



# 'HUMANI GENERIS'

## ITS SIGNIFICANCE AND TEACHING

By Rev. PATRICK J. HAMELL, M.A., D.D.

IN an Allocution in 1946, His Holiness Pope Pius XII referred to the considerable volume of discussion about a "new theology which, with all things in a constant process of evolution, is supposed to be ever evolving, ever advancing, never reaching its term." The tenets of the new system were vague, still fluid. One could scarcely speak of a system at all, but rather of tendencies and tentative propositions. The general preoccupation, however, was with the fundamental question of the relations between intellect and faith, and the Holy Father gave explicit warning of the gravity of the issues involved when he stated that nothing less than the existence of dogma and the unity and stability of the Catholic faith was at stake. In such a system, he asked, *what will be the result of the unshakable doctrine and what will be the result of the unifying and unifying if the (a)holic faith?*

The essential responsible in the contemplation of a 'new theology' were in the main two. The impart of modern philosophy, and the hard, unrelenting, desire to develop modern methods of winning to the true Church of Christ the which were only nominally or not even nominally. The will already aware of the tremendous primary output of the intellectual and the apt-chilly French theologian in the light of the in the court of the controversies on general and particular points of this "new theology." After a decade of free discussion had gone on, the Chief Interest of interest of the journal to the non-nominal errors and the Catholic staff of the Catholic. In an Eminent Letter of the primary interest for the faith, for the theological philosophy, he published an exhaustive treatment of the tendencies and

[1] *ibid.*, "S. II" 46, r. II, p. 354-5. Bracketed numbers hereafter

errors of the new system, defined the nature and purpose of theology, the function of reason and philosophy, and marked out the lines of development for the future.

Before outlining the teaching of the Encyclical, it may be well to recall a few general notions of the relations between faith, theology and reason. Revelation is a message from God to man, and to reach individual men it must be formulated in human language. It is the divine fact or truth which is revealed, not the proposition which expresses it. The divine truth is immutable, inexhaustible. The instrument which we use to state it, human language, is finite, imperfect, changing. No formula fashioned by man can exhaust or perfectly convey divine truth. Christ appointed the Teaching Authority of the Church to be the guardian and interpreter of revealed truth, and this Teaching Authority, in the infallible exercise of its commission, interprets and formulates the truths entrusted to it. Those revealed truths which the Church proposes to us as such for our belief are dogmas. The choice of terms and concepts and the construction of the logical proposition to convey the revealed truth are conditioned by a number of factors including the language, culture and philosophical development of the time.

Theology is a science whose directing and underlying principles are the truths revealed by God, but its proper object is the conclusions, theological conclusions, deduced by reason from divinely revealed truths. By means of these deductions we are able to gain more knowledge of the faith than the simple expression of the revealed truth itself gives, and it is the function of theology to penetrate more and more deeply into the mysteries of revelation and so endeavour to gain a more profound understanding of them.

In these processes, the formulation of revealed truths and the drawing of conclusions from them, the function of reason and the importance of reason are obvious. If the terms and concepts used in a Conciliar definition (e.g. person, nature, substance, individuality, and philosophical system underlying them, are valid permanently, the content of the defini-



his concrete environment, in a manner capable of satisfying his needs and bearing on actual problems he encounters on the way to salvation. Man is conditioned in his life and religious thought by the age in which he lives. He has will and emotions as well as intellect, and his will and emotions have a major role in commending God's message to him. Hence theology should in the main be a matter of exegesis and should occupy itself primarily with the Bible, which contains God's word. It should take account, too, of the Early Fathers in order to recapture the vitality and freshness of their presentation, which have largely been lost in recent centuries, and of the Liturgy, which is a dynamic expression of the life of the Church. With the assistance and example afforded by these, theology, to fulfil its role, should adjust itself to its age and to living experience, to the cultural, literary and scientific attainments of the time. The return to the Fathers, especially to the Greek Fathers, will stress for it the notion of history which has become so important in our day, and enrich it with categories of thought which they employed and which to our loss are no longer used in our theology and philosophy. Moreover, theology should, they say, address itself to the whole man in his actual surroundings, not merely to his intellect, and should express itself not simply in a series of abstract, intellectual judgments but in terms of values, love and hate. That is, the will and the emotions must be catered for, and given a place corresponding to the vital, and perhaps predominant, part which they play in our acquisition of knowledge. Only through such an 'actual' presentation of revealed truth can we gain a real knowledge of God's word proportioned to the state of human development, and surely men cherish the hope that successive generations penetrate more and more deeply into the mysteries of Christianity.

