

On Exonerating Pelagius *

The February 1991 issue of the Catholic magazine *30 Days* features a very striking cover designed by Romano Sicilliani. Massacio's famous painting, the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, is going up in flames, and underneath the legend reads: "Exonerating Pelagius?" The cover story by Antonio Socci - entitled "Yesterday's Heretic, Today's Pastor?" - tells of a rash of recent best-selling Catholic books repudiating the doctrine of original sin, and urging the rehabilitation of the fifth century heretic, Pelagius, who had denied its existence. The article unfortunately offers no real explanations why Pelagius and his rejection of original sin is making such an extraordinary comeback. In this paper I would like to offer a few speculations regarding the causes of this deplorable situation.

At the present time there is underway a vicious two-pronged attack on the teaching of the Church concerning original sin. One attack is coming from what has been variously called liberalism, latitudinarianism, indifferentism, etc., and the other (often by the same men), from evolutionism. Let me begin with the attack on original sin from liberalism.

For the sake of not taking anything for granted, here is a summary of Pelagianism from what used to be a standard text in many Catholic seminaries, *God the Author of Nature and the Supernatural* by Msgr. Joseph Pohle, which was translated from the German by Arthur Preuss - the whole series being called simply "Pohle-Preuss":

Pelagianism, which flourished in the fifth century, held that the state of our first parents in Paradise was not one of supernatural grace, but essentially and purely a natural state. In consequence of this fundamental fallacy the Pelagians denied the necessity and gratuity of actual grace, nay the very existence of original sin. They admitted that Adam possessed sanctifying grace, with its claim to the beatific vision of God, and that he enjoyed freedom from concupiscence, but insisted that man can merit Heaven and attain to absolute sinlessness by his own free volition, unaided and without transcending his natural faculties.¹

Pelagius was a rationalist and, consequently, had to confront in his day the same perplexing question confronting ours: If all men had indeed inherited original sin, and therefore would suffer the loss of the Beatific Vision unless they embraced the One True Faith and were baptized, what of the vast numbers of men at the ends of the earth who had never heard of Christ? Would it not be unjust of God to send such souls to hell? In the same issue of *30 Days* there is reprinted in full a letter from St. Jerome, the principal adversary of Pelagius, to his friend Ctesiphontes, which was translated into English for the first time by Giovanni Ricciardi. St. Jerome reacts with scorn to Pelagius' attempt to preside over the Providence of God:

* This article first appeared in *Res Fidei* in November of 1991, St. Benedict Center, 95 Martin Rd., Richmond, N.H., 03470.

But you, who do you think you, a human being, are to answer back to God? Something that was made, can it say to its maker, why did you make me this shape? A potter surely has the right over his clay to make out of the same lump either a pot for special use or one for ordinary use (Romans 9:20,21). Accuse God of greater calumny by asking Him why He said, when Esau and Jacob were still in their mother's womb: "I loved Jacob but I hated Esau." (Malachi 1:2,3)

It is true that neither fertile Britain, nor the people of Scotland, nor any of the barbarous nations as far as the ocean knew anything about Moses and His prophets. Why was it necessary that He come at the end of those times when numerous multitudes of people had already perished? Writing to the Romans, the blessed Apostle cautiously airs this question but he cannot answer it and leaves it to God's knowledge. So, you should also deign to accept that there may be no answer to what you ask. To God be the power and He does not need you as His advocate.^{@2}

Just before He ascended into Heaven Our Lord told His disciples: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mk. 16:16). St. Thomas Aquinas, following Our Lord's words in the Gospel of St. Mark, taught that explicit faith in the Incarnation and the Blessed Trinity was necessary for salvation: "After grace had been revealed both the learned and the simple folk are bound to explicit faith in the mysteries of Christ, chiefly as regards those which are observed and proclaimed, such as the articles which refer to the Incarnation" (*Summa Theologica*, II-II, Q.2, a.8)

St. Thomas also taught that Baptism was necessary for salvation:

In answer that, men are bound to that without which they cannot obtain salvation. Now it is manifest that no one can obtain salvation, but through Christ; wherefore the Apostle says (Rom. 5:18): "As by the offense of one unto all men unto condemnation; so also by the justice of one, unto all men unto justification of life." But for this end is Baptism conferred a man, that being regenerated thereby, he may be incorporated in Christ, by becoming His member; wherefore it is written (Gal. 3:27): "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ." Consequently it is manifest that all are bound to be baptized in Christ and that without Baptism there is no salvation for men.^{@3}

St. Thomas also treated of the problem of invincible ignorance raised by Pelagius, but not in the same rationalistic manner:

If, however, we take it by way of pure negation, as we find it in those who have heard nothing about the faith, it bears the character not of sin, but of punishment, because such like ignorance of Divine things is a result of the sin of our first parent. If such like unbelievers are damned it is on account of other sins, which cannot be taken away without faith, but not on account of their sin of unbelief. Hence Our Lord said (Jo. 15:22): "If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sinned; which Augustine expounds (*Tract. 89 in Joan.*) as "referring to the sin whereby they believed not in Christ."⁴

As regards Pelagius' problem of people of good will who lived at the ends of the earth and who had never heard of Christ, St. Thomas taught that it pertained to Divine Providence to furnish all such with the means of salvation, provided there was no hindrance on their part:

As It Necessary to Believe Explicitly?

Difficulties:

It seems that it is not, for 1.) We should not posit any proposition from which an untenable conclusion follows. But, if we claim that explicit faith is necessary for salvation, an untenable conclusion follows. For it is possible for someone to be brought up in the forest or among wolves, and such a one cannot have explicit knowledge of any matter of faith. Thus there will be a man who will inevitably be damned. But this is untenable. Hence, explicit belief in something does not seem necessary.

