spirit dwells in them, but they do not know Him. . . . Baptized infants are already indwelt by the Spirit, but this indwelling is not yet in actuality.” [*Epistola* 187.6.21, 26] (Moeller and Philips 19)
      5. “It is clear that the idea of a purely created grace has no mean­ing for Au­gustine; like St. Basil, he speaks only of the contact of the uncreated with the creature . . .” (Moeller and Philips 19)
   3. early middle ages: created grace is “absent in the Early Middle Ages; at this period, the Greek Fathers were little read and the theological climate was formed by a few texts from St. Augustine.” (Moeller and Philips 19)
   4. pre-scholastics
      1. Some pre-scholastics were Sedulius Scotus, 800s; Peter of Blois; and Radulfus Ardens. (Moeller and Philips 20)
      2. “. . . on the subject of the indwelling, the early scholastics are interested particularly in the Spirit which is given, and describe in detail the different gifts received at baptism.” (Moeller and Philips 20)
      3. “The pre-scholastics seem to think along actualist lines, fol­lowing certain texts of Augustine. [19] . . . the actualist interpretation of bibli­cal and patris­tic categories dominates their thought; the dynamic aspect of grace, what we should like to call ‘the fun­da­mental driving force of the new nature given by justification,’ does not appear; they are interested before all else in ac­tions. There is not yet any question of *gratia creata* or *habitus*.” (By “actualist,” do Moeller and Phillips mean *actual* grace rather than sanctifying grace, or do they mean that *actions* resulting from grace are the only interest?) (Moeller and Philips 19-20)
   5. “. . . the whole ‘monastic’ tradition in the Middle Ages—as, for instance, in William of Saint Thierry—kept much closer to the Greek Fathers than has often been said.” (Moeller and Philips 43)
   6. scholasticism up to Thomas Aquinas
      1. Anselm (1033-1109): “baptized in­fants do not have grace, even though their original sin has never­theless been forgiven; they are no longer sinners, but they are not yet sanctified; they do not have grace, for this presumes a con­­scious act; if they die, the Church’s faith is imputed to them.” (Moeller and Philips 21)
      2. Abelard (1079-1142)
         1. “In the same line of thought, Abel­ard states that if infants never made an act of love, they could never enter heaven; but he adds that infants make this act at the very moment they enter into eternity, for the first act of a separated soul is one of love towards God.” (Moeller and Philips 21)
         2. “Unfortunately, Abelard brings forward another idea, which was to weigh heavily upon later tradition; he has a tend­ency to reduce the indwelling of the Spirit to the gifts of the Spirit . . . an ontological transformation has fallen into the background, the important thing being the actualization of the gift of grace.” (Moeller and Philips 21)
      3. Peter Lombard (1100?-60?)
         1. The “opinion of Peter Lombard looks like nothing more than a return to certain texts of St. Augustine.” (Moeller and Philips 22)
         2. He says that “there is no virtue of charity, for it is replaced by the per­son of the Holy Spirit. . . . acts of faith and hope, he says, come from the virtue present in us, but the act of love comes from the Spirit Him­self, without there being in man a *habitus* of love.” (Moeller and Philips 22)
         3. For scriptural justification of his belief that the Spirit *is* charity, he might have cited these verses. (Hahn)
            1. Rom 8:9-10, “you are not in the flesh; you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you. . . . 10But if Christ is in you, . . . the Spirit is life because of righ­teous­ness.”
            2. Rom 8:11, “the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you . . . his Spirit . . . dwells in you.”
            3. Rom 8:13, “by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body . . .”
            4. Rom 8:15, “you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!” 17it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God . . .”
            5. 1 Cor 15:45, Christ “became a life-giving spirit.”
            6. Gal 2:20, “it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me.”
            7. Gal 4:6, “God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!””
            8. Gal 5:22-23, “the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithful­ness, 23gentleness, and self‑control.”
         4. He “seemed to identify the grace residing in man with the Holy Spirit.” [8-9] “. . . his Platonist systematization led him into the error of identifying the supernatural act of man with the Holy Spirit (cf. below, pp. 45-53).” [22 n. 18] (Moeller and Philips 8-9, 22 n. 18)
         5. St. Thomas, on the other hand, says that Lom­bard was not Pla­ton­ist enough, neglecting the doctrine of participation. ‘The Spirit comes to us that we may participate in Him.’” (Moeller and Philips 22 n. 18)
         6. Peter “failed to see that it is possible to speak of a *habitus* of love that is at the same time a direct participation of the Holy Spir­it.” (Moeller and Philips 23)
         7. “Richard Fishacre, an Oxford Franciscan, followed Lombard in this opinion and even spoke of a parallelism between the hypostatic union and union with the Spirit in grace; this theory is curiously reminiscent of Palamas.” (Moeller and Philips 23)
      4. the groundwork for the breakthrough to the concept of “habitual grace”
         1. Before the 1200s, “Habitual grace [was] called *gratia* *gratum* *faciens*,” “grace which makes one pleasing (to God).” (Schmaus 47)
         2. “. . . baptized infants who died before the age of reason” [21]: “what was to lead to the idea of *habitus*, *was not merely Aristot­elian­ism*; . . . if it had had no point [20] of contact with any theological tradition, this idea [*hab­itus*] would never have emerged so clear­ly. Once again it was the question of infant baptism which pro­vided the theological background.” (Moeller and Philips 20-21)
         3. Two groups of texts from Paul “led in time to the medieval idea of “sanctifying grace.”” (Fitzmyer 58)
            1. One is “the Pauline teaching about the Spirit as an energizing force . . .” (Fitzmyer 58)

Rom 8:14, “all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God.”

Gal 4:6, “because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” . . .”

Rom 8:26, “we do not know how to pray as we ought, but that very Spirit intercedes with sighs too deep for words.” (Fitzmyer 57)

* + - * 1. In the other, grace “accompanies Paul or is in him . . .” (Fitzmyer 58)

1 Cor 15:10, “I worked harder than any of them—though it was not I, but the grace of God that is with me.”

Phil 1:7, “all of you share in God’s grace with me, both in my imprisonment and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel.”

* + 1. Alain de Lille (Cistercian of Cîteaux, c 1128-1202)
       1. In the 1200s “a distinction between “habitual” and “actual” grace was adopted—terms which became common after the Council of Trent.” (Schmaus 47)
       2. “The first to touch on the idea of created grace was Alan of Lille by his distinction be­tween virtues *habitu* and *actu*; this [21] dis­tinction is applied by him to the question of bap­tized infants.” (Moeller and Philips 21-22)
       3. Therefore, Schmaus seems to be wrong when he says, “A decisive turning point in this development was the application by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas of Aristotelian conceptions to the idea of grace.” (47) The application occurred before Albert and Thomas.
       4. “Innocent III [pope, 1198-1216] shows the first reactions to this when he still puts forward the view of St. Anselm on the matter as that of the ma­jority, but adds ‘*some* think that these infants are justified *habitu sed non actu*’ . . .” (Moeller and Philips 22)
       5. In “1219, Robert of Courçon tells us that the common opinion is the sec­ond.” “. . . this distinction must have spread like wild­fire . . .” (Moeller and Philips 22)
       6. Council of Vienne: “in 1311, at the Council of Vienne, Clement V said that ‘some’ follow St. Anselm’s view, but *most* accept a distinction between the *habitus* and the act. The Fathers of this council state clear­ly that the opinion of ‘modern theologians’ is to be followed here.” (Moeller and Philips 22)
    2. Franciscans
       1. The Franciscan “outlook is more ‘humanist,’ more anthropocentric.” (Moeller and Philips 24)
       2. Alexander of Hales (1185?-1245): “The first text to speak of created grace appears in the *Summa* of Alexander of Hales” about 1245. (Moeller and Philips 24)
       3. John de la Rochelle, OFM (c. 1200-1245)
          1. “. . . the indwelling Spirit is a *forma transformans* . . . it brings about in the soul a *forma trans­formata*. . . . man must necessarily be adapted to the grace he receives; it is here the object, the recipi­ent of grace, that is under discus­sion; the exposition begins from below. This necessary dispo­sition is called a *habitus* disposing to grace: some passages state that this means a previous gift; others say that the *habitus* is a fruit of the Holy Spirit Himself.” (Moeller and Philips 24)
          2. “These principles make it possible to explain the case of bap­tized infants, as well as to understand progress in the life of grace.” (Moeller and Philips 24)
          3. “But the dominating idea remains that of a direct union, in created grace, with the Spirit who gives it as He gives Himself; there is a *lumen fluens*, which is always in contact with the Spirit who co­mes to visit the soul.” (Moeller and Philips 24)
       4. St. Bonaventure (1217?-74)
          1. “The two principal foundations of St. Bonaventure’s view” (Moeller and Phillips 24) are:

“. . . we must speak of a created *habitus,* *in order to empha­size the fundamental impotence of man, and exclude the righ­teousness of works*.” [25] Yet later Protestants attacked created grace as Pelagianist! “St. Bona­venture and St. Thomas both say that if there were no created grace, one might think that man by his own works gives himself grace. Created grace, therefore, manifests the *in­digentia hominis*; that is why a man must be given a disposi­tion to receive justification.” (Moeller and Philips 25)

“. . . the love of God, giving itself, is effective, producing a change in man. Consequently, the dis­position, the created *hab­itus*, is the *result of the presence of the God of love* [like a fingertip touching water]. In other words, *gratia creata* is the result of the con­tinual influence of the div­ine light . . .” (Moeller and Philips 25)

“. . . in fact, the created *habitus* is . . . a dynamic entity, only existing through the direct and continuous action of God pres­ent in the soul and disposing it to receive Him [like a fingertip touching water].” (Moeller and Philips 27)

* + - * 1. “St. Bonaventure sums all this up in the striking formula, which succeeds in avoiding any ambi­guity, ‘*Habere est haberi*, to possess (a *habitus*) is to be possessed by God.’” (Moeller and Philips 25)
    1. Albert the Great (1206?-80)
       1. acceptable statements
          1. “First of all, we find a very definite anti-pelagian tendency: he says that if we insist on the necessity of created grace, it is not because the Holy Spirit needs anything at all, but because man, as a con­sequence of his fundamental impotence, must be given a disposi­tion.” (Moeller and Philips 26)
          2. “. . . he declares that ‘the Spirit is present to the soul.’ It is, there­fore, clear that St. Albert is aware that the soul is directly united to God, and that this union is to be understood in terms of participa­tion.” (Moeller and Philips 26)
       2. unacceptable statements
          1. Albert says that “For an act to be meritorious, a man must in some sense be master of it; for an act to be his own, a man must be able to act as he wants.” (Moeller and Philips 26)
          2. Worse yet, he says “that between God who gives Himself, and man who is transformed, there is an infinite distance; there must, therefore, be an intermediary, and that is created grace.” This “intro­duces an extremely dangerous dualism, in which it is possible to recognize the source of an idea far too widespread during the period of the decadence of scholasticism . . .” (Moeller and Philips 26)

“This second point betrays a tendency to conceive in material terms what is properly a spiritual gift; carried to its logical con­clusion, it would lead to [26] . . . saying in effect, ‘The Spirit comes with created grace’ . . .” (Moeller and Philips 26-27)

“It cannot be said, therefore, that the risk of ‘turning grace into a thing’ is a myth . . .” (Moeller and Philips 27)

“. . . the dual­ism (between created grace and indwelling) . . . in certain passages of St. Albert the Great . . . must be com­plete­ly rooted out of our speculative theology.” (Moeller and Philips 32)

* + - * 1. “Certain other arguments must also be avoided, such as that of St. Albert on the infinite distance separating man from God, for this excludes one essential aspect of the *habitus*, that it is an en­tity that only comes into being in and through a *union*.” (Moeller and Philips 32)
    1. summary: “­At the conclusion of the disputes that revolved around Peter Lombard, the first schol­astics worked out a doctrine of *created grace*, situated in the very substance of the soul, and con­ceived of according to the pattern of Aris­totle’s categories, as a *habitus* or ἕξις.” (Moeller and Philips 9)
  1. Thomas Aquinas
     1. Three factors dominated the theology of grace at this time. (Moeller and Phillips 23)
        1. “a strongly actualist interpretation of grace, coming partly from St. Augus­tine, but most of all from Abelard”;
        2. “certain theologians who distinguished between the *habitus* and the act”; and
        3. “the opinion of Lombard, likewise Augustinian in origin.” (Moeller and Philips 23)
     2. “Against the thesis of Peter Lombard that grace is the Holy Spirit dwelling in man—therefore against a narrowly personalistic view—Thomas Aquinas, in an application of Aristotelian metaphysics, explained grace as a supernatural *habitus*, resembling an essential quality of the soul.” (Schmaus 47)
     3. “St. Thomas, who was well acquainted with the different tendencies, Pla­tonist and Aristotelian, is far from giving an exclusive place to Aristotle: for example, his criti­cism of Peter Lom­bard is that he neglects to take into account the Platonism of Augustine, and therefore failed to understand how he thought of the Spirit as coming to us that we might par­ticipate in him.” (Moeller and Philips 23)
     4. When “he asks *utrum caritas ponat aliquid in anima* [“whether charity posits something in the soul,” *ST* I-II 110.1; II-II 23.2], he replies that it does, but points out that this *aliquid* is not a thing but a ‘something’; and he adds that it is not a complete thing, but a reality that is not an object.” (Moeller and Philips 27)
     5. “. . . the love of God works effec­tively—a man is changed if the Spirit dwells in him; the *habitus* is the result of this . . .” (Moeller and Philips 27)
        1. “. . . there is no question, therefore, of a *habitus* being required in ad­vance,” i.e., prior to the Spirit’s indwelling. (Moeller and Philips 27)
        2. And there is no question of a *habitus* “produced by any other causality than that of God Himself at the very moment He gives Himself.” (Moeller and Philips 27)
        3. Aquinas (*ST* 2-2.4.4 ad 3): “Grace creates faith not only when faith begins in a person but as long as faith lasts.” (Qtd. in Lutheran World Federation and Roman Catholic Church, *Annex* § 2.C)
        4. “In other words, the idea of created grace simply expresses the reality of regeneration; it is in no way an intermediate reality, a thing, com­plete in itself, which man possesses as his own.” (Moeller and Philips 27)
     6. In *Quaestiones Disputatae de Caritate* q. 3a, [27] “He starts from a more psychological point of view.” (Moeller and Philips 27-28)
        1. “. . . the act of love must be of our own free will, since nothing is so voluntary as love; moreover, the act must be meritorious . . . All this is only possible if a man has in him a disposition allowing him to make voluntary acts of love, because one must have a free dis­position in order to make an act. This implies a *habitus*. And in general, grace must adapt itself to human nature as it is.” (Moeller and Philips 28)
        2. “. . . this *habitus* (this δύναμις) operates like a kind of continuous im­pulse . . .” (Moeller and Philips 28)
           1. It is not “a temporary impulse on a par­ticular occasion, but *a con­tinuous impulse from which actions result*. In other words, the *habitus* is *an active tension set up by God at work in man*; and this is not intermittent but contin­uous . . .” (Moeller and Philips 28)
           2. It “is not a series of actual graces (there is very little sugges­tion of this in Western thought in the Middle Ages), but rather, if one might use the term, an ‘impelling disposition’: better still, the *habi­tus* is nothing less than the will of God expressing itself unceas­ingly within the complex reality of the being of man.” (Moeller and Philips 28)
           3. “He conceives not of an inert object, or a fixed state, cut off, as it were, from its source in God, but a permanent dynamism, built into the very foundations of our being, and causing there a perma­nent disposition (an inherent dis­position, in the words of the Coun­cil of Trent); but which has no reality except through the presence and activity of God Himself.” (Moeller and Philips 29)
     7. “. . . underlying these ideas of Aquinas is the theory of the participation of the soul in the divine life, through [28] the continual action of God.” (Moeller and Philips 28-29)
     8. Thomas may have underemphasized “the personal nature of the relations between the soul and God. St. Thomas’ language is, perhaps, too abstract . . .” (Moeller and Philips 37)
  2. Scotus: “John Duns Scotus accepted the theory of “habitus,” but he interpreted habitus—virtue—as love. His chief contribution was the doctrine of divine acceptance, a teaching very fruitful in the following ages but often misunderstood and misrepresented.” (Schmaus 47)
  3. Luther (1483-1546)
     1. “. . . he was greatly attracted by Peter Lombard, [*Randbemerkungen in I Sent*., dist. 17 (Weimar, *Werke* 9.43)] and accepted only uncreated grace. He rejected the *habitus* because he wanted to express a personal contact with Christ, and not contact with a thing.” (Moeller and Philips 2)
     2. “The Protestants have the impression that our conception of grace as an infused *habitus*, as a created reality, virtually turns it into a ‘thing’ that is at man’s disposal, like a kind of accumulator of [7] divine energy with the human will operating the switchboard.” (Moeller and Philips 7-8)
     3. “. . . created grace is not in any sense considered as a sort of ‘autonomous pos­ses­sion’ of a man, per­mitting him in a way to do without the continual saving activity of God; on the contrary, it is always produced by God Himself, ‘present in the soul.’” (Moeller and Philips 25)
     4. “. . . the *habitus* conceived of according to the ideas of Biel [Gabriel Biel] or Ockham [William of Ockham, 1285?-1349?] could not but be something separate from God, shut off inside the closed system of humanity, with God removed to an arbitrary and inaccessible transcendence. Because nominalism could conceive of no real contact between the creature and the Creator . . .” (Moeller and Philips 29)
     5. “Grace cannot be a thing we possess; it is always inseparable from a person who loves, who gives Himself, who brings us into communion with Himself. This is the essential point in Refor­mation theology.” (Moeller and Philips 38)
     6. “In an adequate presentation, such as that of St. Bonaventure, for example (*habere est haberi* [“to possess is to be possessed”]), Luther would not have rejected created grace.” (Moeller and Philips 29)
     7. “. . . Luther’s opposition to the *habitus* is partly explained by the influence on him of the German mystics; the mystics insisted particularly on the *passiveness* of the mystic life.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
  4. Trent (1545-63)
     1. At Trent “the Church spoke of a varying degree of righteousness, within man, although coming from outside him.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
     2. “The principal intention of the Triden­tine decrees is to teach that this righteous­ness comes not from man but from God; and what the Council emphasizes is the real transformation of man by it; hence the terms *inhaerens*, *infusa permanens*, *capax augmenti*.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
        1. “The Tridentine Fathers do not use the terms *habitus* or *gratia creata*.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
        2. “The Council of Trent limits itself to speaking of the grace of justification as ‘infused’ and ‘inherent’; it does not impose as of faith the terms *habitus* and ‘created grace.’” (Moeller and Philips 18)
     3. “One might sum up the doc­trine of Trent in the words: *the righteousness of God*, *but shared by man*.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
     4. “Sanctification was not taken into consideration by the Council of Trent, which con­tented itself with a number of statements about justification which the Re­formers denied, attributing them instead to sanctification.” (Moeller and Philips 40)
  5. after Trent
     1. “. . . later theology was concerned above all with the ‘production’ of grace, the idea [30] of ‘participation’ falling more or less into the background. Inter­est became more and more concentrated on *gratia creata* (and very soon, on actual grace).” (Moeller and Philips 30-31)
     2. “With Lessius, Cornelius à Lapide and Petavius, who were better acquainted with the Greek Fa­thers, the idea of *gratia increata*, that is, the in­dwelling of the Holy Spirit, found its way back into the theology of the time.” (Moeller and Philips 31)
     3. “. . . though post­-tridentine theology has sometimes followed the rather danger­ous course of limiting the discussion to created grace and actual grace, since Petavius and Schee­ben theologians have tried to present a much fuller picture; there has been a real ef­fort to produce a theology where the two sides, the *habitus* and in­dwelling, are seen in their relationship to one another.” (Moeller and Philips 43)

1. **concept of “created grace”**
   1. God truly gives himself. But “this gift would be a sham if God did not in reality make man live by His own divine life. There is a paradox here: in one sense, every­thing comes from God, and in another, every­thing comes from man, because no one is ever saved or damned who has not willed it.” (Moeller and Philips 9)
   2. “. . . the formula ‘created grace’ . . . can be reconciled perfectly well with the primacy of God in saving [18] . . . the idea of created grace [24] is in no way opposed to the primacy of God in saving and jus­tifying in a permanent action.” (Moeller and Philips 18, 24-25)
   3. “. . . one essential aspect of the *habitus* [is] that it is an en­tity that only comes into being in and through a *union*.” (Moeller and Philips 32)
   4. “What must be made clearer is that the created *habitus* is simply an *active readiness to receive*, in the sense that the soul does not follow the divine call unwillingly, but submits itself willingly in the course of a living and actual converse with the divine persons.” (Moeller and Philips 37)
   5. “. . . what appears is a more *habitual* sensitiveness (this phrase shows clearly the true meaning of the term *habitus*) to the *present* actions of the Spirit (and by this the primacy of God is clearly expressed).” (Moeller and Philips 36)
   6. “. . . God acts and we are passive, but this is, in fact, a higher form of activity. This mystical docility requires no new form of dis­position; clearly, if the nature of the *habitus* is prop­erly understood, it is nothing more than the *habitus* in its full development.” (Moeller and Philips 36)
   7. “Instead of saying, like St. Albert the Great, ‘*with* the gift of grace (*cum quo*), God is given to us,’ it is better to say with St. Thomas, ‘*in* it . . . God is given to us’: ‘in’ does not mean that God is imprisoned, and put at the soul’s disposal, like electricity switched into the circuit where it is needed; it means that the *habitus* can only exist because God constantly produces it within us.” (Moeller and Philips 36)
   8. Several elements “must be jealously preserved in speculative theology [about sanctifying grace]; though, of course, they are not all equally important.” (Moeller and Philips 32)
      1. “The first is that God’s love is *effective*. If we remember that the word *dabar*, in Hebrew, means both ‘word’ and ‘action,’ so that, for example, what God says comes about, we can see how in the same way [the love of God] likewise makes something come to pass . . .” (Moeller and Philips 33)
      2. “Secondly, this change *lasts*; we must never lose sight of the dynamic nature of the *habitus*, which is [not] a state we are in . . .” (Moeller and Philips 33)
         1. “. . . in using the expression ‘state of grace,’ as preachers and moral­ists very commonly do, there may be a certain risk of misunder­standing. It is the *habitus* that causes the state to result in an act; our God-given knowledge and love are poised ready for action.” (Moeller and Philips 33)
         2. “Therefore grace can be increased, simply because when the union with God grows closer, His grace is more freely im­planted . . .” It could not be increased, if grace were merely a state. (Moeller and Philips 33)
         3. “So when the *habitus* grows deeper and more powerful, it is the union with God that is being made closer; in this sense, for one’s acts to be more supernatural, does not mean an increase in the quantity of the state of grace (seen as a [33] thing, like a sum of money increasing at compound interest), but simply to be governed more by the Spirit, to be more recep­tive to Him. [33] . . . All this is per­fectly biblical . . .” (Moeller and Philips 33-34) See Rom 8:14, “all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God.”
      3. “Thirdly, God acts *directly* in the *habitus*. In other words, there is no ‘object’ in be­tween. . . . The *habitus*, so St. Bonaventure says, does not make us possess God, but makes us possess an action that guides us towards Him, in the sense that we are set free (from our . . . faults) on ac­count of having made that act of love—which never ceases to be caused in us by the love of God.” (Moeller and Philips 34)
      4. “Fourthly, we must retain what has been very suitably called ‘the *vital­ism* of the *habitus*.’” (Moeller and Philips 35)
         1. “God is present to the soul: an ex­change takes place in which our free will is perfectly unimpaired, but our nature grows more and more like God’s. We have no control over God, only over our ability to make an act of love towards God; this, however . . . is *the result of the continual presence and activity of God*. He raises us up, He sets us free, but never does us violence; it is still God, always God, who is the active cause . . .” (Moeller and Philips 35)
         2. God “makes us act [Phil 2:13] without its being possible to say that God alone acts [Phil 2:12] . . .” (Moeller and Philips 35)
            1. Phil 2:12-13, “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; 13for it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”
   9. “It may be doubted whether the term *created grace*, which has never been imposed as of faith, is very for­tunate in such a sense. It is no doubt danger­ous to abandon such an ancient expression, but terms must be used in the sense they were meant to have when they were coined . . .” (Moeller and Philips 37)
   10. “Perhaps one might be allowed to use the expression of Père de la Taille, ‘actuation créée par acte incréé,’ [“created actualizing by an uncreated act”] applying it, *mutatis mutandis*, to grace. [“‘Actuation créée par acte incréé,’ is a phrase which cannot readily be put directly into English. The French phrase is therefore left to stand. Its significance may be represented as follows: ‘God’s uncreated act supplies a created actualizing to the creature,’ or ‘The creature is perfected in its nature by an uncreated act.’” Moeller and Philips 37 n. 8] The term ‘created’ is still there, but, applied to the term ‘actuation,’ it is meant to express the permanent presence of God, always underlying the activity and continually, as the *quasi forma*, informing it.” (Moeller and Philips 37, 37 n. 8)

## Aquinas on God Moving the Free Will

Aquinas (*ST* 1.113.3 *corpus*): “The justification of the ungodly is brought about by God moving man to justice. . . . Now God moves everything in its own manner, just as we see that in natural things . . . Hence He moves man to justice according to the condition of his human nature. But it is man’s proper nature to have free-will. Hence in him who has the use of reason, God’s motion to justice does not take place without a movement of the free-will; but He so infuses the gift of justifying grace that at the same time He moves the free-will to accept the gift of grace, in such as are capable of being moved thus.”

## The Theological and Moral Virtues

1. **introduction**
   1. definitions
      1. A habit is a tendency to do a certain act that results from repeated doings of the act.
      2. A “virtue” is a good habit.
      3. A “vice” is a bad habit.
      4. Man “is a being with bodily powers . . . and with powers of the mind by which he can seek to understand his environment and enjoy it, to get rid of obstacles and develop his powers . . . In order to achieve this he can train himself in habits which will enable him to use his powers more easily and effectively. Virtues are habits which tend towards man’s perfection, while vices are habits which tend against his perfection.” (Pontifex 10)
   2. On the basis of scripture the Church taught “that in the communication of himself to man, God brought about a healing—a change not only in man’s metaphysical essence but in his powers as well. The form in which this thesis was expressed was that the justified man was given theological and moral virtues. Although the transformation of a sinner into a new man always encompasses the whole person, different elements in the process can be distinguished: sanctifying grace as the basis and the virtues connected with it.” (Schmaus 82)
   3. “In ecclesiastical and theological language, an “infusion” of these virtues is spoken of. The meaning of this expression is that the human powers are permeated by God and orientated towards him, but not in such a way that man is wholly freed of the burden of trials and temp­tation. In this context the word virtue has a different sense from that of the Aristotelian ethic. Here what is meant is a growth in likeness of the human power to the divine in which an orientation towards God is also included. Thus the virtues are aids to right action; but in a higher sense [82] and more specifically they are conditions for the divinizing of man’s activity.” (Schmaus 82-83)
2. **theological and moral virtues**
   1. “. . . our will needs supernatural aptitudes or virtues which adapt it, as it were, to perform everything under the action of charity.” Grace gives the theological virtues, whose “object is God himself: God in his infinite truth for faith, God in his infinite mercy for hope, God in his infinite loving-kindness for charity.” Grace also gives “the supernatural moral virtues, which adapt our wills not to God himself but to our conduct . . .” (Daujat 108)
   2. “The theological virtues—faith, hope, and love—are to be under­stood as those modifications of the human powers which enable the justified man to accept God on his word; to desire, trust, and strive towards him; and to love him. In Aristotelian terms, one could say that God is both material and formal object of these virtues.” (Schmaus 83)
   3. “By moral virtues the scholastic theologians understand those divine modifications of the human powers which assist man in mastering his daily situation in faith, hope, and love; that is, enable him to act in every situation in a way conforming to his union with God. Here the material object is something created, but the formal object is God. There are further classifications under the moral virtues, of which the cardinal virtues are the most important and the foundation.” (Schmaus 83)
   4. “. . . the Council of Vienne (1311-1312, DS 904) and that of Trent (DS 1530f.) declared that in the divine act of justification man is given the capacity for a divinizing life in faith, hope, and love. Actually this teaching of the Council of Trent does not differ from the idea of regeneration put forward by the Refor­mers, which refers simply to the justifying action of God himself in man.” (Schmaus 83)
3. **faith, hope, and love**
   1. the theological virtues in Paul
      1. verses with “faith,” “hope,” and “love”
         1. Rom 5:1-5, “since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 through whom we have obtained access to this grace in which we stand; and we boast in our hope of sharing the glory of God. 3 And not only that, but we also boast in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, 4 and endurance produces character, and character produces hope, 5 and hope does not disappoint us, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.”
         2. 1 Cor 13:7, “It [love] bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.”
         3. 1 Cor 13:13, “And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.”
         4. Col 1:4-5, “we have heard of your faith in Christ Jesus and of the love that you have for all the saints, 5 because of the hope laid up for you in heaven.”
         5. 1 Thess 1:3, “remembering before our God and Father your work of faith and labor of love and steadfastness of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.”
         6. 1 Thess 5:8, “But since we belong to the day, let us be sober, and put on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation.”
      2. verses with only “faith” and “love”
         1. 1 Cor 13:2, “And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing.”
         2. 2 Cor 8:7, “Now as you excel in everything—in faith, in speech, in knowledge, in utmost eager­ness, and in our love for you—so we want you to excel also in this generous under­taking.”
         3. Gal 5:6, “For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love.”
         4. Eph 1:15, “I have heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and your love toward all the saints . . .”
         5. Eph 3:17, “and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith, as you are being rooted and grounded in love.”
         6. Eph 6:23, “Peace be to the whole community, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.”
         7. Col 1:4, “for we have heard of your faith in Christ Jesus and of the love that you have for all the saints . . .”
         8. 1 Thess 3:6, “But Timothy has just now come to us from you, and has brought us the good news of your faith and love. He has told us also that you always remember us kindly and long to see us—just as we long to see you.”
         9. 2 Thess 1:3, “We must always give thanks to God for you, brothers and sisters, as is right, be­cause your faith is growing abundantly, and the love of everyone of you for one another is increasing.”
         10. 1 Tim 1:5, “But the aim of such instruction is love that comes from a pure heart, a good con­science, and sincere faith.”
         11. 1 Tim 1:14, “and the grace of our Lord overflowed for me with the faith and love that are in Christ Jesus.”
         12. 1 Tim 2:15, “Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty.”
         13. 1 Tim 4:12, “Let no one despise your youth, but set the believers an example in speech and conduct, in love, in faith, in purity.”
         14. 1 Tim 6:10‑11, “For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, and in their eagerness to be rich some have wandered away from the faith and pierced themselves with many pains. 11 But as for you, man of God, shun all this; pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, endurance, gentleness.”
         15. 2 Tim 1:13, “Hold to the standard of sound teaching that you have heard from me, in the faith and love that are in Christ Jesus.”
         16. 2 Tim 2:22, “Shun youthful passions and pursue righteousness, faith, love, and peace, along with those who call on the Lord from a pure heart.”
         17. 2 Tim 3:10, “Now you have observed my teaching, my conduct, my aim in life, my faith, my patience, my love, my steadfastness . . .”
         18. Titus 2:2, “Tell the older men to be temperate, serious, prudent, and sound in faith, in love, and in endurance.”
         19. Titus 3:15, “All who are with me send greetings to you. Greet those who love us in the faith. Grace be with all of you.”
         20. Philem 1:5, “because I hear of your love for all the saints and your faith toward the Lord Jesus.”
      3. verses with only “faith” and “hope”
         1. 2 Cor 10:15, “We do not boast beyond limits, that is, in the labors of others; but our hope is that, as your faith increases, our sphere of action among you may be greatly enlarged . . .”
         2. Gal 5:5, “For through the Spirit, by faith, we eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness.”
         3. Col 1:23, “provided that you continue securely established and steadfast in the faith, without shifting from the hope promised by the gospel that you heard, which has been pro­claimed to every creature under heaven. I, Paul, became a servant of this gospel.”
   2. “In faith, hope, and love the justified man reaches out towards the Father through Christ in the Holy Spirit [better: in the Holy Spirit through Christ towards the Father—Hahn]. Although he is already with God, he is at the same time called by God to himself. God is not only interiorly present to man as the Transcendent; he also stands before him, as the One calling him. The way is Jesus Christ. This way is constantly grasped anew in faith, which produces hope and love as fruits of itself. Faith is the foundation.” (Schmaus 84)
   3. “As faith is the foundation of hope and love, so love is the term of faith [Col 1:4-5; 1 Thess 1:3, 5,8—see quotations above]. Hope is ordered directly to the future. Inasmuch as it is inextricably bound up with faith and love, it carries these two also into the future in their own proper activity. Thus faith, hope, and love as a totality represent a future-orientated reality.” (Schmaus 84)
4. **faith as an element of the state of justification**
   1. “Since faith, hope, and love are the primary principles of the Christian life, it belongs to moral theology to examine and discuss them thoroughly. But . . . several aspects must be stressed.” (Schmaus 84)
   2. “. . . faith is the movement towards Jesus Christ brought about by God. At the same time it is the act effected by God in which man holds fast to Christ, who is turning towards him and apprehended by him. Faith is the perpetual reaching beyond the self to Jesus Christ and the life of union with him. The encounter and union with Jesus Christ naturally implies an encounter also with the heavenly Father brought about by the Holy Spirit.” (Schmaus 84)
   3. “Included in the assent to Christ is the assent to his teachings, since the word of Jesus cannot be separated from his person. He is the Word of the eternal Father spoken in the world. The Father speaks his Word in history, clothed in the human nature of Jesus. The self-revelation of [84] God transmitted to men by Jesus during his life is the translation into human speech of the Word personally spoken by the Father. To examine and accept Jesus’ words means nothing other than to ponder and accept the Word spoken by the Father (Jn. 1,12).” (Schmaus 84-85) John 1:12, “to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God . . .”
   4. “Thomas Aquinas’s definition of faith as an assent of the intellect moved by the will, as an acceptance on the authority of God of the truth of what God has revealed, is a correct definition but not an exhaustive one. For the holding as true is in reality the holding fast of the personal, incarnate Word of God him­self. The believer does not simply or primarily assent in faith to truths or true statements, essential though this may be; rather, he assents to a living, personal Reality. He is not related to the content of his affirma­tion as subject to object; the relation is that of an encounter between persons—an encounter, to be sure, initiated by Christ. But while under­standing faith as an encounter, one must still say that it includes an intellectual element insofar as it is the affirmation of what has been communicated by Christ to men of the eternal divine decree of salvation.” (Schmaus 85)
   5. “Likewise in Scripture faith is characterized not only as seeing but also as surrender in obedience [John 6:45; Rom 1:5, 17; Rom 3:28; Rom 9:32; Gal 2:16; Eph 2:4-9, 3:16-19]. It involves being convinced of the truth of what is not yet seen, of a hidden reality [Heb 11:1].” (Schmaus 85)
      1. John 6:45, “It is written in the prophets, ‘And they shall all be taught by God.’ Everyone who has heard and learned from the Father comes to me.”
      2. Rom 1:5, “we have received grace and apostleship to bring about the obedience of faith among all the Gentiles . . .”
      3. Rom 1:17, “in it [the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.””
      4. Rom 3:28, “we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.”
      5. Rom 9:32, “they [Israel] did not strive for it [righteousness] on the basis of faith, but as if it were based on works.”
      6. Gal 2:16, “we know that a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law.”
      7. Eph 2:4-9, “God, who is rich in mercy, out of the great love with which he loved us 5even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ—by grace you have been saved . . . 8 For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God—9 not the result of works, so that no one may boast.”
      8. Eph 3:16-19, “I pray that, according to the riches of his glory, he may grant that you may be strengthened in your inner being with power through his Spirit, 17 and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith, as you are being rooted and grounded in love. 18 I pray that you may have the power to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth, 19 and to know the love of Christ that surpasses knowledge, so that you may be filled with all the fullness of God.”
      9. Heb 11:1, “faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.”
   6. “In order that man may know the love of God which appears in Jesus Christ, he must become free of the tyranny of his own spirit and surren­der his power of knowledge to the divine Spirit. Only in the obedient surrender of his spirit to the Spirit of God does man achieve the power to see the realities which are disclosed, and at the same time veiled, in Christ [85] . . . [2 Cor 10:3-6]. In faith man gives up his own undiscerning will [Rom 10:2]. The reality he grasps in his obedient surrender to God is different from the experienced reality which is familiar to the natural man. Even when he “sees” in faith, things remain obscure and strange. They are familiar and unfamiliar at the same time [1 Cor 1:18-31; 2 Cor 5:7].” (Schmaus 85-86)
      1. Rom 10:2, “I can testify that they have a zeal for God, but it is not enlightened.”
      2. 1 Cor 1:18-31, “the message about the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. . . . 20 Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? 21 For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, God decided, through the foolishness of our proclamation, to save those who believe. 22 For Jews demand signs and Greeks desire wisdom, 23 but we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, 24 but to those who are the called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. 25 For God’s foolishness is wiser than human wisdom, and God’s weakness is stronger than human strength. 26 Consider your own call, brothers and sisters: not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth. 27 But God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong; 28 God chose what is low and despised in the world, things that are not, to reduce to nothing things that are, 29 so that no one might boast in the presence of God. 30 He is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, who became for us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption, 31 in order that, as it is written, “Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord.””
      3. 2 Cor 5:7, “we walk by faith, not by sight.”
      4. 2 Cor 10:3-6, “we live as human beings, but we do not wage war according to human standards; 4 for the weapons of our warfare are not merely human, but they have divine power to destroy strongholds. We destroy arguments 5 and every proud obstacle raised up against the knowledge of God, and we take every thought cap­tive to obey Christ. 6 We are ready to punish every disobedience when your obedience is complete.”
   7. “The primary basis for this twofold character of faith lies in the fact that God himself is a hidden God, that he exists in man as the transcen­dental reality. It is true that he is ever turned towards man in love. But this love is a prudent love, and the hiddenness of God is an element in its prudent character. The God who is always present ontologically becomes present existentially only for the person who is open to him. It is quite possible for a person who does not open himself to God in faith to suppose that God does not exist.” (Schmaus 86)
   8. “The Letter to the Hebrews presents a list of men of faith, attesting to the history of God’s self-revelation and man’s response, with Abraham at the head as the proto­type of all believers . . .: his faith is the model of faith itself. Abraham’s wanderings and Israel’s journey through the desert are the preparation for and the prefiguring of what took place in Christ. The land of Canaan is the earthly image of the future world. Jerusalem is the figure of the city of the future. Man sees these connections through faith without, of course, penetrating them: faith is both a knowing and a not-knowing (Heb. 11,3.8).” (Schmaus 86)
      1. Heb 11:3, “By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was made from things that are not visible.”
      2. Heb 11:8, “By faith Abraham obeyed when he was called to set out for a place that he was to receive as an inheritance; and he set out, not knowing where he was going.”
   9. “Faith is founded on the unseen, which will become visible only in the future. But . . . the future is in a certain sense already present, for the spiritual energies of the ages to come are already at work (Heb. 6,5)*.* The heavenly city is already dedicated by the blood of Jesus Christ (Heb. 9,24; 12,22f.). Man perceives this city in the distance in faith, but its very remoteness can bring him to doubt from which he is rescued only by his reliance on God’s promise. [86] . . . Since the eschatological fulfillment takes place in the resurrection from the dead, faith in the unseen and in the future becomes faith in the resurrection. Faith exists in the interval between the unfulfilled present and the fulfilling future.” (Schmaus 86-87)
      1. Heb 6:5-6, some “have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come, 6 and then have fallen away . . .”
      2. Heb 9:24, “Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by human hands, a mere copy of the true one, but he entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf.”
      3. Heb 12:22-23, “you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, 23 and to the assembly of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the righteous made perfect . . .”
   10. “. . . the intellectual element in faith is frequently represented by the image of light . . .” (Schmaus 87)
       1. “In the Old Testament, light is the symbol of happiness and salvation and is often mentioned in con­nection with life.” (Schmaus 87)
       2. “In the literature of late Judaism an imagery arose in which light and darkness are in sharp opposition: we meet it often in the Qumran texts, where the Sons of Light war against the Sons of Darkness. This dualism of light and darkness is also fundamental to gnosticism.” (Schmaus 87)
       3. “In the New Testament, light as the symbol of salvation is seen in close connection with Jesus Christ. Light is the domain of God and of Christ, and in this sense it is a dimension of the good and of righteousness. Darkness, as the domain of Satan, symbolizes evil and godlessness, even though Satan sometimes clothes himself as an angel of light (Lk. 16,8).” (Schmaus 87)
          1. Luke 16:8, “his master commended the dishonest manager because he had acted shrewdly; for the children of this age are more shrewd in dealing with their own generation than are the children of light.”
          2. Maybe Schmaus meant 2 Cor 11:14, “Even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light.”—Hahn
       4. Paul “avails himself of the symbolism of light. Through Christ light streams into the darkness (2 Cor. 4,4f.; 1 Thess. 5,4ff.). God has rescued us from the realm of dark­ness and placed us in the kingdom of his beloved Son, so that we may share in the inheritance of the saints in the realm of light . . .” (Schmaus 87)
          1. Rom 13:12, “the night is far gone, the day is near. Let us then lay aside the works of darkness and put on the armor of light . . .”
          2. 2 Cor 4:4-5, “the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God. 5 For we do not proclaim ourselves; we proclaim Jesus Christ as Lord and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus’ sake.”
          3. Eph 5:8-14, “For once you were darkness, but now in the Lord you are light. Live as children of light . . . 11 Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. 12 For it is shameful even to mention what such people do secretly; 13 but everything exposed by the light becomes visible, 14 for everything that becomes visible is light. Therefore it says, “Sleeper, awake! Rise from the dead, and Christ will shine on you.””
          4. Col 1:12-13, give “thanks to the Father, who has enabled you to share in the inheritance of the saints in the light. 13 He has rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved Son . . .”
          5. 1 Thess 5:4-8, “you, beloved, are not in darkness, for that day to surprise you like a thief; 5 for you are all children of light and children of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness. 6 So then let us not fall asleep as others do, but let us keep awake and be sober; 7 for those who sleep sleep at night, and those who are drunk get drunk at night. 8 But since we belong to the day, let us be sober, and put on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation.”
          6. 1 Pet 1:9, “you are receiving the outcome of your faith, the salvation of your souls.”
       5. “Those who believe in Christ are going forward towards the full revelation of the light (Acts 22,4f.).” (Schmaus 87)
          1. Acts 22:4-5 are irrelevant; Acts 22:6, 9, and 11 speak of the “great light from heaven” that shone about Paul on the Damascus road.—Hahn
       6. “We find the light symbolism most frequently and explicitly in John. It recalls the gnostic as well as the Qumran literature . . .” (Schmaus 87)
          1. John 3:19-21, “this is the judgment, that the light has come into the world, and people loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. 20 For all who do evil hate the light and do not come to the light, so that their deeds may not be exposed. 21 But those who do what is true come to the light, so that it may be clearly seen that their deeds have been done in God.”
          2. John 8:12, “I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness but will have the light of life.”
          3. John 9:5, “As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.”
          4. John 12:36, “While you have the light, believe in the light, so that you may become children of light.”
          5. 1 John 1:7, “if we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin.”
          6. 1 John 2:8-11, “I am writing you a new commandment that is true in him and in you, because the darkness is passing away and the true light is already shining. 9 Whoever says, “I am in the light,” while hating a brother or sister, is still in the darkness. 10 Whoever loves a brother or sister lives in the light, and in such a person there is no cause for stumbling. 11 But whoever hates another believer is in the darkness, walks in the darkness, and does not know the way to go, because the darkness has brought on blindness.”
   11. dead faith
       1. “Considering the place held by faith in the formal structure of justifi­cation, the question arises whether a person who separates himself from Christ and God through falling again into mortal sin loses his faith . . .” (Schmaus 87)
          1. “Not every­one who says to Christ: “Lord, Lord” (Mt. 7,21f.) can call himself Christ’s disciple, but only those who fulfill the will of the heavenly Father . . .” (Schmaus 96)
          2. James 2:14-26, “What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? 15 If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, 16 and one of you says to them, “Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill,” and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? 17 So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead. 18 But someone will say, “You have faith and I have works.” Show me your faith apart from your works, and I by my works will show you my faith. 19 You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder. 20 Do you want to be shown, you senseless person, that faith apart from works is barren? 21 Was not our ancestor Abraham justified by works when he offered his son Isaac on the altar? 22 You see that faith was active along with his works, and faith was brought to completion by the works. 23 Thus the scripture was fulfilled that says, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness,” and he was called the friend of God. 24 You see that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone. 25 Likewise, was not Rahab the prostitute also justified by works when she welcomed the messengers and sent them out by another road? 26 For just as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is also dead.”
       2. “The Council of Trent stated that there is an “unformed” faith, a “dead” faith, which is not nourished by love. According to James, the devils also can have such faith . . .” (Schmaus 87)
          1. James 2:17, “faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.”
          2. James 2:19, “You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder.”
          3. James 2:26, “just as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is also dead.”
       3. “It is a complete mystery how [87] anyone can assent in faith to Jesus Christ, and through him to the Father in heaven, without in some sense loving him. It cannot amount to more than a routine performance, insincere and entirely superficial, too weak to involve any real surrender to God.” (Schmaus 87-88)
       4. “Although this “dead” faith is insufficient for salvation, it is still a gift of God, for it can be the beginning of a revivified submission to God. But it is also described in Scripture as a way to that trembling in which the devils make their submission. In any case, it must be granted that there is a defect of faith in every mortal sin, an absence of living faith.” (Schmaus 88)
   12. “If faith, as a community of existence with Christ, in a certain sense also means a community of mind with him and the heavenly Father and an assent to everything that comes from God, including the creation, then in its most essential sense it does not mean a limitation on human thinking but an expansion and liberation of it. But in binding us to Jesus Christ it offers an assurance against error in the ultimate questions of human life. Since man attains his true self only in self-transcendence, faith is the way to true and living selfhood, the way in which a man truly possesses himself.” (Schmaus 88)
5. **hope as an element of the state of justification**
   1. scripture
      1. “The Christian’s hope has models in extrabiblical sources, but its prototype is found primarily in the Old Testament. So long as man lives, he hopes (Qo. 9,4). Hope addresses itself to God not only in need but in happiness. It is true that the divine decrees are not revealed to man, but he is certain of God’s love and protection. He puts his trust not in assurances that he himself creates but in God (Am. 6,1; Is. 19,3; 32,9ff.; Pr. 14,6; 16,9; Ps. 33,10). It is only confidence in God, the Unfathom­able, over whom man has none of the control he has over his own earthly forces, that frees him from anxiety in his life (Is. 7,4; 12,2; Ps. 46,3; Pr. 28.1). Finally, hope is directed to the elimination of all man’s need through the expected Messiah.” (Schmaus 89)
         1. Qoh 9:4, “whoever is joined with all the living has hope, for a living dog is better than a dead lion.”
         2. Amos 6:1, “Alas for those who are at ease in Zion, and for those who feel secure on Mount Samaria, the notables of the first of the nations, to whom the house of Israel resorts!”
         3. Isa 19:3, “the spirit of the Egyptians within them will be emptied out, and I will confound their plans; they will consult the idols and the spirits of the dead and the ghosts and the familiar spirits . . .”
         4. Isa 32:9-17, “Rise up, you women who are at ease . . . 14 For the palace will be forsaken, the populous city deserted; the hill and the watchtower will become dens forever, the joy of wild asses, a pasture for flocks; 15 until a spirit from on high is poured out on us, and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field, and the fruitful field is deemed a forest. 16 Then justice will dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness abide in the fruitful field. 17 The effect of righteousness will be peace, and the result of righteousness, quietness and trust forever.”
         5. Prov 14:6, “A scoffer seeks wisdom in vain, but knowledge is easy for one who understands.”
         6. Prov 16:9, “The human mind plans the way, but the Lord directs the steps.”
         7. Ps 33:10, “The Lord brings the counsel of the nations to nothing; he frustrates the plans of the peoples.”
         8. Isa 7:4, “do not let your heart be faint because of these two smoldering stumps of firebrands, because of the fierce anger of Rezin and Aram and the son of Remaliah.”
         9. Isa 12:2, “Surely God is my salvation; I will trust, and will not be afraid, for the Lord God is my strength and my might; he has become my salvation.”
         10. Ps 46:3, “though its waters roar and foam, though the mountains tremble with its tumult.”
         11. Prov 28:1, “The wicked flee when no one pursues, but the righteous are as bold as a lion.”
      2. “In the New Testament, hope is also described as a gift of God. The challenge to man to be active in shaping his future is radicalized, for Christ brought a new epoch wherein all mankind is caught up in faith into the general movement of history which is that of salvation. Yet this is only a beginning: the form of the world is “in process,” still to be completed . . .” (Schmaus 89)
         1. 1 Cor 7:31, be as “those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it. For the present form of this world is passing away.”
         2. 1 Cor 15:32, “If with merely human hopes I fought with wild animals at Ephesus, what would I have gained by it? If the dead are not raised, “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.””
      3. “The power of evil has been struck a mortal blow, yet its capacity to tempt men to sin has not been eliminated: the Christian is on the way but not at his goal . . . (Rom. 8,­24f.). Whoever takes hold of Christ in the obscurity of faith strives towards that state wherein Christ will show himself openly to the whole creation. This vivifying hope works as an inexhaustible source of energy for all human activity . . .” (Schmaus 89)
         1. Rom 8:24-25, “in hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what is seen? 25 But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.”
         2. Col 1:4-5, “we have heard of your faith in Christ Jesus and of the love that you have for all the saints, 5 because of the hope laid up for you in heaven. You have heard of this hope before in the word of the truth, the gospel . . .”
         3. 1 Thess 5:8, “But since we belong to the day, let us be sober, and put on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation.”
         4. [Neither 1 Pet 1:1-2 nor 2 Pet 1:1-2 seems relevant.—Hahn]
      4. “Hope is not a vague confidence in survival through the upsets of history. Living in history with certain hope for the absolute future, we need not anxiously ask ourselves what will come next. What the Christian hopes for is the face-to-face encounter with the glorified Lord and the God who is always present, though hidden, within history: thus he hopes [89] not only for the fulfillment of individual and community life but for the final fulfillment of the cosmos as well . . .” (Schmaus 89-90)
         1. Acts 23:6, Paul “called out in the council, . . . “I am on trial concerning the hope of the resurrection of the dead.””
         2. Acts 24:15, “I have a hope in God . . . that there will be a resurrection of both the righteous and the unrighteous.”
         3. 1 Cor 15:19, “If for this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all people most to be pitied.”
         4. Col 1:4-5, “we have heard of your faith in Christ Jesus and of the love that you have for all the saints, 5 because of the hope laid up for you in heaven. You have heard of this hope before in the word of the truth, the gospel . . .”
         5. 1 Tim 4:10, “to this end we toil and struggle, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all people, especially of those who believe.”
         6. Titus 1:1-2, “Paul, a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ, for the sake of the faith of God’s elect and the knowledge of the truth that is in accordance with godliness, 2 in the hope of eternal life that God, who never lies, promised before the ages began . . .”
         7. Titus 3:7, “so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”
         8. Heb 6:18-19, “so that through two unchangeable things, in which it is impossible that God would prove false, we who have taken refuge might be strongly encouraged to seize the hope set before us. 19 We have this hope, a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul, a hope that enters the inner shrine behind the curtain . . .”
         9. Heb 7:19, “the law made nothing perfect . . . there is, on the other hand, the introduction of a better hope, through which we approach God.”
         10. 1 Pet 1:3, “By his [the Father’s] great mercy he has given us a new birth into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead . . .”
      5. “When the Christian hopes for “eternal life,” it is for a life free from all oppression and come to the fullness of its perfection, a life of love for the individual and the community in dialogue with God. In the midst of this present era wherein death rules, the Christian looks towards an era in which life will be sovereign.” (Schmaus 90)
      6. “This hope brings him into a new relationship with suffering. In suffering he experiences the painful tension between the now and the then, between the pilgrimage and the heavenly home. In the power of hope he directs his gaze upwards and endures his suffering until that hour when God will relieve him of it . . .” (Schmaus 90)
         1. 2 Cor 4:7-5:10, “we have this treasure in clay jars, so that it may be made clear that this extraordinary power belongs to God and does not come from us. 8 We are afflicted in every way, but not crushed; perplexed, but not driven to despair; 9 persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed; 10 always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be made visible in our bodies. 11 For while we live, we are always being given up to death for Jesus’ sake, so that the life of Jesus may be made visible in our mortal flesh. 12 So death is at work in us, but life in you. 13 But just as we have the same spirit of faith that is in accordance with scripture—“I believed, and so I spoke”—we also believe, and so we speak, 14 because we know that the one who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus, and will bring us with you into his presence. 15 Yes, everything is for your sake, so that grace, as it extends to more and more people, may increase thanksgiving, to the glory of God. 16 So we do not lose heart. Even though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed day by day. 17 For this slight momentary affliction is preparing us for an eternal weight of glory beyond all measure, 18 because we look not at what can be seen but at what cannot be seen; for what can be seen is temporary, but what cannot be seen is eternal. 5:1 For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. 2 For in this tent we groan, longing to be clothed with our heavenly dwelling—3 if indeed, when we have taken it off we will not be found naked. 4 For while we are still in this tent, we groan under our burden, because we wish not to be unclothed but to be further clothed, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life. 5 He who has prepared us for this very thing is God, who has given us the Spirit as a guarantee. 6 So we are always confident; even though we know that while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord—7 for we walk by faith, not by sight. 8 Yes, we do have confidence, and we would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord. 9 So whether we are at home or away, we make it our aim to please him. 10 For all of us must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil.”
         2. 2 Cor 6:4-10, “as servants of God we have commended ourselves in every way: through great endurance, in afflictions, hardships, calamities, 5 beatings, imprisonments, riots, labors, sleepless nights, hunger; 6 by purity, knowledge, patience, kindness, holiness of spirit, genuine love, 7 truthful speech, and the power of God; with the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and for the left; 8 in honor and dishonor, in ill repute and good repute. We are treated as impostors, and yet are true; 9 as unknown, and yet are well known; as dying, and see—we are alive; as punished, and yet not killed; 10 as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing everything.”
         3. Phil 1:12-26, “I want you to know, beloved that what has happened to me has actually helped to spread the gospel . . . 18 I will continue to rejoice, 19 for I know that through your prayers and the help of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance. 20 It is my eager expectation and hope that I will not be put to shame in any way, but that by my speaking with all boldness, Christ will be exalted now as always in my body, whether by life or by death. 21 For to me, living is Christ and dying is gain. 22 If I am to live in the flesh, that means fruitful labor for me; and I do not know which I prefer. 23 I am hard pressed between the two: my desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better; 24 but to remain in the flesh is more necessary for you. 25 Since I am convinced of this, I know that I will remain . . .”
         4. 1 Tim 4:10, “to this end we toil and struggle, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all people, especially of those who believe.”
      7. “Hope is the source of that energy which gives him rest and security, peace and joy, in the trials, sorrows, struggles, setbacks, and tragedies of the world, always enabling him to make a new beginning . . .” (Schmaus 90)
         1. Rom 5:4, “endurance produces character, and character produces hope . . .”
         2. Rom 12:12, “Rejoice in hope, be patient in suffering, persevere in prayer.”
         3. Rom 15:13, “May the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, so that you may abound in hope by the power of the Holy Spirit.”
      8. “Hope has power, too, over death, that great terror against which no earthly force is effective. (This proves the transiency of all earthly life.) Anyone who is unable to integrate death into his life has only a shadowy hope and in the end none at all—no matter how many blessings he expects from the future . . .” (Schmaus 90)
         1. 1 Thess 4:13, “we do not want you to be uninformed, brothers and sisters, about those who have died, so that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope.”
         2. Phil 1:20, “It is my eager expectation and hope that I will not be put to shame in any way, but that by my speaking with all boldness, Christ will be exalted now as always in my body, whether by life or by death.”
      9. “A radical hope in the absolute future does not involve any rejection or devaluation of the present out of spiritualistic or mystical motives. On the contrary, the very fact that this earthly life is a step to the future gives it extraordinary importance: eternity is present in time. In the hope of what is to come there is a perpetual challenge to sanctification, to a transformation belonging to the vocation of those who believe in Christ . . .” (Schmaus 90)
         1. Eph 4:1-4, “I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beg you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called, 2 with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, 3 making every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. 4 There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling . . .”
         2. Titus 2:11, “the grace of God has appeared, bringing salvation to all . . .”
         3. 1 Pet 1:13-14, “prepare your minds for action; discipline yourselves; set all your hope on the grace that Jesus Christ will bring you when he is revealed. 14 Like obedient children, do not be conformed to the desires that you formerly had in ignorance.”
         4. 1 John 3:3, “all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure.”
      10. “But this vocation is not to be realized apart from the world but in its midst, in the very shaping of it. Not in proud isolation but in the service of others does man attain to his true self. The service of our neighbour, wherein our union with Christ is achieved, involves the creation of a properly human order in all the areas of life. What will constitute such an order at any time cannot be predetermined; it changes with the progress of history. Therefore hope in the future calls for a constant alertness and attention . . .” (Schmaus 90)
      11. “The virtue of hope would be wholly lacking if we were content to let the present be, thinking that in the face of the absolute future, concern for the present is fruitless. The Christian lives in this world with the consciousness of a serious responsibility coupled with a great interior freedom. Hope in the life to come endows him with the spirit of liberty in speech and action (2 Cor. 3,12), even to the point of risking his life for Christ . . .” (Schmaus 91)
          1. Acts 7:55-60, “filled with the Holy Spirit, he [Stephen] gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. . . . 59 While they were stoning Stephen, he prayed, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” 60 Then he knelt down and cried out in a loud voice, “Lord, do not hold this sin against them.” When he had said this, he died.”
          2. Matt 10:28-29, “Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell. 29 Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father.”
          3. Eph 1:18, may God give wisdom “so that, with the eyes of your heart enlightened, you may know what is the hope to which he has called you, what are the riches of his glorious inheritance among the saints . . .”
          4. 1 Pet 3:15, “in your hearts sanctify Christ as Lord. Always be ready to make your defense to anyone who demands from you an accounting for the hope that is in you . . .”
      12. “The enduring power of this active hope, whereby man is enabled never to give up in the face of any attack, is received through faith in Jesus Christ from God himself . . .” (Schmaus 91)
          1. 1 Pet 1:21, “Through him you have come to trust in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope are set on God.”
          2. Luke 24:26, “Was it not necessary that the Messiah should suffer these things and then enter into his glory?”
          3. Col 1:25-29, “I became its servant according to God’s commission that was given to me for you, to make the word of God fully known, 26 the mystery that has been hidden throughout the ages and generations but has now been revealed to his saints. 27 To them God chose to make known how great among the Gentiles are the riches of the glory of this mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory. 28 It is he whom we proclaim, warning everyone and teaching everyone in all wisdom, so that we may present everyone mature in Christ. 29 For this I toil and struggle with all the energy that he powerfully inspires within me.”
          4. 1 Tim 1:1, “Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the command of God our Savior and of Christ Jesus our hope . . .”
          5. Rom 5:5-6, “hope does not disappoint us, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us. 6 For while we were still weak, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly.”
          6. “When the Christian’s hope is deprived of all earthly foundation, it nevertheless finds tangible support in faith. The Letter to the Romans says (Rom. 5,5f.): “Such a hope is no mockery, because God’s love has flooded our inmost heart through the Holy Spirit he has given us.”” (Schmaus 91)
   2. speculations
      1. “In his existence in history, man lives essentially in the expectation of what is to come, whether joyful or sorrowful, and feels compelled to shape future events so far as he can. He can never be wholly content with the present order, but finds himself constantly called to move ahead and to restructure the present into new and better forms. He necessarily lives in an evolutionary movement. In extreme instances the evolutionary progress takes on—and must take on—a revolutionary character. The Marxist philosophy provides a theory within history for this perpetual activity of man in constructing the future. It has the shape of hope.” (Schmaus 88)
      2. “This active hope is essential to man. When we use the phrase “Christian hope” it is not in opposition to the secular concept of striving forward into the future; nevertheless it exceeds all worldly hopes not only on the vertical plane but on the horizontal plane as well. It reaches beyond all possible structures within history and directs itself towards the final form of creation and of human life. As a theolo­gical virtue, hope looks for this order as coming from God himself. It [88] involves the conviction that the final order planned by God can be brought about only when man lets himself be called into it by God. Obedience to this divine call includes the highest activity of man. Active hope, whereby man not only awaits what is to come but also shapes it, is so essential to the Christian living within history that without it there is no possible realization of Christian existence.” (Schmaus 88-89)
6. **love as an element of the state of justification**
   1. overview
      1. “. . . God’s dialogue with man in salvation history is one of love even when he appears as judge . . . . According to John, God is love in all his manifestations . . .” (Schmaus 91)
         1. 1 John 4:16-18, “we have known and believe the love that God has for us. God is love, and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them. 17 Love has been perfected among us in this: that we may have boldness on the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world. 18 There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear; for fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not reached perfection in love.”
      2. Augustine said that Christ “is Love entering into time. Love is . . . the entrance of the creative divine activity into human existence.” (Schmaus 91)
      3. “Paul refers to the redeemed man as a man “in” Christ. The expression “in Christ” has a dynamic sense: it means participation in the life of Christ. If Jesus Christ, particularly in his glorified existence, is the love of God in history, then participation in his life is participation in the divine love realized in him. The participation is established through faith wherein man, under the influence of creative divine grace, so fully surrenders himself to Jesus Christ that his existence becomes coexistence with Christ and in a decisive way realizes the meaning of a universal existence, which the coexistence essentially is. In this faith, as the Council of Trent brought out (DS 1526)*,* love is already operative in an incipient form. It develops into its perfect and enduring form in the process of justification.” (Schmaus 91)
      4. “. . . this process whereby man is transformed [91] is described as an infusion of heavenly love (DS 1530f.).” [91-92] “The infusion of heavenly love is attested in the Scriptures, which describe it as the “outpouring” of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2,18; Rom. 5,5). In theology and in the Church’s tradition, the Holy Spirit is characterized as the expression and the seal of that love which binds the Father to the eternal Logos.” (Schmaus 91-93)
         1. Acts 2:18, “Even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.”
         2. Rom 5:5, “hope does not disappoint us, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.”
      5. To speak of an “infusion of heavenly love” “is to say that thereafter [God] provides the impulse for an activity which arises out of love and remains rooted in love. Redemption, or justifica­tion, and love cannot be separated (DS 1561). The attainment of love on man’s part comes as a response to the impulse given by divine love (1 Jn. 4,19). The state of loving union with God comes into being as God . . . eternally gives the impulse of grace. So the scriptural injunction can be understood: “Abide in love” (1 Jn. 4,16), or: “Live in love” (Eph. 5,2). This command is the correlate of the promise that love will remain in the man who is open to God (1 Jn. 4,6f.). In the perfection of love, [justification] reaches its high-point.” (Schmaus 91-92)
         1. 1 John 4:6-7, “We are from God. Whoever knows God listens to us, and whoever is not from God does not listen to us. From this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error. 7 Beloved, let us love one another, because love is from God; everyone who loves is born of God and knows God.”
         2. 1 John 4:19, “We love because he first loved us.”
      6. “It must be said that lack of love is a sign of the absence of redemption, for sin is always a defect of love. The gravity of sin is measured by the extent of this deficiency; it is the norm whereby the extent of a man’s involvement in sin is judged.” (Schmaus 92)
      7. Love “is not one action among many others but the activity in which man is seen as man. . . . The reality of the personal self comes into being through love. By redemption man is placed in that state wherein he can realize love as the main force of personal existence in a meaningful and creative way. He is freed of the bonds of sin, which is nothing other than the domination of the self, the lust for power. In the act of redemption man is freed from himself for himself . . . Such a liberation includes the freeing of the individual for the encounter with others . . . Since the orientation towards and openness to others belongs essentially to human personality, there cannot possibly be a liberation of the true self that is not basically a redemption of this openness towards others . . . To be redeemed is to be for others.” (Schmaus 92)
      8. “. . . man’s openness is directed not only towards other men but also towards God . . . The redeemed man lives essentially [92] in the threefold action of surrender to God, encounter with the human thou, and achievement of his own being. But these three acts are not really separate; they are a single act with a threefold dimension. In the human intention sometimes one, sometimes the other, direction is emphasized; but if the total act is not to be destroyed, none of the dimensions can be completely excluded.” (Schmaus 93)
   2. scripture
      1. Old Testament
         1. “. . . from the first form of love [attraction to the object] we pass on to a higher form of love which is a “giving” to the being loved.” (Daujat 11) This seems to be the distinction between *eros* and *agape*.
         2. “Although the two words have many features in common, there is a specific sense of eros which puts it into strong contrast with agape.” (Schmaus 95)
            1. “In the Dionysiac-Orphic rites, eros is a passionate yearning—often of demonic force—which overpowers consciousness. Through sensual orgies it leads to “encounter with the gods.”” (Schmaus 95)
            2. “According to Plato, eros is the source of moral beauty; it becomes the guide to eternal being and true [95] goodness. Arising out of need and poverty, it surpasses pleasure, culmina­ting in a creative rapture.” (Schmaus 95-96)
            3. “Aristotle sees in eros the cosmic power which orders existence; Plotinus, the urge to seek union with God.” (Schmaus 96)
         3. In the Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament, c 200 bc, abbreviated LXX), “the word used for God’s love for man and man’s love for God is not the Greek word *eros* but the Greek word *agape* (except for “two exceptions in the book of Proverbs”); *agape* is used throughout the New Testament. Its use throughout the LXX “is more remarkable in view of the fact that the prophets Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezechiel and the writer of the Song of Songs often uses [*sic*] the imagery of erotic love in describing the union of God with man. Although the word agape was common in spoken idiom, it has not been demonstrated with certainty that it existed in extrabiblical literature before the Septuagint. But in the Septuagint it attains a new meaning.” (Schmaus 95)
         4. “In the Old Testament agape can mean sexual love as well as the love of God for man and of man for God. When the love of God is meant it is understood, on man’s part, as his response to God’s gracious con­descension and faithfulness. Frequently it denotes the cultic worship of God; but also it has a moral connotation: love becomes the fulfillment of the obligations associated with the divine covenant. The fundamental rule holds: faithfulness for faithfulness (Gen. 15,1-6. [*sic*] Deut. 11,22-32). Here the danger exists of superficiality, of mere legalism and devotion to cultic forms.” (Schmaus 95)
            1. Gen 15:3-6, “Abram said, “You have given me no offspring, and so a slave born in my house is to be my heir.” . . . 5 [The Lord] brought him outside and said, “Look toward heaven and count the stars, if you are able to count them.” Then he said to him, “So shall your descendants be.” 6 And he believed the Lord; and the Lord reckoned it to him as righteousness.”
            2. Deut 11:22-28, “If you will diligently observe this entire commandment that I am commanding you, loving the Lord your God, walking in all his ways, and holding fast to him, 23 then the Lord will drive out all these nations before you, and you will dispossess nations larger and mightier than yourselves. . . . 26 See, I am setting before you today a blessing and a curse: 27 the blessing, if you obey the commandments of the Lord your God that I am commanding you today; 28 and the curse, if you do not obey . . .”
         5. “With regard to the love of neighbor, on the other hand, the Old Testament faith shows a great caution and reserve towards the strangers of foreign races in contrast to the brotherly love practiced towards the members of their own people (Lev. 19,17; Sir. 25,1). (In the Qumran community this reserve towards the foreigner is seen at its worst, intensifying into real animosity.) It is against this background that Christ’s command to love one’s enemies attains its very special signifi­cance.” (Schmaus 95)
            1. Lev 19:17, “You shall not hate in your heart anyone of your kin; you shall reprove your neighbor, or you will incur guilt yourself.”
            2. Sir 25:1, “I take pleasure in three things, and they are beautiful in the sight of God and of mortals: agreement among brothers and sisters, friendship among neighbors, and a wife and husband who live in harmony.”
      2. New Testament
         1. “The love represented in the New Testament as faithful union between God and man is free of all eroticism. It is an ideal of action.” (Schmaus 96)
         2. Paul: 1 Cor 13 “belongs with the exhortation to unity and peace given in the twelfth chapter of the same letter. . . . Love alone is capable of producing community and concord: faith and hope will not suffice. But the love which creates union and concord is not attained unless it takes on the form of the cross: creative love is possible only as a sharing in the life and the suffering of Jesus Christ. Through such a love the human person becomes detached from self and at the same time attains to genuine selfhood.” (Schmaus 93)
         3. the synoptics
            1. “In the gospels, which were written later, love is chiefly interpreted as the following of Jesus Christ . . .” (Schmaus 93)
            2. “. . . it is demanded of Christ’s disciples as the response to God’s love . . .” (Schmaus 93)

Mark 12:28-31, “One of the scribes . . . asked him, “Which commandment is the first of all?” 29 Jesus answered, “The first is, ‘Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one; 30 you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.’ 31 The second is this, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ There is no other commandment greater than these.””