To cling to the methods and terminology of past centuries is to lose the riches of the progressive knowledge gained by the living experience of faith. By faith we believe the truths revealed by God, and faith is something vital, something that exist, and is in un ace and enviriim-'ur.

It concerns itself with revealed truths, gaining an ever-growing realization and knowledge of them. Only secondarily is it concerned with the form in which these truths are expressed, because no human language can adequately express them. Yet they must be formulated by theology, and theology must depend for its terms on human language. The formulae at which theology arrives have only an extrinsic connexion with divine truth, and different formulae can be used to express the same divine facts. The divine truths are immutable, inaccessible, inexhaustible; the language which seeks to express them, and the philosophical systems which it employs, are changing, inadequate, only approximate, but ever evolving and ever being perfected, and hence theology must evolve in order to keep pace with the growing realization of the divine truths and with human experience, and *'the history of dogma consists in stating the various successive forms that revealed truth has assumed according to the different doctrines and theories which have appeared in the course of the centuries'* (15). Theology must adapt itself to changing conditions and new philosophies if it is to remain vital, contemporary, 'actual.' A theology which is not 'actual' will be false.

Our traditional theology, they say, is concerned not with God's word, but with deductions from it, and it has tied itself to an arid Scholasticism which is shackled by categories of thought outmoded to-day. It takes no account of history. It neglects the function of the will. It is concerned with immutable essences, not with existence, and pays no attention to human problems and the human drama. Hence it is not an 'actual' theology, and it cannot be said to give any real knowledge of revealed truth. As the Holy Father sums it up: *'this philosophy, received and honoured by the Church, is scorned by some, who shamelessly call it outmoded in form and rationalistic, as they say. in its method of thought. They say that this philosophy upholds the erroneous notion that there can be a metaphysic that is absolutely true: whereas in fact, they say, reality, especially transcendent reality, cannot better be expressed than by different propositions, which*

*mutually complete each other, although in a way they are mutually opposed. Our traditional philosophy, then, with its clear exposition and solution of questions, its accurate definition of terms, its clear-cut distinctions, can be, they concede, useful as a preparation for scholastic theology, a preparation quite in accord with medieval mentality; but this philosophy hardly offers a method of philosophizing suited to the needs of modern culture. They allege, finally, that our perennial philosophy is only a philosophy of immutable essences, while the contemporary mind must look to the existence of things and to life, which is ever in flux. While scorning our philosophy, they extol other philosophies of all kinds, ancient and 'modern, oriental and occidental, by which they seem to imply that any kind of philosophy or theory, -with a few additions and corrections if need be. can be reconciled with Catholic dogma. . . . Finally, they reproach this philosophy taught in our schools for regarding only the intellect in the process of cognition, while neglecting the function of the will and the emotions . . . (saying) as these innovators do, indiscriminately mingling cognition and act of will, that the appetitive and affective faculties have a certain power of understanding, and that man, since he cannot by using his reason decide with certainty what is true and is to be accepted, turns to his will, by which he freely chooses among opposite opinions' (34).*

t

Applying these theories to theology. 'some want to reduce to a minimum the meaning of dogmas, and to free dogma itself from terminology long established in the Church and from philosophical concepts held by Catholic teachers, and to return in the explanation of Catholic doctrine to the way of speaking, used in Holy Scripture and by the Fathers of the Church' (1-C; The underlying hope in this is to make the acceptance of Catholic doctrine easier for those outside the Church. In this new presentation, modern needs will be satisfied, and dogma can be expressed in terms of up-to-date philosophies.

Further, the field of revealed truth itself is restricted, because the sense of the Vatican Council's definition that is the Author of Holy Scripture is perverted, and in consequence is restricted to those parts of the Bible that treat of

iii  
11  
1

of moral and religious matters. There is mention of 'a human sense of the Scriptures, beneath which the divine sense which they say is the only infallible meaning, lies hidden) and no account is taken of the analogy of faith and the Tradition of the Church in the interpretation of Scripture. And there is a demand for a new, non-literal, but rather symbolic and spiritual exegesis which will for the first time open the treasures of the Old Testament to the faithful and solve the 'difficulties which hinder only those who adhere to the literal meaning of the Scriptures' (22, 23).