Answer to Difficulty No. 1:

Granted that everyone is bound to believe something explicit, no untenable conclusion follows, if someone is brought up in the forest or among wild beasts. For it pertains to Divine Providence to furnish everyone with what is necessary for salvation, provided that on his part there is no hindrance. Thus, if someone so brought up followed the direction of natural reason in seeking good and avoiding evil, we must certainly hold that God would either reveal to him through internal inspiration what had to be believed, or would send some preacher of the faith to him as He sent Peter to Cornelius (Acts 10:20).⁵

However, at the time of the discovery of the New World, where apparently vast numbers of souls had lived and died without ever having heard of Christ or His Church, some theologians, notably the Franciscan, Andreas De Vega, proposed that these souls, since they had lived in invincible ignorance of the true faith, could have been saved without an explicit belief in Christ.⁶ But this opinion was not held by the majority of the theologians of the day; for example, the great Jesuit theologian, Francisco Suarez, held fast to the teaching of St. Thomas: "Whoever has not set obstacles against it will receive the light or the call, either externally by means of men or by interior illumination."⁷

The opinion of De Vega was also rejected by the Magisterium, and in 1679 Pope Innocent XI condemned the following proposition which implied that one could be saved without supernatural faith or revelation: "A faith amply indicated from the testimony of creation, or from a similar motive, suffices for justification."⁸ In 1703 the Holy Office under Pope Clement XI upheld the teaching of St. Thomas and insisted that even a dying Amerindian could not be baptized unless he made an explicit act of faith in Christ and the Blessed Trinity.⁹

But Pelagianism did not die, and it was implicit in the liberalism and indifferentism of the nineteenth

century.¹⁰ One variation of this liberalism and indifferentism was called "Americanism." Fr. Isaac Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Fathers, with the support of some members of the hierarchy, suggested that for the sake of the convert movement, it would be more prudent to hold back on some of the "harder sayings" of the faith, such as "outside the Church there is no salvation," until the neophyte was safely within the fold. This weakness soon developed into explicit Pelagianism.

Father Hecker had been brought into the Church by his good friend, Orestes Brownson, the great champion of the faith in the nineteenth century. Brownson had himself been tainted with Americanism for a brief time, but soon repented of his error. After the Civil War he had been forced to suspend his own *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, and for a short time contributed articles to Father Hecker's *Catholic World*, which was edited by Father Hewit. At that time Brownson wrote to his son Henry:

¶The only trouble I have grows out of the fact that Father Hewit is not sound on the question of original sin, and does not believe that it is necessary to be in communion with the Church in order to be saved. He holds that Protestants may be saved by invincible ignorance, and that original sin was no sin at all except the individual sin of Adam, and that our nature was not wounded at all by it. Father Hecker agrees with him on these points, and is in fact a semi-Pelagian without knowing it.¹¹

But Father Hecker seems tame compared to some of the statements made after Vatican Council II. Here is Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., the most influential *peritus* at the Council:

¶It was declared at the Second Vatican Council that atheists too are not excluded from this possibility of salvation. The only necessary condition which is recognized here is the necessity of faithfulness and obedience to the individual's own personal conscience. This optimism concerning salvation appears to me one of the most noteworthy results of the Second Vatican Council. For when we consider the officially received theology concerning these questions, which was more or less traditional right down to the Second Vatican Council, we can only wonder how few controversies arose during the Council with regard to these assertions of optimism concerning salvation, and wonder too at how little opposition the conservative wing of the Council brought to bear on this point, how all this took place without any setting of the stage or any great stir even though this doctrine marked a far more decisive phase in the development of the Church's conscious awareness of her faith than, for instance, the doctrine of collegiality in the Church, the relationship between scripture and tradition, the acceptance of the new exegesis, etc.¹²

I think even Pelagius would be a little embarrassed by these statements. The main passage on which liberals like Father Rahner base their claim that the Council taught its own version of Pelagian doctrine, is *Lumen Gentium* 2,16:

¶Those who, through no fault of their own, do not know the Gospel of Christ or His Church, but who nevertheless seek God with a sincere heart, and moved by grace, try in their actions to do His will as they know it through the dictates of their conscience - these too may achieve eternal salvation. Nor shall Divine Providence deny the assistance necessary for salvation to those who, without any fault of theirs,

have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God, and who, not without grace, strive to lead a good life. Whatever good or truth is found amongst them is considered by the church to be preparation for the Gospel and given by Him Who enlightens all men that they may at length have life. But very often deceived by the Evil One, men have become vain in their reasonings, have exchanged the truth of God for a lie and served the world rather than the Creator (cf. Rom. 1:21 and 25). Or else, living and dying in this world without God, they are exposed to ultimate despair. Hence to procure the glory of God and the salvation of these, the Church, mindful of the Lord's command >preach the Gospel to every creature=(Mk. 16:15) takes zealous care to foster the missions.@¹³

But this teaching on invincible ignorance is no different from that of St. Thomas which we have already examined. The Council says of persons of good will who labor in invincible ignorance: "Whatever good or truth is found amongst them is considered by the Church to be a *"preparation for the Gospel and given by Him Who enlightens all men that they may have eternal life."* It is to such people, the Council continues, that the Church extends her missionary efforts. "Hence to procure the glory of God and the salvation of these, the Church mindful of the Lord's command 'preach the Gospel to every creature' (Mk. 16:15) takes zealous care to foster the missions@.

The passage quoted by the Council from the Gospel of St. Mark continues: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mk. 16:16). St. Thomas had written: "Thus if someone so brought up followed the direction of natural reason in seeking good and avoiding evil, we must certainly hold that God would either reveal to him through internal inspiration what had to be believed, or he would send some preacher of the faith to him as He sent Peter to Cornelius (Acts 10:20)." (*Ibid.*) St. Thomas is giving in a slightly different way, the same teaching as the Council.

So much for one prong of the attack on original sin, that from liberalism. Let us turn now to the attack from the other quarter, but often involving the same men, the attack on original sin from evolutionism.

Modern scientific opinion on the origin of man is based on population genetics. This requires large breeding populations for successful mutations to occur with sufficient frequency for natural selection to operate. The Nobel Laureate, Jaques Monod, writes: "In so large a population, consequently, mutation is by no means an exceptional phenomenon: it is the rule. And it is within the broader framework of population, not of isolated individuals, that selective pressure is exerted."¹⁴

According to current scientific opinion, the evolution of man required a large population of hominids for a successful humanizing mutation to have taken place. This precluded the possibility of a single first couple (Adam and Eve) and is what is known as polygenism, many first parents, as opposed to monogenism, a single pair. The notion of a simultaneous humanizing mutation in both male and female individuals is considered mathematically impossible, and is rejected out of hand by most scientists today on the grounds that it would require divine intervention, a possibility most refuse to consider.