* + - * 1. “It must prove itself in forgiveness (Mt. 18,35), in sharing and the bearing of one another’s [93] burdens . . .” (Schmaus 93-94)

Matt 18:35, “So my heavenly Father will also do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother or sister from your heart.”

* + - * 1. The love of enemies “is in direct contradiction to the Old Testament view which limited love to one’s own people and race . . .” (Schmaus 94)

Luke 6:35, “love your enemies, do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return. Your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked.”

Matt 5:38-45, “You have heard that it was said, ‘An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’ 39 But I say to you, Do not resist an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also; 40 and if anyone wants to sue you and take your coat, give your cloak as well; 41 and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go also the second mile. 42 Give to everyone who begs from you, and do not refuse anyone who wants to borrow from you. 43 You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’ 44 But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45 so that you may be children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous.”

* + - * 1. “. . . genuine love can be attained only by sharing in the cross of Christ (Mk. 5,10; 8,34; 13,30): it is from the cross that love receives its meaning. From Christ’s cross comes the dynamism that is capable of transforming man. Only this can change a man who hates into one who loves, one who seeks only himself into one who is concerned for others, one who domineers into one who ministers. Love of enemies is a type of that love in which Christ offered himself for man on the cross, for in that death God reconciled to himself men who were estranged from him as enemies.” (Schmaus 94)

Mark 5:10, “He begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country.”

Mark 8:34, “If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me.”

Mark 13:30, “this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place.”

* + - 1. John
         1. “In the fourth gospel the new element of love which came into the world with Christ is brought out explicitly and emphatically. John reports Christ’s words: “A new commandment I give you. Love one another as I have loved you” (Jn. 13,34). This injunction makes it clear that a new era in human history was ushered in through Jesus Christ, an era wherein men would no longer draw apart in warring factions but would gather together in one human family. When men meet one another as brothers—then, and only then, is the redemption evident. As long as love is not effective, men remain in sin and the reign of tyranny, oppres­sion, and terror still prevails.” (Schmaus 94)

John 13:34, “I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another.”

* + - 1. “The order which Jesus Christ has inserted into human history gives new possibilities for humanity, but it imposes new tasks as well. For the new order does not work itself out automatically, but simply provides the possibility of a new human cooperation: its goal is achieved only insofar as man, in his willingness to share in Christ’s life, assumes the burden of creative love. The writers of the New Testament are well aware how difficult it is for men to realize the new order completely; only in this light are the frequent scriptural warnings to be understood. These writings leave no doubt, however, that no one can bear witness to Christ without making the love he brought into the world and demanded of his disciples a reality. Anyone who refuses this burden, and yet believes that he belongs to Christ, not only falls into gross self-deception but mocks the name of Christ . . . The most perfect orthodoxy without love is of no avail for salvation.” (Schmaus 94)
         1. James 1:22-2:17, “be doers of the word, and not merely hearers who deceive themselves. . . . 26 If any think they are religious, and do not bridle their tongues but deceive their hearts, their religion is worthless. 27 Religion that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father, is this: to care for orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself unstained by the world. 2:1 My brothers and sisters, do you with your acts of favoritism really believe in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ? . . . 14 What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? 15 If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, 16 and one of you says to them, “Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill,” and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? 17 So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.” Etc.
         2. 1 John 4:19-21, “We love because he first loved us. 20 Those who say, “I love God,” and hate their brothers or sisters, are liars; for those who do not love a brother or sister whom they have seen, cannot love God whom they have not seen. 21 The commandment we have from him is this: those who love God must love their brothers and sisters also.”
  1. theological development
     1. Church Fathers
        1. “Theology faced a difficult problem in putting the biblical message of love alongside the Greek teaching about eros. This is a special case of the encounter of the gospels with Greek philosophy, and one of extraordinary importance because it involved the full meaning of Christian existence.” (Schmaus 96)
        2. “First, Ignatius of Antioch simply put agape in opposition to eros, but this position was soon modified. The dialogue with Gnosticism and Neoplatonism was rich in consequences for the theological under­standing of the New Testament message of love. Two directions emerged, the traditional biblical and the progressive Alexandrian. Irenaeus and others—for example, Tertullian—placed love above gnosis, knowledge. Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, considered love to be the prerequisite of perfect knowledge and also its sign. Love, in his view, is the step between simple faith and vision. For the true gnostic [i.e., Christian who knows orthodox truth], it can become a secure and enduring support, so that he will no longer sin. The true gnostic does not act for the sake of any reward but will choose knowledge even if it brings no happiness. The problems opened up by these ideas of Clement’s remained themes for discussion long after his time.” (Schmaus 96)
        3. “Still another understanding of the superiority of knowledge over love is proposed by Origen, who endeavors to reconcile the Greek doctrine of eros with the biblical teaching of agape by defining agape as the “heavenly,” as opposed to the “common” eros. Origen’s teaching had one important effect in which terminology is involved: the term eros came into increasing use to describe the love of God and God’s love for men. It seemed well suited to express the interior, emotional character of love. In Origen’s thought, the vision of God is understood as man’s highest end. Agape is interpreted as a process of purification, and so as [96] a gateway to the vision of God. (Similar views are held by Evagrius Ponticus and likewise Maximos the Confessor, according to whom love is a disposition of the soul in virtue of which man prefers the knowledge of God above everything else in existence.) Another teaching about love to be found in patristic times is that love is true fulfillment (Chrysostom, Diadochus, Photius, John Cassian).” (Schmaus 96-97)
        4. “In spite of the gnostic influences, the biblical theme of love remained vital. The Fathers taught universally that love is a gift of God imparted through the inflowing of the Spirit; a gift which makes a demand on all man’s powers.” (Schmaus 97)
        5. Augustine
           1. “Chrysostom and Augustine emphasize that love which seeks no recompense is its own greatest reward.” (Schmaus 97)
           2. “With regard to this question, as in all his theology, Augustine endeavours to synthesize Neoplatonic and biblical thought. Love, he says, is the fundamental power of man. Whereas only God can be loved for his own sake, true love, which is directed towards God as the source of all happiness, necessarily has as its object the creation also, which is the product of God’s love. Love descends from God as he approaches the creation, and it ascends to God in man’s love of God and neighbor. In such formulations as these, Augustine expresses the biblical message of love in the Neoplatonic terms of ascent and descent.” (Schmaus 97)
           3. “Finally, the meaning of love in Augustine’s teaching derives from the fact that he centres it in the Eucharist. Given that the celebration of the Eucharist is seen as a participation in the death of Jesus Christ, this love is integrated with man’s situation in history and thus rescued from the pure speculative abstraction of Neoplatonism. Augustine points out that the eucharistic rite would be meaningless and fruitless if those participa­ting did not enter into the self-giving love of Christ or did not make this love real in their daily living together.” (Schmaus 97)
           4. “The theology of love plays a fundamental role in Augustine’s concept of the Church, for the Church is that community which constantly realizes itself in the eucharistic celebration as Christ’s community. Love as participation in the love of Christ is an essential constituent of the Church’s life. It is the ceaseless self-realization of the Church.” (Schmaus 97)
        6. “The doctrine of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite represents an important step in the development of the theology of love. He set forth the concept of an ecstatic, divinizing love. Although he introduced further Neoplatonic elements into theology, his doctrine is not simply a Neoplatonizing of the biblical message. For whereas in Platonic and [97] Neoplatonic thought the one who loves does not really go out of himself in order to give himself to the beloved thou, but rather becomes aware of his own divinity in the process of love, the ecstasy conceived by Dionysius involves a real going out of the self to the divine and human thou. Furthermore a divinizing of the man who loves God takes place, not, as in Neoplatonism, within the confines of the man’s own nature, but in a movement wherein he transcends himself. Associated with this interpretation is the idea that the intellect is restrained, its activity suppressed by love: love is perfected in intellectual darkness.” (Schmaus 97-98)
     2. the Middle Ages
        1. “In the conception of love, two trends developed in patristic theology, namely the *physical* and the *ecstatic*.” (Schmaus 98)
           1. “In the former, love is seen as a natural power which unfolds under the working of divine grace as love of self, of neighbor, and of God. Given the natural and necessary tendency of every being to seek its own good, there is a fundamental identity between love of self and love of God since God is man’s highest good. . . . the other is always loved for the sake of some good . . . Representatives of the first school of thought are Hugh of St. Victor [and] Peter Lombard . . .” (Schmaus 98)
           2. “In the latter, the ecstatic conception, self-forgetfulness is postulated as the necessary condition of true love; the person, set free of all attachment to self, goes out of himself to lose himself in the beloved. Whereas in the first form of love the other is always loved for the sake of some good, in the second it is loved exclusively for its own sake. Representatives of the [second] school of thought are . . . Eadmer, Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, Abelard, Richard of St. Victor, William of St. Thierry and, most particularly, Francis of Assisi.” (Schmaus 98)
        2. “Anselm of Canterbury developed the idea of a tension in man’s spirituality between self-forgetful and self-seeking love.” (Schmaus 98)
        3. “Aquinas, though he inclined towards the first form, attempted a synthesis of the two in which love is conceived as friendship which desires the good of the beloved, a sort of spiritual exchange. In his concept God is loved as the object of happiness since he is the universal God [should this be “Good”?—Hahn].” (Schmaus 98)
        4. “In the thought of John Duns Scotus, God is conceived as subsisting Love. The love of God is in his view an ecstatic love which is to be distinguished only formally from sanctifying grace. He ascribes to love an unconditional superiority over knowledge; it is perfection itself. Love in its proper sense is for its own sake, according to Scotus, who goes so far as to say that the one who loves is prepared to consent to his own nonexistence for the sake of God (if such a thing were possible). Love of neighbor is founded in the desire to love the neighbor as nearly as [98] possible in the same way as God and for God’s sake.” (Schmaus 98-99)
     3. “According to Theresa of Avila, the essence of genuine love of God lies in the total surrender of self, the unconditional handing over of self to God. In the seventeenth-century controversy over quietism in which Bossuet (an adherent of the physical, or natural, theory of love) was opposed to Fenelon, Fenelon’s thesis that there is a pure love of God in which the soul can be indifferent to salvation (in other words, a permanent state of love from which hope is excluded) was rejected by the Church (DS 1327-1337, 1349). Nevertheless it does not seem that the real possibility of a fully disinterested love as an occasional event is out of the question.” (Schmaus 99)
     4. “In recent philosophy the problem of love is discussed under the key term of Personalism.” (Schmaus 99)
        1. See “M. Scheler, M. Blondel, G. Marcel; J. Ratzinger in *Lexicon* *für* *Theologie v. Kirche*, IV (Freiburg, 1961), 1032-1036; P. Rousselot, *Pour* *L’histoire* *du* *problème de* *l’amour* *au* *moyen-âge* (Paris, 1933); A. Nygren, *Eros* *und* *Agape*, 2 vols (Gütersloh, 1930-1937).” (Schmaus 99 n. 1)
  2. love as commandment
     1. “Since the love attested to in Scripture is not an erotic experience but an endowing with power and an impulse towards action, it can be commanded.” (Schmaus 99)
     2. scripture
        1. “Love proves its genuineness only through actions . . .” (Schmaus 99)
           1. 1 John 3:18, “let us love, not in word or speech, but in truth and action.”
           2. James 1:25-2:17, “those who look into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and persevere, being not hearers who forget but doers who act—they will be blessed in their doing. 26 If any think they are religious, and do not bridle their tongues but deceive their hearts, their religion is worthless. 27 Religion that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father, is this: to care for orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself unstained by the world. 2:1 My brothers and sisters, do you with your acts of favoritism really believe in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ? . . . 14 What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? 15 If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, 16 and one of you says to them, "Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill," and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? 17 So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.” Etc.
           3. 2 Cor 8:7-8, “we want you to excel also in this generous undertaking. 8 I do not say this as a command, but I am testing the genuineness of your love against the earnestness of others.”
           4. Rom 13:8-11, “Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law. 9 The commandments, “You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet”; and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, “Love your neighbor as yourself.” 10 Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law. 11 Besides this, you know what time it is, how it is now the moment for you to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we became believers . . .”
        2. “As the love of God has become incarnate in time and history in Jesus Christ in order to free man from the power of darkness, so must the love bestowed on man by God in Jesus Christ be realized in actions. Only thus does it become a concrete power. The commandment to love is the summation of all the other commandments. Jesus says: “Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. The second is this: “Love your neighbor as yourself. There is no other commandment greater than these.”” (Schmaus 99)
           1. Matt 22:36-40 (= Mark 12:29-34, Luke 10:26-27), ““Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?” 37 He said to him, “‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.’ 38 This is the greatest and first commandment. 39 And a second is like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ 40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.””
           2. Rom 13:8-11, “Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law. 9 The commandments, “You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet”; and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, “Love your neighbor as yourself.” 10 Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law.”
           3. Gal 5:14, “the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.”
           4. James 2:8, “You do well if you really fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.””
     3. “Although love itself can be commanded, it cannot contradict any of the other commandments. For the man united to God the command of love is the highest principle of activity, but this principle alone is not adequate to the mastery of the concrete situations of life since it is not completely clear in all concrete situations what action love prescribes. Sometimes an action which anteriorly looks like love is unmasked in [99] truth as damaging to love—or vice versa. [Or] an act of love which benefits one individual may bring ruin to others. So love must always be viewed within the perspective not only of the individual but of the community as well. It is thus that the commandments give direction and support.” (Schmaus 99-100)
     4. “The commandments of God and those of the Church are to be under­stood basically as interpretations and guidelines of the fundamental command to love (though, as Duns Scotus recognized and pointed out, in particular circumstances a positive command can stand in the way of love and thus in a certain way be in opposition to a man’s conscience).” (Schmaus 100)
     5. “Love becomes the basic principle which should penetrate everything. The commandments are explicit and detailed determinations of love. Even though they come from outside himself, they do not represent something foreign to man’s nature. Here the either-or dichotomy between extrinsic and intrinsic legality (heteronomy vs. autonomy) does not hold true. When the just man is obedient to the commandments, he fulfills himself in union with Christ and with God. In the final analysis, the fulfilling of the commandments, given that they are directions for the accomplishment of love, means self-realization; the breaking of the commandments means damage to oneself.” (Schmaus 100)
     6. “As we have said, the commandments and the laws deriving from them cannot be simply prescriptions for every conceivable set of circumstances. They are binding on the conscience, which must be formed by them; but in particular situations insufficiently explicated or not at all foreseen by the law, a conscience formed in love must independently and maturely make the decision. Here the freedom of the children of God is achieved.” (Schmaus 100)
     7. “Of course, this much discussed freedom of the children of God is not to be understood as a liberation from every commandment [but] liberation from interior obstacles to right action—that is, from man’s enslavement to self-seeking and self-love. The freedom Paul proclaims further involves the empowering of men to make decisions concerning the concrete situations of human life, not only individual lives but in the political, economic, and societal realm generally. The Christian bears the responsibility for realizing ethical principles and commands in action (his adulthood consists in this). Since their precise bearing on the concrete situation is very often not self-evident, there is often a diversity of opinion as to what is right—that is, what will advance human values and freedom.” (Schmaus 101)
     8. “The individual commandment loses none of its urgency nor stringency through being founded in love; nor, on the other hand, does love lose its illuminating power. The commandments are radicalized when they have their origins in love, and love is disciplined with respect to caprice and impetuosity when it is realized within the framework of the command­ments. Love is seen to be the basis of unity and the deepest motivating force of the commandments. . . . law is a revelation of love, and obedience is a mode of love.” (Schmaus 101)
     9. “Though very similar in meaning, the words law and command are not identical. In the word command the personal element appears in the meeting between the one commanding and the one obeying. This aspect is completely missing in the word law, which has an almost exclusively objective character. While the command is fulfilled only in reference to the one commanding, law stands in detachment from man and makes its claim in a certain sense independently, in virtue of its own immanent authority. When law is conceived exclusively in this sense, the danger of legalism arises—the fulfillment of the law for its own sake. Thus it is important that the word law should also be understood in the light of its source in the terminology and thought of Old Testament piety.” (Schmaus 101)
     10. “To the faithful of the Old Testament, law was given not only as task­master but as grace. It was both at the same time. The epochal advance from the Old Testament to the New consists precisely in this, that the [101] law was transcended; or, to put it in another way, man was freed from legalism and yet preserved from lawlessness. In the Old Testament, piety consisted primarily in the obedient encounter with the law, behind which one saw the divine Thou; in the New Testament it consists in the en­counter of the believer with Christ, or with the divine Thou, an encounter which is ordered through the commandments. Commandment or law assists in the achievement of a meaningful and salvific encounter with God . . .” (Schmaus 101-102)
     11. “The foregoing considerations show that the time ushered in by Jesus Christ is not an era without law, even though Paul speaks of the end of the law through Jesus. Through Jesus Christ the law has lost its former literal character and become an aid to the ordering of society. Indeed the law is the love of Jesus Christ and his community. Not only in the central and basic law of love but also in the individual laws which expli­cate it there is a constant fresh revelation of how the new life in Christ is realized in history in the relationships between men and in the relation to God . . .” (Schmaus 102)
         1. John 13:34, “I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another.”
         2. Rom 13:8-9, “Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law. 9 The commandments, “You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet”; and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, “Love your neighbor as yourself.”
         3. 1 Cor 13:1-2, “If I speak in the tongues of mortals and of angels, but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. 2 And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing.”
         4. Gal 5:14, “For the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.”
         5. Gal 6:2, “Bear one another’s burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ.”
         6. 1 John 3:23, “this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as he has commanded us.”
  3. love of God
     1. The question arises “whether love for God is possible in the form of agape—that is, a love wherein man transcends himself in order to place himself at the service of the Other, for the enrichment of the Other. Since God can receive nothing from man but can only give to man, it would appear that the only love man can have for God is eros, that love wherein man goes beyond himself towards the Other in order to take hold of the Other for his own fulfillment.” (Schmaus 102)
     2. “To solve this problem it is necessary to recall that love of God is achieved in obedience to his word; in this obedience the longing for God is caught up and transformed; in God man attains his own self. We must not forget, however, that in both the Old and New Testaments the love of God is understood to include the receptivity for God on man’s part.” (Schmaus 102)
     3. “The person who loves God is present to him; he makes time for him in his life; he listens to him. He submits himself to God’s rule and founds his whole being in him, surrendering himself in unconditional trust. He rejects everything that is contrary to the divine will, everything that might stand in the way of union with God. Above all, he surrenders to God’s authority those three drives against which he must declare war if he wants to love God: the desire for money, the desire for power, the thrust of pride . . .” (Schmaus 103)
        1. Matt 6:19-24, “Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume and where thieves break in and steal; 20 but store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust consumes and where thieves do not break in and steal. 21 For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also. . . . 24 You cannot serve God and wealth.”
        2. Matt 19:23-26, ““it will be hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven. 24 Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God.” 25 When the disciples heard this, they were greatly astounded and said, “Then who can be saved?” 26 But Jesus looked at them and said, “For mortals it is impossible, but for God all things are possible.””
        3. Luke 11:43, “Woe to you Pharisees! For you love to have the seat of honor in the synagogues and to be greeted with respect in the marketplaces.”
        4. Luke 12:33-34, “Sell your possessions, and give alms. Make purses for yourselves that do not wear out, an unfailing treasure in heaven, where no thief comes near and no moth destroys. 34 For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.”
        5. John 5:44, “How can you believe when you accept glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the one who alone is God?”
     4. “The crucial testing of our love for God comes in the temptations, vexations, and insults, the sufferings and dangers of earthly life . . .” (Schmaus 103)
        1. Matt 10:18-42, “you will be dragged before governors and kings because of me, as a testimony to them and the Gentiles. 19 When they hand you over, do not worry about how you are to speak or what you are to say; for what you are to say will be given to you at that time; 20 for it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you. . . . 22 you will be hated by all because of my name. But the one who endures to the end will be saved. . . . 24 A disciple is not above the teacher, nor a slave above the master; 25 it is enough for the disciple to be like the teacher, and the slave like the master. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more will they malign those of his household! 26 So have no fear of them; for nothing is covered up that will not be uncovered, and nothing secret that will not become known. . . . 28 Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell. 29 Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father. . . . 32 Everyone therefore who acknowledges me before others, I also will acknowledge before my Father in heaven; 33 but whoever denies me before others, I also will deny before my Father in heaven. 34 Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. 35 For I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; 36 and one’s foes will be members of one’s own household. 37 Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and whoever loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me; 38 and whoever does not take up the cross and follow me is not worthy of me. 39 Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it.”
        2. Rom 5:3-4, “we also boast in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, 4 and endurance produces character, and character produces hope . . .”
        3. Rom 8:35-39, “Who will separate us from the love of Christ? Will hardship, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . 37 in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. 38 For I am convinced that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, 39 nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
        4. 2 Thess 1:3-5, “your faith is growing abundantly, and the love of everyone of you for one another is increasing. . . . 5 This is . . . intended to make you worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are also suffering.”
        5. 2 Tim 3:10, “Now you have observed my teaching, my conduct, my aim in life, my faith, my patience, my love, my steadfastness . . .”
     5. “Here it becomes clear what the true sense of Christian “contempt of the world” is. It is not to be interpreted in terms of Platonic dualism, according to which material, earthly being is not worth man’s effort and only spiritual being is worthy of his striving. The contempt of the world proper to the Christian can only be understood in an eschatological sense, wherein earthly values are seen in the light of eternity. This means that when the Christian must choose between God and the world—for instance, as the martyrs had to choose between God and the state—he must choose God if he will remain faithful . . .” (Schmaus 103)
        1. Matt 22:17-22, the Pharisees’ disciples and the Herodians asked, ““Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor, or not?” . . . 19 [Jesus said,] “Show me the coin used for the tax.” And they brought him a denarius. 20 Then he said to them, “Whose head is this, and whose title?” 21 They answered, “The emperor’s.” Then he said to them, “Give therefore to the emperor the things that are the emperor’s, and to God the things that are God’s.””
        2. 1 John 2:14-17, “you are strong and the word of God abides in you, and you have overcome the evil one. 15 Do not love the world or the things in the world. The love of the Father is not in those who love the world; 16 for all that is in the world—the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, the pride in riches—comes not from the Father but from the world. 17 And the world and its desire are passing away, but those who do the will of God live forever.”
     6. “As the way to God is always through Christ, so also the love of God always comes into being through Christ. Christ is the beloved Son of the Father (Eph. 1.6; Col. 1,13). His life consists wholly in doing the Father’s will, and those who are joined with Christ in community are included in his submission to the Father.” (Schmaus 103)
  4. love of neighbor
     1. “The love of God is realized and shows its authenticity in the love of neighbor [and] love of neighbor receives its depth and its final guarantee from the love of God. This relationship is described most explicitly in the Letter of James and in the First Letter of John . . .” (Schmaus 103)
        1. James 1:19-27, “let everyone be quick to listen, slow to speak, slow to anger; 20 for your anger does not produce God’s righteousness. 21 Therefore rid yourselves of all sordidness and rank growth of wickedness, and welcome with meekness the implanted word that has the power to save your souls. 22 But be doers of the word, and not merely hearers who deceive themselves. . . . 26 If any think they are religious, and do not bridle their tongues but deceive their hearts, their religion is worthless. 27 Religion that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father, is this: to care for orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself unstained by the world. 2:1 My brothers and sisters, do you with your acts of favoritism really believe in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ? . . . 12 So speak and so act as those who are to be judged by the law of liberty. 13 For judgment will be without mercy to anyone who has shown no mercy; mercy triumphs over judgment.”
        2. 1 John 2:9-11, “Whoever says, “I am in the light,” while hating a brother or sister, is still in the darkness. 10 Whoever loves a brother or sister lives in the light, and in such a person there is no cause for stumbling. 11 But whoever hates another believer is in the darkness, walks in the darkness, and does not know the way to go, because the darkness has brought on blindness.”
        3. 1 John 4:7-21, “let us love one another, because love is from God; everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. 8 Whoever does not love does not know God, for God is love. 9 God’s love was revealed among us in this way: God sent his only Son into the world so that we might live through him. 10 In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins. 11 Beloved, since God loved us so much, we also ought to love one another. 12 No one has ever seen God; if we love one another, God lives in us, and his love is perfected in us. 13 By this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit. . . . 16 So we have known and believe the love that God has for us. God is love, and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them. . . . 19 We love because he first loved us. 20 Those who say, “I love God,” and hate their brothers or sisters, are liars; for those who do not love a brother or sister whom they have seen, cannot love God whom they have not seen. 21 The commandment we have from him is this: those who love God must love their brothers and sisters also.”
     2. “Love of neighbor does not mean emotional effusion; it is sober and unsentimental, sincere, tactful, and prudent without becoming limited—its divine origin prevents that . . .” (Schmaus 103)
        1. Acts 26:25, “I am not out of my mind, most excellent Festus, but I am speaking the sober truth.”
        2. Rom 12:6, 8, “We have gifts that differ according to the grace given to us: . . . 8 the exhorter, in exhortation; the giver, in generosity; the leader, in diligence; the compassionate, in cheerfulness.”
        3. 1 Cor 9:23, “I do it all for the sake of the gospel, so that I may share in its blessings.”
        4. 2 Tim 1:7, “God did not give us a spirit of cowardice, but rather a spirit of power and of love and of self-discipline.”
     3. “As the parable of the merciful Samaritan (Lk. 10,30-37) and Jesus’ judgment speech (Mt. 25,34-40) make clear, the love of neighbor proves itself by responding to need, doing what requires to be done. It is bound up with the situation. [103] The person who neglects the demand of the hour, waiting and listening for a challenge still to come, is condemned by Jesus’ verdict with regard to the Pharisees in the parable of the Good Samaritan and his proclama­tion in the judgment speech: whoever denies help to the neighbor sent to him refuses the Son of God (Mt. 25,41-45).” (Schmaus 103-104)
        1. Matt 25:35-45, “I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, 36 I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me. . . . 40 just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me.”
        2. Matt 25:42-45, “I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink, 43 I was a stranger and you did not welcome me, naked and you did not give me clothing, sick and in prison and you did not visit me. . . . 45 just as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me.”
        3. Luke 10:30-37, “A man . . . fell into the hands of robbers, who stripped him, beat him, and went away, leaving him half dead. . . . 33 a Samaritan while traveling came near him; and when he saw him, he was moved with pity. 34 He went to him and bandaged his wounds, having poured oil and wine on them. Then he put him on his own animal, brought him to an inn, and took care of him. 35 The next day he took out two denarii, gave them to the innkeeper, and said, ‘Take care of him; and when I come back, I will repay you whatever more you spend.’ . . . 37 Go and do likewise.”
     4. “In our day the love of neighbor takes many other forms than in earlier times, a change which is immediately understandable in view of the difference between an agricultural and an industrial society. Today the love of neighbor necessarily includes every movement in society which aims at securing true human goals—the dignity of man, universal freedom, the right of the individual to have a voice in his own destiny and that of his social group and indeed of all humanity, the right of the control over earthly goods which is necessary for freedom. But this means that love of neighbor, if it is not to evaporate in mere spiritual talk, must be realized on the political, social, and economic levels.” (Schmaus 104)
     5. “. . . love of neighbor remains un­realistic without that self-discipline whereby each individual limits himself for the good of the other. Disinterested love is possible only through participation in the cross of Jesus Christ. This is not to say that it is possible only within the Christian community: for Jesus’ role encompasses the whole of history; his cross—the being-for-another even to the ultimate consequences—is at work in all human spheres with greater or lesser intensity. Nevertheless it is true that those who give themselves to Christ in faith are the recipients of the strongest impulses to love. They are also charged with a special responsibility, and their refusal to fulfill it is especially disastrous. They have the commission, as representing the whole of humanity, to realize what the power of Christ is and to proclaim it everywhere. This implies that they may never rest content with things as they are in history, but must always press forward until the ever imperfect love which is the instrument of Christian progress matures in the absolute future through the divine intervention . . .” (Schmaus 104)
        1. 1 Cor 13:9-13, “we know only in part, and we prophesy only in part; 10 but when the complete comes, the partial will come to an end. 11 When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became an adult, I put an end to childish ways. 12 For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. 13 And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.”
     6. “It is not always clear what course of action genuine love prescribes. What constitutes love with regard to one individual or group can involve the absence of love, or an injustice, to another individual or group. Only a critical love [can] evaluate the situation [for] a prohibition or taking away can be love [104] too . . .” (Schmaus 104-105)
     7. “A revolutionary change for the benefit of human dignity always runs the risk of injuring love through violence. Nevertheless there can be extreme situations in which slavery and terror can be overcome only by means of revolution. In that event such means may—in fact, must—be taken by critical love, and the neglect to do so would be a defect of love. (For a detailed analysis moral theology should be consulted . . .)” (Schmaus 105)
     8. Brotherly love “stands under the sign of the cross. It is the willingness to serve and to sacrifice, to forgive, to respect . . .” (Schmaus 105)
     9. “Love is concerned with the person of the other, not with his value—economic, intellectual, or spiritual. It is able, therefore, to give itself to the sick, the poor, the disagreeable, the incurable. It does not regard the other person merely as the occasion for the practice of virtue; he is a thou to be loved for his own sake because love hears in him the call of God.” (Schmaus 105)
  5. love of enemies
     1. “Love of neighbor is first of all the love of “those near,” the members of the household (Gal. 6,10). But the universality of the love required of [105] Christians does not allow it to stop short of one’s enemies. This characteristic of Christian love is the specifically “new” commandment (Mt. 5,38-48).” (Schmaus 105-106)
        1. Gal 6:10, “let us work for the good of all, and especially for those of the family of faith.”
        2. Matt 5:39, 44, “Do not resist an evildoer. . . . 44 Love your enemies . . .”
     2. “Considered on the purely natural level, such a demand is incompre­hensible. It is not motivated by the desire to preserve peace in one’s life by avoiding conflict; how far ideas of this kind were from Christ’s mind is shown by his controversies with the Pharisees. When he enjoined his followers to be ready and willing to endure the world’s enmity, . . . this had nothing to do with a utopia. Jesus knew the world and yet called his followers to love it. . . . this demand is understandable only in terms of faith in the new world situation created by his sacrificial death . . .” (Schmaus 106)
        1. 1 John 2:9-11, “Whoever says, “I am in the light,” while hating a brother or sister, is still in the darkness. 10 Whoever loves a brother or sister lives in the light, and in such a person there is no cause for stumbling. 11 But whoever hates another believer is in the darkness . . .”
  6. the relation between love of God and love of neighbor
     1. “. . . love of neighbor is proof of the Christian’s love of God . . .” (Schmaus 106)
     2. But besides love of neighbor, “There is a specific love of God . . .” (Schmaus 106)
     3. Our neighbor “must not be . . . a means for our encounter with God: man can never be a means, he is always an end in himself. Nevertheless in the neighbor considered as a goal of love God is also present as the all-comprehending goal and is envisioned as such by the believer. He cannot, therefore, be excluded from the love of neighbor. God is the source without beginning of all love, and so is operative in every human love. Every genuine and effective love of a brother reaches to God as long as God is not expressly denied.” (Schmaus 106)
     4. “Only by failing to view man as a creature is it possible to exclude the love of God from the love of neighbor [106] . . . [Likewise,] only by loving an abstract God—that is, a God not seen as Creator—is it possible to exclude the love of neighbor from the love of God. For owing to his creative and salvific will, God is always God-for-men—for all mankind and for each individual man. Love for God, therefore, inevitably en­compasses love for man as well . . .” (Schmaus 106-107)
     5. “Because of the indissoluble connection between God and man, Creator and creature, love includes God and man in one and the same act, even though the primary intention or accent or feeling is at one time directed more towards God and at another time more towards man.” “The two loves cannot be separated [except] when the love of neighbor . . . is ex­plicitly atheistic, at least in its intention; or, on the other hand, when love of God excludes the neighbor—when it is a love lacking in humanity, at least in intention.” (Schmaus 107)
     6. “It would be utopian, not Christian, to exclude from love all hope of self-fulfillment. . . . it is through surrender to God that he attains a higher realization of his own existence. He cannot deny such an unfolding of the self without denying the Creator; nor can he exclude it completely and always from his love. Even though it remains in the background, hope is an essential element of love.” (Schmaus 107)
  7. love as eschatological power
     1. “It is to love, and love alone, that Scripture promises a future in eternity (1 Cor. 13,­12f.). Faith and hope belong to a passing aeon, and they pass along with it.” (Schmaus 107)
     2. “In love the perfect community of men with one another and with God is already present in an inchoative and hidden way. Love is thus the beginning, here and now, of the absolute future and also the movement on which we are continuously borne into it. Every [107] love achieved within history is a step towards perfect love in the absolute future. God is man’s absolute future . . .” (Schmaus 107-108)
  8. conclusions
     1. We can love God as our Creator, for his gifts (existence, free will, etc.). But charity, “of which by ourselves we are incapable, . . . is the fruit of grace . . . God in his infinite and divine truth is the motive and object of faith; God in his infinite and divine goodness is the motive and object of charity. [86] . . . Charity is a sharing in the perfect love which God bears himself . . . it is the life of the Holy Spirit in us . . .” God gives charity “by moving our will interiorly. That is why charity is free and we can refuse it. . . . The love of charity consists not in feeling that we love God, [but] in *will­ing* to love him.” To purify our love, God may allow us “to live in com­plete aridity so far as sensible feeling is con­cerned, so that we are no long­er aware of anything but indifference, weariness, or even repugnance, but yet we never refuse him anything but persevere in wanting him for himself alone . . .” (Daujat 86-87)
     2. Supernatural knowledge of God has two stages, faith and eternal vision; but super­natural love of God is always the same. See 1 Cor 13. (Daujat 88)
     3. “Charity, which is the life of God in itself and for itself, loves the life of God wherever it is to be found: first in God, then in ourselves to whom it is given, and finally in all those to whom also it has been given as to us.” We love ourselves and our fellow humans “for the sake of the life of God that is in us . . .” (Daujat 88)
     4. “. . . supernatural brotherhood is the only universal brotherhood among men; for we can be brethren only by being sons of the same father, and human nature founds among men a natural community but not a brotherhood.” [89] Charity is not natural friendship, philanthropy, or a humanitarianism that works for an equal and high living standard. “. . . charity, the object of which is God living in our brethren, makes us wish for and promote in them their true good, that is, the life of God in them, and its development for life eternal.” [90] *If* the goods of this world help, then we must give the goods of this world. “The more we love sinners and unbelievers—and we ought to love them to the point of giving our lives for them should the necessity arise—the more must we hate and fight against their sin and unbelief.” (Daujat 89-91)

1. **the moral virtues**
   1. Wis 8:7, “And if anyone loves righteousness [here, a synonym for God’s wisdom, personified as a wo­man], her labors are virtues; for she teaches self-control and prudence, justice and courage; nothing in life is more profitable for mortals than these.”
   2. “Traditional teaching gives us . . . wisdom, fortitude, justice, and prudence. These basic (cardinal) virtues were developed in the Stoic ethic; accepted into Christian theology, they underwent that modifica­tion provided by the basic christological structure.” (Schmaus 108) Stoicism was founded by Zeno, who taught in Athens c. 304 or 299 to 259 bc.
   3. “Right conduct is not possible without fortitude, since the events of life bring dangers which must be faced . . . The man living in obedience to God does not let himself be overwhelmed by fear; he does not retreat in the face of a dangerous situation, but takes his stand in union with Christ and strives to overcome it.” (Schmaus 108)
   4. “Since the attainment of justice involves relationships between men and is therefore a social and political problem, love has a part in justice. Justice and love can and must be distinguished, yet in reality they cannot be separated since they require and interpenetrate each [108] other. Love creates the atmosphere in which justice can flourish; it gives the ability to see what is just and then to resolve to accord to the other person what is his due. Without love, justice is lifeless, and anyone who is exclusively concerned with attaining justice will fail to attain it. To achieve justice, we must want more—namely, love. Any apparent opposition between love and justice has its foundation in the disorder of egoism and self-seeking brought about by sin. This may show itself in the fact that the objective order is spoiled, or that men set up excessive claims, or that legitimate demands which accord with human dignity are not met. For justice to be achieved in the world of disorder a balancing of legitimate interests is required. Here prudence is called for . . .” (Schmaus 108-109)
   5. Prudence is “that virtue whereby we are aware of our moral duty and concerned to develop the concrete means for its accomplishment. If we are to work for social justice, a high degree of expert and extensive knowledge is required, together with critical judgment. Good will alone is not enough; indeed, without knowledge it can bring on disaster.” (Schmaus 109)
   6. “Man is called to this: without haste or agitation, without anxiety or fear, but with the exertion of all his powers in patience and persever­ance, to do what lies at hand.” (Schmaus 109)
   7. “These four virtues . . . are powers enabling a man, in Christ and with Christ, to do justice to the demands of real life situations in the spirit of love.” (Schmaus 109)

## The Gifts of the Holy Spirit

1. **the 7 gifts of the Holy Spirit**
   1. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are: wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, piety, and fear of the Lord. See Isa 11:2, “The spirit of the Lord shall rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord.” Piety was added by later tradition.
   2. The 7 defined:
      1. ***fear of the Lord***—fills us with a dread of sin, on account of the goodness of God and the punishment He can inflict. (*Explanation*)
      2. ***piety***—makes us love God as a Father, and obey Him because we love Him. (*Explanation*)
      3. ***knowledge***—enables us to discover the will of God in all things. (*Explanation*)
      4. ***fortitude***—strengthens us to do the will of God, what we should do, in all things. Some know the will of God but lack the courage to follow the dictates of their conscience. For example, a person goes with bad company: the gift of knowledge will teach him that he should give it up; but the gift of fortitude will enable him to do what his conscience shows him to be right. (*Explanation*)
      5. ***counsel***—warns us of the deceits of the devil, and of the dangers to salvation. The devil is much wiser than we are, and has much more experience, being among the people of the world from the beginning. He could easily deceive and overcome us if the gift of counsel did not expose his plots. When we are tempted, our conscience warns us, and if we follow the warning we shall escape the sin. Counsel tells us when persons or places are dangerous for our salvation. (*Explanation*)
      6. ***understanding***—enables us to know more clearly the mysteries of faith. Understanding enables us to know better what His teaching means. The Apostles heard and knew what Our Lord taught, but they did not fully understand the whole meaning till the Holy Ghost had come. (*Explanation*)
      7. ***wisdom***—gives us relish for the things of God and directs all our actions to His honor and glory. (*Explanation*)
2. **the gifts of the Holy Spirit**: **comments**
   1. Aquinas, “speaking of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, [says] they are an instrument by means of which . . . the enjoyment of the divine persons is possible . . .” (Moeller and Philips 34)
   2. “. . . the Spirit is understood by both Greek and Latin Fathers as that gift to man whereby he is united to Christ and through Christ to the Father. In the course of theological development, the diverse ways in which the Holy Spirit works in man were examined.” (Schmaus 110)
   3. “The foundation text was Isaiah 11,2. Here it is said of the coming Messiah that the Spirit of the Lord will rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and piety, and that the spirit of fear of the Lord will fill him (in the original text the gift of piety was not mentioned). Since Christ, as the Head of mankind, possesses all spiritual riches not for him­self but for us, the conclusion reached was that the gifts of the Spirit ascribed to Christ are also extended to man in the state of grace. Scrip­ture testifies that Christ will give new life in its fullness to those who believe in him (Jn. 10,10; Col. 2,9-12). In addition there is Paul’s teaching that the justified man can experience the working of the Spirit directly (1 Cor. 12).” (Schmaus 110)
      1. Isa 11:2, “The spirit of the Lord shall rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord.”
      2. John 10:10, “I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.”
      3. 1 Cor 12:1-31, “Now concerning spiritual gifts, brothers and sisters, I do not want you to be uninformed. . . . 3no one can say “Jesus is Lord” except by the Holy Spirit. 4Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit . . . 7To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. 8To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, 9to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, 10to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discernment of spirits, to another various kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues. 11All these are activated by one and the same Spirit, who allots to each one individually just as the Spirit chooses. 12For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. 13For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body . . . 27Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it. 28And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; then deeds of power, then gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues. . . . 31But strive for the greater gifts. And I will show you a still more excellent way.”
      4. Col 2:9-12, “in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily, 10and you have come to fullness in him, who is the head of every ruler and authority. . . .”
   4. “In the course of time various theories have been offered to explain the gifts of the Spirit. Today there is general acceptance by systematic theology of the ideas proposed by Aquinas: that the gifts of the Spirit effect a special interior relationship with God, preparing the heart to experience the divine impulses not as alien or threatening but as familiar and satisfying, so that he will responds [*sic*] to them with alacrity and joy. The gifts of the Spirit produce in the human soul a delicate receptivity to the divine presence . . . so that in even the most difficult and baffling situations it is possible for us to recognize the truth and do what is right.” (Schmaus 110)
   5. “The strong accent on God’s activity in the operation of the gifts does not lessen the importance of man’s activity. The human action, induced and supported by God, participates in the movement of divine action and is animated by it. This human activity effected by God is not . . . external action: what is meant is rather a synthesizing and enlivening of all man’s powers. . . . a maximum of divine activity depends on a maximum of human activity.” (Schmaus 110)

## Charisms

1. **charisms in Paul**
   1. Rom 12:4-8

For as in one body we have many members, and not all the members have the same function, 5so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another. 6We have gifts that differ according to the grace given to us:

prophecy, in proportion to faith;

7ministry, in ministering;

the teacher, in teaching;

8the exhorter, in exhortation;

the giver, in generosity;

the leader, in diligence;

the compassionate, in cheerfulness.

* 1. 1 Cor 12

Now concerning spiritual gifts, brothers and sisters, I do not want you to be uninformed.

2You know that when you were pagans, you were enticed and led astray to idols that could not speak. 3Therefore I want you to understand that no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says “Let Jesus be cursed!” and no one can say “Jesus is Lord” except by the Holy Spirit.

4Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; 5and there are varieties of services, but the same Lord; 6and there are varieties of activities, but it is the same God who activates all of them in everyone. 7To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good.

8To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom,

and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit,

9to another faith by the same Spirit,

to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit,

10to another the working of miracles,

to another prophecy,

to another the discernment of spirits,

to another various kinds of tongues,

to another the interpretation of tongues.

11All these are activated by one and the same Spirit, who allots to each one individually just as the Spirit chooses. 12For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. 13For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and we were all made to drink of one Spirit.

14Indeed, the body does not consist of one member but of many. 15If the foot would say, “Because I am not a hand, I do not belong to the body,” that would not make it any less a part of the body. 16And if the ear would say, “Because I am not an eye, I do not belong to the body,” that would not make it any less a part of the body. 17If the whole body were an eye, where would the hearing be? If the whole body were hearing, where would the sense of smell be? 18But as it is, God arranged the members in the body, each one of them, as he chose. 19If all were a single member, where would the body be? 20As it is, there are many members, yet one body. 21The eye cannot say to the hand, “I have no need of you,” nor again the head to the feet, “I have no need of you.” 22On the contrary, the members of the body that seem to be weaker are indispensable, 23and those members of the body that we think less honorable we clothe with greater honor, and our less respectable members are treated with greater respect; 24whereas our more respectable members do not need this. But God has so arranged the body, giving the greater honor to the inferior member, 25that there may be no dissension within the body, but the members may have the same care for one another. 26If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it.

27Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it. 28And God has appointed in the church

first apostles,

second prophets,

third teachers;

then deeds of power,

then gifts of healing,

forms of assistance,

forms of leadership,

various kinds of tongues.

29Are all apostles?

Are all prophets?

Are all teachers?

Do all work miracles?

30Do all possess gifts of healing?

Do all speak in tongues?

Do all interpret?

31But strive for the greater gifts. And I will show you a still more excellent way. [1 Cor 13, faith, hope, and love.]

* 1. 1 Cor 14

Pursue love and strive for the spiritual gifts,

and especially that you may prophesy. 2For those who speak in a tongue do not speak to other people but to God; for nobody understands them, since they are speaking mysteries in the Spirit. 3On the other hand, those who prophesy speak to other people for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation. 4Those who speak in a tongue build up themselves, but those who prophesy build up the church. 5Now I would like all of you to speak in tongues, but even more to prophesy. One who prophesies is greater than one who speaks in tongues, unless someone interprets, so that the church may be built up. 6Now, brothers and sisters, if I come to you speaking in tongues, how will I benefit you unless I speak to you in some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching? 7It is the same way with lifeless instruments that produce sound, such as the flute or the harp. If they do not give distinct notes, how will anyone know what is being played? 8And if the bugle gives an indistinct sound, who will get ready for battle? 9So with yourselves; if in a tongue you utter speech that is not intelligible, how will anyone know what is being said? For you will be speaking into the air. 10There are doubtless many different kinds of sounds in the world, and nothing is without sound. 11If then I do not know the meaning of a sound, I will be a foreigner to the speaker and the speaker a foreigner to me. 12So with yourselves; since you are eager for spiritual gifts, strive to excel in them for building up the church. 13Therefore, one who speaks in a tongue should pray for the power to interpret. 14For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unproductive. 15What should I do then? I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the mind also; I will sing praise with the spirit, but I will sing praise with the mind also. 16Otherwise, if you say a blessing with the spirit, how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the “Amen” to your thanksgiving, since the outsider does not know what you are saying? 17For you may give thanks well enough, but the other person is not built up. 18I thank God that I speak in tongues more than all of you; 19nevertheless, in church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue. 20Brothers and sisters, do not be children in your thinking; rather, be infants in evil, but in thinking be adults. 21In the law it is written, “By people of strange tongues and by the lips of foreigners I will speak to this people; yet even then they will not listen to me,” says the Lord. 22Tongues, then, are a sign not for believers but for unbelievers, while prophecy is not for unbelievers but for believers. 23If, therefore, the whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are out of your mind? 24But if all prophesy, an unbeliever or outsider who enters is reproved by all and called to account by all. 25After the secrets of the unbeliever’s heart are disclosed, that person will bow down before God and worship him, declaring, “God is really among you.” 26What should be done then, my friends? When you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all things be done for building up. 27If anyone speaks in a tongue, let there be only two or at most three, and each in turn; and let one interpret. 28But if there is no one to interpret, let them be silent in church and speak to themselves and to God. 29Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said. 30If a revelation is made to someone else sitting nearby, let the first person be silent. 31For you can all prophesy one by one, so that all may learn and all be encouraged. 32And the spirits of prophets are subject to the prophets, 33for God is a God not of disorder but of peace. (As in all the churches of the saints, 34women should be silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also says. 35If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church. 36Or did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only ones it has reached?) 37Anyone who claims to be a prophet, or to have spiritual powers, must acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord. 38Anyone who does not recognize this is not to be recognized. 39So, my friends, be eager to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues; 40but all things should be done decently and in order.”

* 1. Eph 4

“[Make] every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. 4There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling, 5one Lord, one faith, one baptism, 6one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all. 7But each of us was given grace according to the measure of Christ’s gift. . . . 11The gifts he gave were that

some would be apostles,

some prophets,

some evangelists,

some pastors

and teachers,

12to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, 13until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ. . . . 15we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, 16from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body’s growth in building itself up in love. . . . 25let all of us speak the truth to our neighbors, for we are members of one another.”

1. **charisms in *The Catechism of the Catholic Church***
   1. “The Church is the Temple of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the soul, as it were, of the Mystical Body, the source of its life, of its unity in diversity, and of the riches of its gifts and charisms.” (*Catechism* § 809)
   2. “Whether extraordinary or simple and humble, charisms are graces of the Holy Spirit which directly or indirectly benefit the Church, ordered as they are to her building up, to the good of men, and to the needs of the world.” (*Catechism* § 799)
   3. “Charisms are to be accepted with gratitude by the person who receives them and by all members of the Church as well. They are a wonderfully rich grace for the apostolic vitality and for the holiness of the entire Body of Christ, provided they really are genuine gifts of the Holy Spirit and are used in full conformity with authentic promptings of this same Spirit, that is, in keeping with charity, the true measure of all charisms.” (*Catechism* § 800, p. 253)
   4. “It is in this sense that discernment of charisms is always necessary. No charism is exempt from being referred and submitted to the Church’s shepherds. “Their office [is] not indeed to extinguish the Spirit, but to test all things and hold fast to what is good [1 Thess 5:21; see Rom 12:9],” [254] so that all the diverse and complementary charisms work together “for the common good.”” (*Catechism* § 801, pp. 254-255)

## Merit

Terminology

1. “Merit” derives from *mereri* and *meritum*. (Fransen 210)
2. “Merit”: “A deed which God has attached reward to.” (Lamirande, Emilien, O. M. I. *The Communion of Saints*. Trans. A. Manson. Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism. New York: Hawthorn, 1963.)
3. “Merit”: “man’s right to be rewarded for a work done for God.” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
4. “Merit”: “The fruit of justification . . .” (Schmaus 138)
5. “Merit”: either “the meritorious act [or] the intrinsic value of the act.” (Schmaus 138)
6. “In the second century, the technical term “merit” was introduced as a synonym for the Greek word for “reward.” Thus the doctrine of merit and the doctrine of reward are the same thing, simply presented under two different terms.” (“Merit,” Catholic Answers)
7. “This word is foreign to the Eastern tradition, but equivalent terms of biblical origin are found there, such as ‘worthy of . . .,’ referring to the heavenly reward, according to works, as for example [James 2] puts it.” (Moeller and Philips 35)

Merit in Scripture

1. **introduction**
   1. “The conception has its foundation in the Bible, where . . . rewards are promised . . .” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   2. “Although the word “merit” is not found in the Scriptures, the frequent references to reward, recompense, crown, the prize of the victor, all prepare the way for the later theology with its teaching on merit.” (Schmaus 138)
   3. “In Scripture, it is plain that, in some way, God has bound Himself to reward us.” (Fransen 215)
2. **Old Testament**
   1. In the Old Testament “the reward assured by God is always understood as a reward of grace (Is. 49,4; 61,8). God chooses men for their mission by a free judgment, not according to merit (Gen. 6,8; 12,1ff.). The election of the people of Israel likewise is not based on any idea of merit (Deut. 7,7f.; Ex. 33,19; Hosea 1ff.).” (Schmaus 138-39)
      1. Gen 6:8, “But Noah found favor in the sight of the Lord.”
      2. Gen 12:1-6, “the Lord said to Abram, “Go from your country and your kindred and your father’s house to the land that I will show you. 2I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. 3I will bless those who bless you, and the one who curses you I will curse; and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed.” 4So Abram went, as the Lord had told him . . .”
      3. Exod 33:19, “I will make all my goodness pass before you, and will proclaim before you the name, ‘The Lord’; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.”
      4. Deut 5:33, “You must follow exactly the path that the Lord your God has commanded you, so that you may live, and that it may go well with you . . .”
      5. Deut 7:7-8, “It was not because you were more numerous than any other people that the Lord set his heart on you and chose you—for you were the fewest of all peoples. 8It was because the Lord loved you and kept the oath that he swore to your ancestors, that the Lord has brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the house of slavery, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.”
      6. Isa 49:4, “I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nothing and vanity; yet surely my cause is with the Lord, and my reward with my God.”
      7. Isa 61:8, “I the Lord love justice, I hate robbery and wrongdoing; I will faithfully give them their recompense, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them.”
      8. Hosea 1:2-10, “the Lord said to Hosea, “Go, take for yourself a wife of whoredom and have children of whoredom, for the land commits great whoredom by forsaking the Lord.” 3So he went and took Gomer daughter of Diblaim . . . 8she conceived and bore a son. 9Then the Lord said, “Name him Lo-ammi, for you are not my people and I am not your God.” 10Yet the number of the people of Israel shall be like the sand of the sea, which can be neither measured nor numbered; and in the place where it was said to them, “You are not my people,” it shall be said to them, “Children of the living God.””
   2. “The idea took form in Judaism that the keeping of the command­ments established for man a claim against God. By the fulfillment of the law the pious “gathered” merit, and God, so to speak, kept the books. Man counted on an equivalence between deed and reward. Finally this religion of the Pharisees grew into a religion of self-salvation.” (Schmaus 139)
3. **Jesus**
   1. “Christ unambiguously speaks of “reward” and “requital” . . .” (Fransen 207) “It is true that Jesus also spoke of reward . . ., but he vehemently denied the thesis of the Pharisees about a claim to reward and the equivalence of deed and reward. Every reward is a grace . . . For God is the Lord, over whom creation has no rights.” (Schmaus 139)
   2. Matt 5:3-12, “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 4Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. 5Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. 6Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled. 7Blessed are the merciful, for they will receive mercy. 8Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. 9Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God. 10Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 11Blessed are you when people revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account. 12Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you.”
   3. Matt 5:46, “if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same?”
   4. Matt 6:1, “Beware of practicing your piety before others in order to be seen by them; for then you have no reward from your Father in heaven.”
   5. Matt 6:4, “your Father who sees in secret will reward you.”
   6. Matt 6:19-33, “Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume and where thieves break in and steal; 20but store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust consumes and where thieves do not break in and steal. 21For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also. . . . 30if God so clothes the grass of the field, which is alive today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will he not much more clothe you—you of little faith? . . . 32your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. 33But strive first for the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.”
   7. Matt 7:21, “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heav­en, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven.”
   8. Matt 10:41, “Whoever welcomes a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive a prophet's reward; and whoever welcomes a righteous person in the name of a righteous person will receive the reward of the righteous . . .”
   9. Matt 21:28-32, ““A man had two sons; he went to the first and said, ‘Son, go and work in the vineyard today.’ 29He answered, ‘I will not’; but later he changed his mind and went. 30The father went to the second and said the same; and he answered, ‘I go, sir’; but he did not go. 31Which of the two did the will of his father?” They said, “The first.” Jesus said to them, “Truly I tell you, the tax collectors and the prostitutes are going into the kingdom of God ahead of you. 32For John came to you in the way of righteousness and you did not believe him, but the tax collectors and the prostitutes believed him; and even after you saw it, you did not change your minds and believe him.””
   10. Matt 25:14-30, a man “summoned his slaves . . . 15to one he gave five talents, to another two, to another one, to each according to his ability. Then he went away. 16The one who had received the five talents went off at once and traded with them, and made five more talents. 17In the same way, the one who had the two talents made two more talents. 18But the one who had received the one talent went off and dug a hole in the ground and hid his master's money. 19After a long time the master of those slaves came and settled accounts with them. 20Then the one who had received the five talents came forward, bringing five more talents . . . 21His master said to him, ‘Well done . . . enter into the joy of your master.’ 22And the one with the two talents also came forward . . . 23His master said to him, ‘Well done . . . enter into the joy of your master.’ 24Then the one who had received the one talent also came forward, saying, ‘Master, I knew that you were a harsh man, reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you did not scatter seed; 25so I was afraid, and I went and hid your talent in the ground. Here you have what is yours.’ 26But his master replied, ‘You wicked and lazy slave! You knew, did you, that I reap where I did not sow, and gather where I did not scatter? 27Then you ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and on my return I would have received what was my own with interest. 28So take the talent from him, and give it to the one with the ten talents. 29For to all those who have, more will be given, and they will have an abundance; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away. 30As for this worthless slave, throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.’”
   11. Mark 9:41, “whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you bear the name of Christ will by no means lose the reward.”
   12. Mark 10:17-31, ““what must I do to inherit eternal life?” 18Jesus said to him, “. . . 19You know the commandments: ‘You shall not murder; You shall not commit adultery; You shall not steal; You shall not bear false witness; You shall not defraud; Honor your father and mother.’” 20He said to him, “Teacher, I have kept all these since my youth.” 21Jesus, looking at him, loved him and said, “You lack one thing; go, sell what you own, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me.” 22When he heard this, he was shocked and went away grieving, for he had many possessions. 23Then Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, “How hard it will be for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God! . . . 25It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle . . . 27For mortals it is impossible, but not for God; for God all things are possible. . . . 29there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, 30who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age—houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions—and in the age to come eternal life. 31But many who are first will be last, and the last will be first.””
   13. Luke 6:22-23, “Blessed are you when people . . . defame you on account of the Son of Man 23. . . for surely your reward is great in heaven . . .”
   14. Luke 6:32-38, “If you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them. 33If you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners do the same. 34If you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, to receive as much again. 35But love your enemies, do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return. Your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked. 36Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful. 37Do not judge, and you will not be judged; do not condemn, and you will not be condemned. Forgive, and you will be forgiven; 38give, and it will be given to you. A good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap; for the measure you give will be the measure you get back.”
   15. Luke 17:10, “when you have done all that you were ordered to do, say, ‘We are worthless slaves; we have done only what we ought to have done!’”
4. **Paul**
   1. “Paul rejects in the strongest terms the idea that man can achieve salvation by his own efforts.” (Schmaus 139)
   2. “However, he is convinced that God recom­penses everyone according to his works, giving eternal life to those who persevere . . .” (Schmaus 139)
      1. Rom 2:6-16, “he will repay according to each one’s deeds: 7to those who by patiently doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; 8while for those who are self-seeking and who obey not the truth but wickedness, there will be wrath and fury. . . . 13For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous in God’s sight, but the doers of the law who will be justified. 14When Gentiles, who do not possess the law, do instinctively what the law requires, these, though not having the law, are a law to themselves. 15They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, to which their own conscience also bears witness; and their conflicting thoughts will accuse or perhaps excuse them 16on the day when, according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all.”
      2. Rom 14:10-12, “we will all stand before the judgment seat of God. . . . 12So then, each of us will be accountable to God.”
      3. 1 Cor 5:10, “not at all meaning the immoral of this world, or the greedy and robbers, or idolaters, since you would then need to go out of the world.”
      4. 1 Cor 6:9-10, “wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God . . . Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, 10thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers—none of these will inherit the kingdom of God.”
   3. “The recompense corresponds to each one’s works . . .” (Schmaus 139)
      1. 1 Cor 3:8, “The one who plants and the one who waters have a common purpose, and each will receive wages according to the labor of each.”
      2. 1 Cor 3:14, “If what has been built on the foundation survives, the builder will receive a reward.”
      3. 1 Cor 9:24-27, “Do you not know that in a race the runners all compete, but only one receives the prize? Run in such a way that you may win it. 25Athletes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. 26So I do not run aimlessly, nor do I box as though beating the air; 27but I punish my body and enslave it, so that after proclaiming to others I myself should not be disqualified.”
      4. 2 Cor 5:10, “all of us must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil.”
   4. “Man ought not, however, aim at the reward, but seek to please the Lord . . .” (Schmaus 139)
      1. Col 3:23-24, “Whatever your task, put yourselves into it, as done for the Lord and not for your masters, 24since you know that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward; you serve the Lord Christ.”
      2. Acts 11:17-25, Peter says, ““If then God gave them [Gentiles] the same gift [the Holy Spirit] that he gave us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could hinder God?” 18When they heard this, they were silenced. And they praised God, saying, “Then God has given even to the Gentiles the repentance that leads to life.”
   5. “The negative side of reward is the judgment. Paul exhorts his readers so to live that they do not fall under the judgment in spite of their normally Christian state.” (Schmaus 139)
   6. In Paul, the term “works” or “deeds” has two meanings. (Fransen 208)
      1. “Works” are actions “done from religious motives which a man flaunts . . . on the ground that by them he has acquired definite “rights” . . . Many rabbis had come to the notion that God’s judgment is very much like that of a human judge who examines and weighs out man’s good and evil actions.” (Fransen 208) This notion has two unfortunate conse­quen­ces.
         1. “. . . in such a supposition, man is . . . the master of his desti­ny.” This is semi-Pelagianism. (Fransen 208)
         2. Such “a judge . . . has no other function than to confirm official­ly what the scales have measured. . . . But if it is by grace, then *it does not rest on deeds done, or grace would cease to be grace*” (Rom 11:5-6).” (Fransen 208)
      2. But Paul gives a second meaning to “works.”
         1. “It is not by hearing the law, but *by doing it,* that men will be justified before God” (Rom 2:6-16).
         2. Rom 2:6-16, “he will repay according to each one’s deeds: 7to those who by patiently doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; 8while for those who are self-seeking and who obey not the truth but wickedness, there will be wrath and fury. 9There will be anguish and distress for everyone who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek, 10but glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek. 11For God shows no partiality. 12All who have sinned apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. 13For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous in God’s sight, but the doers of the law who will be justified. 14When Gentiles, who do not possess the law, do instinctively what the law requires, these, though not having the law, are a law to themselves. 15They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, to which their own conscience also bears witness; and their conflicting thoughts will accuse or perhaps excuse them 16on the day when, according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all.”
         3. 1 Cor 15:58, “be steadfast, immovable, always excelling in the work of the Lord, because you know that in the Lord your labor is not in vain.”
         4. Either Paul . . . con­tradicts himself [or] “deeds” has in his writing a twofold meaning . . .” The first is the notion of the Pharisees; the second is taken from the prophets and from Christ’s teaching. (Fransen 209)
5. **later New Testament writings**
   1. James 2:14-26, “What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? . . . 17faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead. . . . 19You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder. 20Do you want to be shown, you senseless person, that faith apart from works is barren? 21Was not our ancestor Abraham justified by works when he offered his son Isaac on the altar? 22You see that faith was active along with his works, and faith was brought to completion by the works. 23Thus the scripture was fulfilled that says, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness,” and he was called the friend of God. 24You see that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone. 25Likewise, was not Rahab the prostitute also justified by works when she welcomed the messengers and sent them out by another road? 26For just as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is also dead.”
   2. 1 Pet 1:17, “If you invoke as Father the one who judges all people impartially according to their deeds, live in reverent fear during the time of your exile.”
   3. Rev 2:23, “I am the one who searches minds and hearts, and I will give to each of you as your works deserve.”
   4. Rev 22:12, “See, I am coming soon; my reward is with me, to repay according to everyone’s work.”
   5. Rev 20:12-15, “another book was opened, the book of life. And the dead were judged according to their works, as recorded in the books. 13. . . Death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them, and all were judged according to what they had done. . . . 15and anyone whose name was not found written in the book of life was thrown into the lake of fire.”