So the task of apologetics is made easy, 'a way is found to satisfy modern needs' (15). and we can look forward to 'a more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion' (11).

TEACHING OF "HUMANI GENERIS"

The Holy Father's authoritative analysis and treatment of the errors and dangers inherent in such a new orientation of theology is at once enlightened, paternal and firm. He does not condemn indiscriminately, nor does he confine himself to condemnation. He does not deny that the aims and methods in question spring from motives in part praiseworthy, that there is a real problem to be faced» and that these new theories can provoke discussions ultimately to the good of theology. He affirms that our theology', philosophy and apologetics can and should be improved. He does not regard the views propounded as having hardened m'o a system and infected the minds of large numbers (13, -10, 41). He names no one. But, nevertheless, these views contain grave errors and serious dangers, and the Sovereign Pontiff would be failing in his duty if he did not take cognizance of them (to. 11), and he states openly and pkuiny that these dangerous opinions are being held and disseminated by some, a minority indeed of Catholic teachers, but a minority' that can command a large audience. The errors involve the most serious consequences for faith and theology, and they must be unmasked and oif,et by rhe statement of the true portion.

I ?W:  
MM  
Itic  
HI



Then in bold, clear strokes Pope Pius XII marks out the boundaries of truth and error in the relations of faith and reason, and expounds the functions of revelation, dogma, theology and philosophy.

In the domain of theology the errors and dangers arising from these new opinions are mainly three—an imprudent 'eirenism' (11-15), relativism in dogma (16-17), and neglect of the Teaching Authority of the Church (18-21).

This imprudent 'eirenism' takes the form outlined by the Pope (11, 15), of regarding Catholic institutions and methods as obstacles to reunion, and diluting Catholic doctrine to make it acceptable to every mind, and expressing it in terms of modern philosophy '*whether of immanentism or idealism or existentialism or any other system*' (15).

This necessarily leads to relativism in dogma (16). The meaning of dogmas will change from generation to generation if definitions and our traditional philosophical system and terms are rejected as invalid. In their place we shall have '*conjectures and certain fluid and vague expressions of a new philosophy, which, like the flower of the field, are to-day and to-morrow are withered away*' and dogma will become '*a reed shaken by the wind*' (17). A weakening of the whole structure of traditional scholastic theology must follow contempt for its principles (17).

From despising scholastic theology it is a short step to despising the Teaching Authority of the Church which officially approves of scholastic theology. Because Scholasticism is seen as a hindrance to progress, the authority which commends it is regarded as a hindrance. The Teaching Authority is neglected and ignored by some in those matters that approximate to heresy, and the authoritative teaching of the Holy Father is disregarded (18, 19, 20) habitually and deliberately on some theory supposedly found in the Fathers, especially the Greek Fathers, that in matters disputed the Pope is presumed not to decide but to leave the way open for research in the early sources (18-21).

These three cardinal errors and dangers, with certain erroneous Biblical theories (22, 23), '*have already borne their*

*deadly fruit in almost all branches of theology* ' (25), and questions subjected to doubt include : the power of reason to prove God's existence : whether creation had a beginning ; God's freedom in creating ; God's foreknowledge of free actions ; whether angels are persons ; whether matter and spirit differ essentially ; whether the supernatural order is a gratuitous gift of God ; the concept of sin ; the notion of original sin : the idea of the satisfaction made by Christ ; Transubstantiation and the Real Presence ; the identity of the Mystical Body of Christ with the Roman Catholic Church ; the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to be saved : the reasonable character of the credibility of the Christian faith (26).

B

In the realm of philosophy there are two most serious errors, having grave repercussions on theology. The first is the abandonment of our traditional metaphysics for theories of knowledge which can lead only to relativity of truth and loss of real knowledge. Adoption of these false philosophies means a '*denial of the validity of reason in the field of metaphysics,*' and consequently the end of knowledge as distinct from successive and changing experiences (32). The second error is an extreme Voluntarism, maintaining that the ultimate ground of reality, of psychical activity or moral value is not rational but affective (will), (Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, W. James, Sartre) (33). '*It is not surprising that these new opinions endanger the two philosophical sciences which by their very nature are closely connected with the doctrine of faith, that is, theodicy and ethics* ' (34).