However, it is clear from Scripture, and it has been the constant teaching of Tradition and the Magisterium of the Church, that we are all descended from Adam and Eve. But weighed down by a heavy feeling of inferiority towards the opinions of contemporary science, many Catholic theologians have abandoned the Church's traditional teaching on monogenism and have espoused polygenism. Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, for example, writes: "Thus in the eyes of science, which at long range can only see things in bulk, the 'first man' is, and can only be a crowd, and his infancy is made up of thousands and thousands of years."¹⁵

This espousal of polygenism has forced some Catholics, the so-called "theistic" evolutionists, to deny, or at least cast doubt, on the doctrine of original sin. Fr. Robert Faricy, S.J. in his *Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the Christian in the World* writes:

AIn Teilhard's theory original sin cannot be localized in time or space; it is not an event in a historical chain of events. Rather, it is a global modality of evolution. From this point of view our conception of original sin >considered in its cosmic basis - as opposed to its historical actuation by the first beings - tends to be absorbed by our conception of the very mechanism of creation.= For if creation is thought of as progressive unification, then >original sin represents the action of the negative forces of counter-evolution.= The acceptance of his hypothesis would incidently free us from the obligation, heavier every day, of paradoxically making the whole human race derive from one couple. In Teilhard's theory, Adam is >universalized.=>Strictly speaking there is no Adam. Under this name is hidden the universal law of reversion or perversion.= Evil is >the ransom of progress.= In Teilhard's view Adam is a symbol that all men are born fallen, that all are marked by original sin the instant they become members of mankind. But men are not born in sin because of some aboriginal sin of a primitive Adam. Men are born in original sin because this is the law of the universe, the cosmic condition of a world in evolution.@¹⁶

Pope Pius XII became alarmed at this tendency among Catholic intellectuals, and in 1950 in the encyclical *Humani Generis*, he condemned polygenism:

ABut as regards another conjecture, namely so-called polygenism, the children of the Church by no means enjoy the same liberty. No Catholic can hold that after Adam there existed on earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parent of all, or that Adam is merely a symbol for a number of parents. For it is unintelligible how such an opinion can be reconciled with what the sources of revealed truth teach on original sin, which proceeds from sin actually committed by an individual Adam and which, passed on to all by way of generation, is in everyone as his own.@(*Denz* 2328)

This condemnation of polygenism was repeated in 1966 by Pope Paul VI.¹⁷ But the following year - 1967 - Father Rahner, whom the *30 Days* article lists as one of the main proponents of the exoneration of Pelagius wrote:

AI want to try to prove the following thesis: In the present state of theology and science it cannot be

proved that polygenism conflicts with orthodox teaching on original sin. It would be better therefore if the magisterium refrained from censuring polygenism.

...We can...rightly ask how can one explain in a convincing manner that the mutually independent origin of two human beings from the animal world must be limited to these two only. One may take refuge in every kind of *ad hoc* argument, such as the arbitrary will of the creator or the fact that the hominization is in any case a rare occurrence on biological grounds, but do not such explanations sound rather forced? And then we have to ask ourselves further how can one understand that this one >Adam= found this one >Eve,= both having evolved independently of each other, without appealing to miraculous interventions by God for which there is no justification. In other words, is it seriously probable that, within the wider population unit of the immediately preceding pre-hominids who create the living conditions and opportunity, only these two break through to become human beings and begin to procreate human beings?

A...It is doubtful, to say the least, whether a bodily, historical unity of the first human beings can be understood in terms of monogenism. It is a general principle of biology that true concrete genetic unity is not found in the individual but in the same biotype (organisms of the same genetic constitution). Only within such a situation can evolution come about since selection can exercise its pressure only within such a population and not in isolated individuals.¹⁸

Just recently geneticists by studying mitochondrial DNA which is inherited only from the mother, have come to a startling conclusion. Dr. Rebecca Caan of the University of California, one of the leading researchers in this field, says: "The group that gave rise to us, whether you call them anatomically modern humans, *homo sapiens*, *sapiens*, or whatever, that population contained a woman, an Eve if you want to call her that and we are all descended from her."¹⁹

I suspected that it would be only a matter of time until some liberal Catholic would appeal to this research as a justification of theistic evolutionism, and in an article entitled, "Original Sin: When Did It Happen?" in the February 1988 edition of *Fidelity*, Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, S.V.D. did just that. Father Zimmerman begins the article: "Pope Pius in *Humani Generis* (1950) has freed us from the need of reading Genesis as though it were a history or science text book."²⁰ This is just not true. What the Holy Father actually said is:

AThe first eleven chapters of Genesis, although properly speaking not conforming to the historical method used by the best Greek and Latin writers or by competent authors of our time, do nevertheless pertain to history in the true sense which, however, must be further studied and determined by exegetes; the same chapters in simple and metaphorical language adapted to the mentality of a people but little cultured both state the principal truths which are fundamental for our salvation and also give a popular description of the origin of the human race and chosen people.^{@(Denz. 2330)}

Just because history is written in a popular manner does not mean it is no longer history. Father Zimmerman throughout the article assumes that the evolution of man is a proven fact. Pius XII, whom he

claims to be following, had warned against making this assumption:

ASome, however, highly transgress this liberty of discussion when they act as if the origin of the human body from pre-existing and living matter were already completely certain and proved by facts which have been discovered up to now and by reasoning on those facts as if there were nothing in the sources of Divine Revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question.@ (Denz. 2327)

But even though Rebecca Caan *et alia* are saying we are all descended from one woman, they are not really espousing monogenism, because they maintain that there were true men before and after "mitochondrial Eve" who were not descended from her. Father Zimmerman agrees and thinks that Neandertal Man who according to these geneticists, lived after "Eve," was not truly human, because he lacked the physical capacity for proper speech:

AThis is not to deny that Neandertal Man and other hominids had some kind of speech ability. But they could not have had the rapid speaking ability which we have. If we tried to fit our speech organs into Neandertal Man, the larynx would be located in his chest, and impossible situation never observed among primates (Lieberman, 296). Lieberman mentions a speaking ability with perhaps one-tenth of the speed at which we speak, as attributable to the *non-Homo sapiens* supralaryngeal airway. Therefore only short sentences could be spoken. Anything longer would be lost to the short-term memory because the time lapse is too long (Lieberman), 325). Hence, I believe, people without our type of speech organs would not qualify for the Eden events.@²¹

Even the evolutionists admit that Neandertal Man buried his dead with religious ceremony. This would mean that a non-human or pre-human animal was capable of religious devotion. This should make the animal rights activists happy.²² Father Zimmerman concludes:

ABefore Adam and Eve, then, humans may have existed in a condition of pre-adulthood as far as thinking and a sense of responsibility are concerned. When the fullness of time came, that is when Adam and Eve arrived at the threshold of true human maturity, then God took them apart from the others and introduced them to Eden.@²³

The new genetic theory maintains that there were true men before the appearance of mitochondrial Eve (*Homo erectus* and Archaic *Homo sapiens*) and that there were true men after her (Neandertal Man and the successors of Peking Man) who were not descended from her. These opinions, which are technically known as Pre-Adamism and Co-Adamism, have been around for a surprisingly long time. Pre-Adamism was first proposed by the French Calvinist Isaac Peyrère, who later abjured his error before Pope Alexander VII. In 1890 it was revised by Winchell, supposedly in more scientific form, in his *Pre-Adamites, or a Demonstration of the Existence of Man Before Adam*.²⁴ Co-Adamism, that is that true men existed with Adam who were not from him, is a necessary corollary of polygenism. We have seen that in 1950 Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani Generis* condemned polygenism and in the same section also condemned Co-Adamism. "No Catholic can hold that after Adam there existed on earth true

men who did not take their origin from him as the first parent of all, or that Adam is merely a symbol for a number of first parents." (*Denz.* 2328)

But in *Humani Generis* Pius XII not only condemned polygenism and Co-Adamism in particular, but also evolutionism in general; that is, evolutionism as a natural explanation for the origin of all things.