Merit in Tradition

1. **Church Fathers**
   1. “The term [*meritum*] appears to have been first employed by Tertullian, who already re­cog­nizes diversity of merit followed by diversity of reward [*Scorp*. 6].” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905) “The expression “merit” originated with Cyprian and Tertullian and spread rapidly. Tertullian and Cyprian began to develop a doctrine of merit, making use of con­cepts and expressions from business and legal affairs.” (Schmaus 139) “This doctrine was endorsed by Cyprian, Au­gustine (partly), and the later Fathers . . .” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   2. “Origen felt called on to point out the danger of self-justification; he stressed that eternal life is not the payment of a debt owed to man.” (Schmaus 139)
   3. Augustine
      1. “Augustine associated the teaching on merit more closely than it had formerly been with the [139] doctrine of grace. He characterized merit as another ex­pression for grace; in particular he formulated the more precise ideas for later theology and Church teaching that our “merits” are a gift of God, or that God accounts as merit for us what is really his gift.” (Schmaus 139-40)
      2. Trent adopted “a profound paradox we owe to Augustine’s genius: “God’s goodness toward men is such that *He wants His gifts to be their merits*.”” (Fransen 215)

Middle Ages: Condign and Congruous Merit

1. **introduction**
   1. Merit “was fully developed by the Schoolmen,” who distinguished *meritum de condigno* and *meritum de congruo*. (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   2. Merit “*de* *condigno* (deserved) . . . is that conferred by God’s promise because of the worthiness of the act . . .” (Schmaus 138)
   3. Merit “*de* *congruo* (fitting) . . . is that which God takes notice of in his mercy.” (Schmaus 138)
2. **clarifications of the concepts**
   1. condign merit: merit as a right
      1. merit as wage
         1. “What is merit? . . . The first thing to come spontaneously to mind is the wages earned by a workman. . . . It is a mutual agreement, sanc­tioned by that species of justice known by the name of “commuta­tive justice”: it implies an exchange and a bilateral force binding on the contracting parties. [201] . . . the pay is proportioned to the work done; and time is the more obvious manner of measuring it.” (Fransen 201-2)
         2. “When a man hires out his horse or his cart, he acquires a right to payment; but neither the horse nor the cart can be said to “merit” anything. Merit connotes the performing of an action, and, to speak accurately, an action performed by a human person. A minimum of free­dom is strictly required.” (Fransen 202)
         3. “A specialized workman takes pride in his work and craftsmanship and is perhaps justly conscious of being the only one fit for the job, so much so that he reckons his employer lucky that he is not working elsewhere.” (Fransen 208)
      2. merit as fee
         1. “. . . on a higher level, . . . a doctor, for instance, or a lawyer . . . does not speak of wages, but of fees.” (Fransen 202)
         2. “The work he does cannot be valued in terms of hours spent in it. Not only have doctors and lawyers to devote many years to prepare themselves for their profession, [but] they have to keep up their studies. Be­sides, long experi­ence adds greatly to the value of their interven­tions.” (Fransen 202)
   2. congruous merit: merit as an honor
      1. “. . . we speak of merit also in quite a different connection, [like] a medal, an international prize, etc. . . . This “merit” supposes in the one who awards the prize a . . . desire to offer the prize as a *gift*. . . . he who receives the mark of honor has somehow [203] “merited” it . . .” (Fransen 203-4)
      2. “. . . a doctor or a lawyer can have recourse to a sheriff to exact from the client payments in arrears. But in the instances just mentioned, nothing of the sort can be done. [203] . . . the recipient [of a prize] may not look upon the honor, conferred on him, as his “due.” . . . If it happens that he is passed by, . . . he has no court of appeal . . .” (Fransen 203-4)
      3. “On the one hand, there is the free, almost sovereign initiative of conferring the gift, and on the other, we see a life that ought to be highly valued by society because of the implied personal dedication and of the stake society has in it. More clearly than in the dialectic of wages and fees, a third party is here in evidence, human society.” (Fransen 204)
   3. merit as love between equal humans
      1. “We are now ready for [a third] degree of “merit” . . . more radical than either right or honor. . . . On the level of love, . . . any human gesture [such as giving a necklace] turns out to be a *symbol* of one person surrendering to another. Whether it takes on the shape of a gift or . . . a life of devotion, anything that betokens self-surrender is neither more nor less than an eloquently rich symbol of the mutual relations of love.” (Fransen 204)
      2. Here “there can be no talk of “merit” in the strict sense; for, all distance which “merit” necessarily supposes between persons . . . has vanished. And yet, in love, mutual obligations attain a degree of intensity far beyond what is implied in “merit” as described above.” (Fransen 205)
   4. merit as love between unequal humans
      1. “All our remarks apply more strictly still when we have to do with a love involving a certain degree of inequality between the persons in question, e. g., in the relations of love between father and son. The father gave to the son life, education and name. . . . Should he [the son] reject that love, he would lower . . . the nobility of his own person . . .” (Fransen 205)
      2. “. . . love unites persons not through deeds and rewards, but *without interme­diaries*. “Merit” in love lies in an encounter with the person himself, and no longer in the giving or receiving of either reward or gift.” (Fransen 205)
   5. merit as love between God and humans
      1. ““Theological merit,” as it has been named, should be defined in terms of its own peculiar spiritual content, and not in terms of inferior concrete examples as found in our experience. [Here,] to speak of “commutative justice,” even analogically, is dangerous.” (Fransen 206)
      2. ““To merit” is . . . an active existential relationship. All notion of laying up merits, whether in heaven or in the so-called treasure of the Church, is to be ruthlessly set aside.” (Fransen 207)
      3. “. . . we have to start from the basic principle: *God’s absolute primacy in the dispensation of grace*. . . . There exists no . . . merit, beginning with the first step in the faith and ending with the final consummation in eternity, which does not spring from the prevenient initial love of God who lives in us . . .” (Fransen 207)
      4. “. . . the second moment of the dialectical movement [is]: within the divine initiative, our good deeds are truly ours . . . and at the same time, they are truly meritorious, especially when we live in the “state of grace” . . .” (Fransen 207)
   6. Become what you are. (Fransen 211)
      1. “However, Scripture does not content itself with stating two affirma­tions: the first, that everything is grace, the second, that *with grace* we may truly speak of merit. It goes one step further. . . . this third dialectical movement [is] a profound realization of our sinfulness.” (Fransen 211)
      2. scripture
         1. “We are servants *and deserve no credit* . . . When we do what we have to do, we have done no more than our duty.” (Fransen 211) Luke 17:7-10, “Who among you would say to your slave who has just come in from plowing or tending sheep in the field, ‘Come here at once and take your place at the table’? 8Would you not rather say to him, ‘Prepare supper for me, put on your apron and serve me while I eat and drink; later you may eat and drink’? 9Do you thank the slave for doing what was commanded? 10So you also, when you have done all that you were ordered to do, say, ‘We are worthless slaves; we have done only what we ought to have done!’”
         2. Another parable “affords us a still better insight into the mystery of merit.” [211] In Matt 19:30-20:16, a landowner hires workmen at 6 a.m., 9 a.m., noon, 3 p.m., and 5 p.m. Though the owner promises “a fair wage,” “Christ immedi­ately changes the image of strict wages understood as a legal obligation between equals into something quite relative. In the Kingdom we have no other *rights* than those God *deigns to give us*. “Surely, I am free to do with my money what I [212] like. Why be jealous because I am kind?” The two parts of this quotation throw light on each other. God stays absolutely free, not as an arbitrary tyrant might be, but “because He is kind.” His pre­ferences never exclude the others.” (Fransen 211-13)
      3. “We are now ready for the third step in our dialectic. In our merit there is never room for “boasting.” To begin with, all things come from Christ. . . . There is still another reason: . . . There dwells in us the reality of sin . . .” (Fransen 213)
      4. “In general, Paul and John speak about what in Protestant theology is named “the indicative”—that is, a clear affirmation of what we have become in Christ and the Spirit. Confronting “the indicative” is “the imperative,” the equivalent of a command, namely: become what [i.e., holy] you already are.” (Fransen 213)
      5. “. . . all grace comes from God; and yet the fact remains that our deeds acquire *value* in God’s sight insofar as the nobility of divine sonship shines in them. Nonetheless—and here we have the third step—this merit remains eternally the merit of men who have been freed from sin, of men who are always exposed to the danger of sin, and who daily fall into sin.” (Fransen 214)
   7. later middle ages
      1. “According to John Duns Scotus, the freedom of the omnipotent divine will is central to the thinking on this matter. Hence he gives especially strong emphasis to the divine acceptance. Also, according to Scotus, God attaches his freedom to definite principles. The love in­dwelling in man is the reason why God accepts his works, and this is because God is the substance of love. The man who has charity, there­fore, is accepted and loved by God on the same basis as that on which God affirms himself. So the foundation of merit lies in the relation between the human will and the act produced by the habit of love of God, insofar as God makes such an act good.” (Schmaus 144)
      2. “In the period after Scotus this element of the divine acceptance became the subject of theories which were excessively subtle and nuanced. In connection with the overemphasis on the absolute power of God and his perfect independence, it was theorized that God can likewise accept the works of the unrighteous man, since acceptance or nonacceptance rests exclusively on the decree of his will (John of Bassolis, Francis Mayronis, William of Rubion, William of Occam, Gregory of Rimini, Gabriel Biel).” (Schmaus 144)

Reformation and Catholic Reformation

1. **Luther**
   1. “Luther believed that the justified man was obliged to engage in works which would have value on the day of judgment, but he denied the teaching that the man merited by them because he feared that it would lead to the Christian’s seeking certain help, solace, and salvation itself in his own works rather than as God’s gift.” (Schmaus 140)
   2. “There is a danger that the ill-instructed Christian may hope to gather merit as a basis for bargaining with God, to use his good works as a kind of pledge which God must at once redeem. Needless to say, notions of this sort are very far from the meaning of the scriptural texts and the Church’s teaching.” (Schmaus 143)
   3. Luther “taught the sinfulness of all human works whether done before or after justifica­tion.” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   4. “Most subsequent Protestant theology has denied that merit is a valid Christian cate­gory.” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
2. **Trent**
   1. Trent maintained “the impossibility of meriting the initial grace of justification . . .” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   2. It “emphasized the reality of human merit, based on the supernatural life communicated by Christ as the Head to the members of His Mystical Body.” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   3. Trent said: “justified men, whether they have contin­uously kept grace once they have received it, or whether they have lost it and recovered it again, should consider these words of the Apostle: “Abound in every good work, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord” (cf. 1 Cor. 15,58) “for God is not unjust, that he should forget your work and the love that you have shown in his name” (Heb. 6,10); and: “Do not lose your confidence, which has a great reward” (see Heb. 10,35). And eternal life should therefore be set before those who persevere in good works to the end (see Mt. 10,22) and who hope in God. It should be set before them as being the grace that God, through Jesus Christ, has mercifully promised his sons, and “as the reward” which, according to the promise of God himself, must assuredly be given them for their good works and merits (can. 26 and 32). For this is that crown of justice which the Apostle says is laid up for him after the fight and the race; the crown that will be given him by the just Judge, and not to him alone but to all who love His coming (see 2 Tim. 4,7f.). Indeed, Christ Jesus himself always gives strength to the justified, just as the head gives strength to the members (see Eph. 4,15) and the vine gives strength to the branches (see Jn. 15,5). This strength always precedes, accompanies, and follows the good works of the justified and without it the good works cannot be at all pleasing to God or meritorious (can. 2). Since this is true, it is necessary to believe that the justified have every­thing necessary for them to be regarded as having completely satisfied the divine law for this life by their works, at least those which they have [140] performed in God. And they may be regarded as having likewise truly merited the eternal life they will certainly attain in due time (if they but die in the state of grace) (see Apoc. 14,13, can. 32), because Christ our Savior says: “He who drinks of the water that I will give him shall never thirst, but it will become in him a fountain of water, springing up into life everlasting” (see Jn. 4,13f.). Thus, it is not personal effort that makes justice our own, and God’s justice is not disregarded or rejected (see Rom. 10,3); for, the justice that is said to be ours because it inheres in us is likewise God’s justice because he has put it in us through the merit of Christ (see can. 10,11).” (chapter 16, DS 1545-50) (Schmaus 140-41)
      1. 1 Cor 15:58, “be steadfast, immovable, always excelling in the work of the Lord, because you know that in the Lord your labor is not in vain.”
      2. Heb 6:10, “God is not unjust; he will not overlook your work and the love that you showed for his sake in serving the saints, as you still do.”
      3. Heb 10:35, “Do not, therefore, abandon that confidence of yours; it brings a great reward.”
      4. Matt 10:22, “you will be hated by all because of my name. But the one who endures to the end will be saved.”
      5. 2 Tim 4:7-8, “I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. 8From now on there is reserved for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give me on that day, and not only to me but also to all who have longed for his appearing.”
      6. Eph 4:15, “speaking the truth in love, we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ . . .”
      7. John 15:5, “I am the vine, you are the branches. Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing.”
      8. Rev 14:13, “I heard a voice from heaven saying, “Write this: Blessed are the dead who from now on die in the Lord.” “Yes,” says the Spirit, “they will rest from their labors, for their deeds follow them.””
      9. John 4:13-14, “Everyone who drinks of this water will be thirsty again, 14but those who drink of the water that I will give them will never be thirsty. The water that I will give will become in them a spring of water gushing up to eternal life.”
      10. Rom 10:3, “being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish their own, they have not submitted to God’s righteousness.”
   4. Trent continued: “Christ promises even to the person who gives a drink of cold water to one of his least ones that he shall not be without his reward (see Mt. 10,42), and the Apostle says that our present light affliction, which is for the moment, prepares for us an eternal weight of glory that is beyond all measure (see 2 Cor. 4,17). Although in Holy Scripture such high value is placed on good works, nevertheless a Christian should have no inclination either to rely on himself or to glory in himself instead of in the Lord (see 1 Cor. 1,31; 2 Cor. 10,17), whose goodness towards all men is such that he wants his gifts to be their merits (see can. 32). And since “in many things we all offend” (Jas. 3,2; see can. 23), each one ought to keep severity and judgment in view as well as mercy and good­ness. Neither should anyone pass judgment on himself, even if he is conscious of no wrong, because the entire life of man should be examined and judged not by human judgment, but by the judgment of God who “will both bring to light the things hidden in darkness and make manifest the counsels of hearts; and then everyone will have his praise from God” (1 Cor. 4,5), who, as it is written, will render to every man according to his works (see Rom. 2,6).” (chapter 16, DS 1545-50) (Schmaus 141)
      1. Matt 10:42, “whoever gives even a cup of cold water to one of these little ones in the name of a disciple—truly I tell you, none of these will lose their reward.”
      2. 2 Cor 4:17, “this slight momentary affliction is preparing us for an eternal weight of glory beyond all measure . . .”
      3. 1 Cor 1:30-31, God “is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, who became for us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption, 31in order that, as it is written, “Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord.””
      4. 2 Cor 10:17, “Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord.”
      5. James 3:2, “all of us make many mistakes. Anyone who makes no mistakes in speak­ing is perfect, able to keep the whole body in check with a bridle.”
      6. 1 Cor 4:5, “do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart. Then each one will receive commendation from God.”
      7. Rom 2:6, “he will repay according to each one’s deeds . . .”
   5. “The effect of this [Tridentine] statement is not to establish a new form of salvation by one’s own efforts, after that possibility had seemed to be eliminated by the teaching that grace cannot be “deserved”, for the “merit” here is founded on the power of God. Man can produce acts worthy of salvation because, and insofar as, God produces them through him. . . . In the works of a man possessed and ruled by God, the prime actor is God; and hence it is of God’s own works that we say they are “meritorious.” They [the works of a man] participate in the value, the dignity, and the majesty of God and are in no way impaired by the fact that God works through human weakness or that human imperfection is found in them. In his gratuitous love, God [141] permits man to participate in the divine salvific creativity. God’s acts are at the same time the acts of man; but the meritorious actions of man are the deeds of God.” (Schmaus 141-42)
   6. “We would not dare to hope that God would reward the actions of the justified man if he had not promised it; our hope is based on his word. At the same time, the reward is a grace. Good works are the objectification and the sign of that love which God has himself awakened, and continues to awaken, in the man in grace. This does not, however, mean that the external work in itself is of indifferent value. Love must objectify, actualize itself. Constituted as he is by body and soul, man cannot produce a purely spiritual love. His love must be actualized and objectify itself in activity in the world, in concern for others, in the shaping of the secular order. If, therefore, God rewards the human works done in his love, that means that man’s love is pleasing to him, that he does not overlook it as trivial and insignificant, but rather lets himself be loved by man and accepts the signs of that love—the good works. How could it be otherwise? The love comes to him from those who are united with his own incarnate Son. . . . the “meritoriousness” of good works means that God accepts the love of creatures offered to him through Christ in the Holy Spirit. This is nothing other than the response given by the justified man, in and with Christ, to the love of God himself. And, reciprocally, through his response to the love of God, man becomes ever more receptive to it.” (Schmaus 142)
   7. “The Church teaches that we can in no way merit either our election to grace, or the first grace towards conversion, or perseverance. All this we have to hold as a matter of faith; otherwise, “grace would cease to be grace.”” (Fransen 227)

Modern Theology on Merit

1. **basis of merit**
   1. Merit “confers a claim to reward due in justice to services rendered . . . [But] con­dign­ity of merit in the strict sense is impossible owing to the creature’s absolute de­pend­ence on the Creator. It is, however, admitted in the sense that God, by His free promise, has bound Himself to confer rewards on certain works.” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
   2. “That the transcendent God because of our love for him, which exists through his power and is actualized and manifests itself in good works, should so communicate him­self as to impel man towards an ever greater love is by no means self-evident. That he does so rests on his free decision: he has promised that he will do so, and he keeps his word. Except for this divine promise, no one could [143] flatter himself that his good works would have such an effect. In other words, if the good works of the justified man are meritorious, it is because God makes them good, because he has so ordered things that through our good works we “merit” our final fulfillment . . . The promise, of course, relates to those actions which, as the fruit of justification, have an inner relation to Christ and through him to the Father; actions which, therefore, are performed in the “state of grace.”” (Schmaus 143-44)
      1. Matt 20:4-16, “‘You also go into the vineyard, and I will pay you whatever is right.’ . . . 9When those hired about five o’clock came, each of them received the usual daily wage. 10Now when the first came, they thought they would receive more; but each of them also received the usual daily wage. 11And when they received it, they grumbled against the landowner, 12saying, ‘These last worked only one hour, and you have made them equal to us who have borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat.’ 13But he replied to one of them, ‘Friend, I am doing you no wrong; did you not agree with me for the usual daily wage? 14Take what belongs to you and go; I choose to give to this last the same as I give to you. 15Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me? Or are you envious because I am generous?’ 16So the last will be first, and the first will be last.”
      2. 1 Tim 4:8, “godliness is valuable in every way, holding promise for both the present life and the life to come.”
      3. Heb 10:36, “you need endurance, so that when you have done the will of God, you may receive what was promised.”
      4. James 1:12, “anyone who endures temptation . . . has stood the test and will receive the crown of life that the Lord has promised to those who love him.”
2. **meaning of merit**
   1. “The state of justice itself can in no way be merited, or “grace would cease to be grace” (Rom 11:26). All we can do is prepare ourselves for it, with the help of God’s grace. [210] . . . Election to grace, as such, also falls outside merit; but *given the election,* we can merit the glory of heaven. . . . God’s initial love keeps the [primacy], from the first begin­nings of faith up to the final glory of heaven. That is the mean­ing of [“given the election”].” (Fransen 210-11)
   2. “The danger that the words “merit, reward, recompense” might introduce an element of self-seeking into man’s actions is avoided when the meaning of the promised reward is analyzed. The scriptural texts describe it in images and parables. What is meant is not an extrinsic, material repay­ment for the pain and trouble endured in the accomplishment of good works; it is rather the intrinsic fruit of the action itself.” (Schmaus 142)
      1. Matt 5:6-9, “Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled. 7Blessed are the merciful, for they will receive mercy. 8Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. 9Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.”
      2. 2 John 1:8-9, “Be on your guard, so that you do not lose what we have worked for, but may receive a full reward. 9. . . whoever abides in the teaching has both the Father and the Son.”
   3. “The more generously we respond to God’s action in us, his claim on us, the more we shall increase our availability to God; for God has promised that when a man [142] opens himself to love through the participation in the divine power of loving that is given him, his capacity for love will be increased. Thus his reward is a greater receptiveness to God, a deepening of his knowledge and vivifying of his love which increase his capacity for surrender to God in faith.” (Schmaus 142-43)
   4. “In this life, of course, our love cannot transcend self-seeking; that final fulfillment is reserved to the absolute future.” (Schmaus 143)
   5. “It would not be doing justice to this living interior union if we were to understand merit only as a claim to eternal life . . . The reward is not a transaction between God and man; rather, God gives himself to man in a free gift of grace. God’s action is such that the more intensely man opens himself to God, the more intensely he is able to give himself without infringement of his freedom. God himself is the reward. To interpret the hope for it as a seeking of payment would be to deprive love of its inwardness, friend­ship of its depth, community of its dynamism. Finally, the hope of reward is the hope that we may enter even more fully into the personal holiness of God and into the dialogue with him. Pope St. Leo (d. 461) says in a sermon on fasting (Sermon 92): “One who loves God seeks only to please his Beloved. We can wish for no greater reward than love, since this belongs so much to the nature of God that it is nothing other than God himself.”” (Schmaus 143)
3. **conditions of condign merit**
   1. “The work must be morally good,
   2. be done freely,
   3. be assisted by actual grace,
   4. performed with a supernatural motive (whether with charity or whether faith alone is sufficient is contested by theologians)
   5. in this sphere of life (*in statu viae*),
   6. be done in the state of grace [“not considered always necessary”],
   7. and, lastly, God must have promised to reward it.” (“Merit,” *Oxford Dictionary* 905)
4. **stages of condign merit**
   1. “How can we merit an increase of grace? How can we merit heaven?” (Fransen 219)
   2. “Trent defines that in “the state of grace” we merit an increase in grace (Denz. n. 842). How must we understand those words? [217] Certainly not as an automatic process that would be independent of our free response to grace. For grace is not like capital which at stated periods brings in spiritual interest . . ., increasing by itself.” (Fransen 217-18)
   3. Trent referred “to the inward maturing, in different stages of personal holiness, of the works done in the state of grace . . . (session 6, canon 32, DS 1582) . . .” (Schmaus 144)
   4. “Theologians have tried to explain this aspect of grace as a process of spiritual growth. [218] . . . our progress in grace is a growth . . .” [221] (Fransen 218, 221)
   5. Scripture provides “a few indications” of this “aspect of grace as a process of spiritual growth . . .” (Fransen 218)
      1. Mark 4:26-29, “The kingdom of God is as if someone would scatter seed on the ground, 27and would sleep and rise night and day, and the seed would sprout and grow, he does not know how. 28The earth produces of itself, first the stalk, then the head, then the full grain in the head. 29But when the grain is ripe, at once he goes in with his sickle, because the harvest has come.”
      2. Mark 4:31-32, the kingdom of God “is like a mustard seed, which, when sown upon the ground, is the smallest of all the seeds on earth; 32yet when it is sown it grows up and becomes the greatest of all shrubs, and puts forth large branches, so that the birds of the air can make nests in its shade.”
      3. 1 Cor 3:1-3, “I could not speak to you as spiritual people, but rather as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ. 2I fed you with milk, not solid food, for you were not ready for solid food. Even now you are still not ready, 3for you are still of the flesh. For as long as there is jealousy and quarreling among you, are you not of the flesh, and behaving according to human inclinations?”
      4. Gal 4:19, “My little children, for whom I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you . . .”
      5. Eph 4:11-16, “The gifts he gave were that some would be apostles, some prophets, [etc.,] 12. . . for building up the body of Christ, 13until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ. 14We must no longer be children . . . 15But speaking the truth in love, we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, 16from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body’s growth in building itself up in love.”
      6. Phil 3:10-16, “I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, 11if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead. 12Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached the goal; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. 13Beloved, I do not consider that I have made it my own; but this one thing I do: forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, 14I press on toward the goal for the prize of the heavenly call of God in Christ Jesus. 15Let those of us then who are mature be of the same mind; and if you think differently about anything, this too God will reveal to you. 16Only let us hold fast to what we have attained.”
      7. Heb 5:13, “everyone who lives on milk, being still an infant, is unskilled in the word of righteousness.”
   6. “To understand this text it is necessary to remember that the council had in mind here primarily the objective element in grace (sanctifying grace), but that the personal element, God’s self-communication to men, is not excluded. The divine self-com­muni­ca­tion can increase not because God intensifies his love, but in that man (by God’s impul­sion) grows more receptive to the love of God.” (Schmaus 145)
   7. According to Trent, “Each one receives for himself his own justice [that is, his state of grace] *in the measure* in which the Spirit ‘distributes separately to each individual at will’ (I Cor 12:11), and in accordance with each one’s dispositions and cooperation” (Denz. n. 799). . . . [God] distributes His grace unequally among individuals, insofar as he remains absolutely free, bound by no one, never compelled by any one, and He allots to each one an irreplaceable, singular function in the Church. But, at the same time, grace remains in substance identically one and the same, in this sense at least, that the divine superabundant riches lie open to one and all. It is a sign of human pettiness to fear that the election of a few to more outstanding grace can be injurious to others.” (Fransen 219)
   8. “. . . growth in grace depends also on our cooperation, though, naturally *within the limits* of the divine initiative. . . . we are not to understand this in a . . . semi-Pelagian sense. God and man do not work conjointly like partners who, notwithstanding a [219] great difference in dignity and power, *meet on a level with each other,* and bring to the task their own separate contribution. . . . The more we open ourselves to grace by a loving acceptance of God’s grace, the more it flowers in us. Or, in other words, grace never comes into full bloom in a life of tepidity and indifference; for then no increase of grace can be merited. No sound theology has ever lost sight of the principle: the greater the love, the greater the grace, and consequently, the greater the merit.” (Fransen 219-20)
   9. To say, “our good deeds “merit” an increase of grace” is to say, “by lovingly accepting grace, we grow in grace and thereby to greater love.” (Fransen 220)
   10. “. . . grace on earth can merit heaven [because] Heaven is nothing else than the final revelation of what we have become through grace.” (Fransen 220)
   11. “Our dignity as a child of God unfolds in the course of that growth. [The] life of grace is nothing else than the flowering of the nobility we receive from the indwelling God at the moment divine sonship is con­ferred on us in baptism.” (Fransen 221)
5. **merit and love**
   1. “. . . merit is to be estimated less by performance or achievement than by the dignity of the person who freely expresses himself in the achieve­ment. We found verification of this on the level of ordinary wages, but much more so on the plane of public honors and prizes. This is to be verified further still in our relations born from grace. . . . Much less importance is attached to deeds than to love expressed in life.” (Fransen 222)
   2. If one commandment “sums up all the others, then there exists but one kind of “good works”: love. Scholastic theologians have been unanimous in maintaining the principle, “*par caritas, par meritum*,” love is the measure of merit.” (Fransen 223)
   3. “What do we offer to God by our “good works,” if not ourselves? God has no need whatever of our works. He is waiting for our “hearts.” We have to give ourselves to God because God gave Himself to us in Christ. Consequently, our sole merit is not so much eternal happiness in heaven, but rather Christ Himself Who in the Spirit offers us to the Father.” (Fransen 223)
   4. “Theologians have been so convinced that merit is measured by love that they have sought to know what kind of love is required for merit. [The question] provides an occasion to redress some wrong notions.” [225] In the 1600s, “most theologians tended to restrict love to distinct acts of love. They looked upon love far too much as a separate human action . . . [But] love stands for something more than a human act distinct from the countless other human actions in the course of the day. Love consists in an existential adequate expression of the entire human activity as such. We may liken it to an “openness” dynamically ordained, a fully willed surrender of life as a whole, the “soul” of our *entire* activity in the concrete. Needless to add that love, thus understood, will profitably be formulated now and then in distinct acts. Now, if we conceive of the “state of grace” dynamically, as a fundamental option made by the whole man . . . there is no problem. In a life, dynamically upheld by love, everything is love, down to man’s most commonplace actions. No need, then, to elicit at every turn a special explicit renewal of the “good intention.” There remains the *task of purifying* the fundamental intention . . .” (Fransen 225-26)
   5. The penitent woman in Luke 7:36-50 “is for us a model of the *penitent love* that should characterize each and every Christian “to whom much has been forgiven.” [228] . . . It is in the nature of grace that it is bestowed on sinners. . . . In heaven we shall realize that our love remains what it was on earth: *love of repentant men*.” [230] (Fransen 228, 230)
   6. No sooner do we receive sanctifying grace “than our deeds acquire in God’s eyes a unique value. And this *only* on the ground of the dignity [227] of children of God manifesting itself in our actions—­those actions especially which spring from love; for then the Father recog­nizes in us the countenance of His Son.” (Fransen 227-28)
6. **Moeller and Phillips on merit**
   1. “Admittedly the word ‘mer­it’ has a very Roman and legal flavour about it. The word must therefore be carefully explained, and three points stressed in particular.” (Moeller and Philips 35)
      1. “Firstly, it is an ontological quality (a profound disposition); it is not a ‘cheque’ presented in exchange for something else.” (Moeller and Philips 35)
      2. “Secondly, the personal side must be stressed: one’s ‘merits’ are [35] not rewarded because one is in credit on a sort of moral bank account, but because of what one is; merit is not an object that is being kept ready for the time when it is need­ed, it is not something we have acquired . . .” (Moeller and Philips 35-36)
      3. “Thirdly—and this is . . . the teaching of the Council of Trent—God, when He crowns our merits, *crowns His own gifts*. . . . Merit is therefore essentially inseparable from the work [36] of the Spirit in us, bringing about an exchange of love and friendship; so merit becomes what it is in us that makes us worthy of God.” (Moeller and Philips 36-37)
7. **conclusions**
   1. “The doctrine concerning merit points up the fact that man is a way­farer, always living in the present with an orientation towards the future. He builds for the future with the possibilities which are given him. But it is God himself who will bring man’s efforts to completion.” (Schmaus 145)
   2. “In the indwelling God gives Himself to us and endows us with the means of giving ourselves to Him. He is the sole reward we look to; and *we ourselves* are the sole “work” He expects from us.” (Fransen 228)

# Doctrines of Grace During the Reformation

## Why the Reformation Happened

Many footnotes have their numbers custom-set.

No files in the grace subdirectories contain notes from Moeller pp. 42-ff. (but notes for 42-44 will be added to “indwelling”) except this file, and notes in this file are selective.

1. **initial comments**
   1. “. . . today the differences between major Protestant denominations are far less clear-cut than at the time of their appearance . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 2)
   2. “In Protestantism we are involved not so much with a Church as with a movement made up of churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 2)
2. **factors that decreased the Catholic Church’s influence on minds and hearts**
   1. *mysticism*
      1. Mysticism is “the conviction that God could be directly experienced . . . Tauler’s sermons describe God’s direct presence almost without reference to the mediation of Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 4)
      2. “Eckhart and Tauler in Strasbourg, Ruysbroek and à Kempis in the Netherlands, and Rolle and Julian of Norwich in En­gland [were too few to be] a major pro­blem.” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
      3. “Of a mystical bent but uninterested in the subtleties of theology were various associations of lay individuals, devoted to revitalizing the spiritual life of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
         1. the Friends of God (Rhine Valley)
         2. the Brethren of the Common Life (Holland)
         3. the Sisters of the Common Life (Holland)
         4. The chief works were
            1. Thomas à Kem­pis, the *Imitation of Christ*, and
            2. the anonymous *Theologia Germanica*, “which Luther initially praised.” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
      4. These groups “which stressed the direct experience of God found them­selves in a state of tension with the notion that God was known and mediated primarily through the church as a sacramental agent. . . . many recruits to Protestantism did come from [mystical] people . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
   2. *nominalism*: see the separate handout on “Nominalism.”
   3. *the renaissance* (“particularly in its humanistic form”)
      1. The Renaissance (“rebirth”) began “in the fifteenth century in the city-states of Italy.” Classical learning had been preserved “in mon­as­teries and in the rising universities,” but the Renaissance had a new concern, “the outlook upon life expressed in Greek and Roman” works. (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
      2. “The interest in classical learning demanded new and accurate texts,” and soon critical acumen was turned toward “writings which affected the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
         1. In the “Donation of Con­stantine,” “Emperor Con­stan­tine bequeathed his earthly power to the papacy.” But Lorenz Valla proved that “papal claims to temporal or political authority could not rest upon it . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
         2. Valla questioned “the accuracy of the Vulgate as a translation,” and Eras­mus point­ed out “differences a more accurate text made in religious belief.” (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
      3. Renaissance humanism was “favorable to the concerns of this life . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      4. Humanists stressed the nobility of humanity. (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      5. They “proposed that classical learning be substituted for scholastic theology . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
   4. *economic and nationalist changes*
      1. The Church had “acquired half of the land in France and Ger­many and organized it [according to] feudalism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      2. But “the rise of a middle class preoccu­pied with trade and commerce created a new segment of society inde­pendent of direct influence by the church. [The Cru­sades] facilitated the new interest in trade and commerce.” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      3. Merchants “usually felt themselves . . . free from the church in matters which pertained to their vocational interests.” (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      4. “The new middle class . . . supported ethnic groups. It was in part responsible for the waves of national feelings . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      5. The discontent of victims of the new commerce “finally broke forth in Luther’s own day in the Peasants’ Revolt.” (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
   5. *Augustinianism*: In the later middle ages, there was “a new interest in the thought of Augustine . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      1. “Gregory of Ri­mini, Gabriel Biel, and at the time of the Re­formation, Stau­pitz, were Augustinians who influenced Luther . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      2. “Augustine became of special importance to the major reformers.” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
         1. Luther joined the Observant Augustinians in September 1505. The Augustinians were founded in 1256. (Lapple 51) The Augustinians came together every three years. “One of their common features was a public disputation in which a speaker was selected to defend the theology of Augustine, whom most believed was their founder. [On April 25, 1518,] year Luther was the disputant.” (Kittelson 110)
      3. “The presupposition for the [Protestant] doctrine of justification was a vigorous reassertion of Augustini­an anthropology. Joining himself to the criticism leveled by late medieval Augustinianism against “the new Pelagians,” Luther identified Pelagianism as the one perennial heresy of Christian history, [which,] under the patronage of the church of Rome, had now become dominant.” (Pelikan 4.139)
      4. Through Augustine “the Reformers remained in contact not only with a large part of Christian Platonism, but also with the Bible itself. But at the same time, the Reformers, receiving their Platonism through the medium of certain theories peculiar to Augustine (on concupiscence, the concept of original sin, and anti-pela­gianism), took it over in a reduced form, without its ‘realistic’ develop­ments, and only saw the Bible in the light of certain somewhat constricting preconceptions.” (Moeller and Philips 51)
   6. *other factors*
      1. the printing press (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      2. Columbus discovered the New World. (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      3. Copernicus, in Luther’s lifetime, suggested geocentrism. (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
3. **the situation in the Church**
   1. *conciliarism*
      1. After the Council of Pisa, there were three claimants to the papacy, at Avig­non, Rome, and Pisa. “. . . those who believed in the right of councils . . . suddenly seemed the only hope . . . Pressured by the emperor Sigismund, the Pisan pope called the Council of Con­stance in 1414, where cardinals and theologians elect­ed a new pope in place of the three, but also burned the reformer, John Hus . . . the Council was more interested in defining authority than in reform . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
      2. positions
         1. Some “conciliarists believed in shared authority . . . with the papacy preeminent . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
         2. Others “believed in shared authority [with] the council dominant [but] with con­siderable authority given to the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
         3. Others believed “a council was supreme, with the papacy acting in an exec­u­tive capacity . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
         4. The popes believed councils were extensions of their power. (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
      3. During the Refor­mation, “new appeals were made to the reforming role of councils . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
   2. *a secularized Church*
      1. “Since the state served only one’s earthly pilgrimage and the church directed one . . . to another life, the church naturally felt [more important and] res­pon­sible for forming and directing the social life of society.” [10] By the early 1200s, “Innocent III was more powerful than any monarch.” (Dillenberger and Welch 10-11)
      2. “The church’s claim to control every aspect of life . . . made it almost inevitable that the church would . . . become secularized . . . This, coupled with the picture of rival claimants to the papacy at the end of the Avignon period, had the general effect of undermining the religious, though not the temporal, au­thor­ity of the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
      3. New techniques “came into prominence to meet the [Church’s] financial needs.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         1. “For example, a newly appointed bishop’s first year’s income went to the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         2. “To increase the income, [sometimes bishop] vacancies were not immedi­ately filled so that the papacy could claim the funds in the meantime.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         3. Bishops held dioceses “they seldom visited, but from which they collected revenue.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         4. “A prince was sometimes [an] absentee bishop. He collected funds from his bishopric and not infrequently shared them with the papacy in payment for the assignment of the bishopric to him.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
   3. *indulgences* (see the following handout, “The Catholic Teaching on Indulgences”)
      1. the penitential system
         1. sacrament of confession: “upon the confession of sins, the priest, if he considered the penitent worthy, would declare absolution of sins in the name of the triune God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
            1. Forgiveness restored one’s relationship with God and saved from eternal punishment. (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
         2. penances
            1. But justice demanded that one still make amends: “punishment for sin [was] completed in purgatory . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
            2. But “God had en­trusted the work of redemption to the church [and] what was “bound” or “loosed” on earth would be bound or loosed after one’s death.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
            3. “By making temporal satisfaction, one could already now begin to mit­i­gate and decrease subsequent punishment. . . . Such temporal satisfaction took the form of specific acts (frequently prayers) assigned by the priest to the penitent . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)

“The performance of assigned acts of penance indicated that one was indeed contrite.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)

“But more important, [penances] would *now* begin to pay the penalty of sin . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 12, emphasis added)

* + 1. treasury of merit
       1. “. . . Christ and the saints had done such good works that they accumulated merit far beyond their own needs. . . . the church could draw [on these] to meet the needs of the ordinary person [12] . . . completing the assigned penance.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12-13)
       2. Since “the church was the body of Christ,” and since “the average per­son died before completing the necessary pen­ance,” the treasury of merit could be applied to those in purgatory. “. . . both the extent of their suffering and the length of their sojourn might be reduced.” (Dillenberger and Welch 13)
    2. the indulgences controversy
       1. “Initially, “indulgence” was merely a term for the cancellation under appropriate conditions of a part of [a] penance [because] assigned acts were a distinct hardship [or because a] service to the church, such as a gift of land or money, merited special consideration.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
       2. “The first extensive use of an indulgence for special meritorious service was Pope Urban II’s promise of complete indul­gence to all who joined the first Crusade.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
       3. “An indulgence, therefore, was usually the substitution of one kind of act or deed for another. It did not alter the fundamental con­ception that satisfaction must be made or that justice must run its course.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
    3. the controversy
       1. “The controversy over “indulgences” affected those in the parish more immediately and directly than any of the [11] intellectual or social currents . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 11-12)
       2. “The visible side of an indulgence was a slip of paper upon which was noted its spiritual worth. These could therefore be sold like an article of trade. It was not unusual for the papacy to farm out the sale of indulgences to princes who aspired to ecclesiastical importance. They in turn would send an agreed-upon share of the proceeds to Rome.” (Dillenberger and Welch 13)
       3. “Hence, the need for revenue on the part of the papacy became a temptation to issue one indulgence after another.” (Dillenberger and Welch 13)
       4. Tetzel, a Dominican, preached an indulgence in German lands, “the proceeds of which were to go to Rome for the comple­tion of the new St. Peter’s Church.” Here is an excerpt from one of his sermons:

Listen to the voices of your dear dead relatives . . . “We bore you, nourished you, brought you up, left you our fortunes, and you are so cruel and hard that now you are not willing for so little to set us free.” [13] . . . [Remember,] As soon as the coin in the coffer rings, The soul from purgatory springs.” (Qtd. in Bainton, Roland H. *Here I Stand*. Nashville: 1950. 78.) (Dillenberger and Welch 13-14)

* + - 1. “Increasingly the careful distinction [between] forgiveness and tem­poral sat­is­faction was obscured. . . . officially indulgences had always been confined only to the remission of penal­ties, whether here or in purgatory. [But] In the confessional the average person, just as Luther, was told that the purchase of indulgences was effective also for salvation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
    1. “Large sections of Christendom held fast to distorted marginal truths of the faith: venera­tion of saints and relics, accumulation of indulgences, going on pilgrimages. Many Chris­tians were driven (and tormented) by . . . a highly quantified ethic of earning merit. Thus in the Castle Church of Wittenberg around [1517] it was possible for a believer, by reciting prayers and de­voutly contemplating the elector’s relic collection, to accumulate 1,900,000 years worth of in­dul­gences.” There was also “Belief in the devil and witches [and] anxiety over judgment [and] hell . . .” (Lapple 54)
  1. 1512-1517: Lateran Council V failed to reform the Church. (Lapple 65)

1. **pre-Reformation reformers**
   1. People like John Wyclif (1324-1384), John Hus (1369-1415), Girolamo Savonarola (1452-1498), Martin Luther (1483-1546), Huldreich Zwingli (1509-1564), and John Calvin (1509-1564) had [54] “a deeper feeling of shock and pain [that] forced them to speak out.” (Lapple 54-55)
   2. John Wyclif (England)
      1. “As did the Germans later, Wycliffe protested against the importation of Italian priests and the draining of wealth from the country.” (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
      2. He emphasized “everyone’s responsibility under God without” intermiediaries. (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
      3. He denied transubstantiation because this necessitated an “irreplaceable in­ter­mediary . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
      4. “He organized and sponsored translating the Bible into English.” (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
      5. “While accused of heresy, Wycliffe died before any official action was taken.” (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
   3. John Hus (Bohemia)
      1. Wyclif’s writings influenced Hus and his fellow reformers. “He was outspoken against indulgences, though more conservative in his esti­mate of tradition than Wycliffe.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      2. “A Hussite church was formed . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      3. Hus was burned at the stake by the (sixteenth ecumenical) Council of Constance in 1415. (Lapple 64)
   4. But Wyclif and Hus “did not have the vision of justification by faith as the point around which the life of the Chris­tian and the church must be understood.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
2. “**fear of the idea—bib­lical in its content—of the parti­cipation of the sanctified creature in the very life of God**” (Moeller and Philips 53)
   1. “The fears of our Protestant brethren over the question of a ‘real’ sharing in the divine nature are related to their inter­pretation of eschatology . . . joyful assur­ance can be understood in different ways—it can either be based on a real anticipation in us of eschatology, by the deification of our whole being, or it can simply be certainty in waiting for an event wholly put forward into the future.” (Moeller and Philips 54)
   2. The Reformers’ fear “of the idea of a real sharing in the divine life” resulted from “the too rigid Augustinianism of the Reformers,” from “their unconscious nominalism (the latter being shared by most Catholic theologians in the sixteenth cen­tury),” and from “their way of approaching *Christology*.” (Moeller and Philips 55)
   3. Protestant Christology
      1. “We wonder whether Reformed theology perhaps implies in its theory of grace a Christology somewhat deprived of its human elements. In other words, we sometimes get the impres­sion that Protestant thought is going back unawares to the Old Testament. When our Reformed brethren speak of God who saves [we] get no clear picture of the exact part Jesus’ manhood plays now in the process of salvation; and we feel that if the chief part in the life of the Christian is not played by the manhood transfigured, then the Incarnation of Jesus might as well have ceased; admittedly, it was essential to the sacrifice of the Cross, and made it possible to hear the Word of God in human terms; but after the Ascension, Prot­estant thought seems to treat its function in the ‘economy’ as ended, to dispense with it, and from then on to consider only God giving salvation in Jesus.” (Moeller and Philips 56)
      2. “The Orthodox definitely base their doctrine on Christology, in the sense that deification is the life of the Incarnate Word really given to us (though the essential part played by the Holy Spirit is not denied): in other words, sancti­fication for the Orthodox, is an incarnation continued in the Holy Spirit, the soul of the Church. The West approaches the question of grace more on the lines of the formula *Spiritus in anima*; and for this reason runs the risk of losing sight of the cosmic aspect of redemption, as well as its relation to the community—we become, as members of the people of God, συνεργοὶ θεοῦ;[[20]](#footnote-20)1 but apart from this, it is an approach that can give a clear­er pic­ture of the point where the life of God actually enters the soul. Protes­tantism, carrying this point of view further, has in a way even more ‘spiritual­ized’ the process of salvation, by looking at it from God’s side alone, and taking Christ and the Holy Spirit into account only as *divine persons*.” (Moeller and Philips 55)
      3. Perhaps “the real reason why the Reformed theologian is afraid of the idea of ‘con­tinued’ incarnation, which Ortho­dox and Catholic have in common, is this [deemphasis on Christ’s humanity]. Does this not explain the prefer­ence of the Reformed theologian for Old Testa­ment concepts?” (Moeller and Philips 57)
      4. It is difficult “to speak of any present reality either in eschatology or in sacramental doctrine, because in both, that depends on the Holy Spirit binding us closely into the glorified manhood of the Son of God, God who gives Himself to us in the *Body*, the Church.” (Moeller and Philips 57)
      5. In Paul “the Church is con­nected to the *historic body* of Christ [see 1 Cor 6:15; 10:17; 12:12-13, 27; Eph 4:4; etc.]; she is connected to it *here and now*; and this connection is impossible if this glori­fied manhood is not in some way communicated to the bride, if there is not a union of this ‘personal, historic body,’ and the Church as the Body of Christ.” (Moeller and Philips 57)
      6. Eucharist
         1. “This connection requires sacra­ments; it requires above all the Eucha­rist, seen as a ‘real’ and life-giving presence of that manhood, coming to sanctify the bodies and souls of the baptized.” (Moeller and Philips 57)
         2. “The realistic way in which Orthodoxy and Catholicism con­ceive of the transformation of the soul which grace brings about, depends ultimately not on philosophical notions or on humanity being given an excessive value, but on this basic view of God giving Himself as a gift to man­kind, even to the point of being always present through the Church and the sacraments.” (Moeller and Philips 58)
         3. “If it is true that by grace the Holy Trinity dwells in us and that grace is necessary to take part in ‘communion’—points on which all Christian confessions are agreed—it is difficult to see what specific gift the Eu­charist could give if not a real sharing in *the body and blood of the Son of God*. Were this not so, that is, if the Eucharist were simply a ‘mem­orial’ for faith, a symbolic sign of the presence of Jesus in the soul of the believer, it is no longer clear what part the Saviour’s humanity plays in it.” (Moeller and Philips 58)

## The Development of Luther’s Theology, 1517-20

1. **1483-1517**: **youth**
   1. Luther was born in 1483. His father was an owner of mines and physically abusive.
      1. “According to Luther himself, the strict life his parents had required of him as a child sent him into holy orders.” [54] “They meant well,” Luther later wrote of his parents, “but they did not understand the art of adjusting their punishments.” [54 n. 9] (Jones 54, 54 n. 9)

2) Here add quotes from Heiko Oberman and/or Erik Erikson on physically abusive father (or the other bio—Haile?).

* + 1. “Luther recalled that his mother had once beat him until his hands bled merely for taking a nut from the kitchen table.” (Kittelson 33)
    2. “The methods used by his teachers were . . . barbaric . . . Coercion and ridicule were chief among their techniques. Any child caught speaking German was beaten with a rod. The one who had done least well in the morning was required to wear a dunce’s cap and was addressed as an ass all afternoon. Demerits were then added up for the week, and each student went home with one more caning to make the accounts balance.” (Kittelson 37)
    3. “Luther was caned 15 times in only one morning for not having mastered the tables of Latin grammar.” (Kittelson 37)
  1. “In 1497, at the age of 13, Luther had learned Latin well enough to be sent away to school. [At Magdeburg] he lived and studied at a foundation operated by the Brethren of the Common Life, an extremely pious lay religious organization.” (Kittelson 37)
  2. “Having been nearly struck down by a bolt of light­ning, he had resolved then and there to follow the noblest and most certain path.” He entered an Augustinian monastery. (Dillenberger and Welch 15)

1. **Luther’s scrupulosity**
   1. He believed that “God was a righteous God who demanded one’s unswerving [15] obedience and destined one to salvation only if salvation was merited.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15-16)
   2. “. . . every time he tried to fan his own spark of goodness, he found that all he was doing was focusing his attention on himself. From his own teachers he knew that to think of himself was to be in his most sinful state. How then could he “do what was within him” without yielding to the basest of motives, the desire to save his own skin? How could he possibly confess every one of his sins when he knew that he did so only for the purpose of currying the favor of a righteous God who would surely condemn him for them? Every act of confession therefore became yet another sin. The sincerity of the confession and of the acts of penance that followed was always in question. And if he himself questioned his motives, how could they not have been more than dubious in the mind of a God who knew all and was always right?” (Kittelson 80)
   3. Luther confessed daily. [55] “After the fact, he would suddenly remember a thought or an emotion that contradicted his vocation and stained his heart. He knew that it would rightly bring the wrath of God down on him.” (Kittelson 55-56)
   4. “. . . the question of certainty under God . . . drove him to confess his sins so frequently to his fellow monks as to annoy them.” (Dillenberger and Welch 16)
   5. “In this turmoil, Luther came to Staupitz so frequently to confess his doubts, misgivings, sins, and outright hatred of a righteous God that Staupitz once commanded him to go and commit a real sin. “Pay attention,” Staupitz said. “You want to be without sin, but you don’t have any real sins anyway. Christ is the forgiveness of awful sins, like the murder of one’s parents, public vices, blasphemy, adultery, and the like. These are real sins. . . . You must not inflate your halting, artificial sins out of proportion!”” (Kittelson 84)
   6. “. . . his saintly superior, Staupitz, advising Luther to relax and to trust in the grace of God, did not help.” (Dillenberger and Welch 16)
   7. Luther (referring to Apr. 1511-fall 1513): “. . . I hoped I might find peace of conscience with fasts, prayer, and the vigils with which I miserably afflicted my body . . .” [AE 8.326 (WA 44.819)] “. . . I often repeated my confession . . . but I was always doubting and said, ‘You did not perform that correctly. You were not contrite enough. You left that out of your confession.’ . . . If it had not been for Dr. Staupitz, I would have sunk into hell.” (WATr 6.106-07; AE 27.13 [WA 402.15]) (Kittelson 84)
   8. “He could not put aside the question of certainty . . . Perhaps God was a tyr­ant who never gave peace and who was not even trustworthy. According to late me­dieval nominal­ism, God could act in opposition to his declared intention. There were mo­ments when Luther hated God . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 16)
2. **c**. **February 1519**: **Luther’s** “**tower experience**” (from his 1545 *Reflectiones*)
   1. introduction
      1. Luther “made a very important discovery [134] . . . during the relative calm that followed . . . the death of the emperor [Maximilian, January 1519]. But Luther was well aware that it had been building for years.” (Kittelson 134-35)
      2. “In a moment, perhaps in the twinkling of an eye, Luther suddenly realized that what he had been teaching for four years all fit together. . . . His conscious realization of it came in a rush . . .” (Kittelson 135)
      3. This discovery is known as “the celebrated “tower experience” . . .” (Lapple 5)
      4. Our knowledge of this insight comes from a work of reflections written many years later, in 1545.
   2. text from the 1545 “Reflectiones”
      1. (The reminiscence was written in 1544, when Luther was 61 years old; he was remembering an experience from when he was 35. Dillenberger and Welch 17)
      2. (The following is Kittelson’s translation. For a different translation, see: “Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther’s Latin Writings, 1545.” *Luther’s Works*. Vol. 34. Philadelphia: 1960. 336-37.])
      3. “I was seized with the conviction that I must understand his [Paul’s] letter to the Romans. I did not have a heart of stone, but to that moment one phrase in chapter 1 [:17] stood in my way. I hated the idea, “in it the righteousness of God is revealed,” for I had been taught to understand the term, “the righteousness of God,” in the formal or active sense, as the philosophers called it, according to which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.
      4. “I lived without reproach as a monk, but my conscience was disturbed to its very depths and all I knew about myself was that I was a sinner. I could not believe that anything that I thought or did or prayed satisfied God. I did not love, nay, I hated the righteous God who punishes sinners. Certainly, and with intense grumbling (perhaps even blasphemy), I was angry with God and said, “As if it were indeed not enough that miserable sinners who are eternally lost through original sin and are crushed again by every kind of calamity through the Ten Commandments, God himself adds pain to pain in the gospel by threatening us with his righteousness and wrath!”
      5. “At last, meditating day and night and by the mercy of God, I gave heed to the context of the words, “In it the righteousness of God is revealed, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’ Then I began to understand that the righteousness of God is that through which the righteous live by a gift of God, namely by faith. . . . Here I felt as if I were entirely born again and had entered paradise itself through gates that had been flung open. An entirely new side of the Scriptures opened itself to me . . . and I extolled my sweetest word with a love as great as the loathing with which before I had hated the term, “the righteousness of God.” Thus, that verse in Paul was for me truly the gate of paradise. [134] . . .
      6. “This is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which the merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’” (WA 54, 185-86 [AE 34, 336-338]) (Kittelson 134-35)
   3. Luther’s insight relies primarily upon three passages in Romans and Galatians.
      1. Rom 1:17, “in it [the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.””
      2. Rom 3:21-31, “But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, 23since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; 24they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, 25whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; 26it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. 27Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. 29Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, 30since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith. 31Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.”
      3. Gal 2:16, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law.”
   4. “. . . by early 1519 he was consistently teaching that the sinner is justified (accepted, acquited, forgiven) before God by faith *alone* . . .” (Walker 425)
   5. “Protestants affirm that this renewed religious outlook [i.e., justification by faith,] [was] an act of God in which . . . the burden of a message was laid upon a human being.” In other words, Luther was a prophet sent by God. (Dillenberger and Welch 22)
3. **1517**: **the 95 theses**
   1. “Others, too, had repudiated the practice of purchasing and selling indulgences as a way of shortening the time of the departed in purgatory . . . It was as if one’s relation to God was on the level of barter and trade.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   2. “In the ninety-five theses, Luther did not reject indulgences outright. He rejected only the abuses.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      1. But he limited indulgences to penalties initiated by the pope: “The Pope could change or cancel only those penalties imposed by his own authority or by the canons of the church. Indulgences were valid only when confined to such human and organizational dis­cipline . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      2. He denied “the extension of indulgences to purgatory.” (Walker 426) Indulgences could not “be said to have any effect on purgatory. . . . [They] had no necessary relation to the final destiny of any individual believer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      3. In fact, “The papacy, he declared, did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   3. “Repentance is not a single act of penance, but a constant change of heart and mind extend­ing over one’s lifetime.” (Walker 426)
      1. “The Christian seeks rather than avoids divine discipline.” (Walker 426)
      2. “The true treasure of the church is not the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, subject to papal control, but “the most holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God,” freely offered to repentant sinners by faithful preachers.” (Walker 426)
4. **developing heresies**, **1517-1519**
   1. A heresy is a “doctrine held in opposition to the . . . ­­doctrine of the Catholic Church.” (*Oxford English Dictionary*)
   2. October 31, 1517 (*Ninety-Five Theses*): Luther declared that the pope “did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   3. October 31, 1517 (*Ninety-Five Theses*): Luther declared that indulgences do not “have any effect on purgatory. . . . [They have] no necessary relation to the final destiny of any individual believer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   4. October 14, 1518 (Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan): “a council was above the pope on [123] matters of doctrine . . . [and] the Scriptures were finally authoritative in matters of doctrine because all human beings could err.” (Kittelson 123-24)
   5. “by early 1519”: Luther “was consistently teaching that the sinner is justified . . . before God by faith *alone* . . .” (Walker 425)
   6. June-July, 1519 (Leipzig debate with Eck): Luther proposed “that the supremacy of the Roman church is unsupported by his­tory or Scripture.” Thus he “rejected the . . . final authority of the pope . . .” (Walker 428)
   7. June-July, 1519 (Leipzig debate with Eck): Luther “proclaimed the fallibility of general councils [and restricted] final appeal only to the Scriptures.” (Walker 428)
5. **developing heresies**, **1520**
   1. June 15, 1520: the pope issued a bull, *Exsurge domine*, condemning 41 propositions from Luther’s writings. (Walker 428) “Its publication was prohibited in Wittenberg, [but it was published] in the Netherlands [accompanied by] the burning of Luther’s books at Louvain, Liège, Antwerp, and Cologne.” (Walker 430)
   2. August 1520: *An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Re­form of the Christian Faith*
      1. “Three years after the posting of the theses, Luther rejected indulgences themselves as . . . the “knavish trick of the Roman Sycophants.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
      2. Luther said “the church had built around itself three walls which prevented” reform. (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         1. The first wall “was the claim for supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal order. The church claimed exclusive and absolute authority over one’s spiritual life. Such a unique position under God clearly argued for the church’s supremacy over all earthly affairs . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         2. The second wall was that “One could not utilize the Bible to correct the church since the final right to interpret scripture was in the hands of the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         3. The third wall was that one could not utilize a council to correct the church “since the Pope alone was authorized to call a council.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
      3. He denied “the claim for supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal order.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19) The “superiority of the spirit­ual to the temporal estate is baseless, since all believers are priests by virtue of baptism.” (Walker 429)
         1. “. . . Luther called upon the nobles and princes to effect the reformation. . . . This, too, had been done by Wyclife and Hus . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         2. He denied “that a reformatory council can be called by none but the pope. “A true, free council” for reform of the church should be sum­moned by the temporal authorities.” (Walker 429)
      4. He denied that “the final right to interpret scripture was in the hands of the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19) The “universal priesthood casts down [also the] exclusive papal right to interpret the Scriptures . . .” (Walker 429)
      5. “Luther then proceeded to lay down a reform program . . .” (Walker 429)
      6. “Papal misgovernment [was] to be curbed [and] German ecclesiastical interests placed under a “primate of Germany” . . .” (Walker 429)
      7. “. . . clerical marriage [was to be] permitted . . .” (Walker 429)
      8. “. . . beggary “including that of the mendicant orders” [was to be] forbidden . . .” (Walker 429)
   3. October 1520: *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*
      1. Luther “appealed to the New Testament for the repudiation of many aspects of the develop­ment of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
      2. Luther “had in mind . . . nothing less than the rejection of the entire sacramental system . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         1. “In such a system [one’s] relation to God was of necessity channeled through the agency of the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         2. Also, one’s “relation to God . . . assumed a quantitative character, becoming a question of the amount of merit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         3. “Luther’s insistence that . . . grace was not confined to sacramental realities mediated by priests, challenged the very nature of the constituted church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
      3. the number of sacraments
         1. Of the seven sacraments of the Church (baptism, reconciliation [confession, penance], Eucharist [communion, the Lord’s Supper], confirmation, anointing of the sick [extreme unction], marriage, and ordination), Luther retained only two: baptism and the Eucharist.
            1. “Restricting the name of sacrament to “those promises [of forgiveness] which have signs attached to them,” Luther held that Scripture recognizes only two such sacraments instituted by Christ himself: baptism and the Lord’s Supper.” (Walker 429)
            2. “Only baptism and the Lord’s Supper were instituted in the New Testament as events in which act, word and participation were involved. These three aspects . . . implied that a sacrament had been instituted.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
         2. The other five “were rejected as sacraments, though all of them were considered significant acts in the Christian life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
         3. Though not a sacrament, Luther “wished private confession retained as “a cure without equal for distressed consciences.”” (Walker 430)
      4. He repudiated three aspects of the medieval Mass.
         1. “The first was the withhold­ing of the cup from the laity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         2. “The second [was] transubstantiation . . . the miracle of transforming the bread and wine into the actual blood and body of Christ appeared magical to Luther . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         3. Third “was the idea that the mass was a good work [in which] Christ was offered as a sacrifice to God each time the mass was said.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
            1. “. . . this made the mass a worthy act quite apart from the presence of any believers, except for the priest . . .” According to Luther’s reading of the New Testament, the Eucharist “had no efficacy apart from the believers who received it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
            2. Luther could not find in the New Testament “any basis for the notion of sacrifice [in relation to the Eucharist], since Christ was not offered to God but rather was given by God to us.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)

|  |
| --- |
| Aside: The Eucharist as Sacrifice Luther is surely wrong to say that there is no basis in the New Testament for the Eucharist as a sacrifice.  That the bread and wine lie separate on the table foreshadows the impending violent separation of Jesus’ body and blood. (This separation is found in all four institution narratives: Matt 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, 1 Cor 11.)  “. . . he *broke* it” (the bread) anticipates the breaking of his “body” (Matt 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24).  “This is *my body*” and “*my blood*” is sacrificial language (Matt 26:26, 28; Mark 14:22, 24; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:24-25).  “This is my body, which is *given*” and “this is my blood . . . which is *poured out*” is sacrificial language (Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:19-20).  “This is my body, which is given *for you*” and “this is my blood . . . which is poured out *for many*” is sacrificial language (Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:24). Matt 26:28 even adds, “poured out for many *for the forgiveness of sins* . . .”  “This cup . . . is the *new covenant* in my *blood*” (Luke 22:20, 1 Cor 11:25) recalls the blood that sealed the first covenant, at Sinai.  Exod 24:5-8, “He sent young men of the people of Israel, who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed oxen as offerings of well-being to the Lord. 6Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins, and half of the blood he dashed against the altar. 7Then he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the hearing of the people; and they said, “All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient.” 8Moses took the blood and dashed it on the people, and said, “See the blood of the covenant that the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words.””  See Jer 31:31-34, “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 32It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. 33But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. 34No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, “Know the Lord,” for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.”  The references to “new covenant” and “blood” indicate that Jesus was alluding to Isaiah’s “Servant of Yahweh,” a sacrificial figure. (The “Servant of Yahweh” [or “Servnat of the Lord”] shows up in four passages in Isaiah: 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12.)  Isa 42:6, “I am the Lord . . . I have given you [the Servant] as a *covenant* to the people . . .”  Isa 49:8, “I have kept you and given you as a *covenant* to the people . . .”  Isa 53:12, “he [the Servant] *poured out* himself to *death*, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the *sin* *of many*, and made intercession for the transgressors.”  Compare Matt 26:28, “this is my *blood* of the *covenant*, which is *poured out* for *many* for the forgiveness of *sins*.”  In his Eucharistic words, Jesus “lets it be known that His approaching death is going to replace the sacrifices of the old covenant and free men [from] sin. For such a work God had need of the Servant.” (Benoit 125) |

* + - * 1. “In the theory of the mass, of course, Christ is sacrificed to God in order for us to receive Christ also. There is both an upward and [20] a downward motion. For Luther there could be no upward motion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20-21) He wrote in *Babylonian Captivity*: “the only worthy preparation and proper observance is faith, the faith by which we believe in the mass, that is, in the divine promise.” (Luther, *Luther’s Works* 36.44, qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 21)
        2. For most Protestants (including most Anglicans), “the sacri­ficing of Christ to God is an event of the past and is not repeatable by priest­ly function.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
      1. “. . . monastic vows, pilgrimages, and works of merit are seen to be man-made substitutes for the forgiveness of sins freely promised to faith in baptism.” (Walker 430)
  1. 1520: *The Freedom of a Christian*: “his third great tractate of 1520” was largely ethical in con­tent. (Walker 430)
  2. December 10, 1520: Luther burned the papal bull, *Exsurge domine*, and the canon law. (Walker 430)

1. **establishment of Lutheranism**
   1. “Throughout 1522 and 1523 the movement spread rapidly and took root. Moreover, those who took these first steps [e.g., Huldreich Zwingli in Zurich, John Oecolampadius in Basel, Fabricius Capito and Martin Bucer in Strasbourg] were themselves men of learning and position. They had decided that Luther was right, and the masses followed them.” (Kittelson 187)
   2. From Luther’s divergence from the Catholic faith, “there resulted the constitution of parishes independent of Rome.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)

## Indulgences

1. **the punishments of sin**
   1. “. . . sin has a double consequence.” (*CCC* § 1472)
      1. “Grave sin deprives us of communion with God and therefore makes us incapable of eternal life, the privation of which is called the “eternal punishment” of sin.” (*CCC* § 1472)
      2. “On the other hand every sin, even venial, entails an unhealthy attachment to creatures, which must be purified either here on earth, or after death in the state called Purgatory. This purification frees one from what is called the “temporal punishment” of sin.” (*CCC* § 1472)
   2. “These two punishments must not be conceived of as a kind of vengeance inflicted by God from without, but as following from the very nature of sin.” (*CCC* § 1472)
   3. “A conversion which proceeds from a fervent charity can attain the complete purification of the sinner in such a way that no punishment would remain.” (See Trent, ad 1551 [DS 1712‑13], ad 1563 [DS 1820.) (*CCC* § 1472)
   4. “The forgiveness of sin and restoration of communion with God entail the remission of the eternal punishment of sin, but temporal punishment of sin remains. While patiently bearing sufferings and trials of all kinds and, when the day comes, serenely facing death, the Chris­tian must strive to accept this temporal punishment of sin as a grace. He should strive by works of mercy and charity, as well as by prayer and the various practices of penance, to put off completely the “old man” and to put on the “new man.”” (Eph 4:22, 24, “You were taught to put away your former way of life, your old self, corrupt and deluded by its lusts, . . . 24and to clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.”) (*CCC* § 1473)
2. **the communion of saints**
   1. Paul on the mystical body of Christ
      1. the communion of saints as Christ’s “body”: Rom 12:4-5, 1 Cor 10:17; 1 Cor 12:12-27; Eph 1:22-23; 3:6; 4:4, 15; 5:23; Col 1:18; 2:19; 3:15.
      2. the communion of saints as Christ’s “temple”: 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:19-21.
   2. “The Christian who seeks to purify himself of his sin and to become holy with the help of God’s grace is not alone.” (*CCC* § 1474)
   3. “. . . the life of each individual son of God in Christ and through Christ is joined by a wonderful link to the life of all his other Christian brothers in the supernatural unity of the Mystical Body of Christ till, as it were, a single mystical person is formed.” (Paul VI § 5)
   4. “. . . there certainly exists between the faithful who have already reached their heavenly home, those who are expiating their sins in purgatory and those who are still pilgrims on earth a perennial link of charity and an abundant exchange of all the goods by which, with the expiation of all the sins of the entire Mystical Body, divine justice is placated. God’s mercy is thus led to forgiveness, so that sincerely repentant sinners may participate as soon as possible in the full enjoyment of the benefits of the family of God.” (Paul VI § 5)
   5. “In this wonderful exchange, the holiness of one profits others, well beyond the harm that the sin of one could cause others. Thus recourse to the communion of saints lets the contrite sinner be more promptly and efficaciously purified of the punishments for sin.” (*CCC* § 1475)
   6. “We also call these spiritual goods of the communion of saints the Church’s treasury . . .” (*CCC* § 1476)
   7. “. . . the “treasury of the Church” [is] the infinite and inexhaustible value the expiation and the merits of Christ Our Lord have before God, offered as they were so that all of mankind could be set free from sin and attain communion with the Father. It is Christ the Redeemer himself in whom the satisfactions and merits of his redemption exist and find their force.” (Paul VI § 5)
   8. “This treasury also includes the truly immense, unfathomable and ever pristine value before God of the prayers and good works of the Blessed Virgin Mary and all the saints, who following in the footsteps of Christ the Lord and by his grace have sanctified their lives and fulfilled the mission entrusted to them by the Father. Thus while attaining their own salvation, they have also cooperated in the salvation of their brothers in the unity of the Mystical Body.” (Paul VI § 5)
3. **indulgences**
   1. scripture
      1. Col 1:24, “I am now rejoicing in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I am completing what is lacking in Christ’s afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the church.”
   2. “An indulgence is the remission before God of the temporal punishment due sins already forgiven as far as their guilt is concerned, which the follower of Christ with the proper dispositions and under certain determined conditions acquires through the intervention of the Church which, as minister of the Redemption, authoritatively dispenses and applies the treasury of the satisfaction won by Christ and the saints.” (Paul VI norm 1)
   3. “An indulgence is partial or plenary according as it removes either part or all of the temporal punishment due sin.” (Paul VI norm 2)
   4. “The doctrine and practice of indulgences in the Church are closely linked to the effects of the sacrament of Penance.” (*CCC* § 1471)
   5. “Indulgences may be applied to the living or the dead.” (*CCC* § 1471)
   6. “obtaining indulgence from God through the Church” (*CCC* § 1478)
      1. “An indulgence is obtained through the Church who, by virtue of the power of binding and loosing granted her by Christ Jesus, intervenes in favor of individual Christians and opens for them the treasury of the merits of Christ and the saints to obtain from the Father of mercies the remission of the temporal punishments due for their sins. Thus the Church does not want simply to come to the aid of these Christians, but also to spur them to works of devotion, penance, and charity.” (Paul VI § 5)
   7. “Since the faithful departed now being purified are also members of the same com­mun­ion of saints, one way we can help them is to obtain indulgences for them, so that the tem­poral punishments due for their sins may be remitted.” (*CCC* § 1479)

## The Catholic Teaching on Indulgences

1. **indulgences in general**
   1. definition: “An indulgence is the remission before God of the temporal punishment due for sins already forgiven . . .” (Paul VI 21)
   2. Indulgences cannot be applied to another living person but can always be applied to a dead person. (Paul VI 21)
   3. To receive an indulgence, one must be baptized, not excommunicated, in the state of grace at the completion of the work, and subject to the grantor of the indulgence. (Paul VI 25)
   4. One must have at least a general intention to gain indulgences. (Paul VI 25)
   5. An indulgence cannot be gained by a work one is obligated to do. (Paul VI 27)
2. **partial indulgences** (eliminate some temporal punishment)
   1. Perform the work with contrition or at least attrition. (Paul VI 26)
      1. Contrition excludes all attachment to sin, even venial. (Paul VI 26)
      2. Attrition detests sin from fear of punishment. (Paul VI 26)
   2. A partial indulgence done with contrition receives a remission of punishment acquired by the act and an equal remission through the intervention of the Church. (Paul VI 21)
3. **plenary indulgences** (eliminate all temporal punishment)
   1. Perform the work with contrition. (Paul VI 26)
   2. fulfill three conditions within several days before or after the work (preferably on the day itself):
      1. go to confession
      2. go to Mass
      3. pray for the pope’s intention (one Our Father and one Hail Mary suffice) (Paul VI 26)
   3. The indul­gence is partial if the dis­pos­i­tion is imperfect. (Paul VI 26)
4. **three general indulgences** (all are partial)
   1. “The main concern has been to attach greater importance to a Christian way of life and to lead souls to cultivate the spirit of prayer and penance and to practice the theological virtues, rather than merely to repeat certain formulas and acts.” (Paul VI 17)
   2. *prayer*: Perform duties and bear trials; then think or say a pious invocation (see “examples of prayers with a partial indulgence attached,” below. to God, with humble confidence. (Paul VI 33)
   3. *charity*: Give of oneself or one’s goods to others in need, in a spirit of faith and mercy. (Paul VI 35)
   4. *penance*: Give up what is licit and pleasing, in a spirit of penitence. (Paul VI 38)
   5. “Acts of this kind [referring to all three general indulgences], considering the frailty of human nature, are not frequent.” (Paul VI 32)
5. **examples of acts with a partial indulgence attached**
   1. do the sign of the cross (Paul VI 70)
   2. use an article of devotion blessed by a priest (crucifix or cross, rosary, scapular, medal) (Paul VI 24, 64)
   3. pay attention to preaching (plenary if at a parish mission and you attend the close of the mission) (Paul VI 65)
   4. teach or learn Christian doctrine (Paul VI 55)
   5. recite the missal oration of a saint on his feast day (Paul VI 70)
   6. attend a novena before Pentecost, before the feast of the Immaculate Conception (December 8), or before Christmas (Paul VI 63)
   7. perform part of a work enriched with a plenary indulgence (e.g., a decade only of the Rosary) (Paul VI 44) Examples:
      1. adoration of the Most Blessed Sacrament for less than ½ hour (Paul VI 46)
      2. reading of scripture devoutly for less than ½ hour (Paul VI 45, 68)
6. **examples of prayers with a partial indulgence attached**
   1. “In the matter of prayers, a selection has been made in favor of those which have a more universal appeal.” (Paul VI 18)
   2. The *Enchiridion* lists hundreds of pious invocations, shorter prayers, and longer prayers. Here are a few examples:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *pious invocations* | *shorter prayers* |
| “My God”  “Father”  “Jesus”  “O God, help me”  “I love you”  “I thank you”  “Jesus, Mary, Joseph”  “Holy Mary, pray for us”  “O Lord, increase our faith” | “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit”  “Jesus, meek and humble of heart, make my heart like your Heart”  “O Heart of Jesus, burning with love for us, inflame our hearts with love for you”  “Angel of God” (Paul VI 49)  “Angelus” (Paul VI 50)  “Direct, We Beg You, O Lord” (Paul VI 46)  “We Give You Thanks” (Paul VI 49)  “Remember” (“Memorare”) (Paul VI 62) |
| *longer prayers* | |
| the Apostles’ Creed  the Nicene Creed  the Lord’s Prayer  the Rosary | the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55)  “Come, Holy Spirit” (Veni, Sancte Spiritus) (Paul VI 74)  “Have Mercy on Me” (“Miserere,” Ps 50)  “Out of the Depths” (“De Profundis,” Ps 129) |
| “Act of Love”: “O my God, because you are infinite goodness and worthy of infinite love, I love you with my whole heart above all things, and for love of you I love my fellowmen as my­self.”  “Act of Contrition”: “O my God, I repent with my whole heart of all my sins, and I detest them, because I have deserved the loss of heaven and the pains of hell, but most of all because I have offended you, infinite Goodness. I firmly purpose with the help of your grace, which I pray you to grant me now and always, to do penance and rather to die than offend you again. I purpose also to receive the holy Sacraments during my life and at my death.”  a litany (“The Litany of the Most Holy Name of Jesus,” “of the Most Precious Blood of Jesus,” “of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus,” “of the Blessed Virgin Mary,” “of the Saints,” etc.) | |