Against this formidable catalogue of errors a general Principle laid down by Pope Pius and function of reason, the vs philosophy, and the reality and ] knowledge we deduce bv reaso e trut fills to reason io demonstrate with certainty the existence of ] Personal and one ; to prove beyond doubt from divi very foundations of the Christian faith ; to express law which the Creator has imprimi. in the hearts of

||

notion, of mysteries. But reason can perform these functions safely and well only when properly trained, that is, when imbued with that sound philosophy which has long been, as it were, a patrimony handed down by earlier Christian ages, and which moreover possesses an authority of an even higher order, since the Teaching Authority of the Church, in the light of divine revelation itself, has weighed its principles and fundamental tenets, which have been elaborated and defined little by little by men of great genius (29).

How far can reason penetrate into the truths of faith and validly formulate them? What is the value of conclusions drawn by reason from these dogmatic formulae and built into a theological synthesis? Are the dogmatic definitions and the formulae of theology valid through the centuries? What is the bond between the dogmatic and theological formulae and the revealed truth, and how far are they conditioned by contingent factors of age and culture? In brief, what is the relation between revelation, dogma, theology and reason?

Revelation is the word of God, and 'theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation, for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly in the Scriptures and in Tradition.' Besides, "both sources of divinely revealed doctrine contain so many treasures of truth that they can never really be exhausted" (21). Formulae cannot adequately express divine truth. They can express only aspects of it; but they express real, though partial, truth. There is more than an extrinsic bond between the divine truth and the formulae. "It is perfectly obvious that the terms used to express these concepts both in the Schools and by the Teaching Authority of the Church can be improved and perfected; moreover, it is known that the Church has not always made constant use of the same terms. It is clear, too, that the Church cannot be bound to any ephemeral philosophic system: but those notions and concepts which by common agreement have been elaborated through many centuries by Catholic teachers in order to attain to some understanding of dogma, certainly are not based on ■■■ith

an insecure foundation. They depend rather on principles and concepts that have been derived from true knowledge of creatures, and in obtaining this knowledge the human intellect has through the Church been enlightened by divinely revealed truth as by a star. Thus it is not surprising that some of these concepts have not only been employed by Ecumenical Councils, but also so sanctioned by them that it is wrong to discard their use. Hence to neglect, reject or deny validity to so much of such importance, which has been formulated and perfected through many centuries of effort by men of no common genius and sanctity under the vigilance of the Teaching Church, and not without the light and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, in order that there should be substituted for them conjectures and certain fluid and vague expressions' is imprudent, and is fatal to faith (16, 17).

The Holy Father, therefore, teaches that there is an intrinsic bond between the revealed truth and the formulae expressing it, and that there is an intrinsic bond between the formulae expressing revealed truth and the notions and concepts of the formulae, that these notions and concepts have been developed for the purpose of gaining real knowledge of dogma, that they have been elaborated by men of great genius and sanctity, under the vigilance of the Church, and with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and that the Church has officially employed these concepts and so sanctioned them that we are not free to abandon them. This is a clear and official affirmation of the permanent validity of scholastic philosophy for the expounding of revelation. The formulae elaborated in the circles\* above convey real, if imperfect, knowledge of divine truth and they convey the same knowledge whcm vvr and whervvr they are taught. They are permanently valid in the exact philosophical sense which they had when they were framed, and to abandon them is to abandon a real acquisition of knowledge. They had at the time of their composition, and they still retain, a philosophical significance and a validity which they will never lose, a significance independent of the contingent factors of time and environment. To hold that

IUI

'the mysteries of faith are never expressed by truly adequate concepts but only by approximate and ever changeable notions, in which the truth is to some extent expressed, but is necessarily distorted . . . and that theology should substitute new concepts in place of the old ones in keeping with the various philosophies which in the course of time it uses as its instruments,' and that 'the history of dogma consists in stating the various successive forms that revealed truth has assumed according to the different doctrines and theories., is to lead to relativism in dogma and to 'make dogma itself a reed shaken by the wind' (15, 16, 17).