Some imprudently and indiscreetly hold that evolution, which has not been fully proven even in the domain of natural sciences, explains the origin of all things, and audaciously support the monistic and pantheistic opinion that the world is in constant evolution. The champions of Communism readily use this hypothesis in order to defend and propagate their dialectical materialism and banish from all minds every notion of God.

The fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy which opposing itself to idealism, immanentism, and pragmatism, has assumed the name of existentialism, since it concerns itself only with the existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences.

There is also a certain historicism, which giving value only to the events of man's life, overthrows the foundation of all truth and absolute law in regard to philosophical speculations and especially to Christian dogmas. (*Denz.* 2306,2307)

Let me review briefly the explanations which evolutionism offers for just four origins: 1.) the origin of the universe, 2.) the origin of life, 3.) the origin of species, and 4.) the origin of man.

The origin of the universe. The opening line of Carl Sagan's very popular TV series *Cosmos* tells it all: "The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be." But this is unreasonable because the existence of God can be demonstrated from natural reason. "For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; His eternal power also, and divinity: so that they are inexcusable" (Romans 1:20). Science is an exercise in reason and if a scientific theory is unreasonable, it is also unscientific.

The Big Bang or Expanding Universe Theory maintains that the universe went from a state of maximum disorder to a state of maximum order by purely natural processes. This is in direct violation of one of the most basic laws of physics, the Second Law of Thermodynamics or the Law of Entropy, which states that the universe is gradually running down, or in the process of going from order to disorder.

2.) **The origin of life.** In the nineteenth century Louis Pasteur brilliantly disproved the old theory of "spontaneous generation," that life could be spontaneously generated from non-living things. Today, "biogenesis," the fact that life can only come from living things, is a basic law of biology. But the evolutionists have gone back to the old theory of "spontaneous generation," calling it now "abiogenesis," and claiming once again that life can arise from non-living things. Needless to say abiogenesis has never been

demonstrated.

3.) **The origin of species.** The Catholic scientist Louis Vialleton maintained that the origin of species by evolution was a scientific impossibility. He said that there is an impassible discontinuity between the great classes of fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals, because these classes have completely different physiological systems.²⁵ But the evolutionists ignore this argument and boldly claim that the great classes gradually merged into one another.

4.) **The origin of man.** Carl Sagan wrote in his *The Dragons of Eden*: "My fundamental premise about the brain is that its workings - what we sometimes call 'mind' - are a consequence of its anatomy and physiology and nothing more."²⁶ But again this is unreasonable since the existence of the human soul can be demonstrated from reason. This proposition has led Sagan to all kinds of absurd conclusions: "We are at a similar point in the consideration of machine intelligence. Machines are just passing over an important threshold: the threshold at which, to some extent at least, they give an unbiased human being the impression of intelligence. Because of a kind of chauvinism or anthropocentrism, many humans are reluctant to admit this possibility. But I think it is inevitable. To me it is not in the least demeaning that consciousness and intelligence are the result of 'mere' matter sufficiently complexly arranged: on the contrary, it is an exalting tribute to the subtlety of matter and the laws of Nature."²⁷

I think from the above it is clear that evolutionism is not science, but rather a philosophy, or better a religion, masquerading as science, which by definition is what is called "scientism." Yet this is the only model of origins which can be taught in our public schools. This amounts to an established church, something forbidden by our Constitution. When the "creationists," largely Protestant fundamentalists, petitioned the courts to allow their alternative model of origins, "scientific creationism," equal time in the public schools, they were rebuffed on the grounds of separation of Church and State - talk about a double standard!²⁸ Yet so upset are the Establishment Humanists by this ongoing challenge, that they commissioned a Jesuit priest (wouldn't you know it!) a professor of geology at Boston College, to write a rebuttal of the creationist model of origins.²⁹ Father Skehan dutifully wrote a booklet entitled *Modern Science and the Book of Genesis*, which was published and distributed by the National Science Teachers Association, a humanist front.³⁰

I am afraid that the most charitable thing I can say about this booklet is that it is just pathetic. Father Skehan is supposed to be a geologist, but he never mentions any of the very substantive arguments of the creationists from geology. Instead he concentrates on trivia like the number of animals in the Ark of Noah, etc. But the bulk of the booklet is devoted to an attack on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and the claim that the Hexameron is merely a purified form of a Babylonian creation myth, the *Enuma elish*. These old hat theories were espoused at the beginning of the century by the Catholic Modernists Loisy and Tyrell, who had copied them from the so-called "higher critics," liberal Protestant skeptics like Wellhausen and Gunkel. These theories were condemned by the Magisterium,³¹ which at the same time spelled out in detail just what must be taken in the strictly literal, historical sense in the first three chapters of Genesis:

AHistorical Character of Certain Parts

AQuestion: 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 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.

AAnswer: In the negative.^{@32}

Pope Leo XIII in his marvelous encyclical on biblical studies, *Providentissimus Deus*, wrote:

It is most unbecoming to pass by, in ignorance or contempt, the excellent work which Catholics have left in abundance, and to have recourse to the works of non-Catholics and to seek in them to the detriment of sound doctrine and often to the peril of faith, the explanation of passages on which Catholics long ago have successfully employed their talent and their labour. For...the sense of Holy Scripture can nowhere be found incorrupt outside the Church and cannot be expected to be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw at the bark of Sacred Scripture and never attain its pith.^{@33}

I think these words apply even more strongly to the "Catholic" Modernists of today, than to poor Protestants who have only *sola Scriptura*. The Modernists have the guidance of the Infallible Magisterium, which they deliberately reject.