* 1. An indulgenced prayer can be said alternately with a companion or followed mentally while recited by another. (Paul VI 27)
  2. sacraments: The sacraments themselves never have indulgences attached. (Paul VI 15) But prayers associated with them may. For example:
     1. Mass prayers (if you attend every Sunday)
     2. confession penances (if you confess at least yearly)

1. **examples of acts with a plenary indulgence attached**
   1. adore the Blessed Sacrament for ½ hour (Paul VI 45)
   2. read scripture devoutly for ½ hour (Paul VI 45, 68)
   3. do the Way of the Cross (Paul VI 45, 131)
   4. say the Rosary with your family or in a church with a group
   5. spend three days in spiritual exercises on a retreat (Paul VI 57)
   6. pray for the dead in a cemetery (applicable only to those in purgatory) (Paul VI 52)
   7. take first communion or attend a first communion (Paul VI 66)
   8. recite “Look Down Upon Me” before a crucifix after communion on the Fridays of Lent (Paul VI 56)
   9. renew baptismal vows on Easter Vigil or the anniversary of one’s baptism (Paul VI 78, 131)
   10. recite the “Our Father” and a creed at a church or oratory on All Souls Day (November 2) (applicable only to those in purgatory) (Paul VI 77)
   11. die properly disposed, if in the habit of reciting some prayers during one’s lifetime (these substitute for confession, Mass, and prayer for the pope’s intentions [see “fulfill three condi­tions,” above]) (Paul VI 60)
2. **examples of prayers with a plenary indulgence attached**
   1. “Down in Adoration Falling” (*Tantum Ergo*) on Holy Thursday or Corpus Christi (Paul VI 71)
   2. “O God” (*Te Deum*) publicly on December 31 (Paul VI 72)
   3. “Come, Holy Spirit” (*Veni, Creator*) publicly on January 1 or Pentecost (Paul VI 73)

## The Last Things

1. **death**
   1. Death is a punishment for sin. (*de fide*)
      1. Gen 2:17, “in the day that you eat of it you shall die [= be subject to death].
      2. Wis 1:23, “God created us for incorruption, and made us in the image of his own eternity, 24 but through the devil’s envy death entered the world . . .”
      3. Carthage (ad 418): Adam “was [not] made mortal, so that, whether he sinned or whether he did not sin, he would die in body . . .”
      4. Orange (529): “death of the body . . . is the pun­ish­ment of sin . . . [It] passed through one man into the whole human race . . .”
      5. reason
         1. Because composed of parts (form and matter), humans are mortal by nature.
         2. But Adam had the preternatural gift of immortality.
         3. In the justified, death is no longer a punishment but remains a consequence of sin.
         4. Jesus and Mary
            1. Since they were free of original sin, death was not a punishment or a consequence of sin.
            2. But death for them was natural.
   2. Everyone subject to original sin is subject to death. (*de fide*)
      1. Rom 5:12, “death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned . . .”
      2. Heb 9:27, “it is appointed for mortals to die once . . .”
      3. But individuals can be preserved from death.
         1. Enoch:
            1. Gen 5:24, “Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him.”
            2. Heb 11:5, “By faith Enoch was taken so that he did not experience death . . .”
         2. Elijah: 2 Kgs 2:11, “Elijah ascended in a whirlwind into heaven.”
         3. those alive at the second coming
            1. 1 Cor 15:51, “We will not all die, but we will all be changed . . .”
            2. 1 Thess 4:17, “we who are alive, who are left, will be caught up in the clouds . . .”
   3. At death, conversion, merit, and demerit end. (*sententia certa*)
      1. Luke 16:19-25, “There was a rich man . . . 20And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus . . . 22The poor man died and was carried away by the angels to be with Abraham. The rich man also died and was buried. 23In Hades, where he was being tormented, he looked up and saw Abraham far away with Lazarus by his side. 24He called out, ‘Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am in agony in these flames.’ 25But Abraham said, ‘Child, remember that during your lifetime you received your good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted here, and you are in agony.”
      2. 2 Cor 5:10, “all of us must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil.”
      3. If demerit were possible after death, heaven would not be eternal.
      4. Union with God in love so strengthens the will that sin is impossible (moral impeccability).
      5. “. . . the will of the damned is immovably hardened in evil and is, therefore, inaccessible to any true repentance.”
2. **particular judgment**
   1. The soul is conscious between death and resurrection of the body.
      1. Some say souls between death and resurrection are unconscious, semi-conscious, or non-existent.
      2. Decree of the Holy Office (1887): “The soul of the deceased [is not] as if it did not exist; [it can] exercise . . . reflection upon itself, or have . . . consciousness of itself . . .”
   2. A particular judgment immediately after death decides a person’s eternal fate. (*sententia fidei proxima*)
      1. Reward or punishment immediately after death implies a particular judgment.
         1. Sir 11:26-28, “it is easy for the Lord on the day of death to reward individuals according to their conduct. 27. . . at the close of one’s life one’s deeds are revealed.”
         2. In Luke 16:22-23, Lazarus and the rich man go immediately to Abraham or hell.
         3. Luke 23:43 (Jesus to one of the criminals), “today you will be with me in Paradise.”
      2. the Eastern Orthodox
         1. There is a particular judgment immediately after death.
         2. But between death and resurrection the just and sinners are in unequal but intermediate states.
      3. The *Roman Catechism* (1.8.3) expressly teaches it.
      4. That souls go immediately after death to purgatory, heaven, or hell presupposes a particular judgment.
3. **heaven**
   1. Those who die free from all guilt of sin and punishment for sin enter heaven. (*de fide*)
      1. early OT: Sheol
         1. Num 16:33, “So they with all that belonged to them went down alive into Sheol; the earth closed over them, and they perished from the midst of the assembly.”
         2. Isa 14:9, “Sheol beneath is stirred up to meet you [the king of Babylon] when you come; it rouses the shades to greet you, all who were leaders of the earth; it raises from their thrones all who were kings of the nations.”
      2. later OT: retribution after death
         1. Dan 12:2, “those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.”
         2. Wis 3:1-9, “the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment will ever touch them. 2In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died, . . . 3but they are at peace. 4For though in the sight of others they were punished, their hope is full of immortality. 5Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good, because God tested them and found them worthy of himself . . . 9the faithful will abide with him in love, because grace and mercy are upon his holy ones . . .”
         3. Wis 4:20, 5:15-16, the unrighteous “will come with dread when their sins are reckoned up, and their lawless deeds will convict them to their face. . . . 5:15But the righteous live forever, and their reward is with the Lord; the Most High takes care of them. 16Therefore they will receive a glorious crown . . .”
      3. Heaven is a wedding feast. Matt 22:2-10, “The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who gave a wedding banquet . . .” (See Luke 14:15-20, Matt 25:10.)
      4. Heaven is “life” or “eternal life.” Matt 25:46; John 3:16; 3:36; 4:14; 5:24; 6:35, 40, 47-58; 10:28; 12:25; 17:2-3; 20:31; Rom 2:7; Rom 6:23; 1 John 5:13.
      5. Nicene Creed (381): “his kingdom will have no end. . . . We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.”
      6. Lyons II (1274): “the souls of those who after having received holy baptism have incurred no stain of sin whatever, also those souls who, after contracting the stain of sin, either while remaining in their bodies or being divested of them have been cleansed, . . . are received immediately into heaven.”
   2. Heaven lasts forever. (*de fide*)
      1. See the references to “*eternal* life” above.
      2. Luke 12:33, “Make purses for yourselves that do not wear out, an unfailing treasure in heaven, where no thief comes near and no moth destroys.”
      3. 1 Pet 5:4, “win the crown of glory that never fades away.”
      4. Augustine proves heaven is eternal from bliss: bliss that expects to end is not total bliss.
   3. the beatific vision
      1. The primary object is God himself.
         1. Those in heaven intuit (directly know) God. (*de fide*)
         2. Matt 5:8, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God.”
         3. 1 Cor 13:12, “now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known.”
         4. 1 John 3:2, “we will be like him, for we will see him as he is.”
         5. Rev 7:9, 15, “they are before the throne of God . . .”
         6. Rev 21:3, “the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them . . .”
         7. Augustine: “To the corporeal eye, even in the transfigured state, God is invisible, since God is a pure spirit . . .”
         8. Benedict XII
            1. John XXII (1316-1334) had suggested, as a private opinion, that between death and resurrection, souls in heaven see only Christ’s humanity; after resurrection, they see God.
            2. Benedict XII (1336) responded: all saints “see the divine essence by intuitive vision, and even face to face, with no mediating creature, serving in the capacity of an object seen, but divine essence immediately revealing itself plain­ly, clearly, and openly, to them, and seeing thus they enjoy the same divine es­sence . . .”
         9. Florence [1439]: the blessed “see clearly the one and triune God himself just as he is . . .”
         10. God’s essence is still incomprehensible to the blessed. (*de fide*)
             1. Lateran IV (1215): “God is . . . incomprehensible.”
             2. A finite crea­ture, even in heaven, can understand the infinite God only finitely.
      2. The secondary object is created things seen in God as the origin of all things.
   4. the light of glory
      1. The beatific vision transcends our natural powers. (*de fide*)
         1. Matt 11:27, “no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.”
         2. John 1:18, “No one has ever seen God. It is God the only Son, who is close to the Father’s heart, who has made him known.”
         3. 1 Cor 2:11, “no one comprehends what is truly God’s except the Spirit of God.”
         4. 1 Tim 6:16, God “dwells in unapproachable light, whom no one has ever seen or can see . . .”
      2. We need the light of glory for the beatific vision. (*de fide*)
         1. Ps 36:9, “in your light we see light.”
         2. Rev 22:5, “they need no light of lamp or sun, for the Lord God will be their light . . .”
         3. Vienne (1311-1312): “the soul [needs] the light of glory raising it to see God and to enjoy Him beatifically.”
         4. The light of glory is a supernatural elevation of the intellect, a *habitus.*
            1. *ST* 1.12.4-5: “our intellect . . . can be raised up above its own nature to a higher level by grace. . . . Everything which is raised up to what exceeds its nature, must be prepared by some disposition above its nature . . . it is necessary that some supernatural disposition should be added to the intellect . . . This light is . . . a perfection of the intellect, strengthening it to see God.”
            2. The light of glory is not “a medium in which God is seen [but] one by which He is seen; and such a medium does not take away the immediate vision of God.”
         5. Moses and Paul may have had the beatific vision on earth.
            1. Exod 33:11, “the Lord used to speak to Moses face to face, as one speaks to a friend.”
            2. Num 12:8, “With him I speak face to face . . .”
            3. 2 Cor 12:2-4, “I know a person in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven—whether in the body or out of the body I do not know; God knows. 3And I know that such a person . . . 4was caught up into Paradise and heard things that are not to be told, that no mortal is permitted to repeat.”
         6. The light of glory eliminates faith.
   5. the bliss of heaven
      1. Bliss is mysterious to us.
         1. 1 Cor 2:9, “no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the human heart conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him . . .”
         2. Cf. 2 Cor 12:2-4, “I know a person in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven . . . 3[He] was caught up into Paradise and heard things that are not to be told, that no mortal is permitted to repeat.”
      2. Bliss primarily springs from the immediate vision of God and the perfect love of God.
         1. Benedict XII (1336): saints “see the divine essence by intuitive vision, . . . and seeing thus they enjoy the same divine es­sence . . .”
      3. Bliss secondarily springs from natural knowledge and love of created things. (*sententia communis*)
         1. Christ in his human form, Mary, angels, saints
         2. family and friends
         3. knowledge of God’s works
         4. reunion with the transfigured body at the resurrection
         5. joy over good works performed
4. **hell**
   1. Those who die in original sin or mortal sin enter hell. (*de fide*)
      1. Isa 66:24, “people who have rebelled against me; for their worm shall not die, their fire shall not be quenched . . .”
      2. Dan 12:2, “those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, . . . some to shame and everlasting contempt.”
      3. Jdt 16:17 (c 120 bc), God “will take vengeance on [opposing nations] in the day of judgment; he will send fire and worms into their flesh; they shall weep in pain forever.”
      4. “Gehenna”
         1. Hebrew *ge-hinnōm* (abbreviation for “valley of the son of Hinnom,” which curved around southwest Jerusalem) > Aramaic *ge-hinnam* > Greek *ge­enna*.
         2. As site of the *tophet* (site of human sacrifices), the valley became a place of torment after death.
         3. c 30 New Testament references.
      5. John: punishment for sin is “judgment” (3:8; 5:24-29; 12:31, 48; 16:11), “death” (exclusion from eternal life: 5:29; 8:24; 10:28; 11:25-26; 12:25), “darkness” (8:12; 12:44-46).
      6. Paul: wrath (Rom 2:5), death (Rom 6:23), no share in the kingdom (1 Cor 6:10, Gal 5:19-21), doom (Phil 3:19), eternal destruction (2 Thess 1:9, cf. Heb 10:26-31).
      7. Athanasian Creed: “those who have done evil [go] into eternal fire.”
      8. Innocent IV (1254): “if anyone without repentance dies in mortal sin, without a doubt he is tortured forever by the flames of eternal hell.”
      9. Lyons II (1274): “The souls of those who die in mortal sin or with original sin only . . . immediately descend to hell . . .” (repeated at Florence, 1439)
   2. Hell lasts forever.
      1. Matthew: “unquenchable fire” (3:12), “eternal fire” (18:8, 25:41), “eternal punishment” (25:46).
      2. 2 Thess 1:9, “eternal destruction, separated from the presence of the Lord . . .”
      3. Rev 14:10-11, “tormented with fire and sulfur . . . in the presence of the Lamb. 11And the smoke of their torment goes up forever and ever. There is no rest day or night . . .”
      4. Rev 20:10, “tormented day and night forever and ever.”
      5. Origen denied the eternity of hell, in part from Acts 3:21 (Jesus “must remain in heaven until the time of universal restoration”). But this refers to restoration of the world at the second coming, not restoration of the damned.
      6. The “merciful ones” (e. g., Ambrose) said God’s mercy would restore Christians who die in mortal sin.
      7. Athanasian Creed: “eternal fire.”
      8. Lateran IV (1215): evil persons receive “everlasting punishment with the devil . . .”
   3. The pains of hell are:
      1. pain of loss (*poena damni*): exclusion from the beatific vision, the essential punishment.
         1. Matt 25:12, “I do not know you.”
         2. Matt 25:41, “depart from me into the eternal fire . . .”
         3. Luke 13:27, “go away from me, all you evildoers!”
         4. Rev 22:15, “Outside are the dogs and sorcerers and fornicators and murderers and idolaters, and everyone who loves and practices falsehood.”
         5. the negative punishment
         6. It corresponds to the turning from God implicit in grievous sin.
      2. pain of sense (*poena sensus*): suffering caused by material things (fire, gnashing of teeth).
         1. *fire in scripture: metaphorical:* Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, some moderns: fire is a symbol for spiritual pains, especially a tormenting conscience. This opinion has not been formally condemned by the Church.
         2. *fire in scripture: real:* most see physical fire, but different from ordinary fire.
            1. Scripture refers to wailing and gnashing of teeth, and the outer darkness.
            2. Augustine, Gregory the Great, Aquinas explain “the effect of physical fire on a purely spiritual essence as a binding of the spirits to material fire . . . Through it the spirits are made subject to matter and hindered in their free movement.”
         3. the positive punishment
         4. It corresponds to the turning toward the creature.
5. **purgatory**
   1. Purgatory is a place and state of temporal penal purification.
   2. Those who die with venial sins or temporal punishment due to sin enter purgatory. (*de fide*)
      1. Protestants say purgatory contradicts scripture.
      2. Scripture teaches the cleansing fire indirectly.
         1. Matt 12:32, “Whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.”
            1. Hence sins may be forgiven in the world to come.
            2. Gregory the Great: “In this sentence it is given to understand that many sins can be remitted . . . in the world to come.”
         2. 1 Cor 3:14-15, “If what has been built on the foundation survives, the builder will receive a reward. 15If the work is burned up, the builder will suffer loss; the builder will be saved, but only as through fire.”
            1. “only as through fire”: like someone in a fire who loses everything but his life.
            2. Latin Church Fathers (Augustine) see here a transient purification punishment after death.
         3. 2 Macc 12:39-45, “Judas and his men went to take up the bodies of the fallen . . . 40under the tunic of each one of the dead they found sacred tokens of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbids the Jews to wear. . . . 42they turned to supplication, praying that the sin that had been committed might be wholly blotted out. . . . 43[Judas Maccabeus sent] two thousand drachmas of silver . . . to Jerusalem to provide for a sin offering. . . . 44[and] to pray for the dead. . . . 45looking to the splendid reward that is laid up for those who fall asleep in godliness, it was a holy and pious thought. Therefore he made atonement for the dead, so that they might be delivered from their sin.”
      3. Cyprian “teaches that penitents who die before the reception of the reconciliation must perform the remainder of any atonement demanded in the other world, while martyrdom counts as full atonement . . .” (Ott *Fundamentals* 484)
      4. Augustine
         1. “Some suffer temporal punishments only in this life, others only after death, still others both in life and after death . . .”
         2. Prayers help those who “have not lived such good lives that they can dispense with such help after death, but not such bad lives that such help is no longer of any avail to them, that is to say, to an intermediate group between the blessed and the damned.”
      5. Lyons II (1274): “those who after baptism slip into sin must . . . by true penance attain forgiveness of their sins. . . . if they die truly repentant in charity before they have made satisfaction by worthy fruits of penance . . ., their souls are cleansed after death by purgatorical or purifying punishments” (repeated at Council of Florence, 1439).
      6. Clement VI (1351): “there is a purgatory to which de­part the souls of those dying in grace who have not yet made complete satisfaction for their sins. . . . they will be tortured by fire for a time . . .”
      7. Trent (1547): “the repentance of a Christian after his fall [includes] satisfaction by fasting, almsgiving, prayers, and other devout exercises . . . to every penitent sinner the guilt is [not] so remitted and the penalty of eternal punishment so blotted out that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be discharged either in this world or in the world to come in purgatory . . .”
      8. Trent (1562): the sacrifice of the Mass is offered, “not only for the sins of the faithful living, . . . but also for the dead in Christ not yet fully purged.”
      9. Trent (1565): “a purgatory exists, and . . . the souls there detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful . . .”
      10. Purgatory can be derived from God’s holiness and justice.
          1. God’s holiness demands that only pure souls enter hea­ven.
             1. 2 Thess 1:4-5, “your persecutions [and] afflictions . . . 5[are] intended to make you worthy of the kingdom of God . . .”
             2. Rev 21:27, “nothing unclean will enter it [the heavenly Jerusalem], nor anyone who practices abomination or falsehood, but only those who are written in the Lamb’s book of life.”
          2. God’s justice demands that sins still present be punished.

But it forbids that souls united in love with God be cast into hell.

* 1. Purgatory does not last forever.
     1. Purification endures until one is free of all guilt and punishment. Benedict XII (1336): “immediately after [purgation], even before the resumption of their bodies and the general judgment . . . [they] will be in heaven . . .”
     2. No one knows how long a given individual must endure. Alexander VII (1666) indicated that “As to the length of the purification process for the individual souls, nothing can be said in terms of years.” (Ott *Fundamentals* 485)
     3. purification will not continue after the general judgment. [*sententia communis*] Matt 25:34, 41, “the king will say to those at his right hand, ‘Come, . . . inherit the kingdom’ . . . 41Then he will say to those at his left hand, ‘You that are accursed, depart from me into the eternal fire’ . . .”
  2. The pains of purgatory are (derived by analogy with hell):
     1. the pain of loss: temporary exclusion from the beatific vision
        1. Leo X (1520): “The souls in purgatory are . . . sure of their salvation . . .”
        2. Because those in purgatory, as friends of God, long for intimate union with him, temporary separation is all the more painful.
     2. the pain of sense: sensed purifying punishments
        1. Most theologians assume a physical fire.
        2. But the biblical foundation (1 Cor 3:15, “saved . . . as through fire”) is inadequate.
        3. “Out of consideration for the separated Greeks, who reject the notion of a purifying fire, the official declarations of the Councils speak only of purifying punishments [*poena purgatoriae*] . . .” (Ott *Fundamentals* 485)
     3. Aquinas said (*De male* 7.11) remission of venial sins in the next life occurs as in this life: “by an act of contrition deriving from charity and performed with the help of grace. This act of contrition, which is presumably awakened immediately after entry into the purifying fire, does not, however, effect the abrogation or the diminution of the punishment for sins, since in the other world there is no longer any possibility of merit.” (Ott *Fundamentals* 485)

1. **inequality of reward and punishment**
   1. The degree of beatific vision is proportional to one’s merits. (*de fide*)
      1. Matt 16:27, “the Son of Man . . . will repay everyone for what has been done.”
      2. John 14:2, “In my Father’s house there are many dwelling places.”
         1. Tertullian: “Why are there many mansions in the Father’s house, if not on account of the difference of the merits?”
         2. Augustine: many mansions symbolize grades of remuneration.
      3. 1 Cor 3:8, “each will receive wages according to the labor of each.”
      4. 1 Cor 15:41-42, “There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; indeed, star differs from star in glory. 42So it is with the resurrection of the dead.”
      5. 2 Cor 9:6, “the one who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and the one who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully.”
      6. Florence (1439): the blessed “see clearly the one and triune God Himself just as He is, yet according to the diversity of merits, one more perfectly than another.”
      7. Trent (1547): “the one justified by the good works, which are done by him . . . [merits] an increase of glory . . .”
      8. speculation
         1. The primary object of the beatific vision is God himself. This has degrees (Florence: they see God “according to . . . merits, one more perfectly than another”).
         2. The secondary object is created things seen in God as the origin of all things. This has degrees.
            1. The more extensive one’s beatific vision, the more extensive one’s secondary knowledge.
            2. Aquinas: a soul in heaven at least sees all that pertains to it.
         3. Augustine: “There will be no envy on account of the unequal glory, since the unity of love will reign in all.”
         4. Aquinas (*ST* 1.12.6 *corpus*): “the intellect which has more of the light of glory will see God the more perfectly; and he will have a fuller participation of the light of glory who has more charity; because where there is the greater charity, there is the more desire; and desire in a certain degree makes the one desiring apt and prepared to receive the object desired.”
   2. The degree of punishment is proportional to one’s guilt. (*sententia communis*)
      1. Matt 11:22, “on the day of judgment it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for you.”
      2. Luke 20:47, “They [scribes] will receive the greater condemnation.”
      3. Augustine: “the lot of some of the damned will be more tolerable than that of others.”
      4. Lyons II (1274): “those who . . . descend to hell [are] punished with different punishments.” (Florence [1439] repeats this: “punishments of different kinds.”)
      5. Justice demands that punishment be commensurate with guilt.
   3. Presumably the same is true of purgatory.
2. **the second coming**
   1. Christ will return in glory at the end of the world. (*de fide*)
      1. Matt 16:27 (// Mark 8:38//Luke 9:26), “the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father . . .”
      2. Matt 24:30 (// Mark 13:26//Luke 21:27), “the tribes of the earth . . . will see ‘the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven’ with power and great glory.” (See Dan 7:13-14, “As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him. 14To him was given dominion and glory and kingship, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed.”)
      3. Acts 1:11 (angels to disciples), “Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven.”
      4. Nicene Creed (381): he “is coming again with glory to judge the living and the dead . . .”
      5. Council of Toledo XI (675): “sitting at the right hand of the Father, He awaits the end of time to be the judge of all the living and the dead.”
   2. The purposes of the second coming are the resurrection and the general judgment.
      1. 1 Thess 3:13, “may he so strengthen your hearts in holiness that you may be blame­less before our God and Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints.”
      2. 2 Thess 1:7-8, “the Lord Jesus [will be] revealed from heaven with his mighty angels 8in flaming fire, inflicting vengeance on those who do not know God . . .”
      3. 1 John 2:28, “abide in him, so that when he is revealed we may have confidence and not be put to shame before him at his coming.”
      4. Lateran IV (1215): he will “come at the end of time, to judge the living and the dead, and to render to each according to his works, to the wicked as well as to the elect, all of whom will rise with their bodies which they now bear, that they may receive according to their works . . .”
   3. Signs of the second coming are:
      1. preaching the gospel to the whole world
         1. Mark 13:10, “the good news must first be proclaimed to all nations.”

(Does not say the end is immediately after.)

* + 1. conversion of the Jews: Rom 11:25-26, “a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles [ordained by God] has come in. 26And so all Israel will be saved . . .”
    2. apostasy
       1. Matt 24:5, “many will come in my name, saying, ‘I am the Messiah!’ and they will lead many astray.”
       2. 2 Thess 2:3, “that day will not come unless the rebellion comes first . . .”
    3. the Antichrist
       1. The Antichrist will be a human being acting as Satan’s instrument.
       2. 2 Thess 2:3, “that day will not come unless the rebellion comes first and the lawless one is revealed, the one destined for destruction.” So the Antichrist will cause the apostasy.
       3. 2 Thess 2:9-11, “The coming of the lawless one is apparent in the working of Satan, who uses all power, signs, lying wonders, 10and every kind of wicked deception for those who are perishing . . .” Ott assumes the Antichrist works the signs.
       4. 2 Thess 2:8, “then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy . . ., annihilating him by the manifestation of his coming.”
       5. 1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3, “As you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come. From this we know that it is the last hour. . . . 22Who is the liar but the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, the one who denies the Father and the Son. . . . 4:3every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God. And this is the spirit of the antichrist, of which you have heard that it is coming; and now it is already in the world.”

John uses “Antichrist” for the individual but also for any who speak in his spirit.

* + 1. tribulations (persecutions, natural catastrophes)
       1. persecutions: Matt 24:9, “Then they will hand you over to be tortured and will put you to death, and you will be hated by all nations because of my name.”
       2. catastrophes of nature: Matt 24:29, “Immediately after the suffering of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven will be shaken.” See Isa 13:10, 34:4, “the stars of the heavens and their constellations will not give their light; the sun will be dark at its rising, and the moon will not shed its light. . . . 34:4All the host of heaven shall rot away, and the skies roll up like a scroll. All their host shall wither like a leaf withering on a vine, or fruit withering on a fig tree.”
  1. No one knows the time of the second coming. (*sententia certa*)
     1. 1 Thess 5:2, 2 Pet 3:10, “the day of the Lord will come like a thief [5:2, “in the night”] . . .”
     2. Rev 3:3, 16:15, “I will come like a thief, and you will not know at what hour I will come to you.”
     3. Rev 16:15, “I am coming like a thief! Blessed is the one who stays awake . . .”
     4. Mark 13:32, “about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”
        1. Christ’s human knowledge was free from ignorance and error. (*sententia certa*)
        2. Gregory the Great said knowledge from Christ’s divine nature communicates to his human nature.
        3. Augustine on Mark 13:32: Christ knew the day and hour but willed not to reveal it. Acts 1:7, “It is not for you to know the times or periods that the Father has set by his own authority.”
        4. Gregory the Great on Mark 13:32: Christ as man knew the day and hour but did not know this from his human nature.
     5. Jesus did not expect the second coming soon: Matt 12:41; 13:2413:24-33; 24:14, 21, 31; 24:48; 25:5, 19; Luke 17:22; 21:24.
     6. Statements suggesting he expected the second coming soon refer to revelation of his power
        1. for the punishment of his enemies (Matt 10:23, destruction of Jerusalem)
        2. for extending the kingdom of God on earth (Matt 16:28, Mark 9:1, Luke 9:27)
        3. for the reward of heaven (John 14:3, 18, 28; 21:22)
        4. Matt 24:34 (“this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place”), according to the context, refers to omens of the parousia, including the judgment of punishment on Jerusalem.
     7. Nevertheless, early Christians did expect the parousia soon.
        1. 1 Cor 16:22, “Our Lord, come!” Rev 22:20, “Come, Lord Jesus!”

(Aramaic *marana tha,* “Our Lord, come!”)

* + - 1. Heb 10:37, “in a very little while, the one who is coming will come and will not delay . . .”
      2. James 5:8, “the coming of the Lord is near.”
      3. 1 Pet 4:7, “The end of all things is near . . .”
      4. 1 John 2:18, “it is the last hour!”
      5. Rev 22:20, “Surely I am coming soon.”

1. **resurrection**
   1. The dead and the living will on the last day receive transformed bodies. (*de fide*)
      1. Dan 12:1-3, “at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book. 2Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. 3Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever.”
      2. 1 Cor 15:12-17, “if Christ is proclaimed as raised from the dead, how can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead? 13If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; 14and if Christ has not been raised, then our proclamation has been in vain and your faith has been in vain. 15We are even found to be misrepresenting God, because we testified of God that he raised Christ—whom he did not raise if it is true that the dead are not raised. 16For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. 17If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins.”
      3. Nicene Creed (ad 381): “We look for the resurrection of the dead . . .”
      4. Reason cannot prove the resurrection (it’s a miracle), but it is fitting:
         1. the soul is adapted to the body (body and soul are a natural unity)
         2. the body, as soul’s instrument, should receive a share in the reward or punishment
         3. members of the mystical body will be like their head
         4. grace sanctifies the body, especially through the Eucharist
   2. The resurrected body will be the same body one has now.
      1. 1 Cor 15:53, “*this* perishable body must put on imperishability, and this mortal body must put on immortality.”
      2. Lyons II (1274): “We believe [in the] resurrection of this flesh, which now we bear . . .”
         1. Aquinas, most theologians: “The identity must not be conceived in such a fashion that all material parts which at any time, or at a definite moment belonged to the earthly body, will be present in the body at the resurrection. As the human body always remains [490] the same in spite of the constant changing of its constituent matter, it suffices for the preservation of the identity, if a relatively small share of the amount of matter in the earthly body is contained in the body after the resurrection.
         2. Durandus de S. Porciano (d. 1334): the spiritual soul, as the only essential form of the human body, moulds matter to its body.
   3. Characteristics of spiritualized bodies are:
      1. in general
         1. digestive, reproductive, and sense organs (integrity demands this). Hence there will be the same sexual differences as now.
         2. But digestion and reproduction will no longer need to occur.
            1. *digestive*: Luke 24:41-43, “While in their joy they were disbelieving and still wondering, he said to them, “Have you anything here to eat?” 42They gave him a piece of broiled fish, 43and he took it and ate in their presence.”
            2. *reproductive*: Matt 22:30, “in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.”
         3. mature age (probably) (Aquinas: “greatest possible natural perfection”)
      2. Saints’ bodies are transfigured to the pattern of the risen Christ. (*sententia certa*)
         1. Phil 3:21, “He will transform the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory . . .”
         2. 1 Cor 15:35-44, “someone will ask, “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?” . . . 42what is raised is imperishable. . . . 43it is raised in glory. . . . it is raised in power. . . . 44it is raised a spiritual body.”
         3. Four properties of saints’ bodies are:
            1. impassibility (freedom from suffering: sorrow, sickness, pain, and death), more exactly the impossibility to suffer and die (*non posse pati, non posse mori*)

Rev 7:16, “They will hunger no more, and thirst no more . . . 17 God will wipe away every tear from their eyes.”

Rev 21:4, “Death will be no more; . . . crying and pain will be no more . . .”

* + - * 1. subtlety (freedom in relation to matter: moving through walls, etc.)

Luke 20:36, “they are like angels . . .”

But this is not a transformation of the body into a spiritual essence or a refinement of our matter into an ethereal body.

Luke 24:39, “Touch me and see; for a ghost does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have.”

Christ penetrated closed doors. John 20:19, when “the doors of the house where the disciples had met were locked for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood among them and said, “Peace be with you.””

* + - * 1. agility (ease and speed of movement: instantly disappearing, etc.)

The spiritual body will not be controlled by gravity.

Luke 24:31, “they recognized him; and he vanished from their sight.”

John 20:19, when “the doors of the house where the disciples had met were locked for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood among them . . .”

* + - * 1. clarity (freedom from deformity; beauty and radiance)

Matt 13:43, “the righteous will shine like the sun . . .”

The archetype of our transfiguration is Jesus’ transfiguration. Matt 17:2, “he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his clothes became dazzling white.”

But Luke 24:39, “Look at my hands and my feet; see that it is I myself.”

1 Cor 15:41-42, “There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; indeed, star differs from star in glory. 42So it is with the resurrection of the dead.” Aquinas: the clarity of the body will depend on the clarity of the soul, which will depend on the degree of one’s merits.

* + 1. The damned will have immortal but untransfigured bodies. (*sententia certa*)
       1. Matt 18:9, “better for you to enter life with one eye than to have two eyes and to be thrown into the hell of fire.”
       2. Hell’s eternity requires immortality. But immortality can include susceptibility to pain.

1. **general judgment**
   1. At the second coming, Christ will judge everyone. (*de fide*)
      1. Matt 25:32-46, “All the nations [all mankind] will be gathered before him [the Son of Man] . . . 34Then the king will say to those at his right hand, ‘Come, you that are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom . . . 35for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink . . . 41Then he will say to those at his left hand, ‘You that are accursed, depart from me into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels; 42for I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink . . .”
      2. Rev 20:12-15, “I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne, and books were opened. Also another book was opened, the book of life. And the dead were judged according to their works, as recorded in the books. 13And the sea gave up the dead that were in it, Death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them, and all were judged according to what they had done. 14Then Death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire. This is the second death, the lake of fire; 15and anyone whose name was not found written in the book of life was thrown into the lake of fire.”
      3. Nicene Creed (381): Christ “is coming again with glory to judge the living and the dead . . .”
   2. The purposes of the general judgment are to glorify God and judge humans.
   3. The general judgment differs from the particular judgment.
      1. The particular judgment is at death; the general judgment is at the end of time.
      2. In the particular judgment one is judged as an individual;

in the general judgment one is judged as a member of human society, before the whole of humanity.

* + 1. Reward or punishment is extended to our bodies.
  1. The object of the judgment will be human deeds and intentions.
     1. Matt 12:36, “on the day of judgment you will have to give an account for every careless word you utter . . .”
     2. Matt 16:27, “then he will repay everyone for what has been done.”
     3. 2 Cor 5:10, “before the judgment seat of Christ, [each will] receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil.”
     4. Rom 2:16, God “will judge the secret thoughts of all.”
     5. 1 Cor 4:5, the Lord “will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart.”
  2. God judges the world through Christ; angels, apostles, and saints assist.
     1. God judges the world, but Christ “in his human capacity” executes the judgment.
        1. Rom 14:10, “we will all stand before the judgment seat of God.”
        2. Acts 17:31, God “has fixed a day on which he will have the world judged in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed . . .”
        3. Rom 2:16, “God, through Jesus Christ, will judge . . . all.”
        4. 2 Tim 4:1, “Christ Jesus . . . is to judge the living and the dead . . .”
        5. Matt 16:27, “the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay everyone for what has been done.”
     2. Angels will assist.
        1. Matt 13:41-42, “The Son of Man will send his angels, and they will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers, 42and they will throw them into the furnace of fire . . .”
        2. Matt 24:31, “he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds . . .”
     3. Saints (esp. apostles) will assist.
        1. 1 Cor 6:2, “Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?”
        2. Matt 19:28, “at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man is seated on the throne of his glory, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”

1. **end of the world**
   1. The present world will be destroyed on the last day. (*sententia certa*)
      1. Isa 34:4, “the host of heaven shall rot away, and the skies roll up like a scroll.”
      2. Isa 51:6, “the heavens will vanish like smoke, the earth will wear out like a garment . . .”
      3. Matt 24:29, 35, “the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; the stars will fall from heaven . . .”
      4. 1 Cor 7:31, “the present form of this world is passing away.”
      5. Augustine: the present world will not be destroyed but transformed.
      6. destruction by fire
         1. 2 Pet 3:7-12, “the present heavens and earth have been reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment . . . 10the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fire . . . 12the heavens will be set ablaze and dissolved, and the elements will melt with fire . . .”
         2. Fire is just a way of expressing destruction common in the author’s time.
   2. The present world will be restored on the last day. (*sententia certa*)
      1. Isa 11:6-9, “The wolf shall live with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. 7The cow and the bear shall graze, their young shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. 8The nursing child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put its hand on the adder's den. 9They will not hurt or destroy on all my holy mountain; for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.”
      2. Isa 65:17-25, “I am about to create new heavens and a new earth . . . 18I am about to create Jerusalem as a joy, and its people as a delight. . . . 20No more shall there be in it an infant that lives but a few days, or an old person who does not live out a lifetime . . . 25The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, the lion shall eat straw like the ox; but the serpent—its food shall be dust! They shall not hurt or destroy on all my holy mountain, says the Lord.”
      3. Acts 3:21, Jesus “must remain in heaven until the time of universal restoration that God announced long ago through his holy prophets.”
      4. Rom 8:18-23, “I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory about to be revealed to us. 19For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the children of God . . . 21the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God. 22We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains until now; 23and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies.”
      5. Rev 21:1-5, “Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth . . . 2And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God . . . 3And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, “See, the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them as their God; they will be his peoples . . . 5And the one who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.””
   3. eternity: with all enemies conquered, Christ will present everything to the Father.
      1. 1 Cor 15:24-28, “Then comes the end, when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father, after he has destroyed every ruler and every authority and power. 25For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. 26The last enemy to be destroyed is death. . . . 28When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to the one who put all things in subjection under him, so that God may be all in all.”
      2. “With the end of the world there begins the perfected lordship of God which is the ultimate object of the whole Creation and the final meaning of all human history.” (Ott *Fundamentals* 496)

## Scripture References That Oppose “Faith Alone”

1. **Jesus**
   1. “On occasion Jesus himself declares that love is the cause of justifica­tion: the love of God and of the neighbour together represent the fullness of justice . . .” (Schmaus 31)
      1. Matt 22:34-40 (par. Mark 12:28-34, Luke 10:25-28), “When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together, 35 and one of them, a lawyer [Mark 12:28, “One of the scribes”], asked him a question to test him. 36 “Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?” 37 He said to him, “‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, [Luke 10:27 adds, “and with all your strength,”] and with all your mind.’ 38 This is the greatest and first commandment. 39 And a second is like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ 40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”
      2. Mark 8:34, “If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me.”
      3. Luke 7:47, “her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.”
      4. 1 John 3:14-4:21, “we have passed from death to life because we love one another. Whoever does not love abides in death. 15 All who hate a brother or sister are murderers, and you know that murderers do not have eternal life abiding in them. 16 We know love by this, that he laid down his life for us—and we ought to lay down our lives for one another. 17 How does God’s love abide in anyone who has the world’s goods and sees a brother or sister in need and yet refuses help? 18 Little children, let us love, not in word or speech, but in truth and action. 19 And by this we will know that we are from the truth and will reassure our hearts before him 20 whenever our hearts condemn us; for God is greater than our hearts, and he knows everything. 21 Beloved, if our hearts do not condemn us, we have boldness before God; 22 and we receive from him whatever we ask, because we obey his commandments and do what pleases him. 23 And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as he has commanded us. 24 All who obey his commandments abide in him, and he abides in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit that he has given us. . . . 4:7 Beloved, let us love one another, because love is from God; everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. 8 Whoever does not love does not know God, for God is love. . . . 12 No one has ever seen God; if we love one another, God lives in us, and his love is perfected in us. 13 By this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit. 14 And we have seen and do testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world. 15 God abides in those who confess that Jesus is the Son of God, and they abide in God. 16 So we have known and believe the love that God has for us. God is love, and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them. 17 Love has been perfected among us in this: that we may have boldness on the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world. 18 There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear; for fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not reached perfection in love. 19 We love because he first loved us. 20 Those who say, “I love God,” and hate their brothers or sisters, are liars; for those who do not love a brother or sister whom they have seen, cannot love God whom they have not seen. 21 The commandment we have from him is this: those who love God must love their brothers and sisters also.”
   2. “Again, he says that it [“the cause of justifica­tion”] is repentance.” (Schmaus 31)
      1. Luke 15:11-32, prodigal son
   3. “What he rejects is mere orthodoxy . . .” (Schmaus 31)
      1. Matt 7:21, “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven.”
      2. Luke 6:46, “Why do you call me ‘Lord, Lord,’ and do not do what I tell you?”
   4. “Thus for Jesus faith is equivalent to conversion.” I.e., for Jesus true faith includes repentance. (Schmaus 31)
   5. reward language
      1. ??
2. **Paul**
   1. “. . . in view of its [Jewish Christianity’s] ethical optimism (and his own earlier theology and personal experience), he stresses with bald emphasis, especially in Romans [and] Galatians, that there is salvation only in and through Christ and that this can be taken hold of only by faith.” (Schmaus 30)
   2. “But Paul never intended to weaken or shackle man’s moral efforts. Rather, for him faith is a dynamic force determining a man’s whole life and permeating all his activity.” (Schmaus 30)
   3. “. . . the most perfect orthodoxy is worth nothing if it is not accompanied by love (1 Cor. 13). The only faith that counts is the one which performs acts of love . . .” (Schmaus 30)
      1. Rom 6:12-23, “do not let sin exercise dominion in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions. 13 No longer present your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life, and present your members to God as instruments of righteousness. 14 For sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace. 15 What then? Should we sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means! 16 Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness? 17 But thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18 and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. 19 I am speaking in human terms because of your natural limitations. For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness for sanctification. 20 When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. 21 So what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death. 22 But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
      2. Rom 8:4, “the just requirement of the law [is] fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.”
      3. Rom 12:1-2, “present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. 2 Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds, so that you may discern what is the will of God—what is good and acceptable and perfect.”
      4. 1 Cor 7:19, “Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but obeying the commandments of God is everything.”
         1. See Gal 5:6, “in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love.”
      5. 1 Cor 9:24-27, “Do you not know that in a race the runners all compete, but only one receives the prize? Run in such a way that you may win it. 25 Ath­letes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. 26 So I do not run aimlessly, nor do I box as though beating the air; 27 but I punish my body and enslave it, so that after proclaiming to others I myself should not be disqualified.”
      6. 1 Cor 10:12, “So if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall.”
      7. 1 Cor 13:2-13, “if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing. . . . 8 Love never ends. But as for . . . knowledge, it will come to an end. . . . 12 For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. 13 And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.”
      8. Gal 5:25, “If we live by the Spirit, let us also be guided by the Spirit.”
      9. Eph 2:1-3, “You were dead through the trespasses and sins 2 in which you once lived, following the course of this world, following the ruler of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work among those who are disobedient. 3 All of us once lived among them in the passions of our flesh, following the desires of flesh and senses, and we were by nature children of wrath, like everyone else.”
      10. Phil 1:29, “For he has graciously granted you the privilege not only of believing in Christ, but of suffering for him as well . . .”
      11. Phil 2:12-13, “Therefore, my beloved, just as you have always obeyed me, not only in my presence, but much more now in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; 13 for it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”
      12. Phil 3:12-16, “Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached the goal; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. 13 Beloved, I do not consider that I have made it my own; but this one thing I do: forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, 14 I press on toward the goal for the prize of the heavenly call of God in Christ Jesus. 15 Let those of us then who are mature be of the same mind; and if you think differently about anything, this too God will reveal to you. 16 Only let us hold fast to what we have attained.”
      13. 2 Thess 1:11, “we always pray [that God] will fulfill by his power every good resolve and work of faith . . .”
          1. Here “work of faith” means “an act which is the manifestation of a living faith.” (Schmaus 30)
      14. 1 Tim 1:5, “But the aim of such instruction is love that comes from a pure heart, a good conscience, and sincere faith.”
3. **James**
   1. James 2:14-21, “What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? 15 If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, 16 and one of you says to them, “Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill,” and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? 17 So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead. 18 But someone will say, “You have faith and I have works.” Show me your faith apart from your works, and I by my works will show you my faith. 19 You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder. 20 Do you want to be shown, you senseless person, that faith apart from works is barren? 21 Was not our ancestor Abraham justified by works when he offered his son Isaac on the altar?”
   2. “If James 2,14-21 declares that faith alone is insufficient, the opposi­tion to Paul here is only ap­parent. [This] is clear from the context of the whole letter of James. . . . The com­munity has indeed extricated itself from the ethical optimism under which it lived in the periods of its Old Testament mentality, in the conviction that salvation cannot be obtained through the works of the law, but [30] only through the surrender of one’s self to Jesus Christ. However, it has been misled by this conviction into the notion that works, since they cannot produce salvation, are altogether superfluous. Thus the com­munity has fallen into a fatal error. Its faith is ineffective. Indeed, it is a dead faith because it does not live in actions. Such a faith is without value in face of judgment. Thus James does not minimize the importance of faith but on the contrary demands that the community must live its faith.” (Schmaus 30-31)
   3. “Grace implies freedom because grace is a mutual exchange of love. There can be no grace that is not freely accepted, and therefore grace and charity are inseparable . . . mortal sin, which destroys charity, destroys grace. It does not necessarily destroy faith . . . Such a faith is called “dead faith”. It remains supernatural, that is, a grace, but a grace limited to the intellectu­al faculty, without transforming and involving the whole being; and because the being is no longer sanctified or deified, it is not sanctify­ing grace.” (Dau­jat 99)
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1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . the effects of the divine action [are] the forgiveness of sin and the resultant transformation of man . . .” (Schmaus 64)
   2. “God’s self-communication and his giving of salvific grace to man results in a particular state which can be expressed in the phrase “forgiveness of sin.”” (Schmaus 53)
2. **scripture**
   1. “The resounding proclamation of the forgiveness of sin can be meaningful only when an oppressive sense of sinfulness can be generally presumed. [54] . . . the hope of forgiveness had been alive earlier; what was new was to find it attached to a particular historical situation and person; now it was no longer merely a promise for the future but had become a tangible reality . . .” (Schmaus 54-55)
   2. “It was proclaimed not as an occasional and temporary action but as a divine act of grace characteristic of the messianic time. The forgiveness of sin associated with the Messiah was a concept unknown to the Jews. They had hoped rather to destroy sinners and the unrighteous and in that way to banish sin from human society.” (Schmaus 55)
   3. In the New Testament the promise of the forgiveness of sins stands at the beginning of the list of Jesus’ works (cf. Mt. 1,20f.).” (Schmaus 54) Matt 1:21, “She will bear a son, and you are to name him Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins.”
   4. “The cure of the paralytic, which Jesus prefaced with the announce­ment that the man’s sins were forgiven, as reported by all the synoptics, brings out some significant details . . .” (Schmaus 55)
      1. Mark 2:5-12 (= Matt 9:1-8), “When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the paralytic, “Son, your sins are forgiven.” 6 Now some of the scribes were sitting there, questioning in their hearts, 7 “Why does this fellow speak in this way? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?” 8 At once Jesus perceived in his spirit that they were discussing these questions among themselves; and he said to them, “Why do you raise such questions in your hearts? 9 Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, ‘Your sins are forgiven,’ or to say, ‘Stand up and take your mat and walk’? 10 But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins”—he said to the paralytic—11 “I say to you, stand up, take your mat and go to your home.” 12 And he stood up, and immediately took the mat and went out before all of them; so that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, “We have never seen anything like this!””
   5. the woman who anointed Jesus’ feet
      1. Luke 7:36-50, “One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee’s house and took his place at the table. 37 And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment. 38 She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. 39 Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, “If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him—that she is a sinner.” 40 Jesus spoke up and said to him, “Simon, I have something to say to you.” “Teacher,” he replied, “Speak.” 41 “A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. 42 When they could not pay, he canceled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will love him more?” 43 Simon answered, “I suppose the one for whom he canceled the greater debt.” And Jesus said to him, “You have judged rightly.” 44 Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, “Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. 45 You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. 46 You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. 47 Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.” 48 Then he said to her, “Your sins are forgiven.” 49 But those who were at the table with him began to say among themselves, “Who is this who even forgives sins?” 50 And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.””
   6. Zacchaeus
      1. Luke 19:3-10, “He was trying to see who Jesus was, but on account of the crowd he could not, because he was short in stature. 4 So he ran ahead and climbed a sycamore tree to see him, because he was going to pass that way. 5 When Jesus came to the place, he looked up and said to him, “Zacchaeus, hurry and come down; for I must stay at your house today.” 6 So he hurried down and was happy to welcome him. 7 All who saw it began to grumble and said, “He has gone to be the guest of one who is a sinner.” 8 Zacchaeus stood there and said to the Lord, “Look, half of my possessions, Lord, I will give to the poor; and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will pay back four times as much.” 9 Then Jesus said to him, “Today salvation has come to this house, because he too is a son of Abraham. 10 For the Son of Man came to seek out and to save the lost.”
   7. the good thief
      1. Luke 23:39-42, “One of the criminals who were hanged there kept deriding him and saying, “Are you not the Messiah? Save yourself and us!” 40 But the other rebuked him, saying, “Do you not fear God, since you are under the same sentence of condemnation? 41 And we indeed have been condemned justly, for we are getting what we deserve for our deeds, but this man has done nothing wrong.” 42 Then he said, “Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.””
   8. “The remission of guilt is the first fruit of the act of turning in faith to Christ . . . What is meant here is the remission of a debt; sin is to be understood as a debt charged to our account, and in the forgiveness of sin this debt is cancelled.” (Schmaus 54)
      1. Acts 2:38, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”
      2. Acts 5:31, “God exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Savior that he might give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.”
      3. Acts 8:22, “Repent therefore of this wickedness of yours, and pray to the Lord that, if possible, the intent of your heart may be forgiven you.”
      4. Acts 10:43, “All the prophets testify about him that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name.”
      5. Acts 13:38, “Let it be known to you therefore, my brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you . . .”
   9. “Paul speaks of pardon (Col. 2,13; 3,13; Eph. 4,32) and of God’s “no longer holding men’s misdeeds against them” (2 Cor. 5,19; Rom. 4,8-11; cf. also [1] Pet. 4,8) as well as the forgiveness of sin (Rom. 4,7; Col. 1,14; Eph. 1,7). These passages show that one expression cannot be set against the other. In Paul’s view, man is a debtor before God, and his debt is entered into a ledger. God relinquishes his claim; he remits, he waives, the penalty. This is an act of grace whereby he makes a divine value judgment upon the sinner that has creative force, effecting what it says. It so changes man that he ceases to be a sinner; he becomes a new man. Thus Paul can speak of taking away, of cleansing, of purifying, of freeing from sin (1 Cor. 6,11; Rom. 6; 7,24; Eph. 5,26; Heb. 9,28; see also 1 Pet. 3,21).” (Schmaus 56)
      1. Col 2:13, “when you were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made you alive together with him, when he forgave us all our trespasses . . .”
      2. Col 3:13, “just as the Lord has forgiven you, so you also must forgive.”
      3. Eph 4:32, “be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, as God in Christ has forgiven you.”
      4. 2 Cor 5:19, “in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them . . .”
      5. Rom 4:8-11, ““blessed is the one against whom the Lord will not reckon sin.” 9Is this blessedness, then, pronounced only on the circumcised, or also on the uncircumcised?”
      6. 1 Pet 4:8, “maintain constant love for one another, for love covers a multitude of sins.”
      7. Rom 4:7, “Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered . . .”
      8. Col 1:14, “in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.”
      9. Eph 1:7, “In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses . . .”
      10. 1 Cor 6:11, “And this is what some of you used to be. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.”
      11. Rom 6:4-23, “we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that [we] might walk in newness of life. . . . 6 our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7 For whoever has died is freed from sin. 8But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him. 9 We know that Christ, being raised from the dead, will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him. 10 The death he died, he died to sin, once for all; but the life he lives, he lives to God. 11 So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. 12 Therefore, do not let sin exercise dominion in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions. 13 No longer present your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life, and present your members to God as instruments of righteousness. 14 For sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace. 15 What then? Should we sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means! 16 Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness? 17 But thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18 and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. 19 I am speaking in human terms because of your natural limitations. For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness for sanctification. 20 When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. 21 So what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death. 22 But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
      12. Rom 7:24, “Wretched man that I am! Who will rescue me from this body of death?”
      13. Eph 5:26, “to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of water by the word . . .”
      14. Heb 9:28, “Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to deal with sin, but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him.”
      15. 1 Pet 3:21, baptism “now saves you—not as a removal of dirt from the body, but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ . . .”
   10. “We find the same orientation in the apostle’s statement that the forgiveness of sin takes place through participation in the death of Jesus. In his death Jesus took upon himself the curse uttered by God after the first sin. He fulfilled the law of suffering and death and thereby nullified it. Jesus’ death becomes effective for man through faith and baptism. The person who is baptized is taken up into the living power of the death on Golgotha, and his sinful existence in Adam is transcen­ded. Inasmuch as man, through faith and the sacraments, achieves a share in the dying of Jesus, he is liberated from sin . . .” (Schmaus 55)
       1. Rom 3:25-26, “God put forward [Christ] as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; 26 it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus.”
       2. Col 2:13, “And when you were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made you alive together with him, when he forgave us all our trespasses . . .”
   11. In John, “Jesus is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (1,29). The image of the lamb may be referred either to the paschal lamb or to the daily offering of two lambs in the temple. It is possible that the first formulation of the phrase Lamb of God did not come from John the Baptist but was attributed to him by the primitive Christian community as a testimony to those truths believed by John the evangelist. In John’s gospel the formula of the washing away of sin also occurs (Jn. 13,10). Jesus says to the disciples: “You have already been cleansed by the word that I spoke to you” (Jn. 15,3). This passage testifies not only to the fact of forgiveness but also to the means, namely the word. The word by which sin is forgiven is an effec­tive word, a word of spiritual force and dynamism. According to Jn. 2,12, the faithful have received forgiveness of sins.” (Schmaus 56)
       1. John 2:12, “After this he went down to Capernaum with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples; and they remained there a few days.”
       2. John 13:10, “One who has bathed does not need to wash, except for the feet, but is entirely clean. And you are clean, though not all of you.”
3. **the Reformers and Trent on nonimputation of sin**
   1. Once again, the “difference between the thinking in metaphysical terms and the thinking in existen­tial terms has been the occasion of innumerable misunderstandings.” (Schmaus 57)
   2. “The theological *a* *priori* of the Council of Trent is the metaphysical view brought to maturity by Thomas Aquinas. The theological *a* *priori* of the Reformers is a personal-existential view which looks back to a long history. The two thought forms are not adequately differentiated, since one always includes an element of the other; yet they present characteristic differences. While the council pursues the idea of sin in a metaphysical dimension—and the forgiveness of sin touches just this dimension—Protestant theology leaves this dimension out, approaching the question on an existential-personal level.” (Schmaus 59)
4. **the meaning of forgiveness**
   1. “God’s forgiveness of sin means first of all his taking away of the guilt which man has incurred against God himself. Thus only can sin be overcome: through God’s action. In merciful forgiveness God actually cancels out the sin.” (Schmaus 63)
   2. “This does not mean that God does not take sin seriously, that he regards it good-naturedly as something by which no real harm was intended or condones it as something not really worth bothering about. On the contrary, it means that God looks at sin in its dreadful, unfathomable depths and forgives it through Christ: only by means of the cross on Golgotha is there any forgiveness of sin.” (Schmaus 63)
   3. “The law of grace which God applies to Christ on the cross as the representatives [*sic*] of sinful mankind is extended to the individual sinner. In the forgiveness of sin the grace of Golgotha is actualized for each individual.” (Schmaus 63)
   4. “But that it should be effective for salvation for the individual depends on the condition that each one, moved by divine grace, shall give himself in faith to Christ as his represen­tative, submit to the law of the heavenly Father, and attach himself to Jesus Christ in faith as his vicar before God.” (Schmaus 63)
   5. “Through the forgiveness of sin the *reatus* *culpa*, the indebtedness for sin, is overcome.” (Schmaus 63)
      1. “Catholic as well as Protestant theology is naturally aware that sins, as historical happenings, cannot be cancelled out. On this point neither of the two teachings maintains more nor less than the other.” [60] “. . . sin as an historical event is not nullified; there is no reversal of history.” (Schmaus 60, 63)
      2. “Also, the failure involved in an action done at one time within history is not annulled by the forgiveness of sin. The justified sinner remains a sinner in the sense that he remains always the doer of his once committed sin. This fact is emphasized even more strongly in Protestant theology than in Catholic.” (Schmaus 60)
      3. “Much less does the divine forgiveness eliminate the consequences of the sinful act in history—the spiritual and bodily damage or the disposition towards sin. The Council of Trent stated that although the sinfulness no longer remains in the one whose sin is forgiven, the concupiscence—i.e., the disorderly inclination—is not taken away. This tendency can be called sin in a certain sense because it is the result of sin and tends again towards sin (DS 1514).” (Schmaus 63)
      4. [Forgiveness of sin does not eliminate the consequences of one’s sins on other in­dividuals and the human community at large, consequences which ramify throughout the remainder of history. Schmaus should note this as well.—Hahn]
      5. “. . . the meaning of forgiveness cannot be established experimentally but must be grasped in faith. Whereas it is true that [64] according to Scripture there are signs to show that a man is living in God’s love, the chief of these being love of the brethren (1 Jn. 3,14-23), there is no need to doubt when such signs are not seen. For the forgive­ness of sin is an act of God, not the product of human activity. The wiping out of sinfulness is imperceptible.” (Schmaus 64-65)
5. “**justification as** (**the way to**) **forgiveness**” (Schmaus 63)
   1. “Justification” in scripture “is used chiefly in a juridical sense,” but it is true too that in scripture “God’s word is not a mere statement, it is a creative word. When God declares a man just, he makes him just . . .” (Schmaus 54)
   2. Trent
      1. “Although the council strongly emphasized the metaphysical reality of the forgiveness of sin, it did not reject the idea of justification which the Reformers had so much [63] at heart. [It denied] that man is justified only through the imputation of righteousness of Jesus Christ (DS 1561). The council’s definition implies that the man justified by God is declared just (DS 1528), but that this declaration at the same time creates the state of justification. God’s declaration is not a result of the preceding justifica­tion, but rather its foundation. According to the council, justification is initiated by a sovereign act of God in which God sits in judgment on the sinner. Since a sovereign act of God is in question, one cannot ascribe to it mere juridical significance, as if it were the act of an earthly court. On the contrary, it effects what it says; the effect is produced precisely through the sovereign act of God.” (Schmaus 63-64)
      2. “It must be said, however, that the council mistakenly emphasized the effects of the divine action—the forgiveness of sin and the resultant transformation in man—as identical with the divine act itself. The accent arises from the apologetic stance of the council. It was concerned not merely with correcting accents which seemed wrong but also, and even more, with condemning false teaching.” (Schmaus 64)

## The State of Justification as the New Creation

## (Sanctification, Transformation, Regeneration)

1. **concept**
   1. “Left . . . to his own resources and potentialities, man is a sinner . . . Sinful man cannot, of him­self, be pleasing to God. For that, he must receive a gift from God which transforms him in­ter­iorly, cleanses him and sanctifies him by adorning him with qualities that render him pleasing to his Cre­ator.” (Daujat 13-14)
   2. The Son is God by nature; therefore, he is the Son of God by nature. We are adopted; therefore, we are Sons of God by adoption. But, unlike hu­man adoption, because God is the author of our being, he changes our very nature in the act of adopting us. (Daujat 62)
2. **scripture**
   1. Paul
      1. “Paul often describes the gift of grace under the figure of the new order and the new creation . . .” (Schmaus 67) See the handout, “The State of Justification: Some Scriptural Images.”
      2. “The new order presupposes the ending of the old; the new order arises from the death of the old. The old order—namely, the sinful way of life which leads to perdition—disappears through the sharing in the death of Jesus Christ, and the new way of life in which Christ is formed begins with the sharing in his resurrection.” (Schmaus 67)
      3. “In Christ man receives true salvation and justification. Christ’s holiness becomes analogously his own, and so genuinely that he bears Christ’s mark interiorly.” (Schmaus 67)
         1. Rom 5:5, “God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.”
         2. 1 Cor 3:17, “God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple.”
         3. 1 Cor 6:11, “you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.”
         4. 1 Cor 6:19, “do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?”
         5. Col 3:9, “you have stripped off the old self with its practices . . .”
      4. “Christ is the head of the whole created order, and all things have received his imprint. In a certain sense they have a christocentric structure. But it is in another sense that the justified man bears the mark of Christ. Perhaps we could put it this way: with regard to all other created things, it can be seen that Someone has passed this way, and it is possible to conclude who it has been. By looking into the depths of created things it is possible to recognize that the incarnate, crucified, risen and glorified Son of God has passed over the earth and has a relationship to all things. But only the man in grace is the image of Christ to come, glorified through his death and resurrection. By looking into the depths of his being, it is possible to recognize there this image of Christ . . .” (Schmaus 67)
         1. 2 Cor 3:18, “all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.”
         2. 2 Cor 4:4, “the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.”
         3. Gal 4:19, “I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you . . .”
         4. Col 1:15, “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation . . .”
         5. Col 2:9-10, “For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily, 10and you have come to fullness in him, who is the head of every ruler and authority.”
         6. Col 3:10, you “have clothed yourselves with the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge according to the image of its creator.”
      5. “But here it seems that we must make a further distinction.” (Schmaus 67)
         1. “The mark of the crucified and risen Christ is found in the baptized (Rom. 6).” (Schmaus 67)
            1. Rom 6:4-23, “we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. . . . 6 our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7 For whoever has died is freed from sin. 8But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him. . . . 11 So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. . . . 17 thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18 and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. . . . 22 now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
         2. “Yet the unbaptized just man also bears the mark of Christ. Revelation is [67] silent as to the manner in which Christ is formed in him, but this resemblance he bears to Christ is more than a superficial likeness. The just man who is not baptized nevertheless genuinely shares in the life of Jesus Christ, since justification comes only through Jesus Christ; but it is not in the same way as the baptized man that he is incorporated into the sphere of the death and resurrection of Christ. We must leave the veil over this mystery of how his relationship to Christ is to be interpre­ted.” (Schmaus 67-68)
   2. John
      1. “According to John, God gave to those who do not follow the “will of the flesh”—that is, self-love—but instead believe in his word, the power in Christ to become children of God . . .” (Schmaus 66) John 1:12, “But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God . . .”
      2. “Man becomes a child of God by being born of God (Jn. 1,13; 1 Jn. 5,1.18). This process of birth from God, described in terms of an image derived from the mystery religions, is of a depth that is best conveyed by the following analogy: [66] just as a man must receive his earthly and temporal life from an earthly mother—that is, from the power deriving from created nature—so he can receive the eternal life of heaven only from the life of God, from the power of heaven (see Jn. 3,3ff.). The justified man lives in Christ and through Christ (Jn. 6,57). He is filled to overflowing with the saving power of Jesus Christ which marks him forever (Jn. 17,19). Through Christ he is like the Father in heaven (1 Jn. 3,2). The life in Christ is a life in the spirit of Christ, for it is a life in Christ spiritualized by the resurrection.” (Schmaus 66-67)
         1. John 1:12-13, “to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God, 13 who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God.”
         2. John 3:3, 5-6, “no one can see the kingdom of God without being born from above. . . . 5 no one can enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit. 6 What is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit.”
         3. John 6:57, “Just as the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so whoever eats me will live because of me.”
         4. John 17:19, “for their sakes I sanctify myself, so that they also may be sanctified in truth.”
         5. 1 John 3:2, “we are God’s children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is.”
         6. 1 John 5:1, “Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ has been born of God, and everyone who loves the parent loves the child.”
         7. 1 John 5:18, “We know that those who are born of God do not sin, but the one who was born of God protects them, and the evil one does not touch them.”
   3. 1-2 Peter
      1. “The first and second epistles of Peter show a further influence.” (Schmaus 69)
         1. 1 Peter
            1. 1 Pet 1:3-5, God “has given us a new birth into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, 4 and into an inheritance that is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading, kept in heaven for you, 5who are being protected by the power of God through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.”
            2. 1 Pet 1:22-23, “Now that you have purified your souls by your obedience to the truth so that you have genuine mutual love, love one another deeply from the heart. 23 You have been born anew, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, through the living and enduring word of God.”
            3. 1 Pet 2:9, those who are reborn “are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.”
         2. 2 Peter
            1. “The author of the Second Epistle of Peter writes in a Hellenistic style, using Hellenistic concepts . . .” (Schmaus 69)
            2. 2 Pet 1:3-4, “His divine power has given us everything needed for life and godliness, through the knowledge of him who called us by his own glory and goodness. 4 Thus [you] may become participants of the divine nature.”
            3. “It was in answer to skeptics and cynics that this second letter of Peter proclaimed anew the divine promises whose fulfillment had been so long awaited, the promises of the Parousia and the kingdom of God . . .” (Schmaus 69)

2 Pet 1:16, “we did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we had been eyewitnesses of his majesty.”

2 Pet 3:3-13, “in the last days scoffers will come, scoffing and indulging their own lusts 4 and saying, “Where is the promise of his coming? For ever since our ancestors died, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation!” 5 They deliberately ignore this fact, that by the word of God heavens existed long ago and an earth was formed out of water and by means of water, 6 through which the world of that time was deluged with water and perished. 7 But by the same word the present heavens and earth have been reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and destruction of the godless. 8 But do not ignore this one fact, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like one day. 9 The Lord is not slow about his promise, as some think of slowness, but is patient with you, not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance. 10 But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, and then the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fire, and the earth and everything that is done on it will be disclosed. 11 Since all these things are to be dissolved in this way, what sort of persons ought you to be in leading lives of holiness and godliness, 12 waiting for and hastening the coming of the day of God, because of which the heavens will be set ablaze and dissolved, and the elements will melt with fire? 13 But, in accordance with his promise, we wait for new heavens and a new earth, where righteousness is at home.”

* + - * 1. “The letter expresses these hopes in the language of the Greek philosophy which had for centuries concerned itself with the relation of men to God.” (Schmaus 69)

“According to Plato and his school the divine essence and human nature are not wholly disparate; by understanding this resemblance, man can recognize the value of his own nature.” (Schmaus 69)

“In the Stoic view, man is in a pantheistic sense a part of God. The mystery religions promise to the initiate a union with the godhead.” (Schmaus 69)

“Hellenistic Judaism is also influenced by these views.” (Schmaus 69)

* 1. “According to the proclamation of the New Testament, man can receive a share in the godhead only when God himself guarantees this as a gift . . .” (Schmaus 69)
     1. John 1:12, “to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God . . .”
     2. Rom 5:5, “hope does not disappoint us, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.”
     3. Gal 4:6, “because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!””
     4. 1 John 1:3, “we declare to you what we have seen and heard so that you also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.”
     5. 1 John 3:1, “See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and that is what we are. The reason the world does not know us is that it did not know him.”
     6. “The Second Epistle of Peter stresses this character of gift as well as the eschatological character of the participation in the divine nature.” (Schmaus 69)

1. **tradition**
   1. Church Fathers
      1. “From the fourth century onwards, the Fathers speak of the interior transformation of the justified man in such strong phrases as “deifica­tion,” or “becoming godlike.” According to many of the Fathers, God became man so that man might become God.” (Schmaus 70)
      2. “. . . the reality itself was received by the Fathers from sacred tradition [but] Neoplatonic and gnostic influences contributed to this manner of speaking . . . In gnostic and Neoplatonic teaching, deification was the result of man’s ascent into the divine sphere. In the teaching of the Fathers, it was the result of God’s descent in the historical Christ who was crucified and glorified. It is tied, therefore, to a historical event: it presupposes the incarnation of God, his entrance into time and the world.” (Schmaus 70)
      3. “In the teaching of the Fathers, man does not cast off his created nature through his participation in the divine nature: the difference between God and man is not eradicated through man’s deification, but on the contrary is set forth in its full clarity. The Fathers’ meaning becomes clear in a comparison they frequently made: as iron placed in a fire takes on the nature of fire and becomes firelike, so the justified man takes on the nature of God and becomes godlike. The justified are called God-bearers because they are permeated with the holiness of God. The Fathers likewise compare grace with the sun, which illuminates bodies (Basil), or with perfume diffusing itself among the clothes in a closet (Cyril of Alexandria).” (Schmaus 70)
   2. Trent
      1. “The Council of Trent defined specifically the interior transformation and sanctification which are inseparably bound up with the forgiveness of sin; “If anyone says that men are justified either through the imputa­tion of Christ’s justice alone, or through the remission of sins alone, excluding grace and charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Spirit and inheres in them, or also that the grace which justifies [70] us is only the good will of God: let him be anathema” (DS 1561; cf. also 1524, 1528-1531).” (Schmaus 70-71)
      2. “It can be said that the council made the state of justification in its entirety consist in three elements: God’s declaration that he forgives the sin; the remission of guilt effected by this declara­tion; and the interior renewal and sanctification.” (Schmaus 71)
      3. “During the Reformation the problem of the interior renewal and sanctification of the sinner was the subject of especially vigorous debate. At one time the question was that of the fact of rebirth; at another, of its relationship to justification or forgiveness. The essential thing is that the relationship shall be so defined that the inner renewal and sanctifica­tion are seen as inseparable from forgiveness. The question then becomes one of the causal relationships between the two elements.” (Schmaus 66)
      4. “. . . the only formal cause [of justification, according to Trent, *Decree on Justification* ch. 7] is “the justice of God, not the justice by which he is himself just, but the justice by which he makes us just,” namely, the justice which we have as a gift from him and by which we are renewed in the spirit of our mind.” (Schmaus 61)
      5. Trent “points out that the justice found in man, created by God and mirroring the divine justice, is the formal cause, not the efficient cause, of man’s justification. This is so because the relation between the justice of God and that of man is one of analogy, not of identity. . . . Rightly understood, the Tridentine doctrine that the justice of God alone, through which he makes us just, is the formal cause of justifica­tion contains nothing which would contradict the statement that God by his creative word takes away sin, in the deepest metaphysical sense of sin as a guilt interiorly clinging to man, so that he transforms man interiorly—again in a deep metaphysical sense. This transformation con­sists in a resemblance to God which is produced in man. Thus the sinner becomes a “saint” (or “holy”), not in the sense that he is no longer the one who has committed the sin or is no longer tempted to sin, but rather in the sense that he reflects in his inner being the holiness of God. [71] The formal cause does not explain in what way this inner renewal comes about, but merely describes the structure, telling what it consists in. This inner holiness we call sanctifying grace.” (Schmaus 71-72)
      6. “If, as seems to be the case in Reformation theology, the renewal is interpreted as merely the action of man, or only existentially, then it would be absurd even in the sense of the council to see in the renewal thus understood the basis for the divine forgiveness. The existentially interpreted renewal is, even in the meaning of the Council of Trent, the consequence of the forgiveness. In the spirit of the council this sequence must be adhered to under all circumstances.” (Schmaus 72)
      7. “The reflection of divine holiness and justice in the justified man has christological consequences. And for the baptized person it also has an ecclesiastical character.” (Schmaus 72)
2. **Reformed theology**
   1. “. . . Reformed theology teaches a real regeneration.” (Moeller and Phillips 40)
   2. “The central premise is the distinction introduced by Calvin between justifica­tion and sanc­tification. [40] . . . This distinction is more Calvin’s than St. Paul’s; but it obviously does not contradict the Apostle’s teaching.” (Moeller and Phillips 40-41)
      1. “When Calvin stresses that what is brought about by the judicial pronounce­ment of justification is external and imputed, he is trying to make crystal clear that God’s act is a completely free gift, and that it is eschatological in nature. It always remains a free gift; and as for the realization of redemp­tion, this is still awaited. Reformed theologians are very ill at ease with what they call ‘the theology of glory.’” (Moeller and Phillips 40)
      2. “In his doctrine of sanctification, described in the chapter of the Institutes entitled ‘De vita hominis Christiani’ [*Institutes* 3.6], Calvin takes it for granted that the union of God with man (salvation) is the foundation of the whole of the Christian’s life. The *direct result* of this union is the sanctification by the Holy Spirit, of the man who gives himself to God in faith. The Holy Spirit acts throughout the life of the believer, transforming him little by little into the image of Christ.” (Moeller and Phillips 40)
   3. “Grace has three aspects, justification, sanctification and re­demption.” (Moeller and Phillips 38) See 1 Cor 1:30b: Jesus “became for us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption . . .”
      1. “Justification and sanctification (or regeneration) are inseparable, because we receive them both together.” (Moeller and Phillips 38)
      2. “But they must not be confused, for justification is absolute, perfect and extrin­sic, whereas sanctification is relative, imperfect and intrinsic.” (Moeller and Phillips 39)
      3. “Justification alone provides the basis for our abso­lute certainty, because it rests upon a decision by God without any consideration of human acts; it puts our feet on the path of sanctification, and from the psychological point of view brings it about; faith gives rise to obedience and grateful love.” (Moeller and Phillips 39)
      4. a note “from one of the Protestants who took part” (Moeller and Phillips 39 n. 4)
         1. “There is a danger in this distinction of separating the two stages en­tirely, mak­ing justification God’s part, and sanctification man’s part. If this occurs, both are being looked at apart from the person of Christ living in us through the Holy Spirit. But if the distinction is abandoned, there is a risk of making the certainty of faith depend on whether we are obedient in prac­tice.” (Moeller and Phillips 39 n. 4)
         2. “But this distinction does not seem to be correctly ex­pressed in the classical terms of the Reformation.” (Moeller and Phillips 39 n. 4)
         3. “Sanctification (or regeneration) de­pends like justification on a free and un­mer­ited decision of God; and it brings about a change of status no less absolute and complete: in Christ, a sinner is a sinner both forgiven and sanc­tified.” (Moeller and Phillips 39 n. 4)
         4. “Justification depends on the decisive and conclusive judgement of God, and because of this, is the object of a declaration to which faith clings, and which feeds hope; sanctification is likewise the object of a decisive de­clar­a­tion, but it carries with it an im­perative: ‘in Christ, you are holy; become so in your life’: which is why its realization in practice is always imperfect, incomplete and internal . . .” (Moeller and Phillips 39 n. 4)
      5. “. . . grace must be seen in the cosmic setting of God’s plan. Satan appears as the Accuser of God and men, the Prince of this world, the Adversary; by His sacrifice, Jesus has taken upon Himself and overcome the anger of God, and the Accuser is confounded: by His Death and Resurrection, Jesus Christ has con­quered the Adversary, and set men free from his tyranny; He has become for us justification, sanctification and redemp­tion. By the Holy Spirit, men are made partakers in Jesus Christ, in the fruit of His sacrifice and of His victory; they enter into communion with Him by faith, live in the certainty of victory in the end, and receive strength for the battle; this does not come [39] from them, it is the gift of God.” (Moeller and Phillips 39-40)
   4. “. . . Reformed theologians . . . would accept the term ‘created grace’ if it could be taken as equivalent to the biblical passage [Phil 2:13] where God is said to ‘work in us both to will and to work’ (ἐνεργεῖν), because in this way it would be seen more clearly how this is always a free gift from God’s point of view, and with what joy and trust man puts himself at God’s disposal.” [41] “. . . a Protestant member of the conference admitted that if the idea of ‘created grace’ were equated with the term ἐνεργεῖν which St. Paul uses, Reformed theolo­gians could accept it, and he stressed the simi­larity of this view to the doctrine of uncreated energies in Palamas.” (Moeller and Phillips 41, 49)
   5. “. . . sanctification is *real* and internal. And justification and sanctification are in fact inseparable, as *complementary* aspects (not parallel), one ex­ternal and one internal, of the same act.” (Moeller and Phillips 41)
   6. “In spite of the different emphasis—Calvin puts it on the action of God continu­ally re­newed, and the Catholics on the results, in man, of God’s act—the Refor­mation also accepts the reality of sanctification.” (Moeller and Phillips 41)
   7. “. . . everything without exception in the super­natural life comes from God . . . this action of God is *permanent*, both in the soul and in the sacraments of the Church: ‘*My Father worketh until now; and I work*,’ said Christ.” (Moel­ler and Phil­ips 11) John 5:17, “My Father is still working, and I also am working.”

## John Henry Newman

## on the Lutheran Concept of Justification

1. **introduction**
   1. All agree that, “Born in sin, and the heir of misery, the soul needs an ut­ter change of what it is by nature, both within and without, both in itself and in God’s sight. The change in God’s sight is called justifi­cation, the inward change is regeneration . . .” (Newman 5)
   2. All agree that justifying faith “is a spiritual principle, altogether different from any­thing we have by nature, endued with a divine life and efficacy, and producing a rad­ical change in the soul . . .” (Newman 6) But this fails to specify what the spiritual prin­ciple is: faith? love? etc.
   3. All agree that “justification is the application of Christ’s merits to the individual . . .” (Newman 3)
   4. But “His merits are not communicated . . . except through an in­stru­ment divinely appointed [3] . . . [If] *instrument* be taken to mean in the strictest sense the *immediate* means by which the gift passes from the giver to the receiver, there can be but one instrument . . .” (Newman 4)
      1. Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Anglicans say it is baptism. [4] They assert “just­if­ication by obedience”: justification is vouchsafed “to those who [by] grace are moved to do their duty.” [1] (Newman 1, 4)
      2. Lutherans say it is faith. [4] They assert “justifica­tion by faith”: justification is “vouch­safed to those who are moved by God’s grace to claim it . . .” (Newman 1, 4)
   5. Lutheran theology differs from Catholic “in these two main points among others;—in considering that Faith and not Baptism is the primary instrument of justification, and that this Faith which justifies exercises its gift without the exer­cise or even the presence of love.” (Newman 29)
2. “**faith**” **in Lutheranism**
   1. In Lutheranism “*faith* means trust. [But] what is meant by faith or trust”? (Newman 5-6**)**
   2. Justifying faith is not “mere belief in the being of a God, nor in the historical fact that Christ has come on earth, [nor even in] the sacred truths of the New Testament . . .” (Newman 6)
      1. James 2:19, “You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder.”
   3. the anti-intellectual response
      1. “We are told . . . that to contemplate and dwell upon faith at all, or to ask any ques­tions about it, is a fundamental mistake, considering we should fix our eyes and rest our hearts on the Divine Ob­ject of it only. Faith, it appears, is to be defined, not by its *nat­ure*, . . . not by what *it is*, but by what it *does*. It is trust *in Christ*, and it differs from all other kinds of faith in That to­wards which it reaches . . .” (Newman 11)
      2. “. . . the only way of becoming righteous in God’s sight, the only way of becoming really fruitful in well-doing, is thus to embrace and ap­pro­pri­ate Christ’s atoning power as ours in the first instance, without standing still to spec­ulate whether our trust is as it should be . . .” (Newman 14)
      3. Parrying a possible rebuttal, the anti-intellectuals say that “It does not follow that faith may not admit of being ascertained, because we can­not define it in the language of human [14] science. If there be such a thing as a *real* apprehension of Christ, it must necessarily be beyond explanation. It is a feel­ing, a spiritual taste, perception, sight, known only to him who has the blessedness to experience it.” (Newman 14-15)
      4. Newman’s response: “All theological definitions come short of concrete life. Science is not devotion or literature. . . . Yet dog­matic theology has its use and its importance notwithstanding.” (Newman 31)
   4. justifying faith as merely trust (Newman 8)
      1. According to Luther, justifying faith is “­a belief, not only that Christ has died for the sins of the world, but that He has died specially for the individual so believing, and a sense of con­fi­dent trust in con­se­­quence . . .” (Newman 8)
      2. But justifying faith as simply trust is too broad. Faith as “a trust in Christ’s mer­its and in them alone for sal­va­tion” [6] or “a firm reliance on Christ’s mercifulness” makes justifying faith equivalent to “love, gratitude, de­votion, belief, hol­i­ness, repentance, hope, dutifulness, and all other graces.” (Newman 6-7)
      3. Fiduciary apprehension “is an intelligible account of it certainly; but it is not at all suf­fi­ci­ent [because] justifying faith is always supposed in the Lutheran scheme to be lively or to lead to good works, but such a “fiduciary apprehension,” or confident per­sua­sion, may ex­ist without any fruit following to warrant it. Trust­ing faith is not ne­ces­sar­ily living faith.” (Newman 7-8)
   5. moderate Lutherans (e.g., Melanchthon) and Calvin
      1. Justifying faith is “lively” faith (faith + love).
      2. This is Catholicism’s position.
         1. Aquinas (*ST* 1.113.4 *corpus*): “Hence a movement of faith is required for the justification of the ungodly . . . This movement of faith is not perfect unless it is quickened by charity; hence in the justification of the ungodly, a movement of charity is infused together with the movement of faith”
         2. Aquinas (*ST* 1.113.4 *rep. obj*. 1): “The movement of faith is not perfect unless it is quickened by charity; hence in the justification of the ungodly, a movement of charity is infused together with the movement of faith.”
      3. “Shall we then define the justifying faith of the Lutherans to be faith which *is* lively?” [8] . . . that which results in good works must have some prin­ci­ple in it which is the cause of that result; and this is confessed by calling it lively. What then is the *life* of faith? . . . What is the formal quality of justifying faith?” (Newman 8-9)
      4. Many Lutheran theologians “con­sider this life of faith to be love . . .” (Newman 9)
      5. “. . . even the strict followers of the German Reformer speak in a way to sanc­tion the notion. Thus at all times they have indulged in descriptions of faith as an adhering to Christ, a delighting and rejoicing in Him, and a giving oneself up to Him; all which seem to be no­thing more or less than properties of love.” (Newman 9)
      6. Luther himself seems “to allow that faith *is* in itself something more than trust . . .” For example: “If any men [13] pretend to faith or trust, and do not go on to obey, then they *have* *not* real trust” [Luther *In Gal*. 5.13].” (Newman 13-14)
      7. Melanchthon and Calvin deny “that justify­ing faith can for a moment exist with­­out love . . .” [10 n. 1] The “school of Melanchthon” considered faith “to be inseparable from love, and to jus­tify *correlativè*.” (Newman 10 n. 1, 25 n. 1)
      8. “But what Melanchthon gains in rea­son­ableness, he surely loses in the con­troversy with Rome. For what is the real difference between saying with him that faith is not jus­ti­fying unless love or holiness be *with* it; or with Bellarmine, that it is not so, unless love be *in* it?—What is the distinction between the metaphors conveyed by *in* and *with?*” In fact, Me­lanch­thon elsewhere “grants that love “*inest*,” *is in* faith,” which Bellarmine usually says, and “Bellarmine grants that the love which makes faith living is not part of faith, but ex­ternal to it,” which Melanchthon usually says. (Newman 10 n. 1)
      9. Lutherans face a dilemma: “either faith is more than personal trust, and if so, that ad­dition, whatever it is, is a joint instrument with it in our just­if­i­ca­tion; [or] it is no­thing more, and then it is not necessarily living and operative faith.” (Newman 13)
      10. “The sole question then is, whether love, which on all hands is allowed to be a *sine quâ non*, *communicates* to faith its justifying power.” Whatever is meant by *com­mun­i­cates*. (Newman 10 n. 1)
   6. strict Lutherans (e.g., Luther)
      1. For strict Lutherans, faith alone justifies.
      2. That love is “the true form, [the] principle under which belief is converted into Faith and made justifying . . . Luther rejects with great abhorrence . . .” He calls it “a most pestilent and Satanical gloss.” (*In Gal*. 2.4-5 f. 296-97) [21] “. . . to look for what it is in faith which makes it lively, is to open the door [to] “the cursed gloss of Sophists.”” (*In Gal*. 3.12 f. 347) [12-13] (Newman 12-13, 21)
      3. why Luther rejected love as that which makes faith justifying
         1. “. . . to say that love made faith living was to deny the in­nate life and pow­er of faith as such, and to associate another principle with it as a joint in­stru­ment in jus­ti­fication.” (Newman 9)
         2. Such a doctrine “makes our thoughts centre on our­selves [and] fixes our faith on that love . . . instead of its [faith’s] mounting up worthless, rude, and un­formed, to receive subsistence, fashion, and acceptableness in Christ.” (Newman 21)
      4. Luther’s teaching
         1. Luther (*In Gal*. 2.16): “faith justifies *without* and *before* love.” (“Hæc fides *sine* et *ante* char­i­ta­tem jus­tificat.”) (Qtd. in Newman 21)
         2. “Luther’s doctrine, that justifying faith *is* without love *when* it justifies, is plain enough, and no matter of words.” (Newman 10 n. 1, 21-22 n. 1)
            1. *In Gal*. 2.4-5 (f. 296-7), 2.16 (f. 309-310), ff. 312 (1-2), 316 (1-2), 318 (2), 3.11 (f. 346), 347 (2), 3.12. (Newman 21-22 n. 1)
         3. Strict Lutherans still hold that faith jus­ti­fies “before and without love” [25 n. 1]: “what severe protests [10] are raised by that School against anything but faith, whether virtue or good work, being assigned a share in our just­if­ication . . .” (Newman 10-11, 25 n. 1)
   7. the Lutheran definition of justifying faith
      1. “Let us for argument’s sake grant [Luther] that love is not the life of justi­fying [9] faith; but, if so, the question recurs, *what* is the faith that justifies?” (Newman 9-10)
      2. “Faith, an act or motion of the mind[[21]](#footnote-21)1 produced in­deed by Divine Grace, but still utterly worth­less, applies to the soul the merits of Him on whom it looks . . . It justifies then, not as being lively or fruitful, though this is an inseparable pro­perty of it, but as *ap­pre­hend­ing* Christ, which is its essence.” (Newman 16)
      3. This is extreme anti-Pelagianism: to ensure that *all* of salvation is God’s doing, faith becomes an empty receptacle, whose content alone (i.e., Christ) vivifies.—Hahn
      4. “This doctrine has sometimes been thus expressed by its defenders: “Fides, fœta bonis operibus, justificat ante partum”” (“Faith, which gives rise to good works, justifies prior to them”). (Newman 16 n. 1)
3. **arguments in favor of Lutheranism**
   1. scripture proofs
      1. “. . . many texts . . . speak of the freeness of salva­tion . . .” (Newman 16)
      2. Isa 55:1, “everyone who thirsts, come to the waters . . .”
      3. Matt 7:7, “Ask, and it will be given you; search, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened for you.”
      4. Mark 11:24, “whatever you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours.”
      5. “No words, it is urged, can express more strongly the title of every one who hears of the great gift of God, to make it his own; and his immediate possession of it, without any [16] intermediate channel or instrument of gaining it, if he does but believe he has it.” (Newman 16-17)
      6. Paul’s statements about faith, “though they do not go to the extent of teaching we are justified by faith *only*, [do] speak of the connection of faith with justification in a very remarkable way.” (Newman 17)
         1. Rom 3:24a, “they are now justified by his grace as a gift . . .”
         2. Rom 3:25a, “God put forward [Jesus] as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, ef­fec­tive through faith.”
         3. Rom 3:28, “a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.”
         4. Rom 5:1, “since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God . . .”
         5. Eph 2:8, “by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God . . .”
         6. Gal 2:16-17, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law.”
   2. the practical argument
      1. “Other systems (it seems) have attempted to melt the heart and re­store our corrupt nature by severity, threats, or motives of ex­pediency; but the gospel alone has dared to trust itself to the principle of free and unconditional favour, yet with suc­cess as signal as has been the failure of all other methods . . . This is a prac­ti­cal ar­gu­ment in behalf of the sole instrumentality of Faith in our jus­ti­fi­cation . . .” (Newman 18)
   3. arguments from faith as “apprehending” Christ
      1. Faith justifies “*correlatively* [Gerhard, *De Justif*. §163 etc. (20 n. 1)], . . . from the sup­­posed *fitness* that the principle through which the soul desires and owns God’s mercy should *ipso facto* be the in­stru­ment of obtaining it.” (Luther *In Gal*. 3.13 [f. 351]) (Newman 19 n. 1)
      2. “This however is but a portion of the argument derived from the apprehensive power of Faith. . . .” (Newman 20)
         1. Faith “con­templates the expiatory sacrifice of Christ; and, as having it for its *Object*, it must be believed to have it for its *possession*. It is the instru­ment of ap­pro­priating the *gift*, for the very reason that it is the means by which the mind re­ceives the *news* of it.” (Newman 19)
         2. “Other graces are complete in themselves . . . Thus they do not neces­sarily lead to Christ, but remain within their own limits . . . [But faith] looks out of doors for that in which it centres [and] is alive only as the thought of Him pervades and in­forms it. Since then the thought of Him is ever pres­ent in it, therefore He may be said to be ever present in it, or (what is sup­posed to be the same thing) He is *spir­it­ually* present in it; and if He is present, His merits are present in it, and are in this way conveyed to the soul which exercises it. In this sense Luther seems to speak as if Christ were the *forma fidei* [*In Gal*. 2.20 (f. 318), Newman 20 n. 2], or that which makes faith what it [20] is, jus­tifying; for Christ being the One true Justifier, and the thought of Him being (as it were) He himself, and Faith being filled with the thought of Him, a justifying power is imparted to faith which in itself it has not.” (Newman 20-21)
      3. objections
         1. The “thought of Christ may be possessed by those who have not Christ . . .” (Newman 21)
         2. That faith “apprehends” Christ is a “convenient term as vague­ly in­cluding both ideas, of ac­cept­ing the message and receiving the gift, with­out mark­ing the dis­tinc­tion be­tween them.” (Newman 19)
4. “**imputed righteousness**”; “**faith alone**”
   1. “It follows that, by a strong figure, Faith may be said to *claim* the promised bless­ings, as if it were meritorious, that is, by virtue of the intimate correspondence and sym­pathy be­tween it and Christ. Hence we may be said to be justified, not only *by* or *through* faith . . . but on *account* of faith; for faith is [22] ab­sorbed into its Object, of which it is but the out­ward receptacle, and con­se­quently the symbol and representative. And in this sense faith is con­sidered by Lu­ther and his followers as imputed to us for righteousness, by a mode of speech; Christ really, who is spiritually present in the faith, and not the faith itself, being our sole and true right­eous­ness, in which our acceptance with God consists.” (Newman 22-23)
      1. “And here additional light is thrown upon the statement, as used by them, that we are just­i­fied by faith *only*,faith not thereby excluding the ne­ces­sity of works, nor be­com­ing meritorious, but the formula “by faith only, not by works,” meaning simply this, “by the merit of Christ only, not of works, nor even of faith.”” (Newman 23)
      2. Although “it may be scripturally said that Faith is taken for right­eous­ness, yet it will be safer, as well as more correct, for us to say that Christ is our right­eous­ness . . .” (Newman 26)
      3. Lutherans thus can be said to teach “the doctrine of faith as the instrument, and Christ’s righteousness as the form, of jus­ti­fi­cation . . .” (Newman 26)
         1. imputation of faith: Luther *In Gal*. f. 335 (2), f. 417
         2. faith alone: e.g., *In Gal*. 2.16 (f. 308), f. 347 (2); 3.6
            1. The latter passage (f. 336) says, “Est Chris­ti­ana justitia imputatio divina pro justitia vel ad justitiam, propter fidem in Christum, vel propter Christum.” “In this sense he calls faith *formalis justitia*.” (*In Gal*. 2.16 (f. 308), see f. 334) (Newman 23 n. 1)
      4. “The difference [between Luther and Trent] lies in the area of formal cause—not that Luther has a different thesis from the Council’s, but that he has no thesis at all on the subject.” (Schmaus 72)
         1. This contradicts the preceding statement, that Luther “calls faith *formalis justitia* . . .”
5. **Christ as our righteousness**
   1. Luther had two principal reasons for insisting on justification by faith alone: “first, his wish to ex­tirpate all notions of human merit; next, to give peace and satisfaction to the troubled con­sci­ence.” (Newman 23)
   2. “In effecting these objects, however, he also adopted another tenet, . . . that the Moral Law is not bind­ing on the conscience of the Christian; that Christ has fulfilled it by His own obedi­ence; that He is our Righteousness, in the sense of His obedience being the sub­sti­tute for ours in the sight of God’s justice; and that Faith is the instrument by which that Right­­eousness becomes ours. . . . if Christ has obeyed the Law in­stead of us, it follows, that every believer has at once a perfect righteousness, yet not his own; that it is not his own, pre­cludes all boasting, that it is perfect pre­cludes all anxiety.” (Newman 24)
6. **faith and works**
   1. “. . . works are [not] allowed to have any share whatever in our justification, in spite of St. James’s affirming that they have [2:14-26]. While they have any share in it, it is pos­si­ble to *rest* in our works—they do not imply or remind of Christ’s all-sufficiency; but we can­­not lean upon our faith, . . . it does but give way and carry us back [to] the thought of Christ, in whom it lives. To this argument it may be re­plied, that since no good works can be done but through the grace of God, those works are but evidence that that grace is with the doer; [24] so that to view them as sharing in our justification tends to elate us, neither more nor less than the knowledge that we are under divine in­flu­ences is elating. But they an­swer, that we are not concerned here with formal ad­mis­sions and distinctions, but with prac­tical impres­sions; that to say, that Christ is but the remote source of justification, and that our own doings, though through His grace, are the proximate cause, is in fact to fix the mind on ourselves, not on Him; whereas to teach that He actually in His own person has obeyed the Law for each of us is a most efficacious means of deterring us from think­ing about our own obedience to it at all, and faith . . . has so little in it to recommend it or to rest in, so little in it holy, precious, or praiseworthy, that it cannot seduce us to self-grat­ulation . . ., [though] The pride of man resists this way of salvation from its very easiness, and is not sub­dued with­out much inward conflict [Luther, *In Gal*. 3.2 (f. 331)].” (Newman 24-25)
   2. These doctrines “secure us against self-contemplation. Prayer, alms, fasting, and the like, which are but modes of approaching God, will be dwelt on as ends, as objects for self-com­placency, and sources [of] spiritual benef­its . . .” (Newman 26)

Chapter 2:

Love as the Formal Cause of Justification

1. “Catholics hold that our good works, as proceeding from the grace of the Holy Ghost, cannot be worthless, but have a real and proper value; on the other hand, that the great reward of eter­nal life is due to them only in consequence of the promise of God. Good works have on this ground a claim on God’s faithfulness to His promises, and thereby a claim on His justice, for it would be unjust to promise and not fulfil. The Council of Trent says: “Vita æterna est et tan­quam *gratia misericorditer promissa*, et tanquam merces *ex ipsius Dei pro­missione fideliter reddenda*. [*sic*] [“. . . life eternal is to be proposed, both as a grace mercifully promised to the sons of God through Christ Jesus, and as a recompense which is according to the promise of God himself to be faithfully given to their good works and merits.” Denzinger] Again: “Quæ justitia nostra dicitur, illa eadem Dei est, quia *à Deo nobis infunditur per Christi meritum*.” [“. . . that justice which is called ours, because we are justified through its inherence in us, that same is the justice of God, because it is infused into us by God through the merit of Christ.” Denzinger] Sess. vi. cap. 16.” (Newman 2 n. 1) (2 n. 1 is a note in brackets, i. e., added after Newman’s conversion to Catholicism)

“A Tiptoe Through Tulip”

by James Akin

Predestination means many things to many people. All Christian churches believe in some form of predestination, because the Bible uses the term [1], but what predestination is and how it works are in dispute.

In Protestant circles there are two major camps when it comes to predestination: Calvinism and Arminianism [2]. Calvinism is common in Presbyterian, Reformed, and a few Baptist churches. Arminianism is common in Methodist, Pentecostal, and most Baptist churches [3].

Even though Calvinists are a minority among Protestants today, their view has had enormous influence, especially in this country. This is partly because the Puritans and the Baptists who helped found America were Calvinists, but it is also because Calvinism traditionally has been found among the more intellectual Protestants, giving it a special influence.

Calvinists claim God predestines people by choosing which individuals will accept his offer of salvation. These people are known as “the elect” [4]. They are not saved against their will. It is because God has chosen them that they will desire to come to him in the first place. Those who are not among the elect, “the reprobate,” will not desire to come to God, will not do so, and thus will not be saved [5].

Arminians claim God predestines people by pronouncing (but not deciding) who will accept salvation. He makes this pronouncement using his foreknowledge, which enables him to see what people will do in the future. He sees who will choose to accept his offer of salvation. The people who God knows will repent are those he regards as his “elect” or “chosen” people.

The debate between Calvinists and Arminians is often fierce. These groups frequently accuse each other of teaching a false gospel, at least on a theoretical level, although on a practical level there is little difference between the two since bonow about these subjects: First, Catholics are often attacked by Calvinists who misunderstand the Catholic position on these issues. Second, Catholics often misunderstand the teaching of their own Church on predestination. Third, in recent years there has been a large number of Calvinists who have become Catholics [8]. By understanding Calvinism better, Catholics can help more Calvinists make the jump.

Total depravity

Despite its name, the doctrine of total depravity does not mean men are always and only sinful. Calvinists do not think we are as sinful as we possibly could be. They claim our free will has been injured by original sin to the point that, unless God gives us special grace, we cannot free ourselves from sin and choose to serve God in love. We might choose to serve him out of fear, but not out of unselfish love [9].

What would a Catholic think of this teaching? While he would not use the term “total depravity” to describe the doctrine [10], he would actually agree with it. The accepted Catholic teaching is that, because of the fall of Adam, man cannot do anything out of supernatural love unless God gives him special grace to do so [11].

Thomas Aquinas declared that special grace is necessary for man to do any supernaturally good act, to love God, to fulfill God’s commandments, to gain eternal life, to prepare for salvation, to rise from sin, to avoid sin, and to persevere [12].

Unconditional election

The doctrine of unconditional election means God does not base his choice (election) of certain individuals on anything other than his own good will [13]. God chooses whomever he pleases and passes over the rest. The ones God chooses will desire to come to him, will accept his offer of salvation, and will do so precisely because he has chosen them.

To show that God positively chooses, rather than merely foresees, those who will come to him, Calvinists cite passages such as Romans 9:15-18, which says, “[The Lord] says to Moses, ‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.’ So it depends not upon man’s will or exertion, but upon God’s mercy.... So then he has mercy upon whomever he wills, and he hardens the heart of whomever he wills [14].”

What would a Catholic say about this? He certainly is free to disagree with the Calvinist interpretation, but he also is free to agree. All Thomists and even some Molinists (such as Robert Bellarmine and Francisco Suarez) taught unconditional election.

Thomas Aquinas wrote, “God wills to manifest his goodness in men: in respect to those whom he predestines, by means of his mercy, in sparing them; and in respect of others, whom he reprobates, by means of his justice, in punishing them. This is the reason why God elects some and rejects others.... Yet why he chooses some for glory and reprobates others has no reason except the divine will. Hence Augustine says, ‘Why he draws one, and another he draws not, seek not to judge, if thou dost not wish to err.’“ [15]

Although a Catholic may agree with unconditional election, he may not affirm “double-predestination,” a doctrine Calvinists often infer from it. This teaching claims that in addition to electing some people to salvation God also sends others to damnation.

The alternative to double-predestination is to say that while God predestines some people, he simply passes over the remainder. They will not come to God, but it is because of their inherent sin, not because God damns them. This is the doctrine of passive reprobation, which Aquinas taught [16].

The Council of Trent stated, “If anyone says that it is not in the power of man to make his ways evil, but that God produces the evil as well as the good works, not only by permission, but also properly and of himself, so that the betrayal of Judas is no less his own proper work than the vocation of Paul, let him be anathema.... If anyone shall say that the grace of justification is attained by those only who are predestined unto life, but that all others, who are called, are called indeed, but do not receive grace, as if they are by divine power predestined to evil, let him be anathema.” [17]

Limited Atonement

Calvinists believe the atonement is limited, that Christ offered it for some men but not for all. They claim Christ died only for the elect. To prove this they cite verses which say Christ died for his sheep (John 10:11), for his friends (John 15:13-14a), and for the Church (Acts 20:28, Eph. 5:25) [18].

One cannot use these verses to prove Christ died only for the elect. A person may be said to have given himself for one person or group without denying that he gave himself for others as well [19]. Biblical proof of this principle is found in Galatians 2:20, where Paul says that Christ “loved me and gave himself for me,” not at all implying that Christ did not also give himself for other people. That Christ is said to have given himself in a special way for his sheep, his friends, or the Church cannot be used to prove Christ did not also give himself for all men in a different way.

The Bible maintains that there is a sense in which Christ died for all men. John 4:42 describes Christ as “the Savior of the world,” and 1 John 2:2 states that Christ “is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world.” 1 Timothy 4:10 describes God as “the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe.” These passages, as well as the official teaching of the Church [20], require the Catholic to affirm that Christ died to atone for all men.

Aquinas stated, “Christ’s passion was not only a sufficient but a superabundant atonement for the sins of the human race; according to 1 John 2:2, ‘He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.’“ [21]

This is not to say there is no sense in which limitation may be ascribed to the atonement. While the grace it provided is sufficient to pay for the sins of all men, this grace is not made efficacious (put into effect) in the case of everyone. One may say that although the sufficiency of the atonement is not limited, its efficiency is limited. This is something everyone who believes in hell must acknowledge because, if the atonement was made efficacious for everyone, then no one would end up in hell.

The difference between the atonement’s sufficiency and its efficiency accounts for Paul’s statement that God is “the Savior of all men, especially those who believe.” [22] God is the Savior of all men because he arranged a sacrifice sufficient for all men. He is the Savior of those who believe in a special and superior sense because these have the sacrifice made efficacious for them. According to Aquinas, “[Christ] is the propitiation for our sins, efficaciously for some, but sufficiently for all, because the price of his blood is sufficient for the salvation of all; but it has its effect only in the elect.” [23]

A Catholic also may say that, in going to the cross, Christ intended to make salvation possible for all men, but he did not intend to make salvation actual for all men--otherwise we would have to say that Christ went to the cross intending that all men would end up in heaven. This is clearly not the case. [24] A Catholic therefore may say that the atonement is limited in efficacy, if not in sufficiency, and that God intended it to be this way. [25] While a Catholic could not say that the atonement was limited in that it was made only for the elect, he could say that the atonement was limited in that God only intended it to be efficacious for the elect (although he intended it to be sufficient for all). [26]

Irresistible Grace

Calvinists teach that when God gives a person the grace that enables him to come to salvation, the person always responds and never rejects this grace. For this reason many have called this the doctrine of irresistible grace.

This designation has the drawback of making it sound as though God forces people against their will to come to him (like a policeman shouting, “Resistance is useless! Throw down your weapons and surrender!”) The designation also sounds unbiblical, since Scripture indicates grace can be resisted. In Acts 7:51 Stephen tells the Sanhedrin, “You always resist the Holy Spirit!” [27]

For this reason many Calvinists are displeased with the phrase “irresistible grace.” Some have proposed alternatives. Loraine Boettner, perhaps best known to readers of *This Rock* as the author of the wildly inaccurate *Roman Catholicism*, prefers “efficacious grace.” [28] The idea is that God’s enabling grace is intrinsically efficacious, so it always produces salvation.

This is the principal issue between Thomists and Molinists. [29] Thomists claim this enabling grace is intrinsically efficacious; by its very nature, because of the kind of grace it is, it always produces the effect of salvation. Molinists claim God’s enabling grace is only sufficient and is made efficacious by man’s free choice rather than by the nature of the grace itself. For this reason Molinists say that enabling grace is extrinsically efficacious rather than intrinsically efficacious. [30]

A Catholic can agree with the idea that enabling grace is intrinsically efficacious and, consequently, that all who receive this grace will repent and come to God. Aquinas taught, “God’s intention cannot fail... Hence if God intends, while moving it, that the one whose heart he moves should attain to grace, he will infallibly attain to it, according to John 6:45, ‘Everyone that has heard and learned from the Father comes to me.’“ [31] Catholics must say that, while God may give efficacious grace only to some, he gives sufficient grace to all. This is presupposed by the fact that he intended the atonement to be sufficient for all. Vatican II stated, “[S]ince Christ died for all men, and since the ultimate calling of man is in fact one and divine, we ought to believe that the Holy Spirit in a manner known only to God offers to every man the possibility of being associated with this paschal mystery.” [32]

Perseverance of the saints

Calvinists teach that if a person enters a state of grace he never will leave it but will persevere to the end of life. This doctrine is normally called the perseverance of the saints. [33] All those who are at any time saints (in a state of sanctifying grace, to use Catholic terminology) will remain so forever. No matter what trials they face, they will always persevere, so their salvation is eternally secure. [34]

Analogies are used to support this teaching. Calvinists point out that when we become Christians we become God’s children. They infer that, just as a child’s position in the family is secure, our position in God’s family is secure. A father would not kick his son out, so God will not kick us out.

This reasoning is faulty. The analogy does not prove what it is supposed to. Children do not have “eternal security” in their families. First, they can be disowned. Second, even if a father would not kick anyone out, a child can leave the house on his own, disown his parents, and sever all ties with the family. Third, children can die; we, as God’s children, can die spiritual deaths after we have been spiritually “born again.” [35]

Calvinists also use Bible passages to teach perseverance of the saints. The chief ones are John 6:37-39, 10:27-29, and Romans 8:35-39. The Calvinist interpretation of these passages takes them out of context [36], and there are numerous other exegetical problems with their interpretation. [37]

Calvinists assume perseverance of the saints is entailed by the idea of predestination. If one is predestined to be saved, does it not follow he must persevere to the end? This involves a confusion about what people are predestined to: Is it predestination to initial salvation or final salvation? The two are not the same. A person might be predestined to one, but this does not mean he is predestined necessarily to the other. [38] One must define which kind of predestination is being discussed.

If one is talking about predestination to initial salvation, then the fact that a person will come to God does not of itself mean he will stay with God. If one is talking about predestination to final salvation, then a predestined person will stay with God, but this does not mean the predestined are the only ones who experience initial salvation. Some might genuinely come to God (because they were predestined to initial salvation) and then genuinely leave (because they were not predestined to final salvation). [39] Either way, predestination to initial salvation does not entail predestination to final salvation. [40] There is no reason why a person cannot be predestined to “believe for a while” but “in time of temptation fall away” (Luke 8:13). [41]

A Catholic must affirm that there are people who experience initial salvation and who do not go on to final salvation, but he is free to hold to a form of perseverance of the saints. The question is how one defines the term “saints”--in the Calvinist way, as all those who ever enter a state of sanctifying grace, or in a more Catholic way, as those who will go on to have their sanctification (their “saintification”) completed. [42] If one defines “saint” in the latter sense, a Catholic may believe in perseverance of the saints, since a person predestined to final salvation must by definition persevere to the end. Catholics even have a special name for the grace God gives these people: “the gift of final perseverance.”

The Church formally teaches that there is a gift of final perseverance. [43] Aquinas (and even Molina) said this grace always ensures that a person will persevere. [44] Aquinas said, “Predestination [to final salvation] most certainly and infallibly takes effect.” [45] But not all who come to God receive this grace.

Aquinas said the gift of final perseverance is “the abiding in good to the end of life. In order to have this perseverance man...needs the divine assistance guiding and guarding him against the attacks of the passions...[A]fter anyone has been justified by grace, he still needs to beseech God for the aforesaid gift of perseverance, that he may be kept from evil till the end of life. For to many grace is given to whom perseverance in grace is not give.” [46]

The idea that a person can be predestined to come to God yet not be predestined to stay the course may be new to Calvinists and may sound strange to them, but it did not sound strange to Augustine, Aquinas, or even Luther. Calvinists frequently cite these men as “Calvinists before Calvin.” While they did hold high views of predestination, they did not draw Calvin’s inference that all who are ever saved are predestined to remain in grace. [47] Instead, their faith was informed by the biblical teaching that some who enter the sphere of grace go on to leave it.

If one defines “saint” as one who will have his “saintification” completed, a Catholic can say he believes in a “perseverance of the saints” (all and only the people predestined to be saints will persevere). But because of the historic associations of the phrase it is advisable to make some change in it to avoid confusing the Thomist and Calvinist understandings of perseverance. Since in Catholic theology those who will persevere are called “the predestined” or “the elect,” one might replace “perseverance of the saints” with “perseverance of the predestined” or, better, with “perseverance of the elect.”

A Thomistic TULIP

In view of this all, we might propose a Thomist version of TULIP:

T = Total inability (to please God without special grace)

U = Unconditional election

L = Limited intent (for the atonement’s efficacy)

I = Intrinsically efficacious grace (for salvation)

P = Perseverance of the elect (until the end of life).

There are other ways to construct a Thomist version of TULIP, of course, but the fact there is even one way demonstrates that a Calvinist would not have to repudiate his understanding of predestination and grace to become Catholic. He simply would have to do greater justice to the teaching of Scripture and would have to refine his understanding of perseverance. [48]

ENDNOTES:

1. See Rom. 8:29-30, Eph. 1:5, 11. For the Catholic Church’s teaching on predestination see Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, 242-244, and William G. Most, *Catholic Apologetics Today*, 114-122.

2. Calvinists are followers of John Calvin (1509-1564). Arminians are followers of Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), not people from the Republic of Armenia.

3. In Catholic circles, the two major groups discussing predestination are the Thomists and the Molinists, the followers of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) and Luis de Molina (1536-1600). Thomists emphasize the role of grace, while Molinists emphasize free will. Neither school ignores grace or free will.

4. From the Greek word *eklektos*, which means “chosen.”

5. Calvinists are sometimes wrongly criticized as teaching that a person can be unconcerned about his salvation since he is already either among the elect or the reprobate. According to a Calvinist it would be a mistake for a person to say, “Well, if God chooses me, I’ll be saved, and if he doesn’t, I won’t, so I can sit back and do nothing.” A person who said this until his death would show he was not one of the elect because he never did the things, such as repenting and trusting God, which are necessary for salvation.

6. Among Catholics the discussion has been much more peaceful. Since the controversy over grace in the late 1500s and early 1600s, Thomists and Molinists have been forbidden to accuse each other of heresy. In 1748 the Church declared Thomism, Molinism, and a third view known as Augustinianism to be acceptable Catholic teachings.

7. There are some Calvinists, known as Amyraldians or “four-point Calvinists,” who hold all of TULIP except for “L.”

8. Including Scott Hahn, Steve Wood, myself, and numerous others.

9. There is nothing wrong with serving out of godly fear. The Bible often uses fear of divine chastisement as a motivator. Love and a certain kind of fear do not exclude each other; a child may both love his parents and have a healthy fear of his parents’ discipline. But service based on fear only, being self-interested, does not please God in a supernatural way and does not receive a supernatural reward. Love is necessary to please God and receive rewards.

10. That term is badly misleading, as even Calvinists acknowledge. For example, Calvinist theologian R.C. Sproul proposes the alternative term “radical corruption,” although this is not much better. Author Lorraine Boettner uses the much better term “total inability.”

11. In *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* Ludwig Ott gives the following as a defined article of faith: “For every salutary act internal supernatural grace of God (*gratia elevans*) is absolutely necessary” (Ott 229). He goes on to cite the second Council of Orange, which stated that “as often as we do good God operates in us and with us, so that we may operate” (canon 9) and that “man does no good except that which God brings about” (canon 20). The Council of Trent solemnly condemned the proposition that “without the predisposing inspiration of the Holy Ghost and without his help, man can believe, hope, love, or be repentant as he ought, so that the grace of justification my be bestowed upon him” *(Decree on Justification*, canon 3). The Church teaches God’s grace is necessary to enable man to be lifted out of sin, display genuine supernatural virtues, and please God.

12. *Summa Theologiae* (hereafter ST) I-II:109:2-10.

13. The Arminians, one will recall, said God bases it on his knowledge of what individuals will do in the future.

14. Catholics understand this hardening in terms of Romans 1:20-32, where Paul repeatedly states God gave pagans up to their sinful desires after they refused to acknowledge him. See also James 1:13.

15. ST I:23:5, citing Augustine, *Homilies on the Gospel of John* 26:2.

16. ST 1:23:3.

17. *Decree on Justification*, canons 6 and 17. The same points were taught by the Second Council of Orange (531), the Council of Quiersy (853), and the third Council of Valencia (855), although none of these were ecumenical councils, though the canons of II Orange are normally considered infallible due to their special papal reception.

18. Calvinists view these groups as identical with the elect. This assumption is false. Not all who are at one time Christ’s sheep or Christ’s friends remain so (see below on perseverance of the saints). Similarly, not all who are in the Church are among the elect.

19. Suppose a father sacrifices his life in order to save an endangered group of people that includes his family plus two friends. He might be said to have given himself for his family, even though the group he saved also included other people.

20. See Ott, 188f. 21. ST III:48:2.

22. 1 Timothy 4:10.

23. Commentary on Titus, I, 2:6.

24. Matthew 18:7-9, 22:13, 24:40f, 51, 25:30, Mark 9:48, Luke 3:17, 16:19-31, and especially Matthew 7:13f, 26:24, Luke 13:23ff, and Acts 1:25.

25. Although one must be sure to maintain that God desires the salvation of all men, as the Catholic Church teaches. 1 Timothy 2:4 states God “desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.” See also Ezekiel 33:11. This does not conflict with God’s intent to save only some, since a person may desire one thing but intend another. A father may desire to not punish his son, but he may intend to do so nonetheless.

26. Some Calvinists are unhappy with the statement that the atonement is limited. They prefer saying that Christ made a “particular redemption” rather than a “limited atonement.” These mean the same thing, but the former destroys the TULIP acrostic, so the latter is normally used.

27. See also Sirach 15:11-20, Matthew 23:37.

28. Loraine Boettner, *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1932), ch. 8, “Efficacious Grace.”

29. Some Molinists, such as Bellarmine and Suarez, almost have bee Thomists. they agreed with almost all that Thomism says, such as its affirmation of unconditional election, but they resisted the idea that grace is intrinsically efficacious.

30. One should note Thomists do believe in free will, although not the sort Molinists believe in. They claim God’s grace establishes what will be freely chosen, but in a way that does not disturb the will’s freedom. Aquinas said, “God changes the will without forcing it. But he can change the will from the fact that he himself operates in the will as he does in nature,” *De Veritatis* 22:9.

31. ST I-II:112:3.

32. *Gaudium et Spes* 22; “being associated with this paschal mystery” means being saved.

33. Many Calvinists prefer the phrase “preservation of the saints” since it puts emphasis on God’s preservation of the saints rather than on the saints’ efforts in persevering (which is thought to smack of “works-salvation”). This often results in a “holier-than-thou” attitude (“Look how holy I am; I place the emphasis on God’s action, not man’s”). But Scripture normally uses a human point of view. It calls men to repent, have faith, convert, and persevere. When one insists on preservation-language over perseverance-language, one is actually taking a holier-than-thou attitude, because the one who wrote Scripture used perseverance-language more than preservation-language. In effect one is playing spiritual one-upmanship with Scripture and the one who wrote Scripture.

34. This differs from the “once saved, always saved” teaching common in Baptist circles. According to that theory, a person never can lose his salvation, no matter what he does. Even if he leaves the faith and renounces Christ he will be saved. Perseverance of the saints states that, while a person will lose his salvation if he fails to persevere in faith and holiness, all who do come to God will persevere. If a person does not persevere, it shows he did not come to God in the first place. Passages such as 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 and Galatians 5:19-21, which say a person will not inherit the kingdom if he commits certain sins, are understood to mean that, if one habitually commits these sins, he was never a true Christian, no matter how sincere he appeared. Both “once saved, always saved” and perseverance of the saints teach “eternal security,” but they are not the same. Calvinism admits there are mortal sins, such as failure to persevere, but says that no one who is saved commits these sins. “Once saved, always saved” says no sins would be mortal for a Christian, even in principle.

35. Elements of these responses are brought together in Luke 15, where the prodigal son begins as a son, then leaves the family and is spoken of by the father as “dead,” only to return to the family and be spoken of as being “alive again” (Luke 15:24, 32). Christ teaches we can be sons, die spiritually by severing our ties to the family, then come back and be alive again--spiritually resurrected.

36. John 6:37-38 and 10:27-29 are taken out of context with John 15:1-6, which states Christians are branches in the vine which is Christ (v. 5), that God removes every branch from Christ which does not bear fruit (v. 2), and that the destiny of these branches is to be burned (v. 6). Romans 8:35-39 is taken out of context with Romans 11:20-24, where Paul compares spiritual Israel to an olive tree and states that since certain branches of spiritual Israel were broken off because of unbelief in Christ (v. 20), Christians will not be spared if they fall into unbelief (v. 21), but will be cut off (v. 22). The branches which had been broken off may be grafted in again (vv. 23-24). Romans 8:35-39 is also taken out of context with Romans 8:12f, 17, and 14:15, 20.

37. For further discussion see Robert Shank, *Life in the Son* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1989) and Dale Moody, *The Word of Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 348ff. Both authors are Baptists who believe in conditional security, not eternal security.

38. For example, if a person was predestined to enter my living room, it would not mean he was predestined to remain forever in my living room.

39. Catholic theology has defined “predestined” to mean “predestined to final salvation.” Thus those who will end up with God in heaven are spoken of as “the predestined” or “the elect.” That a person experiences salvation at some point does not mean he is among the predestined (those God has chosen to persevere to the end).

40. Once the philosophical issue is cleared up, we can evaluate the teaching of Scripture objectively. When we do so, it is clear there are numerous indications in the Bible that a person can lose salvation. We already have mentioned John 15:1-6, Romans 8:12f, 17, 11:20-24, and 14:15-20. There are many more. Robert Shank gives a list of eighty-five passages he believes will, if carefully interpreted in context, show that loss of salvation is possible; see Shank, 333-337.

41. I recognized this fact even when I was an ardent Protestant.

42. “Sanctification” and “saintification” are the same word in Greek. When one has been completely sanctified (made holy), one has become a saint in the fullest sense of the word. Since this happens only in heaven, it corresponds to the common Catholic usage of the term “saint.”

43. Trent’s Decree of Justification, canon 16, speaks of “that great and special gift of final perseverance,” and chapter 13 of the decree speaks of “the gift of perseverance of which it is written: ‘He who perseveres to the end shall be saved [Matt. 10:22, 24:13],’ which cannot be obtained from anyone except from him who is able to make him who stands to stand [Rom. 14:4].”

44. Aquinas said it always saves a person because of the kind of grace it is; Molina said it always saves a person because God only gives it to those whom he knows will respond to it. But the effect is the same: The gift of final perseverance always works.

45. ST I:23:6.

46. ST I-II:109:10.

47. The fact Calvinists are not aware of this shows a lack of scholarship. Presbyterian theologian R. C. Sproul attempts to redefine Calvinism as the “Augustinian” view. While Calvin’s view of predestination might be a variation of Augustine’s view, the two are not the same. Augustine did not believe in Calvin’s understanding of the “perseverance of the saints,” and neither did the broadly Augustinian tradition. That understanding was new with Calvin. For an accurate historical discussion of perseverance of the saints, see J. J. Davis’s article “Perseverance of the Saints: A History of the Doctrine,” in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 34/2 (June 1991), 213-228. Davis is himself a Calvinist, and it is fitting a Calvinist help correct the errors of other Calvinists on the history of their doctrine.

48. This has important applications for Calvinists who are thinking about entering the Church, and it has implications for Catholics who want to know what the Church requires them to believe and how they might defend the Church against anti-Catholic Calvinists. For an example of how Thomism can be used to refute Calvinist attacks on the Mass, purgatory, and indulgences, see my article “Fatally Flawed Thinking” (*This Rock*, July 1993). The article critiques *The Fatal Flaw*, a book by James White, a Calvinist and a professional anti-Catholic. For further reading on Catholic teaching in this area, see *Predestination* by Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange (St. Louis: Herder, 1939). Pope John Paul II studied and wrote his dissertation under Garrigou-Lagrange.