It is condign that while the Modernists are busy attacking Holy Scripture by means of literary criticism, for the first time these same tools are being used to examine the writings of the evolutionists themselves. In 1979 Misia Landau, who was at that time working on her doctorate at Yale, was reading a book by Vladimir Propp, a Russian literary critic, entitled *The Morphology of the Folk Tale*:

On the basis mainly of Russian literature, Propp describes the hero myths of old tales in terms of a basic structure they all follow: the hero enters, is challenged by, and overcomes a series of tests, and finally triumphs. Propp was very systematic, and he broke this basic structure down into a sequence of separate functions; the precise identity of characters and activities at each point may differ, but the underlying structure remains the same.^{@34}

Landau, herself an evolutionist, suddenly realized that the "hero myth" was a literary form that could be applied to the story of the evolution of man:

Where Propp identified thirty-one functions within the narrative of the hero myth, Landau simplifies

the analysis to nine. These include the introduction of the humble hero (an ape, a monkey, or a diminutive prosimian) in an initially stable environment; our hero is then expelled from this safety (because of climactic change) and is forced to embark on a hazardous journey during which he must overcome a series of tests (new environmental conditions) and thereby display his worth (develop intelligence, bipedalism, etc.); thus endowed, our hero develops further advantages (tools for Osborn; reason for Keith), only to be tested again.³⁵

Of course Landau does not dare use the word "myth" - she would not be teaching at a prestigious secular university if she did - but contents herself with the term "storytelling," but it is obvious that the evolutionist's account of the origin of man is yet another "hero myth." It is amusing to hear of the reactions of some of the evolutionists to her thesis:

A...When she gave a seminar in the anthropology department at Berkeley, Don Johanson was adamant that even if people told stories in the past, they certainly didn't now. The science is so sophisticated, objective that he for one is engaged in an unbiased search for truth."³⁶

The new Pelagians rejection of original sin, the biblical account of the Fall of Man, the loss of supernatural grace and the preternatural gifts of immortality, integrity, and impassibility, and the incurring of the penalties of death, concupiscence and sickness, have not only profound theological implications, but serious psychological consequences as well. A Catholic layman, John Hammes, a professor of Psychology at the secular University of Georgia, has written an excellent book entitled, *Human Destiny*, which would probably have gotten him fired had he been teaching at a Catholic college:

The interpretations of the Adam and Eve story have both theoretical and practical implications for psychology. Theoretically speaking, with regard to a psychological model of man, is he to be considered a child of evolution or a child of God? Is he ordained to find final termination in death, or to a glorified individual immortality? Practically speaking, the interpretations of the Adam and Eve story bear on the deepest existential problems encountered in counseling and psychotherapy. Carl Jung once declared that the basic problem of almost all of his patients over thirty-five years of age was finding a religious outlook on life (Jung, 1969). Victor Frankel's logotherapy is wholly based on the search for life's meaning (Frankel, 1963). Our age is characterized by anxiety, meaninglessness, and a search for enduring values - problems relating basically to the human condition. Whether or not one can give satisfactory and authentic answers to today's questions on the meaning of guilt, suffering, and death rests ultimately on one's interpretation of the Fall of Man.³⁷

If Pelagianism is true, and there is no original sin, there is also no Redemption, no need for Jesus to have died on the Cross. And also, which I find particularly galling, there was no Immaculate Conception; no "O Mary conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee." The article in *30 Days* names Fr. Karl Rahner as one of the main promoters of the rehabilitation of Pelagius. We have seen why - he was a promoter of liberalism, or better universalism, and evolutionism. But it still comes as a shock that he would dare to attack the Immaculate Conception:

¶The dogma [of the Immaculate Conception] does not mean that the birth of a being is accompanied by something contaminating, a stain, and that in order to avoid it Mary must have had a privilege. The Immaculate Conception therefore consists simply in the possession, from the beginning of her existence, of the life of divine grace, which was given her. From the beginning of her existence Mary was enveloped in the redeeming and sanctifying love of God. Such is, in all simplicity, the content of the doctrine that Pius IX solemnly defined as a truth of the Catholic faith, in the year 1854.³⁸

The always irascible but ever lovable St. Jerome, said of the Pelagians of his day:

¶All their arguments must be dismantled, with the help of Christ. And it must be done through the testimony of the Scriptures, by which God speaks to the faithful every day. Through you, I ask that those who meet in your holy and illustrious house do not welcome as many as three or even one of those insignificant little men and thus give room to the faeces or - at the very least - the infamy of such grave heresies. Therefore, wherever virtue and holiness be praised, the shame of this diabolic presumption and obscene group of people will find no room. Those who help such men should know that they are welcoming a multitude of heretics who are the enemies of Christ and nourish his adversaries. For while they make vain statements claiming one thing, it has been proved that they have quite another thing in their hearts.³⁹

Wouldn't you love to hear what St. Jerome would say about the Pelagians of our day?

References

1. Msgr. Joseph Pohle, *God the Author of Nature and the Supernatural*, translated from the German by Arthur Preuss, B. Herder, St. Louis, 1916, pp.218,219.
2. St. Jerome, *Letter to Ctesiphontes*, Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, 21, 1147-1161, translated from the Latin by Giovanni Ricciardi, *30 Days*, February, 1991, English edition, San Francisco, pp.50,51.
3. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q.68, a.1.
4. As a corollary to the necessity of faith and baptism for salvation, St. Thomas also taught that unbaptized babies went to the Limbo of the Children (*Summa Theologica*, III, Q.68, a.1). But later the rigorist Jansenists taught that unbaptized babies went rather to the fires of hell, and they called the Limbo of the Children a "Pelagian fable." This teaching was condemned by Pope Pius VI in 1794:

¶The doctrine which rejects as a Pelagian fable that place of the lower regions (which the faithful generally designate by the name of the Limbo of the 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 fire, just as if, by this very fact, that those who remove the punishment of fire,

introduced that middle place and state, free of guilt and punishment between the kingdom of God and eternal damnation, such as that about which the Pelagians idly talk: [This proposition is] false, rash, injurious to Catholic schools (*Denz.* 1526).

Today there are many Catholics agitating for the abolition of the Limbo of the Children for the sake of getting the souls of aborted babies into heaven. This going to the opposite extreme is really out-Pelagianing Pelagius. It seems to me that this will only encourage abortion. If a woman is hesitating about having an abortion, and someone tells her that her aborted baby would go directly to the Beatific Vision, this could push her over the brink.

4. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Q.10, a.3.
5. St. Thomas Aquinas, *The Disputed Questions on Truth*, translated by Fr. James V. McGlynn, S.J., II, Q.14, 2.2, Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1952, pp.158,262.
6. Cf. Address to the Confraternity of Catholic Clergy, Third National Colloquium, November, 1977, by Fr. Peter Finnegan, O.P., "The Priest, the Word of God, and the Magisterium," Cardinal Communications, New London, CN.
7. Francisco Suarez, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, Libri 1, ing. 3, tr.2, sect.1, c.8 (n.325); quoted in Fr. Ricardo Lombardi, S.J., *The Salvation of the Unbeliever*, translated by Dorothy M. White, The Newman Press, Westminster, MD., 1956, p.232.
8. *Denz.* 2123, cf. Finnegan, *Op. cit.*
9. **Question:** Whether a missionary is bound before Baptism is conferred on an adult, to explain to him all the mysteries of our faith, especially if he is at the point of death, because this might disturb his mind. Or, whether, it is sufficient if one at the point of death will promise that when he recovers from the illness, he will take care to be instructed, so that he may put into practice what has been commanded him.

Response: A promise is not sufficient, but a missionary is bound to explain to an adult, even a dying one who is not entirely incapacitated, the mysteries of faith which are necessary by a necessity of means, as are especially the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. (*Denz.* 2380)

Question: Whether it is possible for a crude and uneducated adult, as it might be with a barbarian, to be baptized, if there were given to him only an understanding of God and some of His attributes, especially His justice in rewarding and punishing according to this remark of the Apostle: He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder.= (Heb. 11:6), from which it is inferred that a barbarian adult, in a certain case of urgent necessity, can be baptized although he does not believe explicitly in Jesus Christ.

Response: A missionary should not baptize one who does not believe explicitly in the Lord Jesus Christ, but is bound to instruct him about all those matters which are necessary by a necessity of means, in accordance with the capacity of the one to be baptized. (*Denz.* 2381)
10. During the nineteenth century the liberals, by taking passages from the encyclicals of Pope Pius IX out of context, boldly claimed that he taught the Pelagian doctrine of salvation by invincible ignorance. Here is one such passage to which they refer from the encyclical *Singulari Quodam* of

1854:

It must of course be held as a matter of faith that outside the apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved, that the Church is the only ark of salvation, and that whoever does not enter it will perish in the flood. On the other hand, it must likewise be held as certain that those who are affected by ignorance of the true religion, if it is invincible ignorance, are not subject to any guilt in this matter before the eyes of the Lord. Now, who could presume in himself an ability to set the boundaries of such ignorance, taking into consideration the natural differences of peoples, lands, native talents, and so many other factors?

Only when we have been released from the bonds of this body and see God as He is (1 John 3:2) shall we really understand how close and beautiful a bond joins divine mercy with divine justice. But as long as we dwell on earth encumbered with this soul-dulling, mortal body, let us tenaciously cling to the Catholic doctrine that there is one God, one Faith, one Baptism (Ephesians 4:5). To try to proceed with further investigation is wrong. @

The liberals usually stop here, but the Holy Father continues:

Nevertheless, as charity demands let us pray continually for the conversion to Christ of all nations everywhere. Let us devote ourselves to the salvation of all men as far as we can, for the hand of the Lord is not shortened (Isaiah 59:1). The gifts of heavenly grace will assuredly not be denied to those who sincerely want and pray for refreshment by the divine light. These truths need to be fixed deeply in the minds of the faithful so that they cannot be infected with doctrine tending to foster religious indifferentism which we see spreading widely, with growing strength, and with destructive effect upon souls. (*Denz.* 1646-1648)

The teaching here is exactly the same as that of St. Thomas Aquinas. Pope Pius says, persons "affected by ignorance of the true religion if it is invincible ignorance, are not subject to any guilt in this matter," the "matter" being the sin of unbelief; or as St. Thomas puts it, "When such unbelievers are damned, it is on account of other sins, which cannot be taken away without faith, but not on account of unbelief." But concerning a person of good will involved in invincible ignorance Pius says, "the gifts of heavenly grace will assuredly not be denied to those who sincerely want and pray for refreshment by the divine light"; or as St. Thomas says, "it pertains to Divine Providence to furnish everyone with what is necessary for salvation, provided that on his part there is no hindrance." There is complete continuity of Tradition then, in the teaching of St. Thomas and of Pope Pius IX.

11. Henry Brownson, *Orestes A. Brownson's Latter Life* (1855-1876), H.F. Brownson, Detroit, 1900, pp.565,566.
12. Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., "Problem of the 'Anonymous Christian'," *Theological Investigations*, Volume XVI, The Seabury Press, New York, 1976, pp.565,566.
13. *Vatican Council II*, edited by Fr. Austin Flannery, O.P., The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MN, 1975, pp.367,368.
14. Jacques Monod, *Chance and Necessity*, translated from the French by Austryn Wainhouse, Random House, New York, 1972, p.120.
15. Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., *The Phenomenon of Man*, Harper and Row, New York, 1972, p.120.

16. Fr. Robert Faricy, S.J., *Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the Christian in the World*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1967, p.158.

17. It is therefore evident that the explanations of original sin given by some authors will seem to you irreconcilable with the true Catholic doctrine. Starting from the undemonstrated premise of polygenism they deny more or less clearly, that the sin from which so many cesspools of evil have come to mankind, was first of all the disobedience of Adam, first man,=figure of that future Man, committed at the beginning of history. Consequently these explanations do not even agree with the teaching of Scripture, or of sacred tradition and the Church's Magisterium, according to which the sin of the first man is transmitted to all his descendants not through imitation but through propagation, is in each as his own,= that is privation and not simple lack of holiness and justice even in new born babies.

Pope Paul VI, Allocution, *L'Osservatore Romano*, July 15, 1966.

18. Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., "Evolution and Original Sin," in *The Evolving World and Theology*, *Concilium*, Volume 26, Paulist Press, Glenn Rock, NJ, 1967, p.64.

19. *Nova*, "Children of Eve," WGBH Educational Foundation, Boston, MA, 1986, p.1.

20. Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, S.V.D., "Original Sin: When Did It Happen?" *Fidelity*, February, 1988, South Bend, IN, p.38.

21. Zimmerman, *Op. cit.*, p.42.

22. I would think that Carl Sagan would be an embarrassment to the Humanist Establishment for some of his utterances, but he remains one of its most prominent spokesmen. Here he is on animal rights:

If chimpanzees have consciousness, if they are capable of abstraction do they not have what until now has been described as human rights? How smart does a chimpanzee have to be before killing him constitutes murder? What further properties must he show before religious missionaries must consider him worthy of conversion?

I was recently escorted through a large primate research laboratory by its director. We approached a long corridor lined to the vanishing point as in a perspective drawing with caged chimpanzees. They were one, two, or three to a cage, and I am sure the accommodations were exemplary as far as such institutions (or for that matter traditional zoos) go. As we approached the nearest cage, its inmates bared their teeth and with incredible accuracy let fly with great sweeping arcs of spittle, fairly drenching the lightweight suit of the facility's director. They uttered a staccato of short shrieks, which echoed down the corridor to be repeated and amplified by other caged chimps, who had certainly not seen us, until the corridor fairly shook with screeching and banging and rattling of bars.