## Certainty of Salvation

1. **scripture**
   1. “The Scriptures and the Fathers teach both the certainty and the un­certainty of justification.” (Schmaus 111)
   2. uncertainty of salvation
      1. Matt 19:16-21, ““Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life?” 17And he said to him, . . . “keep the commandments.” 18He said to him, “Which ones?” And Jesus said, “You shall not murder; You shall not commit adultery; You shall not steal; You shall not bear false witness; 19Honor your father and mother; also, You shall love your neighbor as yourself.” 20The young man said to him, “I have kept all these; what do I still lack?” 21Jesus said to him, “If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your possessions, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me.””
      2. Matt 25:31‑46 (sheep and goats separated at last judgment). “The Catholic Church teaches that final salvation depends on the state of the soul at death . . .”
      3. Rom 2:3-7, “Do you imagine [that] you will escape the judgment of God? . . . 5by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath . . . 6For he will repay according to each one’s deeds: 7to those who by patiently doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life . . .”
      4. Rom 11:22, “Note then the kindness and the severity of God: severity toward those who have fallen, but God’s kindness toward you, provided you continue in his kindness; otherwise you also will be cut off.”
      5. 1 Cor 4:4-5, “I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted. It is the Lord who judges me. 5Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart. Then each one will receive commendation from God.”
      6. 1 Cor 9:24-27, “Do you not know that in a race the runners all compete, but only one receives the prize? Run in such a way that you may win it. 25Athletes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. 26So I do not run aimlessly, nor do I box as though beating the air; 27I punish my body and enslave it, so that after proclaiming to others I myself should not be disqualified.” “Paul exhorts his readers to run the Christian race. He’s referring to the race of life, the finish line being entrance into heaven.”
      7. 1 Cor 10:12, “if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall.”
      8. 2 Cor 5:10, “all of us must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil.”
      9. 2 Cor 12:5, “on my own behalf I will not boast, except of my weaknesses.” Cf. the Puritans’ boastful assurance that they were saved.
      10. Gal 6:8-9, “If you sow to your own flesh, you will reap corruption from the flesh; but if you sow to the Spirit, you will reap eternal life from the Spirit. 9So let us not grow weary in doing what is right, for we will reap at harvest-time, if we do not give up.”
      11. Phil 2:12, “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling . . .”
          1. “This is not the language of self-confident assurance . . .” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
          2. “Our salvation is something that remains to be worked out.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
          3. “. . . worked out in fear and trembling; that is, with great solicitude and concern as to whether one is doing enough.” (Schmaus 112)
      12. Heb 10:26-29, “if we willfully persist in sin after having received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins, 27but a fearful prospect of judgment, and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries. 28Anyone who has violated the law of Moses dies without mercy . . . 29How much worse punishment do you think will be deserved by those who have spurned the Son of God, profaned the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified, and outraged the Spirit of grace?”
      13. 2 Pet 2:20-21, “if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overpowered, the last state has become worse for them than the first. 21For it would have been better for them never to have known the way of righteousness than, after knowing it, to turn back from the holy commandment that was passed on to them.”
      14. 1 John 3:21-24, “if our hearts do not condemn us, we have boldness before God; 22and we receive from him whatever we ask, because we obey his commandments and do what pleases him. 23And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as he has commanded us. 24All who obey his commandments abide in him, and he abides in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit that he has given us.”
      15. 1 John 4:20, “Those who say, “I love God,” and hate their brothers or sisters, are liars; for those who do not love a brother or sister whom they have seen, cannot love God whom they have not seen.”
      16. Rev 20:12-15, “books were opened. Also another book was opened, the book of life. And the dead were judged according to their works, as recorded in the books. 13. . . and all were judged according to what they had done. . . . 15and anyone whose name was not found written in the book of life was thrown into the lake of fire.”
   3. “But on the other hand, the Scriptures speak of the salvation of all men with such certainty and matter-of-factness that there is no room for anxiety and doubt.” (Schmaus 112)
      1. Mark 16:16 is “obviously so meant that everyone can apply [it] to himself in a plain and straightforward manner, without prolonged reflection and analysis, or in any event without tortuous introspection.” (Schmaus 112) Mark 16:16, “The one who believes and is baptized will be saved; but the one who does not believe will be condemned.”
      2. “The Sermon on the Mount states clearly and definitely that whoever obeys this and that injunction has a share in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 5,1-12 [the beatitudes]).” (Schmaus 112)
      3. “Indeed, Paul himself is full of a joyful confidence . . .” (Schmaus 112) Rom 8:38-39, “neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, 39nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
      4. “In the Old Testament a strong note of joy is already heard . . .” (Schmaus 112)
         1. Sir 30:22-25, “A joyful heart is life itself, and rejoicing lengthens one’s life span. 23Indulge yourself and take comfort, and remove sorrow far from you, for sorrow has destroyed many, and no advantage ever comes from it. 24Jealousy and anger shorten life, and anxiety brings on premature old age. 25Those who are cheerful and merry at table will benefit from their food.”
         2. Qoh 9:7-8, “eat your bread with enjoyment, and drink your wine with a merry heart; for God has long ago approved what you do. 8Let your garments always be white; do not let oil be lacking on your head.”
         3. Qoh 11:9-10, “Rejoice, young man, while you are young, and let your heart cheer you in the days of your youth. Follow the inclination of your heart and the desire of your eyes, but know that for all these things God will bring you into judgment. 10Banish anxiety from your mind, and put away pain from your body; for youth and the dawn of life are vanity.”
         4. Ps 32:7, “You are a hiding place for me; you preserve me from trouble; you surround me with glad cries of deliverance.”
         5. Ps 37:4, “Take delight in the Lord, and he will give you the desires of your heart.”
         6. Ps 68:4, “Sing to God, sing praises to his name; lift up a song to him who rides upon the clouds—his name is the Lord—be exultant before him.”
         7. Ps 100:2-5, “Worship the Lord with gladness; come into his presence with singing. 3Know that the Lord is God. It is he that made us, and we are his; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. 4Enter his gates with thanksgiving, and his courts with praise. Give thanks to him, bless his name. 5For the Lord is good; his steadfast love endures forever, and his faithfulness to all generations.
      5. “The whole New Testament is pervaded by expressions of thankfulness, peace, and joy.” (Schmaus 112)
         1. In the OT joy is heard, “but the fullness of joy comes from union with Christ.” (Schmaus 112)
         2. Matt 5:11, “Blessed are you when people revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account.”
         3. John 15:11, “I have said these things to you so that my joy may be in you, and that your joy may be complete.”
         4. John 16:20-33, “22you have pain now; but I will see you again, and your hearts will rejoice, and no one will take your joy from you. 23On that day you will ask nothing of me. . . . 24Until now you have not asked for anything in my name. Ask and you will receive, so that your joy may be complete. . . . 26On that day you will ask in my name. I do not say to you that I will ask the Father on your behalf; 27for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from God. . . . 33I have said this to you, so that in me you may have peace. In the world you face persecution. But take courage; I have conquered the world!”
         5. John 17:13, “I speak these things in the world so that they may have my joy made complete in themselves.”
         6. Acts 13:52, “the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit.”
         7. Acts 15:31, “When its members [Antiochian Christians] read it [the letter from the Apostolic Council], they rejoiced at the exhortation.”
         8. Rom 12:12, “Rejoice in hope, be patient in suffering, persevere in prayer.”
         9. Rom 14:17, “the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.”
         10. Rom 15:13, “May the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, so that you may abound in hope by the power of the Holy Spirit.”
         11. Gal 5:22, “the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness . . .”
         12. 2 Cor 7:4, “I often boast about you; I have great pride in you; I am filled with consolation; I am overjoyed in all our affliction.”
         13. 2 Cor 13:11, “Put things in order, listen to my appeal, agree with one another, live in peace; and the God of love and peace will be with you.”
         14. Phil 3:1, “rejoice in the Lord.”
         15. Phil 4:4, “Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice.”
         16. Col 1:12, give “thanks to the Father, who has enabled you to share in the inheritance of the saints in the light.”
         17. 1 Thess 5:16, “Rejoice always . . .”
         18. 1 John 1:3-4, “we declare to you what we have seen and heard so that you also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. 4We are writing these things so that our joy may be complete.”
   4. “Another word in which the confidence of the Christian believer is expressed is *peace*.” (Schmaus 112)
      1. “This does not, as a rule, refer to a disposition in the individual person but to a state of the world. Peace is the condition of right relationship to God: it should bring about ordered relationships among men (1 Cor. 14,33). If everything is ordered and things stand in [112] right relation to one another, this constitutes a state of wholeness and health, the state of salvation. In the New Testament peace has the same meaning as salvation: only God can bring about salvation.” (Schmaus 112-113) 1 Cor 14:33, “God is a God not of disorder but of peace.”
      2. “. . . salvation is, like peace, concord among men. It is won through peace with God or lost through enmity with him. It consists in union with the God of peace . . .” (Schmaus 113)
         1. Rom 15:33, “The God of peace be with all of you.”
         2. Rom 16:20, “The God of peace will shortly crush Satan under your feet. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.”
         3. 1 Cor 14:33, “God is a God not of disorder but of peace.”
         4. 1 Thess 5:23, “May the God of peace himself sanctify you entirely . . .”
      3. “Peace, therefore, is grace . . .” (Schmaus 113) 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, and Eph 1:2 all say, “Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.”
      4. “God has made peace through Jesus Christ, so that Christ is our peace . . .”
         1. Luke 1:78-79, “By the tender mercy of our God, the dawn from on high will break upon us, 79to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.”
         2. Acts 10:36, “You know the message he sent to the people of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ—he is Lord of all.”
         3. Eph 2:14, “For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us.”
         4. Phil 1:2, “Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.”
      5. “Christ also characterized his work as the bringing of true peace . . . The individual can share in this peace in the midst of discord among men and the dis­harmony of things.” (Schmaus 112-113)
         1. Luke 7:50, “he said to the woman [who anointed his feet], “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.””
         2. John 14:27, “Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. I do not give to you as the world gives. Do not let your hearts be troubled, and do not let them be afraid.”
         3. John 16:33, “I have said this to you, so that in me you may have peace. In the world you face persecution. But take courage; I have conquered the world!”
   5. “. . . peace stands for the reconciliation of men with God, an objective state of affairs . . . [But] it can also refer to the feeling of safety and security. . . . Paul or John or Peter . . . were [not] living in fear that they themselves were excluded from the peace of Christ. . . . the fundamental attitude of the Christian believer is not anxiety or fear, but joy and confidence . . .” (Schmaus 113)
      1. John 14:27, “Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. I do not give to you as the world gives. Do not let your hearts be troubled, and do not let them be afraid.”
      2. John 16:33, “in me you may have peace. In the world you face persecution. But take courage; I have conquered the world!”
      3. Rom 14:17, “the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.”
      4. Phil 4:7, “the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus.”
   6. But “these feelings [joy and confidence] are not indis­pensable marks of the Christian community. They can be missing, and if they are it does not necessarily indicate the absence of union with Christ. God can take them away.” (Schmaus 113) Matt 27:46, “Jesus cried with a loud voice, . . . “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?””
   7. “. . . peace and joy are not infallible signs of union with God; they can [owe] their existence to an insensitive conscience . . .” (Schmaus 113) Jer 6:14-20 (= Jer 8:11), “They have treated the wound of my people carelessly, saying, “Peace, peace,” when there is no peace.”
2. **Luther on certainty of salvation**
   1. Luther, in *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church*: “Once the divine promise has been accepted by us, its truth lasts until death.” (Kittelson 153)
3. **Calvin on certainty of salvation** (**i**.**e**., **proofs that one is elect**)
   1. signs of election
      1. introduction
         1. “. . . how does one know he is elect? Calvin asked that question too . . .” [*Institutes* 3.24.4] (Klooster 48)
         2. “Assurance of election does not come from some special revelation; nor does it come from curious attempts to pry into the eternal decree of God.” (Klooster 50)
         3. In addition to preaching, “God employs calling, faith, justification, and sanctification as the means for accomplishing the glorification decreed from eternity.” [47] *Institutes* 3.21.7: “we regard the call as a testimony of election. Then we hold justification another sign of its manifestation . . . the Lord seals his elect by call and justification . . .” [25] (Klooster 47, 25) Rom 8:30, “those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified.”
         4. As signs of reprobation, he mentions lack of preaching or failure to respond to preaching. *Institutes* 3.21.7: “by shutting off the reprobate from knowledge of his name or from the sanctification of his Spirit, he, as it were, reveals by these marks what sort of judgment awaits them.” (Klooster 25)
      2. preaching
         1. *Institutes* 3.21.1: “because such preaching is shared also with the wicked, it cannot of itself be a full proof of election.” (Klooster 44)
         2. “A heavier judgment . . . awaits the reprobate who have heard the gospel and rejected it than those who lived before the coming of Christ and never heard the gospel.” [*Institutes* 3.24.12-13] (Klooster 46)
      3. the call
         1. “The calling that is proof of election, the calling referred to in Romans 8:30, “consists not only in the preaching of the Word but also in the illumination of the Spirit.” [*Institutes* 3.24.2] (Klooster 44)
         2. *Institutes* 3.24.2: since the inner call is “the effectual working of his Spirit . . . [it] is a pledge of salvation that cannot deceive us.” (Klooster 44)
         3. *Institutes* 3.24.1: “Although in choosing his own the Lord already has adopted them as his children, we see that they do not come into possession of so great a good except when they are called . . .” (Klooster 44-45)
         4. *Institutes* 3.21.1: “we shall never be clearly persuaded, as we ought to be, that our salvation flows from the wellspring of God’s free mercy until we come to know his eternal election, which illumines God’s grace by this contrast: that he does not indiscriminately adopt all into the hope of salvation but gives to some what he denies to others.” (Klooster 18)
      4. faith
         1. *Institutes* 3.22.10: “faith is a singular pledge of the Father’s love . . .” (Klooster 45)
         2. *Institutes* 3.24.3: by faith election is “confirmed [and] the secret plan of God [i. e., our eternal election], which lay hidden, is brought to light . . .” (Klooster 47)
         3. *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*: “election is prior to faith, but is learnt by faith.” (Klooster 53)
         4. It is false that faith confirms election, as if election were ineffectual and uncertain till confirmed by faith. (Klooster 47)
            1. *Institutes* 3.24.3: some “make man God’s co-worker, to ratify election by his consent . . . [This makes] man’s will superior to God’s plan.” (Klooster 47)
            2. *Institutes* 3.24.3: we are not “merely given the ability to believe [but] faith itself.” (Klooster 47) Eph 2:8, “by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God . . .”
            3. *Institutes* 3.24.3: “it is false to say that election takes effect only after we have embraced the gospel, and takes its validity from this.” (Klooster 47)
            4. “Election is the parent of faith.” (Klooster 47)
      5. works as proof of election (the *syllogismus practicus*)
         1. The “practical syllogism” refers to when people “look at their own good works to find confidence in themselves.” (Klooster 51)
         2. Some interpreters think Calvin introduced the *syllogismus practicus*. (See Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 2 (part 2): 335-336; Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, pp. 170ff., 175ff.—51 n. 108) (Klooster 51)
         3. Though “Calvin did not introduce the so-called *syllogismus practicus* . . . the line between what Calvin did and the practical syllogism is razor thin . . .” (Klooster 51)
         4. “He did say that in seeking the certainty of our election, we should “cling to those latter signs which are sure attestations of it.” [*Institutes* 3.24.4] But here [51] Calvin was contrasting these “latter signs” with the futile attempt to look into the prior eternal counsel and decree of God. When he elaborated upon these “latter signs,” he never emphasized the believer’s good works. It is Christ’s work and His promises that are evident in these “latter signs.”” (Klooster 51-52)
   2. seeking to know directly God’s decree concerning our salvation
      1. “The question is actually how one can come to *know* about this eternal decree and be assured of his election. Calvin [52] answered that we have no direct access to the decree or counsel of God. We can know it only indirectly, though truly and certainly, from the work of Christ in and for us.” (Klooster 52-53)
      2. “Satan deviously tries to unsettle us. Calvin contended that “Satan has no more grievous or dangerous temptation to dishearten believers than when he unsettles them with doubt about their election, while at the same time he arouses them with a wicked desire to seek it outside the way.” [*Institutes* 3.24.4] The desire for security is not itself the temptation; the temptation is to seek security in an improper way. [48] Calvin said: “I call it ‘seeking outside the way’ when mere man attempts to break into the inner recesses of divine wisdom, and tries to penetrate even to the highest eternity, in order to find out what decision has been made concerning himself at God’s judgment seat.” [*Institutes* 3.24.4] If a man attempts to do that, “he casts himself into the depths of a bottomless whirlpool to be swallowed up; then he tangles himself in innumerable and inextricable snares; then he buries himself in an abyss of sightless darkness.” [*Institutes* 3.24.4] To suffer shipwreck on that rock means the loss of “peace and tranquillity [*sic*] toward God.” [*Institutes* 3.24.4] (Klooster 48-49)
   3. Christ as an assurance of election
      1. *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*: “Confidence of salvation is founded upon Christ and rests on the promises of the gospel.” (Klooster 52)
      2. Christ as mirror of election
         1. “It is in connection with the quest for certainty regarding one’s election that Calvin referred to Jesus Christ as the mirror of election.” (Klooster 49)
         2. *Institutes* 3.24.5: “those whom God has adopted as his sons are said to have been chosen not in themselves but in his Christ [Eph 1:4, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world”]; for unless he could love them in him, he could not honor them with the inheritance of his Kingdom if they had not previously become partakers of him. But if we have been chosen in him, we shall not find assurance of our election in ourselves; and not even in God the Father, if we conceive him as severed from his Son. Christ, then, is the mirror wherein we must, and without self-deception may, contemplate our own election. For since it is into his body the Father has destined those to be engrafted whom he has willed from eternity to be his own, that he may hold as sons all whom he acknowledges to be among his members, we have [49] a sufficiently clear and firm testimony that we have been inscribed in the book of life [cf. Rev. 21:27] if we are in communion with Christ.” (Klooster 49-50)
      3. *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*: “Confidence of salvation is founded upon Christ and rests on the promises of the gospel. Nor is it a negligible support when, believing in Christ, we hear that this is divinely given to us, that before the beginning of the world we were both ordained to faith and also elected to the inheritance of heavenly life. Hence arises an impregnable security.” (Klooster 20)
   4. certainty of future salvation
      1. objection: “Looking to Christ as the mirror of our election may give assurance for the present, but what about the future? Some people seem to have true faith and appear to be joined to Christ; yet they fall away later. Calvin also faced this problem. For the future also Christ is the mirror of election and assurance for our perseverance (preservation).” (Klooster 50)
      2. scriptural references used by Calvin
         1. Matt 15:13, “Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted.”
         2. Luke 22:32 (Jesus to Peter), “I have prayed for you that your own faith may not fail; and you, when once you have turned back, strengthen your brothers.”
         3. John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”
         4. John 6:37, “Everything that the Father gives me will come to me, and anyone who comes to me I will never drive away . . .”
         5. John 6:39, “this is the will of him who sent me, that I should lose nothing of all that he has given me, but raise it up on the last day.”
         6. John 10:28, “I give them eternal life, and they will never perish. No one will snatch them out of my hand.”
         7. Rom 8:38-39, “neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, 39nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
         8. Phil 1:6, “the one who began a good work among you will bring it to completion . . .”
         9. 1 John 2:19, “They went out from us, but they did not belong to us; for if they had belonged to us, they would have remained with us. But by going out they made it plain that none of them belongs to us.”
      3. “The calling . . . according to Calvin should be the beginning and end of our examination of this question . . .” (Klooster 52)
      4. *Institutes* 3.24.6 (on John 6:37): “What did Christ wish to have us learn from this but to trust that we shall ever remain safe because we have been made his once for all?” (Klooster 50-51)
      5. *Institutes* 3.24.7: “such persons [who fall away] never cleaved to Christ with the heartfelt trust in which certainty of election has, I say, been established for us. . . . So then, let not such instances induce us at all to abandon a quiet reliance upon the Lord’s promise, where he declares that all by whom he is received in true faith have been given to him by the Father, no one of whom, since he is their guardian and shepherd, will perish [John 3:16; 6:39].” (Klooster 51)
4. **the fundamentalist position**
   1. Fundamentalists “claim to be certain they will go to heaven immediately after death. . . . no matter how sinfully they might live the remainder of their days, their salvation is assured.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
   2. Most fundamentalists say that you must “announce that you’ve accepted Jesus as your personal Savior, and, so long as you really believe it, you’re set. . . . from that point on there is nothing you can do, no sin you can commit, no matter how heinous, that will forfeit your salvation.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
   3. an example: Wilson Ewin, *There Is Therefore Now No Condemnation*
      1. Ewin says that “the person who places his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and his blood shed at Calvary is eternally secure. He can never lose his salvation.”” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      2. See 1 John 5:13, “I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, so that you may know that you have eternal life.”
      3. Ewin also says, “The sinner did nothing to merit God’s grace and likewise he can do nothing to demerit grace. . . . absolute assurance of salvation through imputed righteousness can never be broken by sin. The reason is simple—this righteousness has nothing to do with the keeping of God’s commandments or moral law. The Bible says, ‘But now the righteousness of God apart from the Law is revealed’ [Rom 3:21] . . .” But this interpretation of Rom 3:21 contradicts what scripture says elsewhere (see the many verses quoted above).
5. **the Catholic position**
   1. Sanctifying grace cannot be perceived.
      1. “. . . sanctifying grace is a mystery the existence of which we could not know save by faith. It is therefore something which we have no natural means of finding out or verifying,” and which we cannot understand, prove, or perceive. (Daujat *Theology* 68)
      2. “Those who try to feel or experience something, to enjoy sensible consolation, some interior titilla­tion or vibration of natural feeling, or again, to secure some experience which will enable them to verify God’s presence within them, have forsaken the way of faith, which consists simply in believing, and in consequence have left the way of supernatural life, which can be lived on no other level than faith.” (Daujat *Theology* 69)
      3. Confusing feelings with “graces” is from Rousseau and the romantics, for whom “heart” meant emo­tion; in the Bible, the Fathers, and Pascal, “heart” meant the innermost depth or center of the soul. (Daujat *Theology* 69 n.)
      4. The immanentist heresy says that God is within us (more than as Creator present to creature) and can be uncovered and known directly by mystical expe­rience. (Daujat *Theology* 62)
   2. works and salvation
      1. ““So,” you may ask, “is being a ‘do‑gooder’ sufficient for salvation?” Not at all! The Bible is quite clear that we are not saved by our works, lest any of us should boast, but by God’s free gift of grace that is received through faith (Eph. 2:8‑9). Protestants who cite Ephesians 2:8‑9 as a proof‑text are merely repeating the constant teaching of the Catholic Church. Where they err is in thinking that we are saved by faith alone.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      2. “The biblical teaching is that the good works we do as a result of our faith in Christ are really and truly the work of God in us [Phil 2:13, “it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure”]. In other words, both our faith and our works are wrought not by our own righteousness apart from Christ, but they are God’s gifts of grace in us. That’s why we cannot boast as though our works were solely our own doing.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      3. So “it is not enough to say that . . . the traditional Protestant sense of fiduciary faith (i.e. mere trust in Christ’s promises) can be enough for salvation.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
   3. baptism’s role in salvation
      1. “. . . most Evangelicals and Fundamentalists look at baptism as . . . a way to show others in the congregation that you’re now a Christian (and, of course, they’ll admit that Jesus commanded that believers be baptized—though merely as an outward sign), but they maintain that there is no connection between baptism and salvation because baptism itself does nothing to the soul. It is the intellectual and heartfelt acceptance of Christ that does it all . . .” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      2. But scripture teaches otherwise.
         1. John 3:5, “no one can enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit.” “Catholics hold . . . that the whole phrase, “water and the Holy Spirit,” is one unit; it means baptism.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
         2. Acts 2:38, “Peter said to them, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”
         3. Titus 3:5-7, “he saved us, not because of any works of righteousness that we had done, but according to his mercy, through the water of rebirth and renewal by the Holy Spirit. 6This Spirit he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, 7so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”
         4. 1 Pet 3:20-21, “God waited patiently in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were saved through water. 21And baptism, which this prefigured, now saves you—not as a removal of dirt from the body, but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ . . .” “Peter is quite clear on this point: “Baptism . . . now saves you.” This refers to the sacrament of water baptism which Peter compares to how Noah’s family was “saved through water.”” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
   4. what to say
      1. ““Are you saved?” asks the Fundamentalist. The Catholic should reply: “As the Bible says, I am already saved (Rom. 8:24, Eph. 2:5‑8), but I’m also being saved (1 Cor. 1:8, 2 Cor. 2:15, Phil. 2:12), and I have the hope that I will be saved (Rom. 5:9‑10, 1 Cor. 3:12‑15).”” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      2. ““I am redeemed,” answers the Catholic, “and like the Apostle Paul I am working out my salvation in fear and trembling (Phil. 2:12), with hopeful confidence in the promises of Christ (Rom. 5:2, 2 Tim. 2:11‑13)—but not with a false “absolute” assurance about my own ability to persevere (2 Cor. 13:5). And I do all this as the Catholic Church has taught, unchanged, from the time of Christ.”” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
   5. a hypothetical case
      1. “Let’s take a hypothetical example. Let’s talk about a born‑again minister. After being born again, he works as a minister for fifty years. So far as anyone can see, he leads a holy life. Then, in his old age, in one day, he engages in adultery, shoots his wife, intentionally runs over a pedestrian with his car, and commits suicide. (Let’s presume he’s not insane.) He dies unrepentant. Is this man saved or damned? Will he go to heaven or hell?” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      2. “You can’t say the born‑again Christian has an absolute assurance of salvation and, at the same time, say that we can’t tell who’s saved until death intrudes. That would mean we’d have to keep the assurance in suspense until death, which means it’s no assurance at all.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      3. To say “he was never saved in the first place . . . implies you have no way to tell who’s saved and who’s not. . . . the only way you can be sure is to die without having sinned seriously [and that is] the Catholic position [that] we can sin seriously and lose grace and throw away our salvation.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      4. Or “you’d have to say that this hypothetical minister was saved despite the sins he committed and despite his lack of repentance. If you make any other argument, you undercut the absolute assurance of salvation.” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      5. “The born‑again believer who is a gross sinner, even from the first day of his conversion, will be saved. . . . Once saved, always saved—that’s your principle . . .” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      6. Gal 5:19-21, “the works of the flesh are obvious: fornication, impurity, licentiousness, 20idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, 21envy, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these. I am warning you, as I warned you before: those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God.” Gal 5:19-21 “is aimed at Christians and which explains what sins will exclude them from heaven . . .” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
      7. Certainty of salvation tempts one to lawlessness (antinomianism): “there’s precious little reason to be good. Since he’s got it made, why not enjoy himself here below?” (*No “Assurance of Salvation”*)
6. **tradition**
   1. Trent (*Decree on Justification* ch. 13): “. . . let no one promise himself anything as certain with absolute certitude, although all ought to place and repose a very firm hope in God’s help. . . . [We] are born again “unto the hope of glory,” and not as yet unto glory . . .” (Denzinger 806)
   2. Trent (*Canons on Justification* canon 16): No one should “say that he will for certain with an absolute and infallible certainty have that great gift of perseverance up to the end, unless he shall have learned this by a special revelation . . .” (Denzinger 826)
   3. Trent “declared: “Without a special revelation it is neither possible nor necessary for anyone to have the certainty of faith about the state of justification” (session 6, ch. 9, DS 1533f.). The council stresses that sins are not, and will not be, forgiven to anyone who boasts about his confidence and the certainty of his forgiveness and is satisfied to rest therein. Though no Christian may doubt God’s mercy, Christ’s mediation, and the power and efficacy of the sacraments, he neverthe­less experiences fear and trembling in view of his weakness and insufficient preparation for grace. Thus no one can know with infallible assurance of faith that he has reached the state of justification (see also canons 13 and 14, DS 1563ff.).” (Schmaus 114)
   4. Trent denies “that we attain justification in a confident faith without fruits; that every man must believe in his own justification as in a revealed mystery of faith; that without this faith he does not possess justification, or that, vice versa, with this faith he does possess justification beyond any possibility of doubt. However, it would be a mistake to think that it was the council’s chief concern to emphasize the uncertainty of salvation and to declare that fear and anxiety were exclusively the proper Christian attitude. What it rejected was only a pseudo-certainty. It took no occasion in the discussion to define exactly the limits of uncertainty.” (Schmaus 114)
   5. Trent did not intend “to diminish men’s confidence in the mercy of God; it was speaking out only against a complacent boasting. The council condemned only the certainty which was founded on a proud or quietistic confidence: it did not say that there was pride or quietism in every kind of confidence. It did, however, imply that there was such an arrogant confidence abroad at that time—or at least a thesis which proclaimed it.” (Schmaus 114)
   6. There are “several types of certainty. With regard to the state of justification, we can have no such certainty as that which we possess in our assent in faith to the truths of revelation, because in the state of [114] justification the personal, existential element always enters in. Nor can we have the kind of certainty we have of the highest metaphysical and mathematical principles, or of things observable by the senses: the kind of certainty we have is in accordance with the object. We can, however, have the kind of certainty about justification which has its place in human relations. This certainty, termed “moral” certainty by scholastic philosophy and theology, has its basis in human reliability and faithful­ness. It is sufficient and necessary for the conduct of human life. It consists in this, that in man’s moral behaviour one counts on his dependability and faithfulness. Moral certainty can reach such a degree—for example, in friendship or love—as to leave no room for a single rational doubt. Certainty of this kind is in no way condemned by the council.” (Schmaus 114-115)
7. **ecumenical view**
   1. Since a fundamental option and its resultant fundamental stance occur at our core person (which is always subject), we cannot know if we are in a *state of grace* or a *state of sin*. “. . . like all the other aspects of human-as-person, the fundamental op­tion is not something we can directly see or consciously analyze. At most, it is something of which we can be nonreflexively aware.” [64] “. . . our central personhood never ceases be­ing somewhat opaque. . . . the most important things in life are ultimately mysteries.” (O’Connell 64, 66)
   2. But “by honest observation of our categorical behavior, we are able to posit a reasonable conjecture [72] . . . Hope, as distinguished from presumption on the one hand and despair on the other, prompts Christians to trust in God *despite their own lack of subjective certitude*.” (O’Connell 72-73)
   3. Anyone is capable of reversing or ratifying his or her fundamental stance through a new fundamental option. (O’Connell 73-74)
   4. “Contemporary research into the history of dogma is studying the question whether the views of the Reformers condemned by the Council of Trent were represented as occasional, incidental views or as fundamental, or at least important, elements of their theology of grace. The latter is denied by researchers into Reformation theology, who maintain that the Reformers did not teach that presumptuous faith termed boastful and ethically indifferent by the council, but rather a confident faith united to a deep consciousness of sin. In particular, it is said that the Reformers did not teach that cognitive sort of faith—knowledge as the grounds for certainty regarding salvation which the council condemned. In view of this, the question arises whether the council’s condemnation was not based on a misunderstanding. However, the possibility of misunderstanding on the part of the council is ruled out in face of the formulations and trends in the theology of the Reform which have developed as a consequence of the council’s pronouncements.” (Schmaus 115)
   5. “On the positive side, the council taught that man should abandon himself completely to God, yet never lose the awareness of himself and his own weakness; and so, at the same time, remain in fear and trembling. This was a trust that depended not on man’s own action but on God’s mercy (DS 1526, 1533f., 1536-1539). Thus it concerned itself with the thesis put forward with the greatest intensity by the Reformers them­selves, that salvation is to be attributed not to human effort and striving [115] but to divine grace. Man can place unlimited trust in God; indeed, to limit this trust would be a failure to do honor to God. . . . The more unreserved this [trust] is, the more man becomes aware that between himself and God there is no conflict. [This] conviction [finds] its final justification in the fact that such an unreserved, trusting surrender to God is something brought about by the divine action itself. The certainty here attained lies in the existential, personal realm and not in the metaphysical, abstract sphere.” (Schmaus 115-116)
   6. Phariseeism “is that attitude described by Jesus in . . . the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican [Luke 18:9-14]—the Pharisee [is] conscious of his superiority over all other men, who are sinners . . . a man, completely self-satisfied and self-reliant, will believe that [God can] be placed at man’s service, to minister to his comfort and satisfaction.” (Schmaus 116)
   7. When “the experience of God is seen as the assurance of God’s presence,” experience “becomes decisive. The extreme instance of this condition is when religious experience is sought and hoped for, but God in his personal reality is denied (religion without God).” (Schmaus 116)
   8. “Another concept not very different . . . makes justification consist [in] the value of [the idea of] God for man’s salvation. . . . God becomes a function of man understanding and possessing himself. Even the atheist can affirm such an idea of justification.” (Schmaus 116)
   9. “A survey of the course of piety through the ages shows a clear con­nection of this dialectic between the certainty and uncertainty of salvation with the dogmatic teaching on infant baptism. As a result, Christianity is experienced less and less as a totally transforming way of life, an event of grace producing salvation and peace, and more and more as a sum total of difficult instructions and regulations.” (Schmaus 116)

Newman on Certainty of Salvation

1. **certainty of salvation**
   1. “Reliance then on self . . . is one of the two evils . . . the other is the state of doubt about our justification which must ever attend the be­lief that it depends on our graces and works, though produced by divine in­flu­ences.” (Newman 26)
   2. Certainty of salvation means at least “that, were we to die at the present moment we should be secure of heaven, whatever may be our chance of losing it in time to come . . . [It is] an assurance that we are at present ac­counted sinless [Luther, *In Gal*. 4.3 (f. 373)] . . .” (Newman 27)
   3. Certainty of present salvation “can never be attained by works, because we can never know when we have done enough; whereas Faith is a prin­ciple which a person may easily satisfy himself that he has . . .” (Newman 27)
   4. “Christ has ful­filled the Law for us; faith makes that fulfilment ours; and places us above the Law.” (Newman 27)
   5. “In ob­serv­ing the Law, though we shall observe it, we are not per­form­ing a duty [Luther, *Ar­gum. In Gal*. f. 274] [27] . . . To allow we are under it [is] ne­ces­sarily pol­lut­ing our con­science with a sense of guilt; for . . . we all sin continually . . .” (Newman 27-28)
   6. It is not that “the Christian is . . . at liberty to violate the Law, but only that it is not a mat­ter of con­science to him to keep it [Luther, *De Lib. Christ*. f. 9 (2)] [28] . . . [It is not that] he will not labour to grow in grace, but only that he is not more acceptable to God, if he does [Luther, *De Lib. Christ*. (f. 8)] . . .” (Newman 27-29)
   7. Faith “applies to the soul the merits of Him on whom it looks, gaining at the same time His sanc­tifying aid, and developing itself in good works; which works are the only evi­dence we can have of its being true.” (Newman 16)

## The Council of Trent: Sessions and Topics

Doctrinal documents are in boldface.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ses-  sion | Place | Date | Document |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Trent | 13 Dec.  1545 | Decree Concerning the Opening of the Council *1* |
| 2 | Trent | 7 Jan.  1546 | *Decree Concerning the Manner of Living and Other Matters to be Observed during the Council* |
| 3 | Trent | 4 Feb.  1546 | *Decree Concerning the Symbol of Faith* |
| 4 | Trent | 8 Apr.  1546 | Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures  *Decree Concerning the Edition and Use of the Sacred Books* |
| 5 | Trent | 17 June  1546 | Decree Concerning Original Sin  *Decree Concerning Reform* |
| 6 | Trent | 13 Jan.  1547 | Decree Concerning Justification  Canons Concerning Justification  *Decree Concerning Reform* |
| 7 | Trent | 3 Mar.  1547 | Decree Concerning the Sacraments  Canons on the Sacraments in General  Canons on Baptism  Canons on Confirmation  Decree Concerning Reform |
| 8 | Trent | 11 Mar.  1547 | *Decree Concerning the Translation of the Council* |
| 9 | Bologna | 21 Apr.  1547 | *Decree Concerning the Prorogation of the Council* |
| 10 | Bologna | 2 June  1547 | Decree Concerning the Prorogation of the Session  Bull of the Resumption of the Council of Trent under Julius III |
| 11 | Trent | 1 May  1551 | *Decree Concerning the Resumption of the Council* |
| 12 | Trent | 1 Sept.  1551 | *Decree Concerning the Prorogation of the Session* |
| 13 | Trent | 11 Oct.  1551 | Decree Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist  Canons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist  Decree Concerning Reform  Decree Postponing the Definition of Four Articles Concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist and Granting Letters of Safe-Conduct to Protestants  Safe-Conduct Granted to Protestants |
| 14 | Trent | 25 Nov.  1551 | The Most Holy Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction  Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance  Canons Concerning the Sacrament of Extreme Unction  Decree Concerning Reform |
| 15 | Trent | 25 Jan.  1552 | Decree for Proroguing the Session  Safe-Conduct Given to Protestants |
| 16 | Trent | 28 Apr.  1552 | Decree Suspending the Council  Bull for the Celebration of the Council of Trent under Pius IV |
| 17 | Trent | 18 Jan.  1562 | Decree Concerning the Celebration of the Council  Summoning of the Next Session |
| 18 | Trent | 26 Feb.  1562 | Decree Concerning the Choice of Books and the Invitation of All to the Council under Public Protection  Summons for the Next Session  Safe-Conduct Granted to the German Nation in a General Congregation on the Fourth Day of March, 1562  The Extension of the Above to Other Nations |
| 19 | Trent | 14 May  1562 | Decree for the Prorogation of the Session |
| 20 | Trent | 4 June  1562 | *Decree for the Prorogation of the Session* |
| 21 | Trent | 16 July  1562 | **The Doctrine of Communion under Both Kinds and the Communion of Little Children**  ***Canons on Communion under Both Species and that of Little Children*** |
| 22 | Trent | 17 Sept. 1562 | Doctrine Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass  Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass  *Decree Concerning the Things to be Observed and avoided in the Celebration of the Mass* [a reform, not a doctrinal, decree]  Decree Concerning Reform  *Decree Concerning the Petition for the Concession of the Chalice* |
| 23 | Trent | 15 July  1563 | **The True and Catholic Doctrine Concerning the Sacrament of Order**, **Defined and Published by the Council of Trent in the Seventh Session in Condemnation of Current Errors**  Canons on the Sacrament of Order |
| 24 | Trent | 11 Nov.  1563 | Doctrine of the Sacrament of Matrimony  Canons on the Sacrament of Matrimony |
| 25 | Trent | 3-4  Dec.  1563 | Decree Concerning Purgatory  **On the Invocation and Veneration of Saints, on the Relics of Saints, and on Sacred Images**  Decree Concerning Reform  Decree Concerning the Continuation of the Session on the Following Day  Continuation of the Session on the Fourth Day of December  *Decree Concerning Indulgences* [a reform, not a doctrinal, decree]  Concerning the Choice of Foods; Fasts and Festival Days  Concerning the Index of Books and the Catechism, Breviary and Missal  Concerning the Place of Ambassadors  Concerning the Acceptance and Observance of the Decrees of the Council  *Ten Rules Concerning Prohibited Books Drawn up by the Fathers Chosen by the Council of Trent and Approved by Pope Pius* |

So the doctrinal matters treated at Trent were:

1. the canon of scripture (1546)

2. original sin (1546)

3. justification (1547)

4. the sacraments (1547, 1551, 1562-63)

5. purgatory (1563)

6. saints, relics, and images (1563)

1 There “was a delay in the opening of the Council of Trent, which could not meet because, once again, too few participants had appeared for the first session.” (Kittelson 290)

## Major Statements on Justification

## In Trent’s *Decree on Justification* and *Canons on Justification*

*definition of justification*

“. . . the justification of a sinner is . . . a translation from [original sin] to the state of grace . . .” (*chapter 4*)

Justification “is not merely remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renewal of the interior man . . ., whereby an unjust man becomes a just man, and from being an enemy becomes a friend . . .” (*chapter 7*) (See Schmaus: “the effects of the divine action [are] the forgiveness of sins and the resultant transformation of man . . .” 64)

*predestination*

False: “justification is attained by those only who are predestined unto life, [and] all others, who are called, are called indeed, but do not receive grace, as if they are by divine power predestined to evil . . .” (*canon 17*)

*original sin*

“. . . all men had lost their innocence in . . . Adam . . .” (*chapter 1*)

“. . . not only the gentiles by the force of nature, but not even the Jews by the very letter of the law of Moses were able to be liberated or to rise therefrom [original sin] . . .” (*chapter 1*)

“. . . man [cannot] be justified before God by his own works which are done either by his own natural powers, or through the teaching of the Law, and without divine grace through Christ Jesus . . .” (*canon 1*)

“. . . divine grace through Christ Jesus is [not] given for this only, that man may more easily be able to live justly and merit eternal life, as if by free will without grace he were able to do both, though with difficulty and hardship . . .” (*canon 2*)

*free will*

“. . . free will was not extinguished in them, however weakened and debased in its powers.” (*chapter 1*)

“. . . after the sin of Adam man’s free will was [not] lost and destroyed . . . it is [not] a thing in name only, indeed a title without a reality, a fiction, moreover, brought into the Church by Satan . . .” (*canon 5*)

It is false “that it is not in the power of man to make his ways evil, but that God produces the evil as well as the good works, not only by permission, but also properly and of Himself . . .” (*canon 6*)

It is false “that all works that are done before justification, in whatever manner they have been done, are truly sins or deserving of the hatred of God, or that the more earnestly anyone strives to dispose himself for grace, so much the more grievously does he sin . . .” (*canon 7*)

*objective and subjective redemption*

*objective:* “The Father . . . sent to men Christ Jesus . . ., that He might redeem . . . all men . . .” (*chapter 2*)

*subjective:* “. . . unless they were born again in Christ, they [men] never would be justified, since in that new birth through the merit of His passion, the grace, whereby they are made just, is bestowed on them.” (*chapter 3*)

*subjective:* justification “after the promulgation of the Gospel cannot be effected except through [baptism] or a desire for it . . .” (*chapter 4*)

*causes of justification*

“. . . the final cause indeed is the glory of God and of Christ and life eternal . . .” (*chapter 7*)

“. . . the efficient cause is truly a merciful God . . .” (*chapter 7*)

“. . . the meritorious cause is . . . our Lord Jesus Christ [who] merited justification for us by His most holy passion on the wood of the Cross, and made satisfaction for us to God the Father . . .” (*chapter 7*)

“. . . the instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, which is the “sacrament of faith,” without which no one is ever justified.” (*chapter 7*)

“Finally the unique formal cause is the justice of God, not that by which He Himself is just, but by which He makes us just . . .” (This is sanctifying grace.) (*chapter 7*)

“. . . that justice which is called ours, because we are justified through its inherence in us, that same is (the justice) of God, because it is infused into us by God through the merit of Christ.” (*chapter 16*)

*grace and free will in the preparation for justification*

*against semi-Pelagianism:*

False: “without the anticipatory inspiration of the Holy Spirit and without His assistance man can believe, hope, and love or be repentant, as he ought, so that the grace of justification may be conferred upon him . . .” (*canon 3*)

“. . . in adults the beginning of that justification must be derived from the predisposing grace of God . . .” (*chapter 5*)

*against passivity:*

Man “does not do nothing at all inasmuch as he can indeed reject it . . .” (*chapter 5*)

The will can “dissent, if it wishes . . .” (*canon 4*)

False: “like something inanimate it [the will] does nothing at all and is merely in a passive state . . .” (*canon 4*)

*for activity:*

“. . . through His stimulating and assisting grace [persons] are disposed to convert themselves to their own justification, by freely assenting to and cooperating with the same grace . . .” (*chapter 5*)

“. . . man’s free will moved and aroused by God does . . . cooperate by assenting to God who rouses and calls, whereby it disposes and prepares itself to obtain the grace of justification . . .” (*canon 4*)

False: “the fear of hell, whereby by grieving for sins we flee to the mercy of God or refrain from sinning, is a sin or makes sinners worse . . .” (*canon 8*)

*manner of preparation*

Persons “are disposed to . . . justice when . . . they are freely moved toward God, believing that to be true which has been divinely revealed and promised . . ., and when . . . they are raised to hope . . ., and they begin to love him . . . and are therefore moved [by] repentance, . . . and finally when they resolve to receive baptism . . .” (*chapter 6*)

“Justification itself follows this disposition or preparation . . .” (*chapter 7*)

*against justification by faith alone*

*faith alone:*

False: “by faith alone the sinner is justified, so . . . that nothing else is required to cooperate in the attainment of the grace of justification . . .” (*canon 9*)

It is “necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the action of his own will . . .” (*canon 9*)

“. . . no one should flatter himself because of faith alone, thinking that by faith alone he is made an heir and will obtain the inheritance . . .” (*chapter 11*)

False: “nothing except faith is commanded in the Gospel . . .” (*canon 19*)

*fiduciary faith alone:*

False: “sins are forgiven . . . to anyone who [has] confidence and certainty of the forgiveness of his sins and [it] rests on that alone . . .” (*chapter 9*)

False: “no one . . . is justified, except him who believes with certainty that he is absolved and justified, and . . . by this faith alone are absolution and justification effected . . .” (*chapter 9*)

False: “justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins . . . it is this confidence alone by which we are justified . . .” (*canon 12*)

False: “it is necessary for every man in order to obtain the remission of sins to believe for certain and without any hesitation due to his own weakness and indisposition that his sins are forgiven him . . .” (*canon 13*)

False: “man is . . . justified, because he believes for certain that he is absolved and justified . . .” (*canon 14*)

False: “no one is truly justified but he who believes himself justified . . .” (*canon 14*)

False: “by this faith alone absolution and justification are perfected . . .” (*canon 14*)

*against imputed righteousness*

False: “men are justified without the justice of Christ by which He merited for us . . .” (*canon 10*)

False: “by that justice itself [the justice of Christ by which He merited for us] they are formally just . . .” (*canon 10*)

“. . . men are [not] justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of grace and charity, which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Spirit and remains in them . . . the grace by which we are justified is [not] only the favor of God . . .” (*canon 11*)

“. . . when we are endowed with it by him [“the justice . . . by which he makes us just,” *chapter 7*], we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and not only are we reputed, but we are truly called and are just, receiving justice within us . . .” (*chapter 7*)

*faith and love*

Justification takes place when ““God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us” (Rom 5:5) and inheres in them. Hence man . . . receives in the said justification together with the remission of sins all these infused at the same time: faith, hope, and charity. For faith, unless hope and charity be added to it, neither unites one perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of his body. [James 2:17, “Faith without works is dead”; Gal 5:6, “the only thing that counts is faith working through love.”] . . . without hope and charity faith cannot bestow [eternal life].” (Matt 19:17, “If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments.”) (*chapter 7*)

*faith and works*

“. . . the commandments of God are [not, even for the] justified impossible to observe . . .” (*canon 18*)

“. . . the commandments of God are [not] impossible to observe for a man who is justified. “For God does not command impossibilities, but by commanding admonishes you both to do what you can do, and to pray for what you cannot do, and assists you that you may be able” [Augustine, *De natura et gratia* 43.50]. . .” (*chapter 11*)

False: “the commandments of God are even for a man who is justified and confirmed in grace impossible to observe . . .” (*canon 18*)

“a man who is justified [is] bound to observe the commandments of God and the Church [and not] only to believe . . . the Gospel [is not] a mere absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observation of the commandments . . .” (*canon 20*)

“. . . no one, however much justified, should consider himself exempt from the observance of the commandments . . .” (*chapter 11*)

“. . . men however holy and just fall at times into at least light and daily sins, which are also called venial . . . they do not for that reason cease to be just. For that word of the just, “Forgive us our trespasses,” is both humble and true.” (*chapter 11*)

False: “the just man sins at least venially in every good work, or (what is more intolerable) . . . he merits eternal punishments . . .” (This is “severe wounding.”) (*chapter 11*)

False: “in every good work the just one sins at least venially, or (what is more intolerable) mortally, and therefore deserves eternal punishments, and . . . it is only because God does not impute those works unto damnation that he is not damned . . .” (*canon 25*)

False: “the just sin in all works, if in those works . . . they have in view also the eternal reward . . .” (*chapter 11*)

False: “the one justified sins, when he performs good works with a view to an eternal reward . . .” (*canon 31*)

False: “Jesus has been given by God to men as a Redeemer in whom they should trust, and not also as a legislator, whom they should obey . . .” (*canon 21*)

False: “the just ought not to expect and hope for an eternal recompense from God and the merit of Jesus Christ for the good works which have been performed [if] they persevere even to the end . . .” (*canon 26*)

*the meaning of* “*justification by faith*”

Paul “says that man is justified “by faith” . . . because “faith is the beginning of human salvation,” the foundation and root of all justification . . .” (*chapter 8*)

We are “said to be justified gratuitously [Rom 3:24], because none of those things which precede justification, whether faith or works, merit the grace itself of justification . . .” (*chapter 8*)

*degrees of justification*

We receive “justice within us, each one according to his own measure, which the “Holy Spirit distributes to everyone as he wills,” and according to each one’s own disposition and cooperation.” (*chapter 7*)

That “our inner nature is being renewed day by day” (2 Cor 4:16) is said of the justified. (*chapter 10*)

“. . . they increase and are further justified . . .” (*chapter 10*)

“. . . the good works of the man justified are in such a way the gifts of God that they are . . . also the good merits of him who is justified . . .” (*canon 24*)

“. . . the one justified by the good works which are done by him through the grace of God [does] truly merit increase of grace, . . . eternal life (if he should die in grace), and also an increase of glory . . .” (*canon 24*)

False: “justice received is not preserved and also not increased in the sight of God through good works . . .” (*canon 24*)

False: works done in grace “are only the fruits and signs of justification received, but not a cause of its increase . . .” (*canon 32*)

*on certainty of salvation*

“. . . every one, when he considers himself and his own weakness and indisposition, may entertain fear and apprehension as to his own grace, since no one can know with the certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God.” (*chapter 9*)

No one should “decide for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestined, as if it were true that he who is justified . . . cannot sin any more . . . For except by special revelation, it cannot be known whom God has chosen for Himself.” (*chapter 12*)

The “justified is [not] bound by faith to believe that he is assuredly in the number of the predestined . . .” (*canon 15*)

“If anyone shall say that he will for certain with an absolute and infallible certainty have that great gift of perseverance up to the end, unless he shall have learned this by a special revelation: anathema sit.” (*canon 16*)

False: “a man once justified can sin no more, nor lose grace . . . therefore he who falls and sins was never truly justified . . .” (*canon 23*)

“. . . throughout his whole life [the justified cannot] avoid all sins even venial sins, except by a special privilege of God, as the Church holds in regard to the Blessed Virgin . . .” (*canon 23*)

*the gift of perseverance*

“. . . the gift of perseverance . . . cannot be obtained from anyone except [God] . . .” (*chapter 13*)

“. . . let no one promise himself anything as certain with absolute certitude, although all ought to place and repose a very firm hope in God’s help. . . . [We] are born again “unto the hope of glory,” and not as yet unto glory . . .” (*chapter 13*)

No one should “say that he will for certain with an absolute and infallible certainty have that great gift of perseverance up to the end, unless he shall have learned this by a special revelation . . .” (*canon 16*)

False: the justified can “persevere in the justice received without the special assistance of God . . .” (*canon 22*)

The justified can “persevere in the justice received with . . . the special assistance of God . . .” (*canon 22*)

*the fallen and their restoration*

“. . . he who has fallen after baptism can . . . by the grace of God rise again . . .” (*canon 29*)

“Those who by sin have fallen away from the received grace of justification, will again be able to be justified when, roused by God through the sacrament of penance, they by the merit of Christ shall have attended to the recovery of the grace lost.” (*chapter 14*)

“. . . Jesus instituted the sacrament of penance, when 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].” (Cf. Matt 16:19, 18:18.) (*chapter 14*)

“. . . the repentance of a Christian after his fall is very different from that at his baptism . . . it includes not only a cessation from sins, and a detestation of them, or “a contrite and humble heart” [Ps 51:17], but also the sacramental confession of the same, at least in desire and to be made in its season, and sacerdotal absolution, as well as satisfaction by fasting, almsgiving, prayers, and other devout exercises of the spiritual life, not indeed for the eternal punishment, which is remitted together with the guilt either by the sacrament or the desire of the sacrament, but for the temporal punishment, which . . . is not always wholly remitted, as is done in baptism . . .” (Matt 3:2, 4:17, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near.” Matt 3:8, “Bear fruit worthy of repentance.” 2 Cor 7:10, “godly grief produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret, but worldly grief produces death.” Rev 2:5, “Remember then from what you have fallen; repent, and do the works you did at first. If not, I will come to you and remove your lampstand from its place, unless you repent.”) (*chapter 14*)

“. . . he who has fallen after baptism . . . [cannot] recover lost justice . . . by faith alone without the sacrament of penance . . .” (*canon 29*)

False: after justification “to every penitent sinner the guilt is so remitted and the penalty of eternal punishment so blotted out that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be discharged either in this world or in the world to come in purgatory . . .” (*canon 30*)

*grace is lost by every mortal sin*

“By every mortal sin grace is lost, but not faith.” (*chapter 15*)

False: “together with the loss of grace by sin faith also is always lost . . .” (*canon 28*)

Justification “is lost not only by infidelity, whereby even faith itself is lost, but also by any other mortal sin, although faith be not lost . . .” (*chapter 15*)

False: “there is no mortal sin except that of infidelity, or . . . grace once received is not lost by any other sin [but] infidelity . . .” (*canon 27*)

False: “with the loss of grace by sin . . . the faith that remains is not a true faith, though it be not a living one . . .” (*canon 28*)

False: “he who has faith without charity is not a Christian . . .” (*canon 28*)

“. . . the divine law . . . excludes from the kingdom of God not only the unbelievers, but also the faithful who are [“Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers—none of these will inherit the kingdom of God,” 1 Cor 6:9-11] and all others who commit deadly sins, from which with the assistance of divine grace they can refrain and for which they are separated from the grace of God.” (*chapter 15*)

*merit*

“The fruit of justification [is] the merit of good works . . .” (*chapter 16*)

“. . . life eternal [is] a grace mercifully promised to the sons of God [and] a recompense which is according to the promise of God Himself to be faithfully given to their good works and merits.” (*chapter 16*)

“. . . the good works of the man justified are in such a way the gifts of God that they are . . . also the good merits of him who is justified . . .” (*canon 32*)

Christ’s “goodness towards all men is so great that He wishes the things which are His gifts to be their own merits.” (*chapter 16*)

Christ “continually infuses His virtue into the said justified, a virtue which always precedes their good works, and which accompanies and follows them, and without which they could in no wise be pleasing and meritorious before God . . .” (*chapter 16*)

“. . . to those justified nothing more is wanting from being considered as having satisfied the divine law by those works which have been done in God according to the state of this life, and as having truly merited eternal life to be obtained in its own time (if they shall have departed this life in grace) . . .” (*chapter 16*)

“. . . whereas “in many things we all offend” [James 3:2], each one should have before his eyes the severity and judgment as well as mercy and goodness . . .” (*chapter 16*)

“. . . the one justified by the good works, which are done by him through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ (whose living member he is), does . . . truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life (if he should die in grace), and also an increase of glory . . .” (*canon 32*)

*conclusion*

“. . . this Catholic doctrine of justification . . . unless he faithfully and firmly accepts it, no one can be justified . . .” (*chapter 16*)

## Trent, *Decree on Justification*, Chapter 6 Sentence 1

“Now they are disposed to that justice when, aroused and assisted by divine grace, receiving faith “by hearing,” they are freely moved toward God, believing that to be true which has been divinely revealed and promised, and this especially, that the sinner is justified by God through his grace, “through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus,” and when knowing that they are sinners, turning themselves away from the fear of divine justice, by which they are profitably aroused, to a consideration of the mercy of God, they are raised to hope, trusting that God will be merciful to them for the sake of Christ, and they begin to love him as the source of all justice and are therefore moved against sins by a certain hatred and detestation, that is, by that repentance, which must be performed before baptism; and finally when they resolve to receive baptism, to begin a new life and to keep the commandments of God.”

Now they are disposed to that justice

when,

aroused and assisted by divine grace,

receiving faith “by hearing,”

they are freely moved toward God,

believing that to be true which has been divinely revealed and promised,

and [believing] this especially, that the sinner is justified by God through his grace, “through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus,”

and when

knowing that they are sinners,

turning themselves away from the fear of divine justice, by which they are profitably aroused, to a consideration of the mercy of God,

they are raised to hope,

trusting that God will be merciful to them for the sake of Christ,

and they begin to love him as the source of all justice

and are therefore moved against sins by a certain hatred and detestation, that is, by that repentance, which must be performed before baptism;

and finally when they resolve to receive baptism, to begin a new life and to keep the commandments of God.

“. . . they are disposed to . . . justice

when . . . they are freely moved toward God,

believing that to be true which has been divinely revealed and promised . . .,

and when . . . they are raised to hope . . .,

and they begin to love him . . . and are therefore moved [by] repentance, . . .

and finally when they resolve to receive baptism . . .”

Compare *Canons on Justification*, canon 3: it is false “that without [grace] man can believe, hope, and love or be repentant, as he ought . . .”

## Trent on Justification as Mere Non-Imputation of Sins

1. **introduction**
   1. Trent “did not at any time assign the teachings it was condem­ning to a particular Reformer. If it had done that, then what was condemned would have been only the meaning contained in the wording of particular statements, and not the entire teachings of the authors involved as they appear in context.” (Schmaus 64)
2. **justification** = **nonimputation** + **transformation**
   1. “Late medieval theologians had defined a true Christian as someone who, besides having faith, was in some sense becoming better. As they put it, this was someone whose faith had been “formed by love” and, in particular, by love for God. They were describing a process of sanctification that occurred within the church through the infusion of grace by the sacraments, chiefly the Mass [and] confession . . .” (Kittelson 120)
   2. “. . . the Reformers seem to have been too easily satisfied with a *negative opposition to Pela­gianism*; they are very concerned to show that sin is present everywhere, within the process of justification and even of sanc­tification.” (Moeller and Philips 53)
   3. “Catholicism on the other hand, answered Pela­gianism in *both a positive and a negative way*; negatively, by asserting . . . that the whole pro­cess of justifica­tion, beginning, middle and end, is brought about through the initiative of God; positively, by taking over all the ‘Greek’ propositions concerning deification and indwell­ing.” (Moeller and Philips 53)
   4. “The idea of nonimputation of sin is an element of justification referred to in Scripture, but it does not constitute the whole of justification. The Council of Trent declared that the doctrine of simple nonimputation is insufficient. [58] . . . justification is not merely a matter of covering over or of not imputing sin, but rather a true remitting of sin. [60] . . . [Trent explicitly denied] that man is justified only through the imputation of righteousness of Jesus Christ (DS 1561).” [64] (Schmaus 58, 60, 64)
   5. “The council’s definition implies that the man justified by God is declared just (DS 1528), but that this declaration at the same time creates the state of justification. God’s declaration is not a result of the preceding justifica­tion, but rather its foundation. According to the council, justification is initiated by a sovereign act of God in which God sits in judgment on the sinner. Since a sovereign act of God is in question, one cannot ascribe to it mere juridical significance, as if it were the act of an earthly court. On the contrary, it effects what it says; the effect is produced precisely through the sovereign act of God.” (Schmaus 64)
3. **Tridentine teachings**
   1. “According to the council’s teaching, the captivity by sin, the state of sinfulness clinging to man, the alienation from God—to be understood in a metaphysical rather than a psychological sense—is overcome by God himself. Reformation theology does not refer to this dimension, although its statements about the forgiveness of sin do keep in view the relation of God to men.” (Schmaus 59)
      1. “In the decree on original sin (DS 1514ff.) it [Trent] declared that in baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, that through baptism everything is taken away which the real and proper nature of sin would entail. God does not hate anything in those who are reborn, for nothing deserving of condemnation remains in those who have really died and are buried with Christ through baptism; those who do not live according to the flesh, but have put off the old man and put on the new, created according to the image of God.” (Schmaus 60)
   2. “. . . with the third official draft of the council decree on this subject [justification] from November 1546 the council used the Aristotelian terminology of causes in order to protect its teaching from misunderstanding . . . The failure to establish a precise distinction between formal and efficient cause had led to much confusion in ecumenical dialogue. The primary reason may be—to stress the point we have made before—that the Council of Trent dealt with the question on a metaphysical level, whereas Reformation theology approached it on the existential level. [71] . . . If Aristotelian philosophy is regarded as an unsuitable instrument for theology, then the doctrine of formal cause is inaccessible.” (Schmaus 71-72)
   3. “With regard to efficient causality, there is no difference between the teaching of the Coun­cil of Trent and Luther’s doctrine of justification and rebirth. The difference lies in the area of formal cause—not that Luther has a different thesis from the Council’s, but that he has no thesis at all on the subject.” (Schmaus 72) But see Newman (23 n. 1): Luther “calls faith *formalis justitia* [*In Gal*. 2.16 (f. 308), see f. 334].” (Newman 23 n. 1)

# Doctrines of Grace in the Modern Period

## Human Freedom and Grace:

## “The Unity of the Divine and the Human Action”

(Schmaus 36)

1. **Grace does not eliminate freedom**.
   1. Because the sinner retains freedom, “He is not simply forced by grace—that is, by the fact that God has turned towards him . . . If he decides for him, he is then prepared for lasting and enduring peace with God. This preparation is at once an act of God and an act of man. God does not effect it alone.” (Schmaus 22)
   2. The Reformers’ formula *sola* *gratia* accurately expresses that the initiative is God’s. But it fails to state “that God’s initiative only reaches its goal, is only intended to reach its goal, if man allows himself to be grasped by God’s grace. One might try to express this state of affairs with the formula “God and man.” But . . . God and man are [not] equal partners. God and man do not join forces like two members of a work team. The fact of the matter is that the process involved eludes any concise formulation which will not be subject to misunderstanding.” (Schmaus 22)
2. **efficacious grace and sufficient grace**
   1. “Every grace-giving act of God is of its nature efficacious; every one produces an effect of some kind—for example, preconscious acts of knowing and willing, definite inclinations and emotional reactions. If the salvific act on man’s part belonging to the goal envisioned by God actually takes place under the influence of grace, in modern theology this grace is called efficacious grace (*gratia* *efficax*) in the strict sense. If the act does not take place, the grace involved is called inefficacious grace (*gratia* *inefficax*) or sufficient grace (*gratia* *sufficiens*)*.* The prob­lem is: How does “efficacious” grace in the strict sense differ from “inefficacious” grace; or, how does efficacious grace differ from merely “sufficient” grace? If grace achieves the goal envisioned by God, does the reason for this lie with God or with man? The question can also be formulated in this way: How is the relationship between the efficacy of God’s gift of grace and the free decision of man to be explained?” (Schmaus 36)
   2. scripture on efficacious grace
      1. Scripture “testifies to instances in which the interest God takes in man does not achieve its intended result owing to human obstinacy (cf. Mt. 11,21-24; 23,37; Jn. 8,21-59; 9,25-41; 5,30). It is only in this sense that the countless warnings in the Acts of the Apostles which charge men with grave responsibility with respect to grace are to be understood. One who does not use grace for his salvation possesses it to his ruin (Rom. 2,4-11; 2 Cor. 6,1; cf. Acts 7,51). The greater the grace, the greater the responsibility and thus the guilt of the man who refuses it (Jn. 15,22-25; cf. Mt. 26,24).” (Schmaus 37)
      2. Scripture “also bears witness to the victorious power of grace (Jn. 10,24-29; 15,­16). Those of us who believe in Christ are “God’s handiwork, created in Christ Jesus to devote ourselves to the good deeds for which God has designed us” (Eph. 2,9). Paul pays tribute to the grace which has made him the apostle he is, describing the interaction of the power of divine grace and his own free decision in a dialectical formulation: “However, by God’s grace I am what I am, nor has his grace been given to me in vain; on the contrary, in my labors I have outdone them all—not I, indeed, but the grace of God working in me” (1 Cor. l,9f).” (Schmaus 37)
      3. “Wherever Scripture speaks of the victorious power of grace it [37] also testifies to the freedom of man. However, it makes no attempt to integrate the two factors. For it salvation is at once gift and task. Salvation does not depend upon one’s own will, but on the mercy of God (Rom. 9,16), and yet men must run like the competitors in a race (1 Cor. 9 24-27; see 1 Cor. 15,9f.). The salvific act of a man is brought about by God. Nonetheless, it is up to the man moved by God to per­form his act by his own free decision. Paul writes to the Philippians (Phil. 2,12f.): “So you too, my friends, must be obedient, as always; even more now that I am away, than when I was with you. You must work out your own salvation in fear and trembling; for it is God who works in you, inspiring both the will and the deed, for his own chosen purpose.”” (Schmaus 37-38)
   3. Trent
      1. Trent, canon 4 on justification (DS 1554): “If anyone says that the free will of man, moved and awakened by God, in no way cooperates with the awakening call of God by an assent by which man disposes and prepares himself to get the grace of jus­tification; and that man cannot dissent, if he wishes, but, like an object without life, he does nothing at all and is merely passive: let him be anathema.” (Schmaus 37)
      2. “The differences in the way graces function can be expressed accordingly: There are graces which, though truly grace, are only sufficient, and there are graces which are efficacious. The latter do not rob man of his freedom.” (Schmaus 37)
      3. “Even though God produces the act of man in question, this should not be conceived of in a mech­anistic way. Rather, the activity of God corresponds to his own nature and that of man. God lays claim to the spirit of man in such a way that it becomes active of itself. God’s influence on man does not mean the suppression, but rather the eliciting, of human activity. The more God acts in a man, all the more does that man himself act.” (Schmaus 38)
      4. “The Council of Trent emphasizes, it is true, that man, even though he has not com­pletely lost his freedom through sin, still is not in a position to undertake on his own account and without grace a saving movement towards God. On the other hand, however, it declares with Scripture that man stirred by grace moves himself. He is not at the mercy of the grace, propelled like a stone which has been kicked. Still, the free self-movement of man is not to be understood as though grace only supplied the initial impetus by which a man shifted from the state of rest to that of activity and accomplishment. Rather, grace effects the entire course of the human act, which nonetheless remains a free human act. In order to get a proper perspective on this mysterious dialectic it should be remembered that the freedom of man is always a created freedom; that is, a freedom dependent on the omnipotence of God, limited by it and produced by it. The antinomy constituted by the two poles of this relationship cannot be resolved through a pantheistic mingling of God and man or by exaggerating God’s omnipotence into the principle that God alone acts. The grace producing human activity has a double function: it enables man to make a free decision and at the same time it orders that decision to God.” (Schmaus 38)
      5. “In opposition to the notion which emerged in the period of the Reformation that man under the influence of grace is not an acting *I* (a personal centre of activity) but a compelled *it* (a lifeless object), the Church taught that man remains free even under the influence of efficacious grace (DS 1521, 1555; cf. DS 2002f.). However, the church did not deal with the question of how the divine and human activity, the divine and human freedom, are so integrated that one unified action takes place. If, employing scholastic terminology, it is said that God acts as the first cause (*causa* *principalis*) and man acts as the second cause (*causa* *secunda*)*,* then some indication is given of the way in which God acts and man acts. But the unity and integrity of the salvific act produced by God and by man is not disclosed.” (Schmaus 39)
   4. Thomism (and Augustinianism), Molinism (and congruism), and syncretism
      1. Several schools of thoughts concerning grace developed within Catholicism after Trent.
         1. Two arose in the 1500s.
            1. *Thomism* (largely a Dominican school) grew out of the Thomistic revival in the 1500s, whose leaders were Thommaso Cajetan, Francisco de Vittoria, Dominique Soto, Bartolomé de Medina, and (chief theorist on grace) Domingo Bañez († 1604). (Eberhardt 2: 235)
            2. *Molinism* (largely a Jesuit school) had precursors in the Jesuits Francisco Toletano and Pedro de Fonseca but is named after Luis de Molina († 1600—not to be confused with Miguel de Molinos, founder in 1675 of the heresy of quietism). (Eberhardt 2: 235-236)

Even before 1548 Ignatius Loyola wrote to the Jesuits, “‘We ought not to speak nor to insist on the doctrine of grace so strongly as to give rise to that poisonous theory that takes away free-will. Therefore we may treat of faith and grace . . ., but not in such a way, especially in these dangerous times, that works or free-will receive any detriment or come to be accounted for nothing.’” [*Exercitia Spiritualia*: Regulae aliquot servandae ut cum orthodoxa Ecclesia sentiamus, regula 17a] With such marching orders in their ears it is not surprising that the writers and masters of the Society of Jesus should have been among the foremost opponents of the necessitarian theology which was creeping like a plague over Europe.” (Broderick 4)

* + - 1. Two other schools arose in the 1600s as refinements, respectively, of the first two; they were further polished in the 1700s.
         1. *Augustinianism* (as a school of thought on grace) was developed by the Aug­ustinians Heinrich Noris and Laurentius Berti. (Ott 248)
         2. *Congruism* was developed by the Jesuits Gabriel Vásquez, Francisco Suarez, Rob­ert Bellarmine, the Jesuit General Claudius Aquaviva, and, later, by Leonard Lessius. (Eberhardt 2: 237)
      2. Fifthly, *syncretism* was developed by theologians at the Sorbonne and by Alphonsus Liguori as “a middle path between the above-named systems.” (Ott 249) It is supported by the Redemptorists. (Schmaus 41)
    1. “In theology after the Council of Trent this question [how the divine and human free wills “are so integrated that one unified action takes place,” 39] was posed and was answered in terms of the *a* *priori* principles of the different schools . . . (grace dispute: 1582-1601) [39] . . . Both the Thomists and the Molinists call upon Scripture, the doctrinal decrees of the Church, and theological tradition.” (Schmaus 39-40) “The great theological controversy going on since the end of the 16th century on the relation of efficacious grace to the freedom of the will revolves round the question: How does efficacious grace secure salvation with infallible certainty for the person who receives it? Does this efficacy lie in the grace itself or in the free assent of the human will foreseen by God, i. e., is the grace efficacious by its intrinsic power [or] by the free assent of the will . . .? Is efficacious grace intrinsically different from sufficient grace or only extrinsically different by reason of the free assent of the will?” (Ott 248)
    2. the Thomist-Molinist clash
       1. “Origins. The first rumblings of storm are seen in 1581 when Bannez objected to certain theses on grace proposed by the Jesuit theologian, Prudencio de Montemayor. In 1587 the Baianist clique, apparently in revenge, condemned certain propositions drawn from Jesuit theologians who had opposed their own opinions. These accusations were answered by Lessius until the papal nuncio commanded silence in 1588. But in the same year Molina’s *Concordia* was published at Coimbra University. Bannez prevailed on the Spanish viceroy, Archduke Albert, to ban the sale of the book but Molina obtained sanction from the Portuguese Inquisition to republish the work in 1589. “It denies efficacious grace,” objected Thomists. “It does not; you preach determinism,” retorted Molinists. Charges and countercharges mounted to a crescendo of anathemas against “Pelagianism” and “Calvinism” respectively. In 1594 the peace was so disturbed by public debates, that the papal nuncio at Madrid referred the affair to Rome.” (Eberhardt 2: 240)
       2. “Papal nondecision. Papal commissions were named to investigate the dispute, but their findings were challenged. Pope Clement VIII formed a new *Congregatio de Auxiliis* which occupied itself with the case from 1598 to 1607. After two months of inquiry, however, the congregation, under the lead of Cardinals Madrucci and Arrigone, recommended condemnation of the *Concordia.* But the pope ordered more leisurely consideration. When a similar recommendation was submitted six months later, the pope summoned the Dominican and Jesuit generals to name defenders. The debate resumed with the Jesuit theologians Gregorio de Valencia, Pedro de Arrubal, Fernando de Bastida, and Juan de Sales sustaining the prosecution by the Dominicans, Diego Alvarez and Tomas de Lemos. By 1601 the majority vote of the congregation once again pronounced in favor of condemnation of Molinism, but Clement VIII denied his approbation. Debate recommenced, reaching its climax on November 30, 1602, when Valencia collapsed in the course of argument. Still refusing to accept a technical knockout, the pope began to referee the debates personally. These went on for three more years until the patient pontiff died. Pope Paul V also heard seventeen more debates within two years, and then decided that not even Spanish theologians could have anything more to say. On August 28, 1607, he suspended the congregation *sine die,* and announced that a decision would be rendered at the proper time. To date the “proper time” has not arrived, though, shorn of its animosity, the debate occasionally rumbles on in the lecture halls. For a time, however, the decree of silence (1611) imposed on disputes about grace complicated the detection of the next heresy regarding the supernatural principles, Jansenism.” (Eberhardt 2: 240)
    3. Thomism
       1. “The Thomists see grace as a motion proceeding from God and communicated to the human person in the form of a flowing—that is, quickly arising and quickly passing—vital power (quality). In thus moving the spirit of man, God also causes the potentialities of human nature to radiate his own glory and power. This continues only as long as God is effectively present to man in actual grace: hence Uncreated and created grace can never be separated.” (Schmaus 10)
       2. God “has predetermined from all eternity that certain people shall be saved, and for the realisation of this bestows effective grace on these people.” (Ott 248)
       3. God “physically affects the free will [so] that they decide *freely* to co-operate with grace.” (Ott 248)
       4. “The Thomists explained that the distinction between effica­cious and sufficient grace resides in God himself.” (Schmaus 39)
       5. “Efficacious grace [is] intrinsically and substantially different from sufficient grace, which merely confers the power or potency to do a salutary act. In order that this potency may be translated into act, [efficacious grace] must appear.” (Ott 248)
          1. “Sufficient grace is merely a form of “supernatural” outfitting or equip­ping. [It transmits] supernaturally elevated powers . . . “Sufficient” grace fully deserves its name. It confers the complete capacity to act, but not the act.” (Schmaus 39)
          2. Efficacious grace “is efficacious of itself and as a result of its own inner con­sti­tution. It is actually and intrinsically distinct from inefficacious or merely sufficient grace. It is a move­ment proceeding from God which through its own inner power brings about the consent of a man’s will with infallible certainty. It leads the will to the intended action by taking hold of it and mov­ing it (physical movement). . . . Efficacious grace goes beyond the mere transmission of supernaturally elevated powers and proceeds from rest to act. The movement proceeding from God is set over the human de­ci­sion. The Thomists express this by the term *praemotio* *physica.* Since the movement or motion aims at a completely determined act it is also called the *praedeterminatio* *physica.* . . . The premotion of the will by God does not [39] cancel or diminish freedom. For God can move second causes to the acts proper to them in accordance with the nature of second causes. This “premotion” not only brings it about that the human will performs an act, but that it does so freely. God produces both the “that” and the “how” of the human act. How the will preserves its freedom under the influence of a divine premotion is something which we cannot understand. (The priority involved in the premotion is, of course, not temporal but metaphysical.)” (Schmaus 39-40)
          3. Sufficient grace is “very closely connected with efficacious grace. Efficacious grace always follows sufficient grace if the free will does not resist it.” (Schmaus 39)
       6. advantages and disadvantages of Thomism
          1. “The Thomistic teaching is entirely in consonance with the principle that God is the Prime Cause of all created activities, and that the creature, both in his being, and his action, is entirely dependent on God.” (Ott 248) “Thomism takes as its point of departure the omnipotence of God and clarifies the relationship resulting from the fact that God is God and the creature is a creature.” (Schmaus 40)
          2. “But the question as to how gratia sufficiens is truly sufficient, and how the freedom of the will is to be reconciled with gratia efficax give rise to serious difficulties in this system.” (Ott 248) “It may be said, however, that the Thomist system fails to preserve the con­cept of freedom of the will. It is forced, moreover, in its stress on the divine omnipotence, either to attribute sin to the divine causality or to except the sinful act from the divine omnipotence and thus contradict its basic position. Finally, sufficient grace as Thom­ism explains it is not [40] really suf­ficient.” (Schmaus 40-41)
    4. “Augustinianism is related to Thomism.” (Schmaus 40)
       1. Augustinianism “assumes, like Thomism, an efficacious grace [effective by its intrinsic power] . . . [But] this efficacious grace determines the will to perform the salutary act not by physical but by moral pressure, so that the will is led by an irresistible desire to perform freely those salutary acts which lead to salvation.” (Ott 248)
       2. “It substitutes a moral influence for the “physical” premotion of the Thomists. God awakens in man love and joy in the good.” (Schmaus 40)
       3. “Augustinianism seeks to preserve the freedom of the will, but conceives grace too one-sidedly as delectatio, and does not adequately explain the infallible success of efficacious grace, or the Divine prescience.” (Ott 248)
    5. Molinism
       1. “The Molinists identify it [grace] with [God’s influencing] the subconscious process of knowing and willing. The mysterious realm of the sub­con­scious is crucial for the rectitude and fruitfulness of conscious life, for it is here that the decisions preliminary to conscious decision take place. What is in question is the immanent life processes of human nature.” (Schmaus 10)
       2. God’s foreknowledge
          1. “God from all Eternity foresees the free assent of the will by reason of His Scientia Media.” (Ott 249)
          2. “God sees the result of efficacious grace with infallible certainty because he knows what every man will do in every possible dispensation of salvation, and thus he knows that a definite man in the present dispensation of salvation will on the basis of his inborn freedom give his consent to a definite grace.” (Schmaus 40)
       3. how sufficient and efficacious grace are distinguished
          1. “. . . there is no intrinsic substantial difference [248] . . . between sufficient and efficacious grace. God equips the faculty of will with sufficient grace for . . . acts leading to salvation.” (Ott 248-249)

“If the free will assents to the grace and with it accomplishes the salutary act, sufficient grace is, ipso facto, efficacious grace.” (Ott 249)

“If the free will refuses its assent the grace remains sufficient only.” (Ott 249)

* + - * 1. “According to Molinism, efficacious grace is not efficacious on account of its own inner power, but as the result of something extrinsic to grace itself; that is, as the result of the free consent of the will.” (Schmaus 40)
      1. “Even though the consent of the will is the reason that grace is efficacious, still the salvific act according to Molinism is the effect of grace and the will together—indeed, of grace first and then of the will, or of the will informed by grace. There is no need of any special impetus in order that the will informed by grace should proceed from the state of rest to that of action. The supernaturalized will provides its own motion as a result of the dynamic nature of grace itself.” (Schmaus 40)
      2. advantages and disadvantages of Molinism
         1. Molinism “upholds the freedom of the human will in the salutary act, but it seems to detract somewhat from the Divinity as Prima Causa.” (Ott 249) “. . . in trying to do justice to human freedom, [it] seems not to assign to the divine causality the im­portance which is its due.” (Schmaus 41)
         2. “The explanation of the infallible foreknowledge by God of the outcome of man’s free choice by Scientia Media and the consequent infallible efficacy of gratia efficax is very obscure in this system.” (Ott 249)
    1. congruism (“a further extension of Molinism,” Ott 249)
       1. Congruism “was prescribed as a doctrine of the [Jesuit] Order . . .” (Ott 249)
       2. God’s foreknowledge: “God, by Scientia Media, foresees the congruity of the grace and its infallible success.” (Ott 249)
       3. how sufficient and efficacious grace are distinguished
          1. “. . . the difference between efficacious and sufficient grace lies not only in the assent of the free will, but also in the congruity of the grace to the individual circumstances of the recipient. When the grace suits the individual inner and outer conditions of the man (gratia congrua), it becomes effective by the free assent of the will; if it does not (gratia incongrua), it remains, by lack of the free assent of the will, ineffective.” (Ott 249)
          2. “Congruism differs from strict Molinism in that it sees in efficacious grace a grace which is suited (congruous) to the circumstances of the receiver.” (Schmaus 40)
    2. syncretism
       1. how sufficient and efficacious grace are distinguished
          1. Syncretism “distinguishes two kinds of efficacious grace.” (Ott 249)

“With Molinism and Congruism it agrees that for the easier good works, especially prayer,” sufficient grace is made efficacious by the will’s consent. (Ott 249)

“With Thomism and Augustinianism, it requires for the performance of more difficult works, and for the conquering of more difficult temptations, [efficacious grace that is intrinsically effective] . . .” (Ott 249)

Intrinsically effective efficacious grace, however, “predetermines the free will, not physically, but (in the sense of Augustinianism) morally . . .” (Ott 249)

“Those who cooperate with an extrinsically effective grace, especially the grace of prayer, infallibly receive grace which is intrinsically effective since God has guaranteed that He will hear prayer.” (Ott 249)

* + - * 1. “According to Alphonsus Ligouri [*sic*], both sufficient and efficacious grace are ef­fi­cacious by their very nature. The one is *gratia fallibiliter efficax,* the other *gratia infallibiliter efficax.* Sufficient grace, efficacious from within on the basis of its own nature, produces primarily the easier salvific acts. Among these Alphonsus Ligouri reckons prayer. Thus, he assigns to prayer a key position in the dispensation of salvation. Prayer is not only a way to *gratia infallibiliter efficax,* but is itself the goal of grace.” (Schmaus 41)
      1. advantages and disadvantages of syncretism
         1. Syncretism “represents an attempt to unify the favourable elements in the two systems and omit the obscure factors.” (Schmaus 41)
         2. “The Syncretistic System unites in itself almost all the difficulties of the various systems of grace.” (Ott 249)
         3. “However, the thought that prayer plays an important rôle in the achieving of salvation is certainly correct.” (Ott 249)
    1. conclusions
       1. historical conclusion:
       2. speculative conclusion: “In passing judgment on the two chief schools or tendencies it must be admitted that both involve a legitimate theological point of departure. One cannot simply assign to Thomism a more theocentric, to Molinism a more anthropocentric, orientation. For human freedom is a revealed truth, and to clarify it and attest to it is a genuine theological concern. On the other hand, the omnipotent God is a God continually turned towards man. Theocentric and anthropocentric are inseparably bound together. The problem of grace and freedom represents a special case, a particularly acute form of that antinomy which lies at the root of created existence: the antinomy of complete dependence and created independence, and in particular of complete dependence and freedom. This antinomy is not surprising when we reflect that the whole of reality, including the triune life of God, is constituted of opposites. One may well view Thomism and Molinism as two attempts at understanding conformed to the dialectic of reality itself and demanded by it. Thomism takes as its starting point the revealed truth of God’s omnipotence and moves from there to human freedom, only to have the latter vanish in obscurity. Molinism executes the counter-movement. Ultimately we must have recourse to the unfathomable mystery of God himself. God is other than man. Thus he also acts differently from man. His activity is analogous—that is, similar—to that of the creature, but in a much greater measure it is unlike anything created. As a result we can form no image or concept of an act of God that would do it justice. Knowing about God flows into not knowing about God. In this insight thought finds, as T. Cajetan says, rest and peace.” (Schmaus 41)

1. **conclusion**: “Therefore we shall have that divine life in us provided that we will it. . . . There can be no question of his constraining us to live by his divine life in spite of ourselves, because to live by that life implies a communion of love, an exchange of love that can take place only freely. . . . Because God created us for this exchange of love, his attitude towards us, freely chosen by himself, is to be an appeal of love addressed to our free will . . . He created us to adhere to him freely; this adherence we can refuse, and he will respect our free will.” (Daujat 96-97)

## Jansenism

*Encyclopædia Britannica 1997 CD-ROM*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1997. (Articles on: “Arnauld, Antoine.” “Baius, Michael.” “Duvergier de Hauranne, Jean.” “France: History: France, 1490-1715: The Age of Louis XIV.” “Geulincx, Arnold.” “Innocent X.” “Innocent XI.” “Jansen, Cornelius Otto.” “Jansenism.” “Nicole, Pierre.” “Port-Royal.” “Quesnel, Pasquier.” “Roman Catholicism. Developments in France. Jansenism.”)

Baius, Michael, also spelled Bajus, also called Michel de Bay [1513-1589], theologian whose work powerfully influenced Cornelius Jansen, one of the fathers of Jansenism.

Baius was educated at the University of Louvain, where he studied philosophy and theology and held various university appointments. In about 1550, with the theologian Jan Hessels, he began to advance revolutionary doctrines of grace and justification based on a new, rigid, and pessimistic interpretation of the writings of St. Augustine. Baius’ numerous short treatises on theological subjects incurred censures by ecclesiastical authorities; in 1567, Pope Pius V condemned 79 statements from his works in the bull *Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus*. Baius submitted, but indiscreet utterances by him and his supporters led to a new condemnation in 1580 by Pope Gregory XIII. Baius, however, kept his professorship and became chancellor of Louvain in 1575.

The most distinctive features of Baius’ system, which are found also in some Protestant writers, concern the Fall of man. Baius held that the innocence of Adam and Eve was part of their nature, so that the first sin destroyed intrinsic principles of human nature. His principal works were published by the Maurists in Cologne in 1696, edited by G. Gerberon.

Jansen, Cornelius Otto [1585-1638], Flemish leader of the Roman Catholic re­form movement known as Jansenism. He wrote biblical commentaries and pamphlets against the Protestants. His major work was *Augustinus*, published by his friends in 1640. Although condemned by Pope Urban VIII in 1642, it was of critical importance in the Jansenist movement.

Education. Jansen entered the University of Louvain, in the Spanish Netherlands in 1602 to study theology. According to the custom adopted by the humanists of the Renaissance, Jansen Latinized his name to Cornelius Jansenius. His teacher, Jacques Janson, taught the doctrine of the theologian Michael Baius (Michel de Bay), who had died at Louvain in 1589. According to the latter, man is affected from his birth by the sin of Adam, his ancestor. His instincts lead him necessarily to evil. He can be saved only by the grace of Christ, accorded to a small number of the elect who have been chosen in advance and destined to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. This doctrine, inspired by certain writings of St. Augustine, attracted Jansen and another student who had come to study at Louvain, a Frenchman named Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, who was to become a leader of the Jansenist movement. The two young men became friends in Paris, where Jansen went in 1604. They decided to revive theology, which they believed the theologians of the Sorbonne had reduced to subtle and vain discussions among Scholastics. Jansen and Duvergier thought that it was necessary to render to God the homage owed by men and that the pride of the Renaissance savants had alienated Christians from the Jesus who loved the simple and the humble.

In 1611 Jansen followed Duvergier to the home of the latter’s parents, located in the outskirts of Bayonne. The bishop of the city entrusted to Jansen the direction of the episcopal college there from 1612 to 1614. For three years afterward the young Dutchman, with Duvergier, dedicated himself to the study of the writings of the early Church Fathers.

Return to Louvain: the *Augustinus*. In 1617 Jansen returned to Louvain, where he directed the college of Sainte-Pulchérie, created for Dutch students. A violent dispute had arisen at Louvain between the disciples of Baius and the Jesuits, who considered as dangerous the doctrines of this theologian, who had been condemned by Pope Pius V in 1567. Jansen then undertook a thorough study of the works of Augustine by which Baius had been inspired. He read them, he declared, 10 times consecutively. But he devoted himself most particularly to the texts drafted by Augustine to combat the doctrine of Pelagius, who had held that, in spite of the fault committed by Adam, man continues to be entirely free to do good and to obtain salvation by means of his own merits. Jansen then began his great work, the *Augustinus*. For him, the divine grace that alone can save man is not due at all to his good actions. It is, he claimed, a gratuitous gift by means of which Christ leads the elect to eternal life, but the multitude, “the mass of perdition,” is doomed to damnation. Thus, men are predestined to obtain grace or to suffer condemnation. In reality, Augustine had not envisaged the fate of human beings with such great rigour. He had even proclaimed the power of man’s free will at the time when he was engaged in the struggle against the Manichaeans. But Augustine had then been constrained to enclose the liberty of man within strict limits, in order to refute the affirmations of Pelagius, who had radically reduced the value of the divine grace obtained by Jesus on the cross.

Jansen was so fascinated by Augustine’s treatise against the Pelagians that he apparently lost sight of Augustine’s works against the Manichaeans.

Jansen also wrote commentaries on the evangelists and on the Old Testament—notably on the Pentateuch—as well as a “Discourse on the Reformation of the Inner Man.” He was likewise the author of pamphlets directed against the Protestants.

Last years. Having acquired the degree of doctor in theology at Louvain, Jansen became the rector of that university in 1635, and in 1636 he became bishop of Ypres. The Jesuit scholar René Rapin asserted in his book *Histoire du Jansénisme* (1861) that Jansen had obtained his mitre as a result of the personal intervention of the king of Spain, Philip IV. This sovereign had recognized him for having published a pamphlet entitled *Mars Gallicus*, in which he strongly criticized the policy of the French cardinal and prime minister, Richelieu, who had contracted an alliance with the Dutch Protestants against Spain. In 1638, a short time after his elevation to the episcopate, Jansen died of the plague. In 1640 his friends published at Louvain the work he had dedicated to St. Augustine, under the title *Augustinus Cornelii Jansenii, Episcopi, seu Doctrina Sancti Augustini de Humanae Naturae, Sanitate, Aegritudine, Medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses* (“The Augustine of Cornelius Jansen, Bishop, or On the Doctrines of St. Augustine Concerning Human Nature, Health, Grief, and Cure Against the Pelagians and Massilians”).

This book had cost its author 22 years of effort. In the epilogue Jansen declared: “I leave my work to the judgment of the Roman Church. . . . I retract all that she will decide that I ought to (must) retract.”

Condemnation of Jansen’s teachings. In a bull of 1642, Pope Urban VIII forbade the reading of the *Augustinus*, which had been published without the authorization of the Holy See and was based on the doctrine of Baïus, already condemned. Five propositions in the *Augustinus* were condemned by Pope Innocent X in 1653, and by his successor, Alexander VII. The bishops of France were required to make all of the priests, monks, and nuns sign a formulary conforming to the pontifical decisions. But Duvergier de Hauranne, who had become the abbé of Saint-Cyran, had taught the doctrine of Jansen to the nuns of the abbey of Port-Royal. This convent became a focus of resistance against the Jesuits, who, having obtained the pontifical decisions in their favour, intended to impose them. From that time, a conflict began between the Jesuits and Antoine Arnauld, a disciple of “Monsieur de Saint-Cyran” (Duvergier de Hauranne) who called himself an Augustinian. The Jesuits, however, called him a Jansenist. According to them, the doctrine of Arnauld was that of Jansen and not of St. Augustine. Blaise Pascal wrote *Les Provinciales* (“Provincial Letters”) in 1656 and 1657 to defend Antoine Arnauld. The latter was condemned by the Faculty of Theology at the Sorbonne.

Although Louis XIV was determined to eliminate the Jansenists as a threat to the unity of his kingdom, there was a temporary peace after Clement IX became pope in 1667, and the conflict ceased to be a major concern when the papacy and the French Roman Catholic church clashed on Gallicanism. But after the controversy between the papacy and the monarchy was settled, Louis XIV obtained from Clement XI in 1705 the bull *Vineam Domini*, which renewed the earlier condemnations. In 1709 Louis XIV ordered the dispersal of the nuns of Port-Royal into diverse convents, and he had the abbey destroyed in 1710. He then obtained in 1713 the bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, which condemned 101 propositions of Quesnel. The promulgation of *Unigenitus* as French law in 1730 finally caused the decline in strength of the Jansenist party.

In 1723 followers of Jansen’s views established an autonomous Jansenist church at Utrecht, Holland, which still existed in the late 20th century. Jansenism also spread to Italy, where in 1786 the Synod of Pistoia, which was later condemned, propounded extreme Jansenist doctrines. (M.M.E.)

Bibliography. Alexander Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-century France* (1977), is an introduction to Jansenist theology and philosophy. Marc Escholier, *Port-Royal: The Drama of the Jansenists* (1968), explains the relationship between Jansen and Saint-Cyran and discusses the theological theses supported in Jansen’s *Augustinus*.

Innocent X, original name Giovanni Battista Pamphili, or Giambattista Pamfili [1574-1655], pope from 1644 to 1655.

. . . In theological matters he intervened in the quarrel between the Jesuits and the Jansenists and in a bull of 1653 condemned five propositions concerning the nature of grace as interpreted by Bishop Cornelius Jansen, the founder of Jansenism. A century of controversy with the Jansenists ensued, which was particularly damaging to the French Church. . . .

Duvergier de Hauranne, Jean, Abbé de Saint-Cyran [1581-1643], French abbot of Saint-Cyran and a founder of the Jansenist movement. His opposition to Cardinal de Richelieu’s policies caused his imprisonment.

Duvergier studied theology at Louvain, Belg., then settled in Paris after taking holy orders. His friendship with Cornelius Otto Jansen, a young champion of Augustinianism, led him to oppose the Louvain Jesuits who stood for Scholasticism. The two studied together from 1611 to 1616, after which Jansen returned to Louvain (1617), and Duvergier became confidential secretary to the bishop of Poitiers, where he met Cardinal de Richelieu. He was ordained priest in 1618 and was made sinecure abbot of Saint-Cyran (1620); thereafter, he was generally called Saint-Cyran.

As western Touraine was the headquarters of French Protestantism, Duvergier aimed his learning against the Huguenots. He dreamed of reforming Roman Catholicism on Augustinian lines. His zeal soon forced him out of Paris, where his attempt to gain the support of influential people led to his friendship with the Arnauld family, leading proponents of Jansenism. In 1637 he established a community that became known as the Solitaires (hermits) in the former convent at Port-Royal des Champs near Versailles.

Under the pseudonym of Petrus Aurelius, Duvergier attacked the Jesuits’ precarious utilitarianism and their defiance of episcopal authority. This work so annoyed Richelieu, whom he openly opposed, that Duvergier was imprisoned (May 14, 1638) in Vincennes until Richelieu’s death (1642).

Arnauld, Antoine, byname the Great Arnauld [1612-1694], leading 17th-century theologian of Jansenism, a Roman Catholic movement that held heretical doctrines on the nature of free will and predestination.

Arnauld was the youngest of the 10 surviving children of Antoine Arnauld, a Parisian lawyer, and Catherine Marion de Druy (see Arnauld family). He studied theology at the Sorbonne and, in 1641, was ordained into the Roman Catholic priesthood. Under the influence of the abbot of Saint-Cyran—a founder of Jansenism and spiritual adviser to several members of the Arnauld family—he published his treatise *De la fréquente communion* (1643; “On Frequent Communion”), defending controversial Jansenist views on the Eucharist and on penance. With his *Théologie morale des Jésuites* (1643; “Moral Theology of the Jesuits”), Arnauld launched his long polemical campaign against the Jesuits, in which Pierre Nicole, a young theologian from Chartres, was to be his collaborator. In 1655 Arnauld wrote two pamphlets in which he affirmed the substantial orthodoxy of Cornelius Otto Jansen (the Belgian theologian who initiated the movement). These works sparked a dispute that resulted in Arnauld’s expulsion from the Sorbonne in 1656. It was this controversy that provoked the French philosopher Blaise Pascal to write his defense of Arnauld in the series of letters known as *Les Provinciales* (1656-57). During the period of the great persecution of the Jansenists (1661-69), Arnauld emerged as a leader of the resistance.

The so-called Peace of Clement IX (1669) brought Arnauld some years of tranquillity, beginning with the gracious reception accorded to him by King Louis XIV, and he next turned to writing against the Calvinists and on subjects disputed between Protestants and Roman Catholics. He then won such fame as a theologian that Pope Innocent XI is said to have considered making him a cardinal.

In 1679, the persecution of Jansenists was renewed and Arnauld sought refuge first in the Netherlands and then in Belgium. He settled permanently in Brussels in 1682, where he was to remain in voluntary exile until his death. Despite the precarious conditions in which he had to work, the amount of Arnauld’s writing during his exile was enormous. He not only resumed his attack on the Jesuit casuists in the last six volumes of his *Morale pratique des Jésuistes* (1689-94; the first two had appeared in 1669 and 1682) but also intervened in the dispute over the rights of the French monarch in the Gallican church. The major written works of Arnauld’s later years were generated by his disagreements with the French philosopher and theologian Nicolas Malebranche and with Pierre Nicole, his ally in the earlier anti-Jesuit polemics.

Port-Royal, in full Port-Royal des Champs, celebrated abbey of Cistercian nuns that was the centre of Jansenism and of literary activity in 17th-century France. It was founded about 1204 as a Benedictine house by Mathilde de Garlande on a low, marshy site in the valley of Chevreuse, south of Versailles. Its church was built in 1230.

In 1609 the young abbess Jacqueline-Marie-Angélique Arnauld began a much-needed reform. In 1625-26, because of the unhealthy atmosphere of the site, Mère Angélique established her community in Paris, where new buildings were erected, including a Baroque church. In 1638 the deserted building was occupied by the Solitaires (hermits), pious laymen and secular priests who lived without vows or a definite rule under the spiritual guidance of Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, abbot of Saint-Cyran and a friend of Cornelius Jansen. Among the Solitaires were several members of the Arnauld family. The Solitaires began to teach a few boys and established the Petites Écoles (“Little Schools”), which provided a type of education that differed in important ways from that of the Jesuits. In 1648 a group of nuns returned to occupy the buildings, and the Solitaires moved to Les Granges on a neighbouring hillside. The Petites Écoles survived until 1660.

In 1665 most of the nuns of Port-Royal de Paris, having refused to sign the formulary condemning Jansen, were sent to Port-Royal des Champs, where they were confined and denied the sacraments. The Solitaires dispersed and went into exile or hiding. In 1669, however, a compromise was reached with Pope Clement IX, and a 10-year period of calm, called the Peace of the Church, prevailed. The houses of Paris and Les Champs were separated, the latter enjoying the protection of the Duchess de Longueville, a cousin of King Louis XIV. After her death in 1679, persecution was renewed, and the community was forbidden to receive novices. In 1705 the bull *Vineam Domini* of Pope Clement XI renewed measures against the Jansenists, and the remaining nuns refused to submit. The community was dispersed on Oct. 29, 1709, and the nuns were exiled to various other convents. Between 1710 and 1712 most of the buildings were destroyed, and corpses in the cemetery were exhumed and thrown into a common grave at nearby Saint-Lambert.

Port-Royal de Paris became a prison during the Revolution, and in the 19th century it became the Hôpital de la Maternité. Both the original chapter house and the original choir have been restored.

Nicole, Pierre [1625-1695], French theologian, author, moralist, and controversialist whose writings, chiefly polemical, supported the Roman Catholic reform movement known as Jansenism.

Educated in Paris, Nicole taught literature and philosophy at Port-Royal des Champs, a Cistercian abbey that was a stronghold of Jansenism. With the Jansenist leader Antoine Arnauld and others, he wrote several textbooks, among them *La Logique, ou L’art de Penser* (1662; Logic; or, The Art of Thinking). Nicole was an influential spokesman from 1655 to 1668 through his writing or editing of most of the Jansenist pamphlets. He was probably the source of the celebrated distinction between the two “questions of fact,” an adroit device allowing him to separate into two parts the charge of heresy often made against the Jansenists. The two questions were: Are Jansenist doctrines rightly called heretical? And did Jansen in fact teach these doctrines? By answering the first question affirmatively and the second negatively, Nicole enabled the Jansenists to pursue their program of criticism and reform without openly breaking with the Roman Catholic church.

From 1669 on, Nicole used his talents to defend Catholic dogma against Protestant criticism. A friend of the French philosopher Blaise Pascal, he used one of his numerous pseudonyms to translate into Latin Pascal’s *Provinciales* (“Provincial Letters”). Nicole’s best-known work is the *Essais de morale*, 4 vol. (1671; “Essays on Morality”), eventually enlarged to 14 volumes, in which he discussed the problems raised for ethics by human nature, which he found seldom capable of virtue.

Geulincx, Arnold, pseudonym Philaretus [1624-1669], Flemish metaphysician, logician, and leading exponent of a philosophical doctrine known as occasionalism based on the work of René Descartes, as extended to include a comprehensive ethical theory.

Geulincx studied philosophy and theology at the University of Louvain, where he became a professor in 1646. In 1658 he was dismissed, probably because of his sympathy with Jansenism, the Roman Catholic movement emphasizing man’s sinful nature and dependency on God’s grace for salvation. Taking refuge at Leiden, in Holland, he adopted the strict, Jansen-like theology of John Calvin. In September 1658 he became a medical doctor and, in the following year, was authorized to lecture privately in philosophy for a few months. He lived in poverty until 1662, when he obtained a lectureship in logic at the University of Leiden, where in 1665 he became professor extraordinary of philosophy and ethics.

Geulincx’s major works include *Quaestiones Quodlibeticae* (1653; “Miscellaneous Questions”), reedited by him at Leiden as Saturnalia (1665); *Logica* . . . *Restituta* (1662; “Logic Restated”); and the ethical dissertation *De Virtute* (1665; “On Virtute”). After his death, his pupil C. Bontekoe published, under Geulincx’s pseudonym, Philaretus, his six treatises on ethics, *Gnothi Seauton* (1675; “Know Thyself”). As Philaretus, Geulincx accepted the progression in Cartesian metaphysics from doubt to knowledge and from knowledge to God and affirmed the dominant role of the will in forming judgments. Geulincx, however, aimed to submit the will to the authority of reason. This “ethics of humility” reflects the author’s Jansenism and Calvinism. In his *Metaphysica Vera* (1691; “True Metaphysics”), he disappointed Cartesian expectations that a scientific mastery of matter, life, and mind will develop and instead emphasized man’s impotence before the transcendent Creator.

The inspiration for Geulincx’s attempt to complete Descartes’s system came primarily from the writings of St. Augustine. The opposition between the incomprehensible Deity and his creation also formed the basis for Geulincx’s doctrine of occasionalism: God uses the “occasion” of the body to produce various human attitudes. Though people may believe that they act unaided, God actually works within them to make their will effective.

Geulincx’s works have been collected as *Arnoldi Geulinex Antverpiensis Opera Philosophica*, 3 vol. (1891-93; “The Philosophical Works of Arnold Geulincx of Antwerp”).

Bibliography. J.P.N. Land, *Arnold Geulincx und seine Philosophie* (1895); M. Paulinus, *Die Sittenlehre Geulincx* (1892); E. Terraillon, *La Morale de Geulincx dans ses rapports avec la philosophie de Descartes* (1912); K. Nagel, *Das Substanzproblem bei Arnold Geulincx* (1930); P. Hausmann, *Das Freiheitsproblem in der Metaphysik und Ethik bei Arnold Geulincx* (1934).

Quesnel, Pasquier [1634-1719], controversial French theologian who led the Jansenists (followers of Bishop Cornelius Jansen’s heretical doctrines on predestination, free will, and grace) through the persecution by King Louis XIV of France until they were papally condemned.

Quesnel joined the French Oratory (a religious society of secular priests) in 1657 and was ordained in 1659. His Jansenist sympathies led to his banishment from Paris in 1681, and three years later he was expelled from the Oratory for refusing to accept the anti-Jansenist decrees it promulgated. He fled to Brussels where he lived with the exiled Antoine Arnauld, champion of the Jansenist resistance, until Arnauld’s death in 1694. In 1703 he was arrested but soon escaped to Amsterdam, where he finally settled.

Quesnel’s *Nouveau Testament en français avec des réflexions morales* (1692; “New Testament in French with Thoughts on Morality”) was a major contribution to the literature of Jansenism, but it caused serious repercussions. It rekindled doctrinal conflicts between the Jansenists and the papacy, which were further complicated by the intervention of Louis XIV. Pope Clement XI’s bull *Unigenitus* (1713)—prompted by Louis—condemned 101 sentences from the *Réflexions morales*, yet Quesnel never admitted that his opinions were heretical. Quesnel’s correspondence was edited by A. Le Roy (2 vol., 1900).

Roman Catholicism. Developments in France. Jansenism. . . . In 1640 there was published, posthumously, a book by the Dutch theologian Cornelius Jansen, entitled *Augustinus*, which was a defense of the theology of Augustine against the dominant theological trends of the time within Roman Catholicism. Its special target was the teachings and practices associated with the Jesuits. Jansen and his followers claimed that the theologians of the Counter-Reformation in their opposition to Luther and Calvin had erred in the other direction in their definition of the doctrine of grace; i.e., emphasizing human responsibility at the expense of the divine initiative and thus relapsing into the Pelagian heresy, against which Augustine had fought in the early 5th century. Over against this emphasis, Jansenism asserted the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, including the teaching that man cannot keep the commandments of God without a special gift of grace and that the converting grace of God is irresistible. Consistent with this anthropology was the rigoristic view on moral issues taken by Jansenism in its condemnation of the tendency, which it claimed to discern in Jesuit ethics, to find loopholes for evading the uncompromising demands of the divine law. When it was espoused in the *Lettres Provinciales* (“Provincial Letters”) of Blaise Pascal, a French philosopher, this campaign against Jesuit theology became a cause célèbre. The papacy struck out against Jansenism in 1653, when Innocent X issued his bull *Cum Occasione* (“With Occasion”), and again in 1713, when Clement XI promulgated his constitution *Unigenitus* (“Only-Begotten”).

Theologically, Jansenism represented the lingering conviction, even of those who refused to follow the Reformers, that the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church was Augustinian in form but not in content; morally, it bespoke the ineluctable suspicion of many devout Roman Catholics that the serious call of the Gospel to a devout and holy life was being compromised in the moral theology and penitential practice of the church. Though Jansenism was condemned, it did not remain without effect, and in the 19th and 20th centuries it contributed to an evangelical reawakening not only in France but throughout the church.

Quietism. Quietism . . . was, in many ways, yet another form of the Augustinian opposition to any recrudescence of the Pelagian idea that man’s religious activity can make God propitious to him. In Quietism this belief was associated with the development of a technique of prayer in which passive contemplation became the highest form of religious activity. . . . In the theology of François de Fénelon, a French archbishop and mystical writer, Quietism was combined with a scrupulous orthodoxy of doctrine to articulate the distinction between authentic Catholic mysticism and false spiritualism. . . . the Roman Catholicism that came out of the Counter-Reformation . . . con­demned Quietism.

France: History: France, 1490-1715: The Age if Louis XIV [1643-1715, known as “the Sun King”]: Louis’s religious policy. Lou­is was also on his guard against religious dissent. Like most of his contemporaries, he believed that toleration had no virtue and that unity in the state was extremely difficult to maintain where two or more churches were tolerated. Consequently, especially after 1678, Louis intensified the persecution of Protestants; churches were destroyed, certain professions were put out of reach of the Huguenots, and Protestant children were taken away from their parents and brought up as Roman Catholics. The notorious practice of dragonnades, the billeting of soldiers on Protestant families with permission to behave as brutally as they wished, was introduced. Finally, in 1685 the Edict of Nantes was revoked in order that Louis could claim that he had succeeded where Emperor Leopold I had failed—that is, in extirpating Protestantism from his realm.

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes angered Protestant Europe at a time when Louis’s European designs were beginning to meet serious resistance. The revocation deprived France of a number of gifted craftsmen, sailors, and soldiers. At least 600 officers, including Marshal Friedrich, Count von Schomberg, and Henri de Massue, Marquis de Ruvigny (later the Earl of Galway), joined William of Orange, the leader of the Grand Alliance against Louis. Research, however, has reversed the earlier view that the decay of French industry at the end of Louis’s reign was the direct result of the expulsion of Huguenot mercantile talent.

The same zeal for uniformity made Louis attack the Jansenists. The theological position of the Jansenists is difficult to define; but Louis, who was no theologian, was content with the simple fact that these zealous Catholics had taken up an unorthodox position that threatened the unity of the state. The movement had begun over the perennial issue of grace and free will as it was propounded in the *Augustinus* of Bishop Cornelius Otto Jansen, published in 1640. In 1653 Pope Innocent X condemned five propositions from Jansen’s doctrine, but the movement grew in strength with notable adherents, including Jean-François-Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, and the great mathematician Blaise Pascal. In 1705 Pope Clement XI published the bull *Vineam Domini*, which further condemned the writings of Jansen; but the archbishop of Paris, Louis-Antoine Cardinal de Noailles, appeared ready to lead the Jansenist forces in opposition to the pope. Under the influence of his confessor, Père Michel Le Tellier, Louis decided to ask the pope for another formal condemnation of the creed. Finally, in 1713, the famous bull *Unigenitus* was promulgated, which, far from ending Jansenism, drove it in the following reign into a disruptive alliance with Gallicanism. Louis’s real attitude in this situation is not entirely clear: certainly his policy was in keeping with his authoritarian insistence upon unity. He was suspicious of religious innovation, and his action was consistent with the increasingly orthodox and rigid mood of his last years. Yet, in seeking the pope’s support in this matter, he was reversing years of bitter hostility toward Rome when, like many of his predecessors, including Francis I and Henry IV, he had leaned heavily upon the traditional Gallican doctrine.

According to that doctrine, the French king possessed the right of temporal and spiritual regale—that is, the right to nominate new bishops and to administer and draw the revenue from bishoprics while they remained vacant. In 1673 Louis extended this right to the whole of the French kingdom, which had been enlarged in the recent War of Devolution (see below), despite papal opposition. Eventually, in 1682, the Gallican Articles were published as a law of the French state, asserting that the king was in no way subject to the pope in temporal matters and could not be excommunicated and reaffirming the independence of the French church from Rome. The mutual animosity of king and pope only ended in 1693, when, following William of Orange’s successful attempt to secure the English throne, Louis agreed to suspend the edict of 1682; but it was a suspension only, not a recantation. The tradition of Gallican independence remained.

Innocent XI, Blessed, original name Benedetto Odescalchi [1611-1689, beatified 1956; feast day August 13], pope from 1676 to 1689.

. . . He inherited an insolvent papal treasury but averted bankruptcy through wise taxation, rigid economizing, and financial support from Catholic powers. Innocent aided the war against the Turks by subsidizing King John III of Poland and the Holy Roman emperor Leopold I in a campaign that led to the relief of Vienna (1683) from the Turkish siege.

Innocent quarrelled with Louis [XIV, 1643-1715,] when two French bishops resisted the edict of 1673 that extended the king’s right to administer vacant sees. Louis then convoked a French synod, which issued the famous Gallican Articles, four statements in support of Gallicanism, a French ecclesiastical doctrine that advocated restriction of papal power. In response, Innocent refused to confirm the promotion of clergymen involved in the synod, and the deadlock worsened.

Realizing that Protestantism had to be tolerated to maintain peace, Innocent opposed Louis’s persecution of the Huguenots. In May 1685 he furthered the threat of a break between France and the Holy See by acting against the French embassy in Rome for extending political asylum in such an abusive way that the neighbourhood adjacent to the embassy became a haven for criminals. The situation deteriorated further when Innocent opposed Louis’s candidate for the archbishopric of Cologne (1688).

In doctrinal matters, Innocent sympathized somewhat with the Jansenists, followers of a nonorthodox ecclesiastical movement created by Bishop Cornelius Jansen of Ypres, which opposed Louis’s religious policies. Although a friend of Miguel de Molinos, the Spanish mystic and proponent of the doctrine of Christian perfection known as Quietism, Innocent allowed Molinos to be arrested by the papal police and tried for personal immorality and heresy. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, and Innocent condemned his propositions in 1687.

Innocent is considered the outstanding pope of the 17th century, largely because of his high moral character. In a time of frequent papal corruption he was free from nepotism and his integrity was unquestioned. Louis O’Brien’s *Innocent XI and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* was published in 1930.
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## Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification

DS: Denzinger, Henry, and A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Defini­tionum* *et* *Declara­tionum* *de* *rebus* *fidei* *et* *morum*. Freiburg im Breis­gau: Herder, 1953. (This is Schönmetzer’s revision of Denzinger’s *Enchiridion* *Sym­bolorum,* *De­fin­­i­tionum* *et* *Declara­tionum* *de* *rebus* *fidei* *et* *morum*.)

*JD*: Lutheran World Federation, The, and the Roman Catholic Church. *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000. (Original: *Gemeinsame Erklärung zur Rechtfertigungslehre*. Frankfurt am Main: Otto Lembeck [et al.], 1999.) (This work contains, in addition to the text of the *Joint Declaration*, two appendices, an *Official Common Statement* and an *Annex to the Official Common Statement*. Because each appendix enumerates paragraphs or sections afresh, the appendices are noted in in-text citations. All biblical quotations are nrsv.)

1. **Christ died for all**
   1. “All people are called by God to salvation in Christ.” (*JD* ¶ 16)
2. **justification as a central criterion**
   1. “The doctrine of justification was of central importance for the Lutheran Reformation of the sixteenth century. It was held to be the “first and chief article” . . . the “ruler and judge over all other Christian doctrines” . . .” (*JD* ¶ 1)
   2. Justification “is more than just one part of Christian doctrine. . . . It is an indispensable criterion that constantly serves to orient all the teaching and practice of our churches to Christ. When Lutherans emphasize the unique significance of this criterion, they do not deny the interrelation and significance of all truths of faith. When Catholics see themselves as bound by several criteria, they do not deny the special function of the message of justification.” (*JD* ¶ 18)
   3. “Catholics as well as Lutherans can acknowledge the need to test the practices, structures, and theologies of the church by the extent to which they help or hinder” justification by faith. (Anderson, Murphy, and Burgess 153)
   4. “The doctrine of justification is [the] measure or touchstone for the Christian faith. No teaching may contradict this criterion.” (*JD* *Annex* § 3)
3. “**justification by faith and through grace**” (*JD* § 4.3)
   1. “In faith we together hold the conviction that justification is the work of the triune God. The Father sent his Son into the world to save sinners. The foundation and presupposition of justification is the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Justification thus means that Christ himself is our righteousness, in which we share through the Holy Spirit in accord with the will of the Father.” (*JD* ¶ 15)
      1. 1 Cor 1:30, “He [God] is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, who became for us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption . . .”
   2. “Together we confess: By grace alone, in faith in Christ’s saving work and not because of any merit on our part, we are accepted by God and receive the Holy Spirit . . .” (*JD* ¶ 15)
   3. “We confess together that sinners are justified by faith in the saving action of God in Christ. By the action of the Holy Spirit in baptism, they are granted the gift of salvation, which lays the basis for the whole Christian life. They place their trust in God’s gracious promise by justifying faith, which includes hope in God and love for him. Such a faith is active in love, and thus the Christian cannot and should not remain without works. But whatever in the justified precedes or follows the free gift of faith is neither the basis of justification nor merits it.” (*JD* ¶ 25)
4. **grace and free will**
   1. “We confess together that all persons depend completely on the saving grace of God for their salvation. The freedom they possess in relation to persons and the things of this world is no freedom in relation to salvation, for as sinners they stand under God’s judgment and are incapable of turning by themselves to God to seek deliverance, of meriting their justification before God, or of attaining salvation by their own abilities. Justification takes place solely by God’s grace.” (*JD* ¶ 19)
   2. “When Catholics say that persons “cooperate” in preparing for and accepting justification by consenting to God’s justifying action, they see such personal consent as itself an effect of grace, not as an action arising from innate human abilities.” (*JD* ¶ 20)
   3. “According to Lutheran teaching, human beings are incapable of cooperating in their salvation because as sinners they actively oppose God and his saving action. Lutherans do not deny that a person can reject the working of grace. When they emphasize that a person can only receive (mere passive) justification, they mean thereby to exclude any possibility of contributing to one’s own justification, but do not deny that believers are fully involved personally in their faith, which is effected by God’s Word.” (*JD* ¶ 21)
5. ***simul justus et peccator***
   1. After justification “we would be wrong were we to say that we are without sin . . . To this extent, Lutherans and Catholics can together understand the Christian as *simul justus et peccator*, despite their different approaches to this subject . . .” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.A)
   2. “. . . the Holy Spirit unites one with Christ, justifies, and truly renews the person. But the justified . . . also are continuously exposed to the power of sin still pressing its attacks [Rom 6:12-14] and are not exempt from a lifelong struggle against the contradiction to God within the selfish desires of the old Adam [Gal 5:16; Rom 7:7-10]. The justified also must ask God daily for forgiveness, as in the Lord’s Prayer . . ., are ever again called to conversion and penance, and are ever again granted forgiveness.” (*JD* ¶ 28)
   3. “Lutherans understand this condition of the Christian as being “at the same time righteous and sinner.” Believers are totally righteous, in that God forgives their sins through Word and Sacrament and grants the righteousness of Christ, which they appropriate in faith. In Christ, they are made just before God. Looking at themselves through the law, however, they recognize that they remain also totally sinners. Sin still lives in them . . . Nevertheless, the enslaving power of sin is broken on the basis of the merit of Christ. It no longer is a sin that “rules” the Christian, for it is itself “ruled” by Christ with whom the justified are bound in faith. In this life, then, Christians can in part lead a just life. Despite sin, the Christian is no longer separated from God because in the daily return to baptism the person who has been born anew by baptism and the Holy Spirit has this sin forgiven. Thus this sin no longer brings damnation and eternal death. Thus, when Lutherans say that justified persons are also sinners and that their opposition to God is truly sin, they do not deny that, despite this sin, they are not separated from God and that this sin is a “ruled” sin. In these affirmations, they are in agreement with Roman Catholics, despite the difference in understanding sin in the justified.” (*JD* ¶ 29)
   4. “Catholics hold that the grace of Jesus Christ imparted in baptism takes away all that is sin “in the proper sense” and that is “worthy of damnation” (Rom 8:1) [DS § 1515]. There does, however, remain in the person an inclination (concupiscence) that comes from sin and presses toward sin. Since, according to Catholic conviction, human sins always involve a personal element and since this element is lacking in this inclination, Catholics do not see this inclination as sin in an authentic sense. They do not thereby deny that this inclination does not correspond to God’s original design for humanity and that it is objectively in contradiction to God and remains one’s enemy in lifelong struggle. Grateful for deliverance by Christ, they underscore that this inclination in contradiction to God does not merit the punishment of eternal death [DS § 1515] and does not separate the justified person from God. But when individuals voluntarily separate themselves from God, it is not enough to return to observing the commandments, for they must receive pardon and peace in the Sacrament of Reconciliation through the word of forgiveness imparted to them in virtue of God’s reconciling work in Christ.” (*JD* ¶ 30)
   5. “The concept of “concupiscence” is used in different senses on the Catholic and Lutheran sides. In the Lutheran Confessional writings “concupiscence” is understood as the self-seeking desire of the human being, which in light of the law, spiritually understood, is regarded as sin. In the Catholic understanding concupiscence is an inclination, remaining in human beings even after baptism, which comes from sin and presses toward sin. Despite the differences involved here, it can be recognized from a Lutheran perspective that desire can become the opening through which sin attacks. Due to the power of sin the entire human being carries the tendency to oppose God. This tendency, according to both the Lutheran and the Catholic conception, “does not correspond to God’s original design for humanity” [*JD* ¶ 30]. Sin has a personal character and, as such, leads to separation from God. It is the selfish desire of the old person and the lack of trust and love toward God.” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.B)
6. **forgiveness and transformation**
   1. “By grace alone, in faith . . ., we are accepted by God and receive the Holy Spirit . . .” (*JD* ¶ 15)
   2. “. . . because we are sinners our new life is solely due to the forgiving and renewing mercy that God imparts as a gift and we receive in faith, and never can merit in any way.” (*JD* ¶ 17)
   3. “Justification is forgiveness of sins and being made righteous, through which God “imparts the gift of new life in Christ” . . .” (*JD* ¶ 22)
   4. “We confess together that God forgives sin by grace and at the same time frees human beings from sin’s enslaving power and imparts the gift of new life in Christ. When persons come by faith to share in Christ, God no longer imputes to them their sin and through the Holy Spirit effects in them an active love. These two aspects of God’s gracious action are not to be separated, for persons are by faith united with Christ, who in his person is our righteousness (1 Cor 1:30): both the forgiveness of sin and the saving presence of God himself.” (*JD* ¶ 22)
   5. “When Lutherans emphasize that the righteousness of Christ is our righteousness, their intention is above all to insist that the sinner is granted righteousness before God in Christ through the declaration of forgiveness and that only in union with Christ is one’s life renewed. When they stress that God’s grace is forgiving love . . ., they do not thereby deny the renewal of the Christian’s life. They intend rather to express that justification remains free from human cooperation and is not dependent on the life-renewing effects of grace in human beings.” (*JD* ¶ 23)
   6. “When Catholics emphasize the renewal of the interior person through the reception of grace imparted as a gift to the believer [DS § 1528], they wish to insist that God’s forgiving grace always brings with it a gift of new life, which in the Holy Spirit becomes effective in active love. They do not thereby deny that God’s gift of grace in justification remains independent of human cooperation.” (*JD* ¶ 24)
   7. “According to Lutheran understanding, God justifies sinners in faith alone (*sola fide*). In faith they place their trust wholly in their Creator and Redeemer and thus live in communion with him. God himself effects faith as he brings forth such trust by his creative word. Because God’s act is a new creation, it affects all dimensions of the person and leads to a life in hope and love. In the doctrine of “justification by faith alone,” a distinction but not a separation is made between justification itself and the renewal of one’s way of life that necessarily follows from justification and without which faith does not exist. Thereby the basis is indicated from which the renewal of life proceeds, for it comes forth from the love of God imparted to the person in justification. Justification and renewal are joined in Christ, who is present in faith.” (*JD* ¶ 26)
   8. “The Catholic understanding also sees faith as fundamental in justification. For without faith, no justification can take place. Persons are justified through baptism as hearers of the word and believers in it. The justification of sinners is forgiveness of sins and being made righteous by justifying grace, which makes us children of God. In justification the righteous receive from Christ faith, hope, and love and are thereby taken into communion with him [DS § 1530]. This new personal relation to God is grounded totally in God’s graciousness and remains constantly dependent on the salvific and creative working of this gracious God, who remains true to himself, so that one can rely upon him. Thus justifying grace never becomes a human possession to which one could appeal over against God. While Catholic teaching emphasizes the renewal of life by justifying grace, this renewal in faith, hope, and love is always dependent on God’s unfathomable grace and contributes nothing to justification about which one could boast before God (Rom 3:27).” (*JD* ¶ 27)
   9. “We are truly and inwardly renewed by the action of the Holy Spirit, remaining always dependent on his work in us. . . . The justified do not remain sinners in this sense.” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.A)
7. **law and gospel**
   1. “Lutherans state that the distinction and right ordering of law and gospel are essential for the understanding of justification. In its theological use, the law is demand and accusation. Throughout their lives, all persons, Christians also, in that they are sinners, stand under this accusation which uncovers their sin so that, in faith in the gospel, they will turn unreservedly to the mercy of God in Christ, which alone justifies them.” (*JD* ¶ 32)
   2. “. . . Christ is not a lawgiver in the manner of Moses. When Catholics emphasize that the righteous are bound to observe God’s commandments, they do not thereby deny that through Jesus Christ God has mercifully promised to his children the grace of eternal life [DS § 1545].” (*JD* ¶ 33)
8. **faith and good works**
   1. “We also confess that God’s commandments retain their validity for the justified and that Christ has by his teaching and example expressed God’s will, which is a standard for the conduct of the justified also.” (*JD* ¶ 31)
   2. “ . . . the Holy Spirit . . . renews our hearts while equipping and calling us to good works.” (*JD* ¶ 15)
   3. The Holy Spirit “leads believers into that renewal of life which God will bring to completion in eternal life.” (*JD* ¶ 16)
   4. “Justification takes place “by grace alone” [*JD* ¶¶ 15, 16], by faith alone; the person is justified “apart from works” [Rom 3:28].” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.C)
   5. “We confess together that good works . . . follow justification and are its fruits. When the justified live in Christ and act in the grace they receive, they bring forth, in biblical terms, good fruit. Since Christians struggle against sin their entire lives, this consequence of justification is also an obligation they must fulfill. Thus both Jesus and the apostolic Scriptures admonish Christians to bring forth the works of love.” (*JD* ¶ 37)
   6. “The working of God’s grace does not exclude human action: God effects everything, the willing and the achievement; therefore, we are called to strive.” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.C)
      1. Phil 2:12-13, “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; 13for it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”
   7. *Formula of Concord* (SD 2.64-65; BSLK 897.37ff): “As soon as the Holy Spirit has initiated his work of regeneration and renewal in us through the Word and the holy sacraments, it is certain that we can and must cooperate by the power of the Holy Spirit . . .” (Qtd. in Lutheran World Federation and Roman Catholic Church *Annex* § 2.C)
   8. “Grace as fellowship of the justified with God in faith, hope, and love is always received from the salvific and creative work of God (cf. *JD* no. 27). But it is nevertheless the responsibility of the justified not to waste this grace but to live in it. The exhortation to do good works is the exhortation to practice the faith (cf. BSLK [45] 197, 45). The good works of the justified “should be done in order to confirm their call, that is, lest they fall from their call by sinning again” [*Apol*. 20.13].” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.D)
9. **merit**
   1. “In the final judgment, the justified will be judged also on their works (cf. Mt 16:27; 25:31-46; Rom 2:16; 14:12; 1 Cor 3:8; 2 Cor 5:10, etc.). . . . Any reward is a reward of grace, on which we have no claim.” (*JD* *Annex* § 2.E)
   2. “According to Catholic understanding, good works, made possible by grace and the working of the Holy Spirit, contribute to growth in grace, so that the righteousness that comes from God is preserved and communion with Christ is deepened. When Catholics affirm the “meritorious” character of good works, they wish to say that, according to the biblical witness, a reward in heaven is promised to these works. Their intention is to emphasize the responsibility of persons for their actions, not to contest the character of those works as gifts, or far less to deny that justification always remains the unmerited gift of grace.” (*JD* ¶ 38)
   3. “The concept of a preservation of grace and a growth in grace and faith is also held by Lutherans. They do emphasize that righteousness as acceptance by God and sharing in the righteousness of Christ is always complete. At the same time, they state that there can be growth in its effects in Christian living. When they view the good works of Christians as the fruits and signs of justification and not as one’s own “merits,” they nevertheless also understand eternal life in accord with the New Testament as unmerited “reward” in the sense of the fulfillment of God’s promise to the believer.” (*JD* ¶ 39)
   4. *Formula of Concord* (SD 4.38): “It is God’s will and express command that believers should do good works, which the Holy Spirit works in them, and God is willing to be pleased with them for Christ’s sake and he promises to reward them gloriously in this and in the future life.” (Qtd. in Lutheran World Federation and Roman Catholic Church *Annex* § 2.E)
10. **assurance of salvation**
    1. “We confess together that the faithful can rely on the mercy and promises of God. In spite of their own weakness and the manifold threats to their faith, on the strength of Christ’s death and resurrection they can build on the effective promise of God’s grace in Word and Sacrament and so be sure of this grace.” (*JD* ¶ 34)
    2. “This was emphasized in a particular way by the Reformers: in the midst of temptation, believers should not look to themselves but look solely to Christ and trust only him. In trust in God’s promise they are assured of their salvation, but are never secure looking at themselves.” (*JD* ¶ 35)
    3. “Catholics can share the concern of the Reformers to ground faith in the objective reality of Christ’s promise, to look away from one’s own experience, and to trust in Christ’s forgiving word alone . . . With the Second Vatican Council, Catholics state: to have faith is to entrust oneself totally to God [*Dei Verbum* § 5]. . . . Every person, however, may be concerned about his salvation when he looks upon his own weaknesses and shortcomings. Recognizing his own failures, however, the believer may yet be certain that God intends his salvation.” (*JD* ¶ 36)
11. **mutual condemnations**
    1. sixteenth-century condemnations
       1. “Doctrinal condemnations were put forward both in the Lutheran Confessions and by . . . Trent. These condemnations are still valid today and thus have a church-dividing effect.” (*JD* ¶ 1)
    2. modern developments
       1. But, “By appropriating insights of recent biblical studies and drawing on modern investigations of the history of theology and dogma, the post-Vatican II ecumenical dialogue has led to a notable convergence concerning justification . . .” (*JD* ¶ 13)
    3. “consensus on basic truths” (*JD* ¶ 5)
       1. “. . . the subscribing Lutheran churches and the Roman Catholic Church are now able to articulate a common understanding of our justification by God’s grace through faith in Christ.” (*JD* ¶ 5)
    4. remaining differences
       1. “. . . the mutual condemnations of former times do not apply to the Catholic and Lutheran doctrines of justification as they are presented in the *Joint Declaration*.” (*JD*, *Annex* § 1)
       2. The consensus “does not cover all that either church teaches about justification . . .” (*JD* ¶ 5)
       3. But the consensus “shows that the remaining differences in its [justification’s] explication are no longer the occasion for doctrinal condemnations.” (*JD* ¶ 5)
       4. “The understanding of the doctrine of justification set forth in this *Declaration* shows that a consensus in basic truths of the doctrine of justification exists between Lutherans and Catholics. In light of this consensus the remaining differences of language, theological elaboration, and emphasis in the understanding of justification described in paras. 18 to 39 are acceptable. Therefore the Lutheran and the Catholic explications of justification are in their difference open to one another and do not destroy the consensus regarding the basic truths.” (*JD* ¶ 40)
    5. “Thus the doctrinal condemnations of the sixteenth century, insofar as they relate to the doctrine of justification, appear in a new light: The teaching of the Lutheran churches presented in this *Declaration* does not fall under the condemnations of the Council of Trent. The condemnations in the Lutheran Confessions do not apply to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church presented in this *Declaration*.” (*JD* ¶ 41)
12. **the significance and scope of the consensus reached**
    1. “. . . questions of varying importance still need further clarification. These include, among other topics, the relationship between the Word of God and church doctrine, as well as ecclesiology, ecclesial authority, church unity, ministry, the sacraments, and the relation between justification and social ethics. We are convinced that the consensus we have reached offers a solid basis for this clarification.” (*JD* ¶ 43)
    2. “We give thanks to the Lord for this decisive step forward on the way to overcoming the division of the church. We ask the Holy Spirit to lead us further toward that visible unity which is Christ’s will.” (*JD* ¶ 44)

# Appendix A: Luther’s Theological Development

## LUTHER ON THE SEVERE WOUNDING

## OF HUMAN NATURE AFTER THE FALL

1. **exaggerated view of man**’**s sinfulness**
   1. “. . . a too pessimistic view of man’s sin . . . comes from St. Augustine . . .” (Moeller and Philips 53)
   2. It also comes from a desire to glorify God by increasing the distance between God and man. “. . . Protes­tants accord a privileged position to . . . the primacy of God [John 15:5, “apart from me you can do nothing”] [10] . . . [But all Christians] have always affirmed that only God can for­give sins and that everything without exception in the super­natural life comes from God . . .” (Moeller and Philips 10-11)
   3. The Refor­ma­tion “brings into prominence all the wickedness of our nature, and ar­rives at a theology of imputation and of a grace which is extrinsic and whose realization is deferred until the last days.” (Moeller and Philips 9)
   4. “Protestant teaching has always laid great stress on the for­mula ‘simul justus et pecca­tor’; it . . . has certainly the virtue of emphasizing the sinful condition of man . . .” (Moeller and Philips 53)
2. **1512-1513**: ***Lectures on Genesis***
   1. Luther substituted “the image of the devil” for the “image of God” referred to in Gen 1:26-27 (*Lectures on Genesis* 1.26). He wrote: “the divine image was no longer . . . present, for “it was lost through sin in Paradise”” (*Lectures on Genesis* 1.26). He directed this doctrine “against the peril that the doctrine of the image of God and of the freedom of the will as part of the content of that image would glorify human powers at the expense of grace and thus jeopardize the doctrine that the role of the human will in conversion was “purely passive” . . .” (Pelikan 4: 142)
3. **1517**: ***Lectures on Romans***
   1. Luther (AE 25.345, WA 56.355): ““It is said that human nature has a general notion of knowing and willing what is good, but that it goes wrong in particulars. It would be better to say that it knows what is good in particular things but that in general it neither knows nor wills the good.” (Qtd. in Kittelson 92)
   2. “For Luther, therefore, whenever people hated or behaved badly toward their neighbors, they were not just committing a single sin for which they could seek forgiveness. They were acting in perfect accord with their basically selfish nature.” (Kittelson 92)
4. **September 1517**: ***Disputation against Scholastic Theology***
   1. Luther had “opened his *Disputation against Scholastic Theology* with a spirited defense of Augustine, arguing (against the Manicheans) that the human will was not “evil by nature, that is, essentially evil,” but then going on immediately to insist (against Scotus and Gabriel Biel) that it was “nevertheless innately and inevitably evil and corrupt” and therefore “not free to strive toward whatever is declared good.”” (Pelikan 4: 141)
5. **April 25**, **1518**: **Heidelberg Theses**
   1. Thesis 11: “genuine hope [cannot] exist, unless it is feared that every work brings with it the judgment of condemnation.” (Kittelson 111)
   2. Thesis 16: “Anyone who thinks he would attain righteousness by doing what is in him is adding sin to sin, so that he becomes doubly guilty.” (Kittelson 112)
   3. Thesis 13: ““Free will” after the fall is nothing but a word, and so long as it does what is within it, it is committing deadly sin.” (Kittelson 111)
6. **November 1520**: ***On the Freedom of a Christian***
   1. Luther: “the moment you begin to have faith you learn that all things in you are altogether blameworthy, sinful, and damnable.” “A Christian was therefore to be constantly penitent.” (Kittelson 156)
   2. Luther: “if someone were not first a believer and a Christian, then all his works would amount to nothing and would be truly wicked and damnable sins.” (Qtd. in Kittelson 156)
7. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
   1. “As he commented in the *Preface to Romans*, [176] “. . . all it [the law] does is remind us of our sins, uses them to kill us, and makes us guilty, subject to everlasting wrath.”” (AE 35.377, WADB 7.20) (Kittelson 176-77)
8. **December 1525**: ***On the Bondage of the Will*** (***Servium arbitrium***)
   1. “. . . we do everything by necessity and nothing by our free will, since the power of the free will is nothing and neither does the good nor is capable of it in the absence of grace . . .” (*Servium arbitrium*, in WA 1.636) (Pelikan 4: 141)
   2. Luther “confined free will to “natural matters, such as eating, drinking, procreating, governing” and the like.” (*Servium arbitrium*, in WA 1.752) (Pelikan 4: 141) “He granted that “free choice is allowed to man, [but] only with respect to what is beneath him, and not to what is above him.” (AE 33.170, WA 18.636) (Kittelson 205)
   3. “The human will could not “move toward the righteousness of God.” True freedom of the will was a divine attribute “that can no more justly be attributed to human beings than can divinity itself.” [AE 33.68, WA 18.636] He borrowed from Augustine to illustrate his meaning: “The human will is like a beast between [God and Satan]. If God sits on it, it wills and goes where [205] God wills to go. . . . If Satan sits on it, it wills and goes where Satan wills. Nor does it have the power to choose which rider it will go to or seek, but the riders struggle over which of them will have it or rule it.” [AE 33.65-66, WA 18.635] Not even the most faithful people had any choice in the matter.” (Kittelson 205-6)
   4. In the debate on free will, “Luther accused Erasmus of reviving the Pelagian heresy, in fact of going even beyond it, in his willingness to ascribe freedom to the fallen will of man . . .” (Pelikan 4: 140)
   5. Luther held “the doctrine that the role of the human will in conversion was “purely passive” . . .” (Pelikan 4: 142)
   6. For Luther there could be no Christianity without “staunchly holding your ground, stating your position, confessing it, defending it, and persevering in it unvanquished.” [AE 33.20, WA 18.603] . . . He fully intended the implication that Erasmus was not a Christian.” (Kittelson 206)

## Luther on “Faith Alone”

1. “***sola fide***” **before Luther**
   1. “In a gloss to 1 Timothy 1,8 [“the law is good, if one uses it legitimately”], Thomas Aquinas had explained that justification is not the result of fulfilling the law, but is received through faith alone.” (Schmaus 29)
   2. “. . . the trans­lation of the Bible that appeared in 1483 had rendered Galatians 2,16: “justified only by faith.”” (Schmaus 29) Gal 2:16, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ . . .”
   3. “Three Italian editions of Scripture (Genoa, 1476; Venice, 1583 and 1546) offered a similar trans­lation.” (Schmaus 29)
   4. “In his work “On Justification” [*De Justificatione* 1.25, in *De* *Controversus* vol. 4], Cardinal Bellarmine [29] cited a series of Fathers and Church documents as witnesses for the formula “by faith alone.”” (Schmaus 29-30)
2. **justification by faith in scripture**
   1. Rom 1:17, “For in it [the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.””
   2. Rom 3:21-31, “But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is at­tes­ted by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no dis­tinc­tion, 23since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; 24they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the re­demption that is in Christ Jesus, 25whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, be­cause in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously com­mitted; 26it was to prove at the present time that he him­self is right­eous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. 27Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. 29Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, 30since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith. 31Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.”
   3. Gal 2:16, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law.”
   4. Eph 2:8-10, “For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God—9not the result of works, so that no one may boast. 10For we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life.
3. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. Cajetan “declared Luther’s insistence that faith (rather than the sacraments) justified sinners to be “a false innovation.” Luther replied that he could not withdraw this point.” (Kittelson 123)
4. **c. February 1519**: **Luther’s tower experience** (from his 1545 *Reflectiones*)
   1. introduction
      1. Luther “made a very important discovery [134] . . . during the relative calm that followed . . . the death of the emperor [Maximilian, January 1519]. But Luther was well aware that it had been building for years.” (Kittelson 134-35)
      2. “In a moment, perhaps in the twinkling of an eye, Luther suddenly realized that what he had been teaching for four years all fit together. . . . His conscious realization of it came in a rush . . .” (Kittelson 135)
      3. This discovery is known as “the celebrated “tower experience” . . .” (Lapple 5)
      4. Our knowledge of this insight comes from a work of ??reflections written many years later, in 1545??.
   2. text from the 1545 *Reflections*??
      1. (The reminiscence was written in 1544, when Luther was 61 years old; he was remembering an experience from when he was 35. Dillenberger and Welch 17)
      2. (The following is Kittelson’s translation. For a different translation, see: “Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther’s Latin Writings, 1545.” *Luther’s Works*. Vol. 34. Philadelphia: 1960. 336-37.])
      3. “I was seized with the conviction that I must understand his [Paul’s] letter to the Romans. I did not have a heart of stone, but to that moment one phrase in chapter 1 [:17] stood in my way. I hated the idea, “in it the righteousness of God is revealed,” for I had been taught to understand the term, “the righteousness of God,” in the formal or active sense, as the philosophers called it, according to which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.
      4. “I lived without reproach as a monk, but my conscience was disturbed to its very depths and all I knew about myself was that I was a sinner. I could not believe that anything that I thought or did or prayed satisfied God. I did not love, nay, I hated the righteous God who punishes sinners. Certainly, and with intense grumbling (perhaps even blasphemy), I was angry with God and said, “As if it were indeed not enough that miserable sinners who are eternally lost through original sin and are crushed again by every kind of calamity through the Ten Commandments, God himself adds pain to pain in the gospel by threatening us with his righteousness and wrath!”
      5. “At last, meditating day and night and by the mercy of God, I gave heed to the context of the words, “In it the righteousness of God is revealed, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’ Then I began to understand that the righteousness of God is that through which the righteous live by a gift of God, namely by faith. . . . Here I felt as if I were entirely born again and had entered paradise itself through gates that had been flung open. An entirely new side of the Scriptures opened itself to me . . . and I extolled my sweetest word with a love as great as the loathing with which before I had hated the term, “the righteousness of God.” Thus, that verse in Paul was for me truly the gate of paradise. [134] . . .
      6. “This is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which the merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’” (WA 54, 185-86 [AE 34, 336-338]) (Kittelson 134-35)
5. **Dillenberger and Welch on the** “**tower experience**”
   1. “. . . he experienced God’s righteousness as also God’s mercy . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 29)
   2. God indicated his mercy “toward those who knew that they were not righteous. . . . with­out rescinding a demand, [yet without] asking a sign of worth, God extended mercy to those who trusted, [17] not themselves and their activities, but God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 17-18)
   3. “. . . the accent shifted from the one who was actually righteous to the one “who through faith is righteous.” The release was tremendous. Now one might be accepted as one was, since God justified those who came, not on their own merit or righteousness, but on their trust in God . . . God, without easing the demand upon us, had revealed righteousness as mercy . . . one need no longer be preoccupied with self; one is set free from oneself. But this is only possible if one abandons all calcula­tion . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 18)
6. **after the tower experience**
   1. “At the time of the Reformation the major debate centred on the question whether faith alone [sufficed] to establish an enduring dialogue with God. The affirmative answer to this question cited Romans 3,28, where it is said that we are justified by faith. Luther added the qualifier “alone.”” (Schmaus 29) Rom 3:28, “For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.”
   2. “. . . by early 1519 he was consistently teaching that the sinner is justified (accepted, acquited, forgiven) before God by faith *alone* . . .” (Walker 425)
   3. “However, this was [not] a complete innovation . . .” See the examples above. (Schmaus 29)
   4. “In the light of this usage [of *sola* in relation to *fide* by Luther’s predecessors] it is clear that the formula [in Luther’s writings] should not be taken literally, without adverting to its full sense. What it is intended to stress is that man is justified by grace alone, and not by his own efforts.” (Schmaus 30)
      1. But Luther did say, “faith justifies *without* and *before* love.” (*In Gal*. 2.16) (Newman 21)
   5. April 25, 1518: Heidelberg Disputation: “Near the end of the disputation he declared, “The law says, ‘Do this!’ and it is never done. Grace says, ‘Believe in this man!’ and immediately everything is done. . . . The theologian of glory calls the bad good and the good bad. The theologian of the cross says what a thing is.”” (Kittelson 112)
   6. Oct. 12-14, 1518: Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan at Augsburg: Cajetan “declared Luther’s insistence that faith (rather than the sacraments) justified sinners to be “a false innovation.” Luther replied that he could not withdraw this point.” (Kittelson 123)
7. **mid-December**: **letter to Spalatin**
   1. “Luther was once again reducing everything in the life of a Christian to the promises of God that called forth trust in his goodwill. In this way he denied the church any power over the life of the individual Christian.” (Kittelson 149)
8. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. the sacraments and faith alone
      1. ““All the sacraments were instituted to feed our faith,” Luther wrote.” (WA 6, 512 [AE 36, 39-40]) (Kittelson 153)
      2. “In both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Luther found Christ alone, the fulfilled promise of God.” (Kittelson 153)
      3. baptism: see “baptism” below.
      4. Eucharist: Luther: “Faith believes Christ to be truthful in these words and does not doubt that these immense blessings have been bestowed on it.” (WA 6, 514-515 [AE 36, 39-40]) (Kittelson 154)
   2. Luther: God “does not first accept our works and then save us. The Word of God comes before everything else. Faith follows, and then after faith comes love, and love finally yields every good work.” “Once again Luther placed the emphasis exclusively on God’s work and God’s promise.” (Kittelson 154)
9. **November 1520**: ***On the Freedom of a Christian***
   1. antinomianism
      1. “Luther began with “the following two propositions concerning the freedom and the bondage of the spirit: “A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.””” (WA 7, 49-52 [AE 31, 344-347]) (Kittelson 155)
   2. “. . . “contemplation, meditation, and all that the soul can do, does not help” in making someone righteous before God and therefore free. The other side of the coin was that living within the world and partaking fully of its joys and sorrows could do the soul no harm. “One thing and only one thing is necessary for Christian life, righteousness, and freedom. That one thing is the most holy Word of God, the gospel of Christ.” This gospel created faith. “To preach Christ means to feed the soul, make it righteous, set it free, and save it, provided it believes the preaching.”” (Kittelson 156)
   3. “. . . “only ungodliness and unbelief of the heart, and no outer work, make him guilty and a damnable servant of sin,” no matter what else the person did or did not do.” (Kittelson 156)
   4. “Works of love for the neighbor followed naturally. “So the Christian who is consecrated by his faith does good works, but the works do not make him holier or more Christian, for that is the work of faith alone. And if someone were not first a believer and a Christian, then all his works would amount to nothing and would be truly wicked and damnable sins.” He concluded that therefore “we are not freed from works through faith in Christ but from false opinions concerning works, that is, from the foolish presumption that justification comes by works.”” (Kittelson 156)
   5. “A Christian was both free from the obligation to do good works in order to please God and still bound to do them.” (Kittelson 156)
10. ***Against Latomus*** (June 20, 1521 [Kittelson 23])
    1. “In his response to Latomus, which he completed within a month, Luther came as close as he ever did to a full treatment of his doctrine of justification.” (Kittelson 167)
    2. “There was no part of the human being that stood above or beyond sin. The whole person was condemned and therefore the whole person was saved. “Whoever is subject to wrath is entirely subject to the entirety of wrath, and whoever is subject to grace is entirely under the entirety of grace, for wrath and grace concern the person” as a whole. [WA 8, 106-7 (AE 32, 228)] There was for Luther therefore no room to speak of a spark of goodness that might incline a Christian to do partially good works . . . There was no way to attain salvation through doing works of any kind.” (Kittelson 167)
11. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
    1. While staying at the Wartburg castle (May 1521-March 1522), “Luther translated the entire New Testament into German within 11 weeks.” The translation was from December 1521 to February 1522. (Kittelson 23, 175)
    2. “Translating the Scriptures [was] a theological act . . . In the *Preface to the New* [175] *Testament* he insisted that the reader “must be shown what to expect in this volume, that he might not search through it for commandments and laws, when he should be looking for the gospel and promises of God.”” (WADB 6, 2 [AE 35, 357]) (Kittelson 175-76)
    3. “He admonished his readers to “beware lest you make Christ into a Moses and the gospel into a book of law or doctrine, as has been done before now. . . . the gospel demands no works of us to become holy and redeemed. Indeed, it damns such works and requires of us only that we trust in Christ, because he has overcome sin, death, and hell for us.”” (WADB 6, 8 [AE 35, 360]) (Kittelson 176)
    4. “Indeed, Luther held, “it is not yet knowledge of the gospel when you know the doctrines and commandments, but only when the voice comes that says, ‘Christ is your own, with his life, teaching, works, death, resurrection, all that he is, has, does, and can do.’” The gospel [177] was not a distant abstraction but an intensely personal matter.” (AE 35, 361 [WADB 6, 8]) (Kittelson 177-78)
12. **March 1522**: **the Invocavit sermons**
    1. Luther: “a faith without love is not enough. Indeed, it is no faith at all; in fact it is a false faith, just as a face seen in a mirror is not a face but merely the image of one.” (WA 103, 1, 4 [AE 51, 70-71]) (Kittelson 182)
    2. So the local church authorities at Wittenberg should not coerce changes, since (Kittelson’s words) “Love did not coerce others.” (Kittelson 183)

## The Reformers on Justification

## as Mere Non-Imputation of Sins

1. **introduction**: “forgiveness is seen as having great value. As to this, the council [of Trent] and the Reformers are of one mind.” (Schmaus 62)
2. **the Reformers**
   1. The Protestant heresy concerning grace is that Christ’s passion, without any other gift, makes us pleasing to God by remitting our sins, because by his passion we obtain a juridical title which causes God to treat us as just, though we aren’t. (Daujat 67) (Daujat seems wrong here: Luther required faith also as a necessary gift. Luther required subjective redemption in addition to objective redemption.—Hahn)
   2. “Contemporary investigation of Reforma­tion theology has given rise to a lively debate as to whether the teaching condemned by the council was actually that of the Reformers. It is not to be denied that these theses are to be found in the wording of the Reformers’ writings. So far as the wording is concerned, a clarification was attempted by the council, especially of such teachings as might have disastrous consequences. But it still remains to be shown whether the Reformers, and Luther in particular, understood the doctrine of non-imputation in the sense condemned by the council.” (Schmaus 58)
   3. “In this doctrine [of nonimputation of sin] the Reformers were probably influenced by late scholasticism. Peter Aureolus, Durandus of St. Pourçain, William of Occam, and, to a certain extent, Gabriel Biel (but not John Duns Scotus), in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, had emphasized the extrinsic nonimputation of sin. In stressing the freedom of God, they reached the point of speaking about the “free will” of God.” (Schmaus 58)
   4. The Reformers “understood the word whereby God declared the sinner justified not as a mere analytical statement, but as a creative word. When the sinner is held by God to be a just man, then he does not simply pass for one, he *is* a just man. The judgment of God effects the reality. According to Luther, justification includes two [58] elements: the declaration that a man is justified and the changing of an unjust into a just man. The transformation must be understood as coming out of the declaration. Man is transformed into a just man through the judgment of God. The declaration of God and the trans­formation of man cannot be separated from each other, but they must be clearly distinguished. This is the teaching of the Reformers if one looks at it as a whole, notwithstanding the condemnation by the Council of Trent of one-sided theses which actually are not in essential opposition to the council’s doctrine.” (Schmaus 58-59)
      1. “Justification” in scripture “is used chiefly in a juridical sense,” but it is true also in scripture that “God’s word is not a mere statement, it is a creative word. When God declares a man just, he makes him just . . .” (Schmaus 54)
      2. “The council’s definition implies that the man justified by God is declared just (DS 1528), but that this declaration at the same time creates the state of justification. God’s declaration is not a result of the preceding justification, but rather its foundation.” (Schmaus 64)
   5. “When God speaks the word of forgiveness, man becomes other than he was. According to Luther, the word of forgiveness is directed to regeneration, to sanctification, to rebirth. In place of his enslaved will man achieves, through God in the Holy Spirit, a will freed from enslavement and docile to God. The change wrought by God in the declaration of justification to the sinner appears on the ethical-psychological, on the existential, level. It shows itself in fruits of love, of faith and hope. These are the work of God also; the justification and rebirth are one unified action of divine grace. The sanctification is a consequence of the forgiveness of sin, not an element of, much less the basis for, the forgiveness.” (Schmaus 59)
   6. “Luther points out that although forgiveness of sin and rebirth are [59] indivisibly united, the signs of rebirth appearing to the reborn individual cannot be the basis either of faith in his justification or of his consola­tion. The consolation of the Christian is the work of Christ alone. On the other hand, the defects and imperfections of the regenerated man should not lead to doubt about his justification. In the face of the daily sins which the Christian commits, the identification of forgiveness and rebirth would destroy the solace of forgiveness and the faith that he is beloved and possessed by God.” [59-60] “See E. Schunk, *Theologie* *der* *lutherischen* *Bekenntnisschriften* (Munich, 1940).” (Schmaus 59-60, 60 n. 3)
   7. “By defining justification as the forgiveness of sins, Luther emphasized even more sharply its gratuitous character.” (Pelikan 4: 148)
   8. “. . . the text, “God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing [*non reputans*] their trespasses to them” [2 Cor 5:19 Vg.], had given to justification and forgive­ness a definition as the non-imputation of sin, a definition that was accepted as valid [by, e.g., Aquinas].” (Pelikan 4: 149)