I was powerfully reminded of those American motion pictures of the 1930's and 40's set in some vast dehumanized state penitentiary, in which the prisoners banged their eating utensils against the bars at the appearance of the tyrannical warden. These chimps are healthy and well-fed. If they are "only" animals, if they are beasts which abstract not, then my comparison is a piece of sentimental foolishness. But chimpanzees can abstract. Like other animals, they are capable of strong emotions. They have certainly committed no crimes. I do not claim to have the answer, but I think it is certainly worthwhile to raise the

question: Why, exactly, all over the civilized world, in virtually every major city, are apes in prison?

Carl Sagan, *The Dragons of Eden*, Random House, New York, 1977, pp.120,121.

23. Zimmerman, p.43.

24. Cf. Pohle-Preuss, *Op. cit.*, pp.131-136.

25. Mutations happen by chance, and therefore we must see if chance, even if aided by natural selection, has been able to achieve any results...The desired result is that the new production not be an incoherent ensemble, but an organ, i.e., something possessing different parts which complement one another so that the whole may be able to exercise a definite function. If we consider, for example, the eye, it is necessary among other requirements that the crystalline be transparent and that its curvature, and therefore its focal distance, have a definite relation with its distance to the retina...Another result to be attained is that the new organ form with its organism a coherent whole...For example, an eye would have no use at all if it should develop inside the stomach.

Besides, an organ is not something you attach to an organism the same way you attach a rear view mirror to an automobile door. Its coordination with other already existing organisms supposes a more or less profound revision of the whole living being; for example, the eye, even assuming that it appears on a suitable location and properly connected by nerves to the sensorial and motor centers of the brain and the cerebellum, would serve no purpose at all if these nervous centers had not at the same time become fit to use the stimuli received by the optic nerve in a manner useful to the individual...Vialleton showed how impossible it was for the new organs to form a coherent whole with what existed before, and therefore the need for a recasting of the whole individual. The reasons brought forward by...him have never been the object of serious discussion. I recall them briefly...in the hope that they will not fall into oblivion.

George Salet, *Hasard et Certitude*, Editions Scientific, Paris, 1972, pp.273,274; translated from the French by Bro. Stanislaus Ribera Faig, O.S.B.; quoted in Thomas Mary Sennott, *The Six Days of Creation*, Ravengate Press, Cambridge, MA, 1985, pp.237,238.

26. Sagan, *Op. cit.*, p.7.

Again for the sake of not taking anything for granted, let me give one of the arguments from reason for the existence of the soul from a standard college text:

By what sentient faculty can you do a sum in mathematics? By what organ can you discover that two and two make four? You can see two bricks; you can hear two sounds; you can smell two odors; you can touch and feel two bodily objects; you can taste two flavors; you can imagine two dragons. But you cannot by any sense or sense-organ lay hold of two...That is of two by itself; not two this or that but simply two. But the mind of man can understand what two means. A man, confronted with the exacting problem of adding two and two, does not pause and say, 'Two what?' When little boys and girls first go to school the teacher trains them to make pure mathematical concepts (or ideas) by connecting the quantities with definite and sensible materials. The teacher says, 'If John had two apples and Mary gave him two apples, how many apples has John?' But in a very short time the minds of the smallest children are ready to dispense with the apples and with other material substances, and are able to deal with quantity in the abstract. And so the children add two and two, and three and five, and nine and seven, not being puzzled by the task of handling quantities without any sensible thing that is quantified. What organ could begin to do such a thing? The brain?

You might as well say the eye or the ear. For no organ deals with objects in the abstract; no organ can deal with objects in the universal. The brain is the organ of the interior senses of the imagination, for example, and sense-memory. Now imagination and sense-memory can deal with their object when it is no longer outwardly and physically present; but to do this they must project the object within themselves in an image that is individual, concrete, circumstanced. This is an example of the highest type of organic operation, and it is still a matter of concreteness and circumstance. But

thinking and reasoning are not limited by concreteness, individuality and circumstance. Hence thinking and reasoning are operations of a character superior to any organic operation. They are supra-organic; they are of spiritual character. Hence they come from a spiritual first principle. This is the soul.®

Msgr. Paul Glenn, *A Class Manual in the Philosophy of Organic and Rational Life*, B. Herder, St. Louis, 1948, pp.189,190.

27. Sagan, *Op. cit.*, pp.209,210.

28. I admire the ongoing legal battles the creationists are waging in the courts throughout the land against the exclusive teaching of the evolutionist model of origins in the public schools, and I think they deserve the sympathy of every Catholic. But I believe the Franciscan, Fr.Peter Fehlner, has more clearly stated the proper Catholic position on the teaching of origins in the public schools:

¶There are those who maintain that however plausible an evolutionary hypothesis might seem, it does not stem from any scientific character of the theory, but rather from the religious-philosophical assumptions employed in such a theory as a matrix for the organization of a great deal of disparate

phenomena. Similarly there are those who maintain the difficulty, indeed the impossibility of separating creation science as a scientific hypothesis from the dogma of creation, a truth whose certainty is on revealed grounds beyond doubt and not to be confused with the merely hypothetical. The Church cannot agree that a revealed truth may be taught on the same footing as a hypothesis which in fact is false, for

such in fact would amount to a tacit acceptance of religious indifferentism. It may well be that the only workable solution is to eliminate the treatment of origins from a "neutral" school, since once the subject is introduced, it may become difficult for a public school to remain neutral.®

Fr. Peter D. Fehlner, F.F.I., "In the Beginning," *Christ to the World* (published in three parts in this journal, Nos. 1, 2 and 3) No. 3, May-August, 1988, p.39.

I highly recommend this definitive paper on the true Catholic position on evolutionism according to the Magisterium, of the Church. It was published in serial form in Rome in *Christ to the World*, the official journal of the *Propaganda Fidei*, and in this country by Fr. James Downey, O.S.B. in *Religious Life*, Chicago, but unfortunately has not yet been published in book or booklet form, which tells a lot about Catholic publishers today.

29. I am sure the atheistic humanists were glad to have Father Skehan do their dirty work for them, but I suspect that deep in their hearts, they felt the same way about his compromise as the atheistic evolutionist Jacques Monod, felt about the theistic evolutionist, Teilhard de Chardin:

¶The biology of Teilhard de Chardin would not merit attention, but for the startling success it has encountered even in scientific circles. A success which tells of the eagerness, of the need to revive the covenant. Teilhard revives it, and does so nakedly. His philosophy, like Bergson's, is based entirely upon an initial evolutionist postulate. But, unlike Bergson, he has the evolutive force operating throughout the entire

universe, from elementary particles to galaxies: there is no inert-matter, and therefore no essential distinction between matter and life. His wish to present this concept as scientific leads Teilhard to base it upon a new definition of energy. This is somehow distributed between two vectors, one of which (I presume) would be ordinary energy, whereas the other would correspond to the upward evolutionary surge. The biosphere and man are the latest products of this ascent along the spiritual vector of energy. This evolution is to continue until all the energy has become concentrated along the spiritual vectors: that will be the attaining of point omega.

Although Teilhard's logic is hazy and his style laborious, some of those who do not entirely accept his ideology yet allow it a certain poetic grandeur. For my part I am most of all struck by the intellectual spinelessness of his philosophy. In it I see more than anything else a systematic truckling, a willingness to conciliate at any price, to come to any compromise. Perhaps, after all, Teilhard was not for nothing a member of that order which, three centuries earlier, Pascal assailed for its theological laxness.

Monod, *Op. cit.*, pp.31,32.

30. We have seen that Pope Pius XII said that Catholics should not accept the claim that the evolution of man is a proven fact. I find it amusing to watch Father Skehan distinguish (*distinguo*), in what unfortunately has come to be considered "typical Jesuit" fashion, between "proven" and "logically demonstrated":

Characteristically, creationists claim that there is no scientific proof for evolutionary theory, to which they are unalterably opposed. But no respectable scientist claims that the evidence for a particular theory of evolution is so compelling and complete that it should be regarded as proven - or completely understood, including its mechanism. Strictly speaking a theory cannot be proven in the same sense in which a mathematical theorem can be proven. This is not a judgement of any particular theory, but only a statement of the way in which human knowledge develops. Theories are erected on evidence; as studies proceed, the evidence increases and theories are modified. Our understanding grows.

At this point in time experts have presented evidence for evolution that is so massive and convincing that the general validity of the theory is logically demonstrated.

Fr. James W. Skehan, S.J., *Modern Science and the Book of Genesis*, National Science Teachers Association, Washington, D.C., p.26.

31. ON THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

The Biblical Commission answers the following questions:

1. *Authenticity* - Whether the arguments amassed by critics to impugn the Mosaic authenticity of the sacred books designated by the name Pentateuch are of sufficient weight, notwithstanding the very many evidences to the contrary contained in both Testaments, taken collectively, the persistent agreement of the Jewish people, the constant tradition of the Church, and internal arguments derived from the text itself, to justify the statements that these books have not Moses for their author but have been compiled from sources for the most part posterior to the time of Moses.

Answer: In the negative.

A.A.S. 39 (1906); *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, St. Meinrad, IN, 1964, p.122.

ON THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF GENESIS

The Biblical Commission answers the following questions:

2. *Historical Character of the Three Chapters:* - Whether we may, in spite of the close connection of the first three chapters with one another and with those which follow, of the manifold testimony of the unanimous opinion of the Fathers, and of the traditional view which transmitted also by the Jewish people - has always been held by the Church, teach that the aforesaid chapters 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 historical and partly fictitious, freely handled for the instruction and edification of souls.

Answer In the negative to each part.

A.A.S., 1 (1909); 567-569; cf. *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, pp.122,123.

32. A.A.S., 1 (1909) 567-569; cf. *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, p.123.

33. Pope Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*, November 18, 1893, (15); cf. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M., *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, McGrath Publishing Co., Raleigh, NC, 1981, p.332.

There is an excellent article in the September 1990 issue of *Theological Studies*) by Fr. J.P.M. Walsh, S.J., a professor of Scripture at Georgetown, which puts Leo XIII's teaching in a slightly different manner:

¶What of the poor modern reader, to whom biblical images can be obscure - whose world of experience may be so different from that of the Biblical poets? Modern readers are in the same position as the Ethiopian eunuch. They need a deacon. They are not biblical scholars. Someone has to explain the text to them. ¶Mediation= is indicated.

¶In short, I believe the text needs to be taken on its own terms - and that a deacon= will make this possible, one who can mediate between those different worlds of experience.

¶Finally, the theological implications of these matters are too profound to go into here. Suffice to say that there are Christological (incarnational) and ecclesiological aspects to these questions. The Word went forth, and became incarnate, in a certain time and world and language. The Church (including biblical scholars!) mediates the Word. The world-wide community of believers is called to perform that diaconal service. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.

J.P.M. Walsh, S.J., "Dynamic or formal equivalence?" *Theological Studies*, September, 1990, Society of Jesus, Baltimore, MD, p.508.

There is no salvation outside the Church, and there is no proper interpretation of Scripture

outside the Church.

34. Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1987, p.32.

35. Lewin, *Op. cit.*, p.33.

The apostate Catholic, Joseph Campbell, was considered the world's leading authority on mythology. His analysis of the "hero myth" is similar to that of Propp and Landau:

MOYERS: Why did you call your book *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*?

CAMPBELL: Because there is a certain typical hero sequence of actions which can be detected in stories from all over the world and from many periods of history. Essentially, it might be said there is but one archetypal mythic hero whose life has been replicated in many lands by many, many people. A legendary hero is usually the founder of something - the founder of a new age, the founder of a new way of life. In order to found something new, one has to leave the old and go in quest of the seed idea, a germinal idea that will have the potentiality of bringing forth that new thing.

Joseph Campbell with Bill Moyers, *The Power of Myth*, Doubleday, New York, p.136.

Isn't this exactly Australopithecus or whatever, becoming *Homo habilis*, etc., etc., and finally *Homo sapiens*? But not only do the evolutionists reduce the origin of man to a "hero myth," some of them speak of our alleged ancestors in what can only be described as "totemistic" terms. Here again is Jacques Monod

As we all know, the great turning points in evolution have coincided with the invasion of new ecological spaces. If terrestrial vertebrates appeared and were able to initiate that wonderful line from which amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals later developed, it was originally because a primitive fish chose to do some exploring on land, where it was however ill-provided with means for getting about. The same fish thereby created, as a consequence of a shift in behavior, the selective pressure which was to engender the powerful limbs of the quadrupeds. Among the descendants of this daring explorer, this Magellan of evolution, are some that can run at speeds of fifty miles an hour; others climb trees with astonishing agility, while yet others have conquered the air, in a fantastic manner fulfilling, extending, and amplifying the ancestral fish's hankering, its dream.®

Monod, pp.126,127.

36. Lewin, p.37.

37. John Hammes, *Human Destiny*, Exploring Today's Value Systems, Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1978, p.258.

38. Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., *Maria Meditazione*, p.50; quoted in: Joseph Cardinal Siri, *Gethsemane, Reflections on the Contemporary Theological Movement*, Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, 1981, pp.87,88.

39. St. Jerome, *Op. cit.*, p.51.