## Imputed Righteousness

1. **Luther**
   1. no habitual grace
      1. “. . . the *habitus* conceived of according to the ideas of Biel [Gabriel Biel] or Ockham [William of Ockham, 1285?-1349?] could not but be something separate from God, shut off inside the closed system of humanity, with God removed to an arbitrary and inaccessible transcendence. Because nominalism could conceive of no real contact between the creature and the Creator . . .” (Moeller and Philips 29)
      2. “It is understandable, therefore, that Luther, finding in St. Augustine the doc­trine of the persistence of concupiscence (in the Augustinian sense), should conclude that man was not transformed ontologically, and deny that grace produced a *habitual* transformation in us. [However,] he recov­ered from else­where, and in another context, the idea of a real transformation of man by grace.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
   2. Christ as shield
      1. “Reformation theology was especially concerned to emphasize the remission of sin by God. The question is what is to be understood by this forgiveness of sin; very often the Reformation doctrine concerning it is presented in the sense of a simple nonimputation. In this view the process of forgiveness is to be interpreted as follows: the Father in heaven looks upon Jesus Christ and sees his love and obedience. Christ stands in front of sinful man as a shield so that God the Father no longer sees their sinfulness. In gazing on his beloved Son, he declares the sinner guiltless and justified for the sake of his Son. Justification is a [57] nonimputation of sin for the sake of Christ.” (Schmaus 57-58)
2. **imputed righteousness**; **alien righteousness**
   1. Luther had defined justification as forgive­ness, the non-imputation of sin. “But now, by extension this became the positive imputation of faith in Christ as righteousness: As Melanchthon said at the beginning of the Reformation, “all our righteousness is the gratuitous imputation of God.” [*Thes. bacc*. 10 (Plitt-Kolde 251)] Luther developed this positive definition in extenso [*sic*]. In the doctrine of justification “these three things are joined together: faith, Christ, and acceptance or imputation.” [*Gal*. (1535) 2:16] Christian righteousness was “a trust of the heart in God through Christ,” on account of which “God overlooks sins.” This is accomplished by imputation, when for the sake of Christ “God reckons imperfect righteousness as perfect righteousness and sin as not sin, even though it really is sin.” [*Gal*. (1535) 3:6] [149] . . . Imputation meant that “God averts his eyes from our sins, yes, even from our righteousness and virtues, and reckons us as righteous because of faith, which lays hold of his Son.” [*Gen*. 15:6] . . .” (Pelikan 4.149-150)
   2. “. . . it was necessary to specify just what was being imputed. Having asserted that “no one will be justified by any works whatever . . ., but by faith alone,” Luther went on to explain that “we must live by alien righteousness,” [*Jes*. 11:4] and that “those who know Christ . . . rely . . . on the life and righteousness of Christ alone.” [*Jes*. 11:9] The concept of an alien righteousness, the righteousness of Christ, as imputed to the believer in the divine act of justification, meant that, to be quite precise, one would describe justification as taking place “on account of Christ” but only “through faith,” with Christ as the ground and faith as the instrument. . . . [As Melanchthon, in the later Lutheran statement, *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, said (4.305), in] Romans “‘justify’ is used in a forensic fashion to mean ‘to absolve a guilty man and pronounce him righteous,’ and to do so on account of an alien righteousness, namely that of Christ, which is communi­cated to us through faith.” And Luther himself . . . did use the concept of the alien righteousness of Christ, a righteousness “outside ourselves,” to prove that justification must be through faith alone [*Disp. just*. 27-29] . . .” (Pelikan 4.150)
   3. “Thus Luther’s “forensic” doctrine of imputation, as made precise by Melanchthon, gained dominance in the confessional interpretations of justification (whether Lutheran, Calvinist, or Arminian) . . .” (Pelikan 4.152)
   4. “Generally, . . . Luther had declared that the righteousness of God is imputed to us, that is, ascribed to us though we do not actually possess it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
   5. “As a believer, one may be more righteous than as an unbeliever. But in Luther’s understanding, one is not yet righteous and needs to be covered by God’s cloak of righteousness. He did not deny that the Christian was actually righteous *in contrast* to a former status. His main point, however, was that the unrighteousness which still characterized the believer made it impossible to think of righteousness or consider even degrees of righteousness. In the last analysis, we need God’s righteousness ascribed to us if we are to stand before God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
3. **later Lutheranism**
   1. “Andreas Osiander insisted that we were genuinely made righteous in faith. In asserting that faith made a difference and that one entered into a new reality, Osian­der was correct. But the insistence that even believers were unrighteous was so much a part of the Reformation that Osiander’s view had no chance of success.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
4. **Calvin**
   1. *Institutes* 3.22.1: “When Paul teaches that we were chosen in Christ ‘before the creation of the world’ [Eph. 1:4a], he takes away all consideration of the real worth on our part, for it is just as if he said: since among all the offspring of Adam, the Heavenly Father found nothing worthy of his election, he turned his eyes upon his Anointed, to choose from that body as members those whom he was to take into the fellowship of life.” (Klooster 41)
   2. *Institutes* 3.24.5: “those whom God has adopted as his sons are said to have been chosen not in themselves but in his Christ [Eph. 1:4]; for unless he could love them in him, he could not honor them with the inheritance of his Kingdom if they had not previously become partakers of him.” (Klooster 41)

## *Simul Justus et Peccator* (No Increasing Holiness)

1. **August 1520: *Address to the Christian Nobility***
   1. monasticism
      1. “In his *Address to the Christian Nobility*, he had declared that celibacy should not be mandatory for secular priests who worked daily with the laity in the world. But monks and nuns were different, because they had taken their vows freely and had not had them imposed on them from without.” (Kittelson 171)
2. **May 1521-April 1522** (works written at the Wartburg): ***Commentary on the Magnificat***
   1. saints (Mary)
      1. ““We ought to call on her,” he wrote, “so for her sake God may grant and do what we ask.” But, he added, “she does nothing; God does everything.” Mary stood as a lesson to all Christians not because she was so pure but because she was so impoverished, a woman who was pregnant but not married. The lesson was obvious: “You must not only think and speak in a lowly manner,” he concluded, “but actually become impoverished and be completely wrapped up in poverty so that, without any human help, God alone may do the work.” [WA 7, 593-594 (AE 21, 347-348)] Mary was far from a saint whose great worthiness Christians should copy. She was an example of utter worthlessness, blessed by God.” (Kittelson 166)
3. **November 1521**: ***On Monastic Vows***
   1. monasticism
      1. May 1521: Luther “heard that one of his Augustinian friends had left the order and had married. Luther neither condemned nor blessed the act.” (Kittelson 169)
      2. August 1521: “he had confessed to Melanchthon, “If Christ were here, I do not doubt he would dissolve these chains and would annul all vows.”” (AE 48, 286 [WABr 2, 374]) (Kittelson 171)
      3. August 1521: “he received yet another of Carlstadt’s essays. This time the restless spirit was arguing that vows of celibacy were themselves sinful and had to be broken. Luther declared that his friends “will never force a wife on me!”” (WABr 2, 377 [AE 48, 290]. See WABr 2, 385 [AE 48, 303].) (Kittelson 169)
      4. “If the vow had been taken in order to make the taker more righteous, and if it still served this purpose, then it was idolatrous. But if a Christian was able to serve freely within monastic vows, then there was no compulsion to reject them. He therefore insisted that “According to Paul, the law is not law when you keep it of your own accord; so too the vow is not a vow when you keep it freely.” [WA 8, 331] Luther sent these considerations to Wittenberg in two separate documents that totaled 280 theses.” (Kittelson 171)
      5. November 11, 1521: letter to Spalatin: ““I have decided to attack monastic vows and to free the young people from that hell of celibacy, totally unclean and condemned as it is through its burning and pollutions.” (AE 48, 328 [WABr 2, 403]) (Kittelson 171)
      6. November 12, 1521: “. . . 13 of his fellow monks left the Augustinian cloister in Wittenberg.” (Kittelson 171)
      7. *On Monastic Vows* was “120 pages long and written in only 10 days . . . [Luther] admitted that [his father] Hans [171] had been right when he had asked if perhaps Luther had not been hearing the devil in the thunderstorm.” (Kittelson 171-72)
      8. Monastic vows “could be freely taken, but were not to be legally binding. Above all, such vows went against the law of love, and in particular love for one’s parents. By being in a monastery and withdrawing from the world, he could do nothing to help others. “Therefore,” he concluded, “we may keep our vows, but we are not obligated to do so, because love is our only obligation.” He closed with the advice that those who were thinking of leaving a monastery or convent should first examine their consciences. If they had taken those vows because they then thought they would be pleasing God but now thought they could serve God’s creatures better in the outside world, they should freely leave.” (WA 8, 664 [AE 44, 393]) (Kittelson 172)

## Against Good Works

1. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. penitence vs. penance
      1. “. . . God demanded not outward deeds but a changed heart and mind. “Doing” had literally nothing to do with salvation, particularly with regard to indulgences.” (AE 48.65-68, WA 1.525-526) (Kittelson 113)
   2. on merit
      1. “. . . he assaulted the idea that the church possessed a treasury of merits from which, under the proper conditions, Christians could make withdrawals. He insisted that no saint had been saintly enough to make any deposits in this treasury. Only Christ had left behind a positive legacy. He offered it freely, directly, and to all. If the pope had any authority in this area, it extended only to penalties that he himself had established for violations of church law.” (Kittelson 114)
2. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
   1. “The law, commandments, and regulations had their place. Their chief task was to condemn everyone at all times. “How,” he asked, “can anyone prepare himself to be good with works when he never does a good work without some reluctance or reticence inside him? How can it be possible for God to delight in works that grow out of reluctant and resisting hearts?” For Luther the Scriptures, and in particular Paul in his letter to the Romans, were absolutely clear about the law and right living. “To fulfill the law is to do its works happily and in love, and freely without the compulsion of the law to live godly and virtuous lives as if there were no law or punishment.” [AE 35.368, WADB 7.6] No one, not even the most pious Christian, could fulfill this requirement—ever.” (Kittelson 176)
   2. “Therefore the law was also a hammer that smashed down human pride and prepared Christians to hear the gospel once again, because “to know [Christ’s] works and the story of his life is not the same thing as to know the gospel, because it does not mean that you trust that he has vanquished sin, death, and the devil.”” (AE 35.361, WADB 6.8) (Kittelson 176)
   3. Moses, Luther declared, “urges, drives, threatens, strikes out, and punishes severely.” By contrast, the gospel, even in the Beatitudes, “does not constrain us but invites us in a friendly way.”” (AE 35.361, WADB 6.8) (Kittelson 176)
   4. ““With the law God was working in a hidden way, as if behind a mask. For under the horrible face of the law and God’s demands there lay his gracious work of preparing sinners (and all Christians were sinners) to receive grace. Hearing the law had to lead to one conclusion, that “a person must have something other than the law, more than the law, to make him righteous and save him.” Consequently Paul moved from his treatment of the law to the gospel, where he “assures us that we are still God’s children, however hard sin may be raging within us, so long as we follow the Spirit and resist sin in order to slay it.” The law started and restarted Christians on their pilgrimage, while the gospel “comforts us in our sufferings by assuring us of the support of the Spirit, of love, and of all created things, namely that the Spirit sighs within us and the creatures long with us that we may be without the flesh and sin.”” (AE 35.377, WADB 7.20, 22; AE 35.377, WADB 7.22) (Kittelson 177)
   5. “For him the Bible was not first and foremost a book of doctrines or collection of laws with respect to what one must believe in order to be saved. Rather, it proclaimed Christ and him crucified, that is, the back-and-forth of law and gospel which repeatedly condemned and saved sinners.” (Kittelson 177)
3. **1537**: **Antinomian controversy**
   1. John Agricola, a former student and rector of the school in Eisleben, “began to argue that good works had so little place in the life of Christians that parishioners should not even be exhorted to perform them. In particular, the law should not be preached to believers as law.” (Kittelson 269)
   2. “Luther repeatedly reminded him that the law was to be preached to Christians (just as good works were to be expected of them), even if fulfilling the law could not affect their standing in the presence of God.” (Kittelson 270)
4. **year unknown**: **common morality**
   1. “Faced with an attack on faith, Luther even had little regard for common morality, at least if it was used to make believers feel guilty. He was frequently very explicit on this subject. “Sometimes it is necessary to drink a little more, play, joke, or even commit some sin in defiance and contempt of the devil in order not to give him an opportunity to make us scrupulous about small things. We will be overcome if we worry too much about falling into some sin. . . . What do you think is my reason for drinking wine undiluted, talking freely, and eating more often if it is not to torment and vex the devil who has made up his mind to torment and vex me? Would that I could commit some token sin simply for the sake of mocking the devil, so that he might understand that I acknowledge no sin and am conscious of no [287] sin. When the devil attacks and torments us, we must completely set aside the entire Ten Commandments.” [WABr 5, 519 (*Letters of Spiritual Counsel* 86)] Nothing, absolutely nothing was more important to Luther than faith and, with it, a free conscience.” (Kittelson 287-88)
5. **1539**: **bigamy**
   1. In late 1539, Philip of Hesse’s “marriage was a terribly unhappy one and Philip was having an affair with one of the ladies at court. There was nothing unusual about this situation for politicians and rulers of the time, whose marriages were rarely made with more than the tacit consent of the couple. But Philip alleged that his sin caused him so much distress that he was unable to partake of the Lord’s Supper. Bucer informed Luther of the situation. After discussing the matter with Philip, Luther and Melanchthon deliberated and recommended that the landgrave marry the other woman. As the Scriptures freely attested, bigamy was not contrary to the law of God. It was far preferable to a courtly liaison, because it would protect both Philip’s conscience and the woman’s status. “Bigamy did, however, violate both imperial law and common morality. Partly for these reasons, Luther urged Philip to keep the matter secret. He also regarded his advice as having been given within the confessional. For this reason, too, it was to remain secret. Very soon, however, both Philip of Hesse’s bigamy and Luther’s cooperation with it were well-known. The landgrave could not keep quiet on either matter.” (Kittelson 288)
   2. In the 1540s, “. . . Katie [Luther’s wife] was not at all amused when her husband proved from the Scriptures, and in the presence of others, that a man might take more than one wife without violating the law of God. If Luther acted on this truth, she replied, she would return to the convent and leave him to manage the children. No one present, including the learned doctor, had any doubt that she was serious.” (Kittelson 284)

## Luther and the Indulgences Controversy

1. **the 1517 indulgence**
   1. In 1500, “the papacy was in severe financial straits. Pope Leo X’s predecessors had figured prominently in the politics of both Italy and Europe as a whole. It was an expensive game, and now Leo was determined to compete directly with the crowned heads of Europe by having Rome outdo all other courts in its magnificence. His contribution would be to complete St. Peter’s . . .” (Kittelson 104)
   2. “To the north, in the patchwork of competing principalities, cities, and bishoprics that made up Germany, there was another man who desperately needed money. His name was Albert, and he was a member of the ambitious House of Hohenzollern . . . Albert—a soft-skinned, pudgy youngster with scarcely a beard—was doing his part for the family’s future. Not legally of age even to hold a bishopric, by 1517 he had already secured both Magdeburg and Halberstadt. Now Mainz was open, and he wanted it as well. To get it would require a substantial dispensation from Leo X, payable in cash. [104] . . . Leo authorized the preaching of this indulgence in Albert’s territories, . . . to help build the Sistine Chapel.” (Kittelson 104-5)
2. **Johann Tetzel**
   1. “Johann Tetzel was a short, dumpy, stump-preacher . . .” In the fall of 1517 he went from town to town in Germany. “Several horsemen, drummers, and trumpeters announced the imminent arrival of something important. With Tetzel himself and his armed guard came the symbols of the papacy and Pope Leo X’s family coat of arms. A copy of the prized indulgence was attached to a makeshift cross and raised high above onlookers for all to see. Then came Tetzel, who strode to the prepared platform and began to preach.” (Kittelson 103)
   2. Tetzel (qtd. in: Köhler, Walther, ed. *Dokumente zum Ablassenstreit von 1517*. 2nd rev. ed. Tübingen: 1934. 125): “Do you not hear the voices of your dead relatives and others, crying out to you and saying, ‘Pity us, pity us, for we are in dire punishment and torment from which you can redeem us for a pittance’? And you will not? . . . Will you not then for a quarter of a florin receive these letters of indulgence through which you are able to lead a divine and immortal soul safely and securely into the homeland of paradise?” (Kittelson 103)
   3. “A money chest, a supply of blank indulgences, a scale to make certain that people’s coins were good, and the scribes were all ready and in their places. Then came Tetzel’s last exhortation: “Once the coin into the coffer clings, a soul from purgatory heavenward [103] springs!”” (Kittelson 103-104)
3. **opposition to indulgences**
   1. Luther had “sought them [indulgences] for his own relatives by saying special masses when he was in Rome in 1510.” [105] (Luther’s journey to Rome was November 1510-April 1511. Kittelson 79) In Rome was “the *scala sancta*, the very steps Christ climbed to the palace of Pontius Pilate. . . . Just by crawling up the *scala sancta* on his knees, Luther could free one of his loved ones from purgatory.” [59] (Kittelson 59, 79, 105)
   2. Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony “was an assiduous buyer of relics for the Castle Church [in Wittenberg]. His collection was [very] extensive . . .” (Kittelson 105)
   3. Erasmus strongly disapproved of the selling of indulgences. (Kittelson 104)
   4. ““Roman bloodsucking” was what many German princes called this and other money-raising schemes that came from south of the Alps. It was indeed common for someone such as Tetzel to encounter at least mild opposition as he rode into a territory, stayed a few days, and then rode out with its gold and silver in his saddlebags. In fact Frederick the Wise warned Tetzel against even entering Electoral Saxony.” (Kittelson 104)
4. **October 31, 1517**: **the *95 Theses***
   1. October 31, 1517: Luther sent his 95 theses to the bishops of Mainz and Brandenburg.
   2. “When Luther issued his ninety-five theses . . ., he was merely following the accepted custom of preparing propositions one was ready to debate.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   3. It is not known whether he posted them “on the door of the castle church in Wittenberg, which served as the university bulletin board, . . . though it seems most likely that he did.” (Walker 426)
   4. Luther “did not reject indulgences outright.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   5. But “The Pope could change or cancel only those penalties imposed by his own authority or by the canons of the church. Indulgences were valid only when confined to such . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   6. He denied “the extension of indulgences to purgatory.” (Walker 426)
   7. Indulgences “had no necessary relation to the final destiny of any individual believer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   8. In fact, “The papacy, he declared, did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
5. **aftermath of the *95 Theses***
   1. Luther “had no idea that anything momentous would happen.” (Kittelson 108)
   2. Albert, Archbishop of Mainz, was one of Luther’s ecclesiastical superiors, and Luther sent him a copy of the theses, along with a cover letter. “God on high!” he said. “Is this how souls entrusted to your care are taught?” (WABr 1.111?) (Kittelson 107)
   3. “The theses themselves, composed in Latin for a learned audience of clergy and professors, were quickly translated into German, and soon popular cartoons showing the love of Christ vastly outweighing an indulgence in the balance of salvation were circulating all over Germany. Luther’s protest was so effective that even today the very word *indulgence* has a slightly unsavory smell about it. Tetzel’s enthusiastic crowds soon contained substantial numbers of hecklers. His mission was ruined.” (Kittelson 106)
   4. “Within months it was arranged for Tetzel to receive his own doctor’s degree so he could publish against Luther as a professional equal. At the same time, Archbishop Albert sent Leo X a copy of Luther’s theses. Leo appointed a new general of the Augustinians and gave him explicit instructions to silence [Luther].” (Kittelson 108)
   5. “In mid-January [1519], . . . he had been asked to comment on the new papal decree regarding indulgences. There he said that it “does not allege a single word from the Scriptures, neither of the teachers [of the church] nor of [church] law nor of reason” as support; therefore it was “just empty words” that “I am unable to acknowledge as proper and sufficient teaching of the holy church. I must hold to the commands of God.”” (WABr 1.307-8; Smith and Jacobs 1.155) (Kittelson 137)
6. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. Cajetan “pointed to the decree *Unigenitus*, which did not have the standing of official doctrine but which did employ the doctrine of the treasury of merits as the grounds for indulgences.” (Kittelson 123)
   2. “. . . the discussion finally came to the fundamental issue: the authority of the pope versus the authority of the Scriptures or a council of the church. . . . Cajetan insisted that Luther bow to *Unigenitus* and therefore to the right of the pope to authorize indulgences, even in principle those Tetzel preached.” (Kittelson 123)
   3. On the third day Luther presented “a document that was several pages long. [123] . . . Luther would not agree that indulgences had solid doctrinal standing.” (Kittelson 123-24)
   4. Then “Cajetan insisted that papal authority required Luther to submit to *Unigenitus* and therefore to indulgences. Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures, that indulgences were no more than a scheme to raise money, and that in any event they were not the same thing as the merits of Christ. This was too much. Cajetan threatened to shackle Luther and take him to Rome . . .” But Cajetan honored Luther’s safe conduct and allowed him to leave. (Kittelson 124)
7. **November or December, 1521**: ***Against the Idol at Halle***
   1. “With Luther out of sight, the archbishop of Mainz thought he could get away with opening a new collection of relics at his residence in Halle. . . . [Luther] responded with a little essay, *Against the Idol at Halle*, whose very title suggested that the idol was not just the relic collection but the good archbishop himself! . . . [Spalatin] held up publication of the book. But the mere threat of a blast from the Wartburg was enough to put an end to the new reliquary.” (Kittelson 172)

## Luther on Church Authority

1. **October 31, 1517**: **the *95 Theses***
   1. “The Pope could change or cancel only those penalties imposed by his own authority or by the canons of the church. Indulgences were valid only when confined to such . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   2. “The papacy, he declared, did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
2. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. Luther (WATr 5.34-35): “The church needs a reformation, [but it] is not an affair of one man, namely the pope, or of many men, namely the cardinals, both of which have been demonstrated by the most recent council. On the contrary, it is the business of the entire Christian world, yes, the business of God alone.” (Kittelson 114)
   2. Luther “dedicated the [*Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses*] to Pope Leo X . . . in the dedication he declared to Leo, “I put myself at the feet of Your Holiness . . . I will regard your voice as the voice of Christ, who speaks through you.”” (AE 31.83 [WA 1.529]) (Kittelson 114)
3. **August 31**, **1518**: **Luther’s reply to Prierias’s *Dialogus***
   1. The *Dialogus* of Sylvester Prierias, overseer of doctrine for the Dominicans, said the *95 Theses* were in error because the pope is as infallible as the church as a whole. (Kittelson 117)
   2. Luther replied that popes and councils can err (but never have). “. . . he had not yet come to the point of saying that the church of Rome and the pope *were* in error. He argued only that in principle both pope and councils *could* err, as judged by the standard of the Scriptures. In fact, Luther still declared that the church of Rome “has never contradicted the true faith by any of its decrees.” Rather, it retained “the authority of the Bible and of the ancient church Fathers . . .”” (Kittelson 119)
   3. Luther: “the church is virtually present in Christ alone, and it is represented only in a general council.” (WABr 1.192; WA 1.656-57) (Kittelson 119)
   4. “Perhaps Luther had been listening to his colleagues and friends such as Carlstadt [who asserted *sola scriptura*]. . . . No longer did he pledge allegiance to the Fathers, the canons, and the decretals of the church.” (Kittelson 119)
4. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met at Augsburg with Cardinal Cajetan, “papal legate [and] learn­ed commentator on Aquinas.” (Walker 427)
   2. Cajetan “pointed to the decree *Unigenitus*, which did not have the standing of official doctrine but which did employ the doctrine of the treasury of merits as the grounds for indulgences.” (Kittelson 123)
   3. “. . . the discussion finally came to the fundamental issue: the authority of the pope versus the authority of the Scriptures or a council of the church. . . . Cajetan insisted that Luther bow to *Unigenitus* and therefore to the right of the pope to authorize indulgences . . .” (Kittelson 123) “Cajetan ordered Luther to retract, especially his criticisms of the complete­ness of papal power of indulgence.” (Walker 427)
   4. On the third day Luther presented “a document that was several pages long. In it he insisted that a council was above the pope on [123] matters of doctrine . . . and that the Scriptures were finally authoritative in matters of doctrine because all human beings could err.” (Kittelson 123-24)
   5. Then “Cajetan insisted that papal authority required Luther to submit to *Unigenitus* and therefore to indulgences. Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures . . .” (Kittelson 124)
5. **June 1519**: ***Resolution Concerning the Authority of the Pope***
   1. “The preeminence of the pope was a human creation and the pope was neither infallible nor the sole and final authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 138)
6. **June 27-July 6, 1519**: **Leipzig debate with Johann Eck**
   1. John (Johannes) Eck, professor of theology at the University of Ingolstadt [111], became friends with Luther in 1517. But in 1518 Eck “insisted on the absolute authority of the pope and declared that anyone (like Luther) who questioned papal pronouncements was a heretic.” [115] (Kittelson 111, 115)
   2. prior to the Leipzig debate
      1. December 1518: “. . . Eck published 12 theses of his own that he proposed as the agenda. He defended confession, the treasury of merits, purgatory, and indulgences on the grounds that they had been established by the church. From the very beginning of Christianity, he argued, the church of Rome, headed by the pope, had the divine right to make authoritative pronouncements on the life of faith.” (Kittelson 137)
      2. January 1519: “To Eck’s theses he [Luther] replied two weeks later: “Against them stand the recognized history of the past 1100 years, the text of the Scriptures, and the decrees of the Council of Nicea.”” (WA 2, 160-61 [AE 31, 318]) (Kittelson 137)
      3. end of February 1519: “To Spalatin he remarked at the end of February, “I count papal authority among those things that are neutral, such as health, wealth, and other temporal things.” Then he declared that the pope and his representatives were putting forth “an utterly perverse interpretation of the Word of God and conclusions that are contrary to it.” (WABr 1.354) (Kittelson 138)
      4. late February 1519: “By late February Luther’s old loyalties were rapidly disappearing. He had concluded that the papacy was not a divinely-created institution. About two weeks later he wrote Spalatin again: “I am studying the decrees of the popes in preparation for my disputation. And (I whisper this in your ear) I do not know whether the pope is the Antichrist himself or his apostle, so wretchedly in his decrees does he corrupt and crucify Christ, that is, the truth.” (AE 48.114 [WABr 1.359]) (Kittelson 138)
   3. Church authority at the Leipzig debate
      1. “Eck immediately confronted him with the traditional argument for papal authority, the passage from Matthew 16:18 according to which Christ said, “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.” Eck was outlining the common understanding that the pope, as Peter’s successor, held the power of the keys and with it divine authority over the church on earth.” (Kittelson 140)
      2. “. . . Luther replied that the Greek church . . . continued to exist without acknowledging the authority of Rome.” (Kittelson 140)
      3. Luther wrote Spalatin afterward that at the debate, “I openly confessed that [councils] have faithlessly damned some articles that have been taught by Paul, Augustine, and even Christ himself in so many words. . . . I proved from the very words of the Council [of Constance] itself that not all the condemned articles were heretical and in error.” (WABr l, 424 [AE 31, 325]) (Kittelson 140)
      4. “. . . Luther had denied not only the authority of the pope but also that of councils of the church. He insisted that only Christ was the head of the church, even here on earth.” (Kittelson 141)
      5. “Luther’s understanding of the church did in fact have a distinctly Hussite smell, though he did not realize it. He soon received a letter from two Czech theologians who were still avowed followers of Hus. [141] They applauded him and included a gift of several quality knives, plus a copy of a little book, *Concerning the Church*, which spelled out Hus’s views on the subject. In their letter they freely called Luther “the Saxon Hus.” Luther was cautious. He replied by sending copies of his own works, but he had Melanchthon dictate a cover letter to the courier so it could not be positively traced back to him. It would do no good to have real Hussites publicly calling him a Hussite. But later he read the little book. “We are all Hussites without knowing it!” he exclaimed. His astonished realization had nothing to do with Hus’s understanding of faith, grace, works, and righteousness before God, subjects about which Hus had little to say. . . . Rather, his amazement came from the [fact that Huss] also taught that only Christ was the head of the church . . .” (WABr 2, 42 [AE 48, 153]) (Kittelson 141-42)
      6. “Anyone who did not acknowledge Christ and him alone was the Antichrist, that is, someone who put himself in the place of Christ. This was what Luther now meant when he called the pope the Antichrist. The papacy had put itself in the place of Christ.” (Kittelson 142)
      7. During the debate, Luther “declared that even councils might and did err—as in the case of Hus at Constance a century earlier.” (Kittelson 263)
   4. During the Leipzig debate, Luther proposed “that the supremacy of the Roman church is unsupported by his­tory or Scripture.” (Walker 428)
   5. He admitted “that his positions were in some respects those of Jan Hus and that in con­demning Hus the revered Council of Constance had erred. [This denied] the infallibility of a general council . . .” (Walker 428)
7. **June 1519**: ***Resolution Concerning the Authority of the Pope***
   1. “The preeminence of the pope was a human creation and the pope was neither infallible nor the sole and final authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 138)
   2. June 1519: “By June his study of church law and history led him to publish a *Resolution Concerning the Authority of the Pope*. There he sought to be as clear and evenhanded as possible. The institution of the papacy, he declared, existed by the will of God. But the Scriptures granted it no specifically sacred status, not even in the pastoral office of the keys as given to Peter. The preeminence of the pope was a human creation and the pope was neither infallible nor the sole and final authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 138)
8. **May 1520**: ***On the Papacy at Rome***
   1. “. . . he declared that there were two [149] churches in the world. One was external and visible and had the hierarchy and the pope at its head. The other “we call a spiritual, inner Christendom” that acknowledged only Christ.” (Kittelson 149-50)
9. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. Luther: if “the pope and all the Romanists . . . do not abrogate all their laws and traditions [and] restore proper liberty to the churches of Christ, [then] the papacy is identical with the kingdom of Babylon and the Antichrist itself.” (AE 36.72 [WA 6.537]) (Kittelson 152)
10. **November 1520**: ***On The Freedom of a Christian***
    1. “Luther began with “the following two propositions concerning the freedom and the bondage of the spirit: “A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.””” (Kittelson 155)
11. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
    1. The “Babylonian captivity” is “the priests’ hold on the sacraments and the insistence that Christians must perform good works in order to gain salvation. . . .” (Kittelson 152)
    2. antinomianism: Luther wrote that, if “the pope and all the Romanists . . . do not abrogate all their laws and traditions [and] restore proper liberty to the churches of Christ, . . . then . . . the papacy is identical with the kingdom of Babylon and the Antichrist itself.” (WA 6, 537 [AE 36, 72]) (Kittelson 152)
12. **October 1520**: **cover letter to *On the Freedom of a Christian***
    1. On October 12, Luther “agreed to write the pope a defense of his actions in which he would say that he had never attacked Leo X personally and that the entire uproar was the fault of Eck.” (Kittelson 154)
    2. Luther: “[I] with all my heart wish you and your see every blessing, for which I have begged God with earnest prayers to the best of my ability.” (AE 31.334-341 [WA 7.42-48]) (Kittelson 155)
    3. “But finally he could not contain himself. “I have truly despised your see, the Roman curia,” he confessed; “neither you nor anyone else can deny that it is more corrupt than any Babylon or Sodom ever was. As far as I can see, it is marked by a completely depraved, hopeless, and notorious godlessness.”” (WA 7, 42-48 [AE 31, 334-341]) (Kittelson 155)
    4. “Eck in his vainglory was responsible for the way things had gone. “I detest contentions.”” (WA 7, 42-48 [AE 31, 334-341]) (Kittelson 155)
13. **January 1521**: **the Diet of Worms**
    1. Luther: “This will be my recantation at Worms: ‘Before I said the pope is the vicar of Christ. Now I declare that the pope is the opponent of Christ and the apostle of the devil.’” (WABr 2.389) (Kittelson 160)
    2. Luther: “I will enter Worms under the banner of Christ against the gates of hell. . . . I have had my Palm Sunday. Is all this pomp merely a temptation or is it also a sign of the passion to come?” (WABr 2.395-96) (Kittelson 160)
14. **April 16-18**, **1521**: **Luther before the Diet of Worms**
    1. Luther distinguished three categories among his works. “There were some “in which I have taught about the Christian faith and good works in such a proper, clear, and Christian manner” that even his opponents thought well of them. He certainly could not retract these. There were others in which he had “attacked the papacy and papist teaching.” To retract them would be to encourage tyranny. Finally, there were some in which he had attacked individuals. Perhaps he had done so too harshly, but he still could not retract them, because these people defended papal tyranny. . . . “Unless I can be instructed and convinced with evidence from the Holy Scriptures or with open, clear, and distinct grounds and reasoning—and my conscience is captive to the Word of God—then I cannot and will not recant, because it is neither safe nor wise to act against conscience.” He then added: “Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me! Amen.”” (*Buch der Reformation* 243-46) (Kittelson 161)
15. **July 1521**: **reply to Jerome Emser**, **canon at Meissen**
    1. Church authority: priesthood of all believers
       1. “. . . he pressed the idea that all Christians were priests to one another.” (Kittelson 167)
16. **May 1530**: ***To the Clergy Assembled at Augsburg***
    1. “. . . one of his most potent assaults ever on the Church of Rome.” (Kittelson 232)
17. **1531-1532**: ***Commentary on the Alleged Imperial Edict***
    1. Luther says the papacy is so corrupt “that those who are with me cannot any longer even pray for it.” [AE 34.103 (WA 303.386-87)] [237] . . . The Diet of Augsburg . . . proved that Rome and its defenders were utterly and hopelessly reprobate. True Christians were no longer even to pray for the pope.” (Kittelson 237, 239)
    2. “He hoped that people would “say of me from this moment forward how full I am of evil words, abuse, and cursing for the papists. [258] . . . [since] there is no hope” for them. Because the “papal asses” were utterly reprobate, he planned “from this day forward until I am in the grave to busy myself with cursing and rebuking these miscreants.” [WA 303.470] . . . Earlier, he had declared that he and his supporters could no longer pray for them. Now he added that true prayer carried with it curses on the papacy: “For I cannot pray without therefore being forced to curse. If I say, “Holy be thy name,” then I must add, “Cursed, damned, and disgraced must be the papists’ name . . .”” (Kittelson 258-59)
18. **early January, 1532**: ***On Infiltrating and Clandestine Preachers***
    1. church order; Anabaptists
       1. Anabaptists “were for the most part lay men and women who earnestly desired to create a church of true believers. In order to guarantee the church’s purity, they practiced believers’ baptism, which they limited to adults on the grounds that children could not knowingly confess their faith. Standing opposed to infant baptism in a world in which everyone had been baptized as an infant, they often urged true believers to be rebaptized as a sign of their membership in the true church. Moreover, they insisted that this true church knew no territorial or political boundaries. It consisted purely, simply, and finally of the faithful.” (Kittelson 242)
       2. “Luther’s letter [warned] those in authority [that the Anabaptists] had taken the idea of the priesthood of all believers and turned it into license for people to preach whatever they wished. Now everyone claimed the office of preacher, but, Luther insisted, no one could have the office without authorization and a calling, and the infiltrating preachers had neither. Their preaching, he declared, was properly the work of Satan. He added that these people could be recognized by their works. . . . they claimed private revelations, while the Holy Spirit “flew down from heaven publicly” so people could see it . . . Whoever listened to one of these preachers needed to recognize that they were listening “to a man possessed.” The gospel and the sacraments, on the other hand, were preached and administered by regularly called and ordained pastors.” (AE 40, 384 [WA 303, 518]; WA 303, 527 [AE 40, 394]) (Kittelson 242)
       3. Luther “and his colleagues consciously began to train new pastors and systematically to examine, ordain, and place them.” [248] “By and large Luther left the business of actually composing the new church orders and seeing them established to younger colleagues such as Melanchthon and Bugenhagen . . .” [247] (Kittelson 247-48)
    2. anti-intellectualism
       1. “. . . education in general had suffered during the stormy 1520s. In this sense, Erasmus had been perfectly justified in his fear that Luther’s movement would harm the revival of learning. Wittenberg’s own enrollment plummeted after the Diet of Worms, and people such as Müntzer and the Zwickau Prophets bluntly rejected study as a qualification for preaching the Word of God. Carlstadt’s decision in 1524 to give up his academic position in order to become “the new layman” symbolized what was happening all over Gennany. To the Anabaptists, someone like Luther was learned “according to the letter” but not “according to the Spirit.” By contrast, Luther was convinced that proper education was essential.” (Kittelson 248)

## *Sola Scriptura*

1. **April 1518**: After the Heidelberg disputation (April 25), “In the wagon on the way back . . . he wrote to one of his former professors, “. . . it will be impossible to reform the church unless the canon law, the decretals, scholastic theology, philosophy, and logic, as they now exist, are absolutely eradicated and other studies instituted.” (WABr 1, 170) (Kittelson 112)
   1. 1518: Luther reordered “the course of study at his own university. Aristotle’s logic was virtually banished from the theological curriculum, and direct study of the Bible, the church Fathers, and the ancient languages was put in its place.” (Kittelson 248)
   2. 1518: Luther “worked to bring an able scholar of Greek and Hebrew to Wittenberg so that he and others could readily learn the biblical languages.” Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), skinny and young (21 years old), was chosen. He was nephew of Johannes Reuchlin, Europe’s greatest Hebraist. [110] In November 1518, Luther wrote Spalatin that “Greek studies were flourishing under Melanchthon, but the new instructor in Hebrew was trying to teach his students to speak the language rather than just to read it.” (WABr l, 224 [AE 48, 90]) [125] (Kittelson 110, 125)
   3. December 1518: At the University of Wittenberg, “He [Luther] and the rector agreed to put an end to all lectures that followed the teachings of Thomas Aquinas, whose disciples included Cajetan and most Dominicans. Now, Luther declared, students would be able to [learn] without the pollution of [Aquinas].” (WABr 1.262) (Kittelson 131)
2. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. “Luther insisted that he would “set forth nothing except what is found and can be found in the Holy Scriptures in the first place but also in the church Fathers as received by the Church of Rome and in the papal canons and decretals” of church law. He would even heed earlier theologians to the extent that their views were in harmony with these sources. [114] . . . in the *Resolutions* Luther pictured himself as the very model of loyalty to the genuine traditions of the church.” (AE 31.83, WA 1.529) (Kittelson 114-15)
3. **August 1518**: **Andreas Carlstadt and *sola scriptura***
   1. “One of his colleagues at Wittenberg, Andreas Carlstadt, also had a work published in August 1518. It was a collection of theses in which he insisted that only the Scriptures—not the church Fathers, not the papal canons, and not the decretals—were authoritative in matters of faith.” (Kittelson 115)
4. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. Cajetan “pointed to the decree *Unigenitus*, which [used] the doctrine of the treasury of merits as the grounds for indulgences. . . . Cajetan insisted that Luther bow to *Unigenitus* and therefore to the right of the pope to authorize indulgences . . .” (Kittelson 123)
   2. “. . . the discussion finally came to the fundamental issue: the authority of the pope versus the authority of the Scriptures or a council of the church.” (Kittelson 123)
   3. On the third day Luther presented “a document that was several pages long. In it he insisted that a council was above the pope on [123] matters of doctrine . . . and that the Scriptures were finally authoritative in matters of doctrine because all human beings could err. . . . Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures . . .” (Kittelson 123-24)
   4. “Cajetan insisted that papal authority required Luther to submit to *Unigenitus* and therefore to indulgences. Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures . . .” (Kittelson 124)
5. **January or February 1519**: **letter to Pirckheimer**
   1. To Pirckheimer in Nuremberg he wrote, “I will serve and acknowledge the authority and majesty of the pope, but I will not become a corrupter of the Scriptures.” [WABr 1.351, 348] . . . The authority of the papacy and the history of the institutional church and its laws still had a powerful hold on his loyalties.” (Kittelson 137)
6. **June 27, 1519**: **the Leipzig debate**
   1. “Luther had still not come to his revolutionary insistence that only the Scriptures were authoritative in matters of faith.” (Kittelson 137)
7. **May 1521-April 1522**: **unidentified work** (written at the Wartburg)
   1. “. . . his teachings had by now been condemned by the theological faculties of the universities of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne. . . . Luther scarcely replied to these condemnations. “Who,” he asked, “can imagine that the Scriptures still carry any weight when one is obligated to assent to professors who concoct their arguments without reference to the Scriptures?”” (AE 32.135 [WA 6.181-82]) (Kittelson 167)
8. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
   1. Luther “stayed at the Wartburg and took up the translation of the New Testament. If he could put the Scriptures and a guide to reading and understanding them in the hands of every Christian, then they could all become *theodidacti*, people taught by God. . . . he took great care to use the language of the people. . . . In this last of his works at the Wartburg, Luther was once again the theologian and pastor . . .” (Kittelson 175)
   2. “Luther obviously did not think that Bible reading by itself would necessarily lead anyone to a saving knowledge of God.” (Kittelson 176)
   3. “For him the Bible was not first and foremost a book of doctrines or collection of laws with respect to what one must believe in order to be saved. Rather, it proclaimed Christ and him crucified, that is, the back-and-forth of law and gospel which repeatedly condemned and saved sinners.” (Kittelson 177)
   4. “This understanding allowed Luther even to declare that not all books of the Bible had equal authority in the Christian life.” (Kittelson 177)
      1. Luther removed 4 books of the New Testament from their traditional order and placed them at the end of the New Testament.
      2. According to Luther, James “does not belong in the Bible among the proper chief books of the NT (“compared to them it is simply an epistle of straw, since it has in it no quality of the gospel”). It is disorganized and Jewish and thus not an apostolic writing . . . Luther would have preferred to omit it from his Bible, and still in 1543 he rejected the letter as a basis for dogmatic proof.” (Luther died in 1546.) (Kümmel 406)
      3. “Luther placed at the end of the NT four of the sevn writings which were disputed in antiquity and by the humanists (Heb, James, Jude, and Rev), and he did not number them in with the rest. In this way he made it clear that these four books which “in earlier times had received a different estimate” he would not count among “the really certain chief books of the NT,” because only the later [*sic*] “clearly and purely present Christ to me.” [505] . . . The placing of Heb, James, Jude, and Rev at the end of the printing of the Luther Bible survived from Reformation times—but not in any other of the Reformation translations . . .” (Kümmel 505-06)
      4. ““You,” he addressed his readers, “are now in a position to differentiate properly among all the books [of the Bible] and decide which are the best.” Among these he included the gospel of John, the letters of Paul, and the first letter of Peter. “You will not find much said in these books about the works and the miracles of Christ,” he admitted, “but you will find a masterly treatment of how faith in Christ conquers sin, death, and hell, and gives life, righteousness, and salvation.”” (WADB 6.10 [WA 35.361-62]) (Kittelson 177)
      5. “Of the books he recommended he declared, “They teach everything you need to know for your salvation, even if you were never to see or hear any other book or hear any other teaching. In comparison with these, the letter of St. James is full of straw, because it contains nothing about the gospel.” Set beside John, Luther thought even Matthew, Mark, and Luke were inferior because “they record many of [Christ’s] works but few of his words.” [AE 35.362 (WADB 6.10)] For Luther, the gospel was the one authority for Christian life and the one message he wished to convey.” (Kittelson 178)

## Luther on the Sacraments in General

### The Sacraments and Faith Alone

1. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. On the third day Luther presented a document. “In it he insisted [123] . . . that faith was necessary before the sacraments could be effective . . .” (Kittelson 123-24)
2. **November 1519**: “**series of published sermons**” **on the sacraments** (Kittelson 147)
   1. The Mass “was a sign that pointed to Christ and that strengthened faith.” (Kittelson 147)
3. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. Luther: “All the sacraments were instituted to feed our faith.” (AE 36.39-40, WA 6.512) (Kittelson 153)
   2. “In both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Luther found Christ alone, the fulfilled promise of God.” (Kittelson 153)
   3. “By remembering their baptisms, Christians found their faith “constantly aroused and cultivated.” . . . The whole purpose of Baptism was to strengthen faith. “[The Christian] has a solace . . . when he [the Christian] says, ‘God is faithful in his promises, and I received his sign when I was baptized.’” . . . [Baptism] was always there, ever reminding them of God’s graciousness in Christ. No spiritual exercises could add anything to it.” (Kittelson 153)

### The Number of the Sacraments

1. **mid-December 1519**: **letter to Spalatin**
   1. “Luther [said] that in his view there were only three sacraments rather than seven. These three—Baptism, confession, and the Lord’s Supper—carried a promise with them. “For me,” he continued, “the others are not sacraments, because a sacrament does not exist unless there is given with it an explicit divine promise [147] that promotes faith, because without the Word of promise and without trusting that something has been received, there is no work with God that benefits us.”” (WABr 1.595) (Kittelson 147-48)
2. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. Luther repeated his “rejection of confirmation, marriage, holy orders, and extreme unction on the grounds that they had no basis in the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 153)
   2. By the end of *Babylonian Captivity* he had rejected confession as well. (Kittelson 153)
   3. “. . . where there had been seven sacraments there were now only two.” (Kittelson 153)

## Luther on the Sacrament of Reconciliation

1. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. In the prefatory letter to Staupitz, Luther “recalled that in confession Staupitz had always emphasized the inclination of the heart rather than particular sins or particular good works as a determinant of the status of the soul.” (Kittelson 113)
   2. “Luther pointed out . . . that common confessional practices had no basis in the Scriptures. The Latin translation of Jesus’ command at Matthew 4:17 read, “Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” But the Greek said, “Be penitent . . .” [The usual English translation is, “Repent.”] Therefore God demanded not outward deeds but a changed heart and mind. “Doing” had literally nothing to do with salvation . . . “To repent” and “to do penance” were two different things.” (AE 48.65-68, WA 1.525-26) (Kittelson 113)
   3. Luther “focused on the absolution that came from a priest after confession. He concluded that a priest could declare forgiveness in Christ, but had no authority to absolve. “Christ did not intend [by the power of the keys] to put [113] the salvation of people into the hands or at the discretion of an individual.” *Instead, everything depended on* “*believing only in the truth of Christ’s promise*.” [WA 1.631] In these words [was] an end not only to indulgences, but also to pilgrimages, special masses for the dead, shrines, images, relics, special spiritual exercises . . ., much that was central to the practice of late medieval religion.” (Kittelson 113-14)
2. **late August or early September 1519**: ***Fourteen Consolations for Those Who Suffer***
   1. Luther: there “is no work of the church so much in need of reforming as confession and penance. For it is here that rage [146] all the laws, profits, power, tyranny, error, danger, and innumerable evils for all souls and the entire church.” (WA 2.646) “Thereby, he charged, people were led to depend on the power of their confession and its validation by the church rather than on Christ.” (Kittelson 146-47)
3. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. In a letter to Spalatin (mid-December 1519), Luther reduced the number of the sacraments to three: baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and confession. “. . . but by now Luther had doubts about confession as well.” (Kittelson 153)
   2. “By the end of [*Babylonian Captivity*] he had reduced confession to a useful practice but no longer a sacrament.” (Kittelson 153)
   3. “Personally, Luther continued daily to confess his own sins . . .” (Kittelson 153)
4. **June 1, 1521**: ***On Confession****:* ***Whether the Pope Has the Power to Require It***
   1. “It was not necessary, he insisted, to confess one’s sins to a priest, because Christ himself ordered only that Christians confess to one another.” (Kittelson 168)
5. **1540s**
   1. “As a pastor, Luther sought above all to console troubled consciences. His medieval predecessors had debated whether a thorough confession [284] was worth the tortured spirit that might result from it, and they had agreed that it was. In both theory and practice, however, Luther insisted that consolation came first.” (Kittelson 284-85)
   2. “There was good reason to protect the conscience first and foremost. It was here that Luther found Satan at work most powerfully. Faith or the absence of faith was all that counted in the end, and it was faith that Satan sought to destroy. “Paul’s ‘thorn in the flesh,’” he said, “refers to the tempting of our faith. He regarded it as a big skewer that would impale our soul and flesh.” In spite of all his own labors, Luther confessed that “nothing has so exhausted me as sorrow, especially at night.” [WATr 3, 439, 341 (AE 54, 207)] From his own experience and that of others, he declared, “To raise one conscience up out of despair is worth more than a hundred kingdoms.”” (WATr 2, 263) (Kittelson 285)
   3. “For Luther, nothing was more important than this struggle for faith. The first thing a Christian had to do was always to look at Christ, who was both Savior and cosufferer [*sic*]. Luther told one dying man, “God will not forsake you. He is not a tyrant who holds a good, crude blunder against you either, not even blasphemy when you are in distress, or denial of God, such as Peter committed and Paul too.”” (WATr 3, 507) (Kittelson 285)

## Luther on Baptism

1. **November 1519**: “**series of published sermons**” **on the sacraments** (Kittelson 147)
   1. Baptism is “the beginning of the Christian life, the first step of justification before a righteous God, and the source of all true repentance.” (Kittelson 147)
   2. “There was no need to add to Baptism through indulgences; what was needful was remembering the graciousness of a God who through Christ accepted even helpless children.” (Kittelson 147)
2. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. The purpose of baptism was primarily as a reminder, as “evidence of God’s grace. By remembering their baptisms, Christians found their faith “constantly aroused and cultivated. Once the divine promise has been accepted by us, its truth lasts until death.” The whole purpose of Baptism was to strengthen faith. “[The Christian] has a solace . . . when he [the Christian] says, ‘God is faithful in his promises, and I received his sign when I was baptized.” . . . [Baptism] was always there, ever reminding them of God’s graciousness in Christ. No spiritual exercises could add anything to it.” (Kittelson 153)

## Luther on Holy Orders

1. **August 1520**: ***Address to the Christian Nobility***
   1. Luther’s *Address to the Christian Nobility* “put forth his famous doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. With it he destroyed the idea of a special class of priests who, because they held in their hands the means of grace, also held special authority . . . [Priests] had no authority over anyone other than that of the gospel.” (Kittelson 151)
2. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. The “Babylonian captivity” is “the priests’ hold on the sacraments and the insistence that Christians must perform good works in order to gain salvation. . . .” (Kittelson 152)

## Luther on the Eucharist

1. **Catholic understanding**: “when the priest uttered the Words of Institution, he suddenly and substantially changed the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ. This transubstantiation, as it was called, was the basis for the idea that the Mass was a sacrifice, and therefore a good work that was meritorious for salvation. In this act also lay the distinctive authority of the priest, for only he could perform it.” (Kittelson 195)
2. **1519**: ***Sermon on the Body of Christ***
   1. Luther “simply assumed . . . that Jesus’ words meant precisely what they said, that the bread became the body of Christ and the wine his blood.” (Kittelson 196)
3. **November 1519**: “**series of published sermons**” **on the sacraments** (Kittelson 147)
   1. The Mass “was a sign that pointed to Christ and that strengthened faith.” (Kittelson 147)
   2. “Luther even threw a bouquet to some of Hus’s followers. He added that the common practice of withholding the cup from the laity lest they spill it was misleading, because simple people might conclude that priests were somehow closer to God. This comment caused an uproar. Duke George of Saxony called it “full of heresy and scandal.” . . . he *had* openly identified himself with the hated Hussites.” (Kittelson 147)
4. **1520**: ***Explanation of Certain Articles on the Holy Sacrament***
   1. “the Lord is saying nothing about the sacrament in this passage [John 6]. On the contrary, he is talking about faith in . . . Christ.” (WA 6, 80 [see also WABr 2, 531ff.]) (Kittelson 200)
5. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. real presence
      1. Luther: “Faith believes Christ to be truthful in these words and does not doubt that these immense blessings have been bestowed on it [the Eucharist].” (AE 36.39-40 [WA 6.514-15]) (Kittelson 154)
   2. the Mass
      1. “The doctrine of transubstantiation (the idea that in the Mass the priest turned bread and wine into Christ’s body and blood) made the priest, rather than Christ, the actor.” (Kittelson 153)
      2. “Describing the sacrament as effective *ex* [153] *opere operato*, a completed work that the priest performed by making sacrifice, denied that grace was a free gift directly from God. Rather, Luther suggested, the Mass should more properly be called an opus *operans*, a work that God was doing and by which he was feeding his people. As practiced, the Mass was therefore blasphemy and idolatry in the most basic sense, because it stood in the place of Christ. “This abuse,” he wrote, “has then brought with it countless other abuses to the point that the faith of this sacrament is entirely obliterated and people turn the divine sacraments over to market days, shopkeepers, and tax collectors.”” (AE 36.39-40, WA 6.512) (Kittelson 153-54)
   3. the Eucharist and faith alone
      1. ““All the sacraments were instituted to feed our faith,” Luther wrote.” (AE 36.39-40, WA 6.512) (Kittelson 153)
      2. “In both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Luther found Christ alone, the fulfilled promise of God.” (Kittelson 153)
6. **November 1521**: ***On the Abolition of Private Masses***
   1. the Mass
      1. October 20, 1521: The Wittenberg faculty “declared that the Mass, when conceived as a sacrifice, was idolatry. Therefore it could not be celebrated in private, as in the case of masses for the dead. Moreover, withholding the cup from the [169] laity suggested that the priest was somehow closer to God than they were. . . . [Luther] had more than implied the need for such changes in his three treatises of 1520.” (Kittelson 169-70)
      2. “Luther’s reply to these developments was *On the Abolition of Private Masses* . . . the New Testament did not speak of a special priesthood that was empowered to handle the mysteries of God in a magical way. Nonetheless, for the present at least, nothing should be said against a brother who wished to celebrate the Mass in the old way for the nourishment of his own soul. Luther refused to require anyone to commune in both kinds. Just because it was preferable for all to be offered both the body and the blood of Christ did not require anyone to take them both.” (Kittelson 170)
7. **1522**: **letters to Paul Speratus and Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach**
   1. 1522: Paul Speratus, a friend, asked Luther about venerating the consecrated species.
   2. 1523: the Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach asked about the same thing.
   3. Luther answered that “In their sacramental use, the bread and wine were Christ’s body and blood, but whether one venerated them was an indifferent matter. No one was to be compelled either [way].” (Kittelson 197)

### The Sacramentarian Controversy

### (August 1524-May 1536)

1. **symbolic interpretations**
   1. *Wyclif*: “. . . the Englishman John Wycliffe [d. 1384] had argued that the bread and wine were symbols of the body and blood rather than the things themselves. Therefore priests had no special power over the laity.” (Kittelson 196)
   2. *Hus*: “Jan Hus, the Bohemian, concurred, and his followers declared that the laity could indeed handle the sacred elements and should receive both the bread and the wine.” (Kittelson 196)
   3. *Carlstadt* espoused these ideas before March 1522. (Kittelson 196)
   4. *Zwingli*
      1. Before November 1524, Zwingli was “teaching that references to eating Christ’s body in the Lord’s Supper meant only that Christians were “to believe that his body was given over to death for us.”” (Kittelson 200)
      2. Before November 1524, Zwingli wrote in a letter “that he admired Carlstadt’s boldness on the subject of the Eucharist.” (Kittelson 200)
   5. “The position that Luther’s opponents took in the Sacramentarian Controversy was therefore largely developed before the conflict began.” (Kittelson 199)
2. **the Sacramentarian Controversy**
   1. August 1524: Luther could not dissuade Carlstadt from his symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist. Carlstadt was therefore expelled from his parish. (Kittelson 196-97)
   2. November 1524: Capito and Bucer wrote in a letter to Luther: “The bread and the cup are external things (whatever they may be) and by themselves they accomplish nothing for salvation; but the memory of the Lord’s death is both beneficial and necessary.” They appealed to John 6:63 (“It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh is useless. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life”). (Kittelson 199)
   3. November 1524: *Letter to the Christians in Strasbourg against the Enthusiasts* (reply to Capito and Bucer’s letter of November 1524). Luther wrote: “For me, the text [“This is my body”] is too powerful. I cannot get away from it.” (AE 40.68, WA 15.394) He felt that “Anyone who sought to turn the bread and the wine into symbols of Christ’s body and blood was an instrument of Satan.” (Kittelson 199)
   4. March 1525: Zwingli’s *Commentary on True and False Religion* says “that Christ was not physically present in the bread and the wine.” (Kittelson 200)
   5. mid-July 1525: “Luther’s colleague, Bugenhagen, countered . . .” (Kittelson 200)
   6. Oecolampadius
      1. Oecolampadius replied to Bugenhagen’s reply (of July 1525) to Zwingli. (Kittelson 200)
      2. Oecolampadius “joined Zwingli in depending on John 6:63 for his understanding of the Words of Institution.” (Kittelson 207)
      3. “But he added [the further argument] that because Christ was resurrected and seated at the right hand of the Father, he could not be physically present in the elements of the Lord’s Supper.” (Kittelson 207)
   7. Luther replied: “the Word says first of all that Christ has a body, and this I believe. Secondly, that this same body rose to heaven and sits at the right hand of God; this too I believe. It says further that this same body is in the Lord’s Supper and is given to us to eat. Likewise I believe this, for my Lord Jesus Christ can easily do what he wishes, and that he wishes to do this is attested by his own words.” (AE 38.44, WA 303.130) (Kittelson 207)
   8. spring 1527: “For Luther, . . . the great error came in the argument that according to John 6:63, physical things could not, by their nature, carry spiritual benefits. In a work prepared for the Frankfurt book fair in the spring of 1527, he [said,] . . . “Our fanatics . . . think nothing spiritual can be present where there is anything material and physical, and they assert that the flesh is of no profit [citing John 6:63].”” (AE 37.95, WA 23.193) (Kittelson 208)
   9. “To Luther’s mind, the claims of his opponents in the Sacramentarian Controversy . . . allowed human reason to intrude on the plain words of the Scriptures. [They] required Christians to bring something of their own to their salvation.” (Kittelson 208)
   10. Luther: “I write not against flesh and blood, as St. Paul teaches, but against Satan and his followers . . .” (AE 3.270, WA 26.402) This “is the way Luther finally directed his attack against Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, and [206] Capito. [207] . . . Luther found no reason to be more charitable with the “false brethren” than he was with his opponents from Rome.” (Kittelson 206-7)
3. **October 1-4, 1529**: **Marburg Colloquy**
   1. Luther said to his opponents (Zwingli, Bucer, Capito, and Oecolampadius): “You seek to prove that a body cannot be in two places at the same time. I will not listen to proofs . . . based on arguments derived from geometry.” (AE 38.16 [WA 303.112]) (Kittelson 223)
   2. “Oecolampadius [argued that] The Scriptures were full of metaphors . . . There was no reason to deny metaphor in this place if Luther accepted it in other passages, such as “I am the vine.” . . . [Luther replied:] “I do not deny figurative speech [in the Scriptures], but you must prove that this is what we have here. It is not enough to say that these words . . . could be interpreted in this way. You must prove that they *must* be interpreted in this figurative sense.” [See AE 38.17, WA 303.114, and AE 38.37.] This neither Oecolampadius nor Zwingli could do.” (Kittelson 224)

## Luther on Church-State Relations

1. **August 1520**: ***Address to the Christian Nobility***
   1. “The 4000 copies in the first press run (an enormous number for that time) sold out in two weeks.” (Kittelson 151)
   2. “. . . he called on the secular authorities to legislate the reforms that popes, cardinals, bishops, and the like refused to undertake. Taken together, his 27 proposals struck at each of the ways the church maintained its power in civil affairs.” (Kittelson 151)
   3. Luther: “Here and now, the German nation, its bishops and princes, . . . should protect them [the German people] from these ravening wolves who come dressed in sheep’s clothing as if they were shepherds and rulers.”” (AE 44.145 [WA 6.419]) (Kittelson 151)
   4. “. . . papal officials were a “crawling mass of reptiles” who told everyone, “We are Christ’s agents and the shepherds of Christ’s sheep, and the senseless, drunken Germans must put up with it.”” (Kittelson 152)
   5. In the *Address* Luther argued “that a Christian who held secular office was still a Christian and as such was equally obliged to serve the well-being of the church as was any priest, bishop, cardinal, or pope.” (Kittelson 215)
      1. “On the other hand, in the midst of the Peasants’ War [1524-25] he had also declared that people must be allowed to believe and teach as they wished, even if it were utter nonsense.” (Kittelson 215)
      2. But in 1527, Luther approved Elector John of Saxony’s decision to visit every parish in his realm to ensure that only Evangelical doctrine was taught. (Kittelson 214-15)
2. **December 15, 1521**: ***An Admonition to All True Christians to Guard Themselves against Sedition***
   1. “He declared that any public uproar was “a precise and certain sign of Satan’s intervention.” Above all, he insisted, “There are no grounds for insurrection, [173] because it almost always harms the innocent more than the guilty. . . .” (WA 8, 681 [AE 45, 63-64]) [175] (Kittelson 173, 175)
3. **March 1523**: ***On Temporal Authority, the Extent to which It Should Be Obeyed***
   1. Luther “rejected stirring up the populace . . .” (Kittelson 188)
   2. “. . . no one had the right to rebel against those whose task it was to govern. God, he said, had created two kingdoms in this world. In one belonged the righteous, and over them God ruled with the love of the gospel. To the other belonged sinners. Over them God ruled through the might and terror of the secular sword. Without the sword, he declared, “men become beasts.”” (Kittelson 188)
   3. Christians “owed allegiance to the secular authorities . . . “so that good order may not perish” and people live in fear for their lives. Emperor, king, prince, city council—all held authority directly from God . . . Christians themselves remained sinners and required the constraints of judge, jailer, and executioner. . . . Christians could resist only if the authorities acted with manifest injustice and against the gospel. Even then, resistance ought to take the form of passive disobedience, grow out of love for one’s neighbor, and stand in full readiness to suffer the consequences of imprisonment and death. Never were private citizens to seize the sword of rebellion or act against the authorities simply in defense of what they took to be their own rights.” (Kittelson 188)
   4. “But when it came to condemning Carlstadt, the Zwickau Prophets, and those he generally called *Schwärmgeister* (or “spirits who swarm about” in the manner of a beehive gone mad), Luther’s own actions presented him with a problem. He himself had defied the [188] authorities on a matter of principle. How could he consistently condemn those who appeared to follow his example?” (Kittelson 188-89)
4. **January 1525**: ***Against the Heavenly Prophets***
   1. “. . . iconoclasm and rapid, compulsory changes in the forms of worship . . . were acts of sedition of the same type as the Peasants’ War.” (Kittelson 195)
5. **April 19, 1525**: ***An Admonition to Peace***
   1. “. . . he condemned as blasphemy their [the peasants’] appeal to Christian liberty and the gospel as justification for self-serving violence.” (Kittelson 191)
6. **May 1525**: ***Against the Murderous and Thieving Hordes of Peasants***
   1. “. . . the princes were to “smite, strangle, and stab [them], secretly or openly, remembering that nothing can be more poisonous, hurtful, or devilish than a rebel.” (AE 46, 50 [WA 18, 358]) (Kittelson 191)
   2. Luther’s *An Open Letter on the Harsh Book against the Peasants* (June 1525) was intended to deflect criticism of the earlier work. “But he took back scarcely a word.” (Kittelson 192)
7. **mid-April, 1529**: **on war against the Turks**
   1. “Contrary to all tradition, Luther then declared that the emperor “is not the head of Christendom, neither is he the defender of the gospel or of the faith.” Whatever the emperor did with his sword was “a bodily, worldly affair.”” (WA 302, 130-31 [AE 46, 185-86]) (Kittelson 221)
8. **October-November 1530**: **meeting with lawyers**
   1. civil disobedience
      1. After meeting with the lawyers of Elector John and Landgrave Philip, Luther agreed that “resistance—even armed resistance—was legitimate for a Christian prince, but only because the German constitution allowed princes to take up arms against an emperor who disregarded the law of the land.” [236] His friends were “disturbed by Luther’s apparent sanctioning of disobedience, and they well remembered the harsh position he had taken against the peasants only five years earlier. Luther simply replied that “we have left such matters to the competence of the lawyers. When they find that in such a case imperial law allows resistance . . . then we cannot suspend temporal law” in favor of the gospel. [WABr 6, 56] All authority was divinely established, including the peculiarities of the German constitution.” (Kittelson 236-37)
      2. Luther (a statement from a later date): “Office in itself is divinely instituted and it is good, be it the office of the prince or that of his ministers. But those who occupy these offices are usually put there by the devil.” (AE 13, 212 [WA 51, 254]) (Kittelson 289)

# Other Appendices

## A Summary Chronology of Universal History

Dates are from various articles in *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002 Deluxe Edition CD-ROM*.

(b = billion, m = million, t = thousand)

13.7 b *universe* if 14b = 24 hrs, then 1 hr = 583,333,333; 1 min = 9,722,222; 1 sec = 162,037

4.6 b *solar system*

3.5 b oceans; *life*: viruses and prokaryotes (bacteria and cyanobacteria [blue-green algae])

2.1 b eukaryotes (amoebas)

700 m multicellular organisms (specialized cells): invertebrates (jellyfish, worms)

540 m Cambrian explosion: mollusks, seaweed, sponges (all life is still in ocean shallows)

420 m land plants

410 m ferns; crustaceans on land

400 m fish

380 m spiders

370 m amphibians; seed plants (360 m)

340 m reptiles; winged insects (330 m)

280 m major extinction (35% of all species, 80% of reptile species)

220 m dinosaurs

195 m birds

141 m flowering plants

66.4 m *dinosaurs die out* (80% of all species die out)

66.4 m flowering plants, birds, and mammals (e.g., mouse, tree-shrew) take over

35 m monkeys; oppositional thumb, 3-D vision

25 m apes; horse and cow

15 m orangutan splits from line that will become gorillas, chimpanzees, and humans

8 m gorilla and chimpanzee split from hominid line (biochemists say 5-4 m)

5 m *Australopithecus*: human feet (can run and carry), rough-edged pebble tools (2 m)

1.6 m *homo erectus* (to 250 t): human hands, upright, 5', brain = 2x chimp; hand axes (two straight edges, 750 t); caves; fire (400 t)

250 t archaic homo sapiens (to 100 t): between erectus and anatomically modern humans

200 t *Neanderthals* (to 30 t): burial, bear cult

100 t *anatomically modern humans*: migrate from Africa to Europe and Asia

20-10 t *rock paintings* in France and Spain

10 t *neolithic revolution*: domestication of plants and animals; then pottery, cloth, metal

3200 bc *writing* (Sumer)

river valley civilizations:

3500 *Mesopotamia* (Tigris and Euphrates)

3100 *Egypt* (Nile River)

2500 *India* (Indus Valley)

1700 *China* (Yellow River)

American civilizations (none north of Mexico):

1300-400 Olmecs (Gulf of Mexico)

1500 bc Mayans (Yucatan, Guatemala); cities, ad 200; peaks c. ad 700; dying by ad 1400s

200 bc writing (Central America)

ad 1000 Toltecs (from Mexico, conquer Mayans)

1200-1500 Aztecs (Mexico), establish Mexico City in ad 1325

1476-1534 Incas (Peru)

ad 1750 *industrial revolution*

## Major Forms of Christianity

Paul Hahn, University of St Thomas, Houston

Small capitals: five major forms of Christianity.[[22]](#footnote-22) Italics: movements, not denominations.

Numbers of adherents are from *Encyclopædia Britannica* 1997.

**ad 30** Roman

Catholicism (981 million)

│

Council of Ephesus: │ ad 431 Assyrian Church of the East (Nestorians) (.4 million)

Council of Chacedon │ ad 451 Oriental Orthodoxy (monophysites) (53 million) (in communion with each other)

**ad 500** │ │

│ │ │ │ │ │ │

│ Armenians Jacobites Malankarese Copts Abyssinians Eritreans

│ (Syria) (India) (Egypt) (Ethiopia)

│

**ad 1000** │

Eastern Schism: │ ad 1054 Eastern Orthodoxy (218 million)

│ groups in communion: schismatic groups:

│ Greek Cypriot Ukrainian

│ Russian Georgian Belarusian

│ Serbian Albanian Macedonian

│ Romanian Bulgarian Montenegrin

│ Czech-Slovak Polish Old Believers

**ad 1500** │

Reformation: │ ad 1517 Protestantism (404 million)

│ │

│ │ │

│ *mainline Reformation* *radical Reformation*

│ │ │

│ │ │ │ │

│ Lutheranism Calvinism Anglicanism Anabaptism

│ (Germany, 1517) (Switzerland, 1536) ↘ (England, 1534) ↙ (Netherlands, 1525)

│ │ ↘ │ ↙ │

│ Presbyterianism (1560) │ Mennonites (1525)

│ Dutch Reformed (1571) │ Amish (1693)

│ │ │

│ │ │ │ │

│ │ Congregation- Baptists *evangelicalism* (1726)

│ │ alists (1592) (1609) │

│ │ (e.g., Pilgrims, │

│ │ 1620) │ │ │

│ │ │ Methodism (1739) │

│ *premillennialism* │ │ │

│ (1820) │ │ │

│ │ Christian Church (1832) *holiness* │

│ │ (Disciples of Christ, *movement* Adventists

│ │ Churches of Christ) (1839) (1843)

│ │ │

│ *fundamentalism* (1878) *Pentecostalism* (1901)

│ │ │

│ │

│ │ │

**ad 2000** │ *neo-evangelicalism* (1950s) *neo-fundamentalism* (1979)
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