ii

Hence we may not, without damage to our faith, abandon, or impugn the permanent validity of the metaphysics employed by scholastic theology in the exposition of revealed truth. Reason, 'when imbued with that sound philosophy which has long been, as it were, a patrimony handed down by earlier Christian ages and which moreover possesses an authority of an even higher order,' can establish 'from divine signs the very foundations of the Christian faith' and 'attain to son\* notion, indeed a very fruitful notion, of mysteries' (29). The 'method, doctrine and principles of the Angelic Doctor' hold a place of special honour and authority in that 'patrimony handed down by earlier Christian ages,' but other teachers, too, of great genius have helped to elaborate and define the tenets the Teaching Authority of the Church upholds. Their work is a rich patrimony which we inherit, a perennial sophy which, 'acknowledged and accepted by the Church, wfi" guards the genuine validity of human knowledge. the unsimiable metaphysical principles of sufficient reason, causali'y. awl finality, and finally the mind's ability to attain certain unchangeable truth' (29).

ii

111

What, then, of theology and the duty of th to-day? The Holy Father does not merely condemn erm but points the way to the effective presentation of the divin-revealed truths. Catholic theologians and ph a 'grave duty to defend natural and supernatural truth instil it into the hearts of men' (9). They '

DF fhvvd, m vevc uulit, l' l'3' vvirv v'uffv'iv»

must come to understand these theories well, both because diseases are not properly treated unless they are rightly diagnosed, and because sometimes even in these false theories a certain amount of truth is concealed, and, finally, because these theories provoke more subtle discussion and evaluation of theological truths' (9). They must realize that, on the one hand, the concepts used by scholastic philosophy and theology have an enduring validity, and that, on the other hand, the terms used to express these concepts 'both in the schools and by the Teaching Authority of the Church, can be improved and perfected' (9). The most effective means of gaining true knowledge of revelation and of adapting ecclesiastical teaching to modern conditions and requirements must be employed, and to this end 'we may clothe our philosophy in a more .suitable and richer dress, make it more vigorous with a more effeetke terminology, divest it of certain scholastic aids found less useful, prudently enrich it with the fruits of progress of the human mind. But never may we overthrow it, or contaminate it with false principles, or regard it as a great, but obsolete, relic' (29). Progress in theology, and deeper penetration into the divine mysteries, mean, not the substitution of new, dlective concepts for the valid concepts inherited from the past and relating successive but varying forms, but 'building truth upon truth in the same order and structure that exist in reality, the source of truth' (30). Above and before all, theologians 'must always return to the sources of divine retrialion. . . . It is through the study of its sacred sources that it remains ever fresh : on the other hand, speculation which neglects a deeper search into the deposit of faith proves ■derde. . . .' In their exploration of the sources of revelation,

f

mol explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic not even to

111

*Authority of the Church. . . . Hence Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, (ini with very good reason : " in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church " ) (21).*

Patrick J. Hamell.

## NOTE

For an extensive list of the documents of the theological controversies *κ* 'Tentatives françaises pour un renouvellement de la théologie,' by P. Ti. Deman, O.P., in *Revue de l'Unité d'Ottawa*, vol. 20, July-September, 1931, pp. 129\*-67\*. See also 'Current Theology,' by Rev. P. Donnelly, S.J., in *Theological Studies*, viii. (1947), September (pp. 471-91), December (pp. 66\*-89) for a good survey of the literature. The list of books, articles, critical studies, replies and counter-replies is too lengthy to be given here in full, but the following relevant works include :

*Sources chrétiennes* : Collection dirigée par M. de Lubac, S.J., et J. Daniélou, S.J. Théologie : Études publiées sous la direction de la faculté de théologie. C.J. de Lyon-Fourvière.

P. Daniélou, S.J., 'Les orientations présentes de la pensée religieuse,' *Études*, cexlix. (1946).

P. Labourdette, O.P., 'La théologie et ses sources,' *Revue Thomiste*, Lxi. (1946), pp. 353-71. Critical study of the foregoing.

*Conversion et grâce chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*, by H. Bcuillard, S.J. (Tio Oi 5' 1), with reviews : 'La théologie et ses sources,' by P. Labourdette, O.P., *Revue Thomiste*, xlvi. (1946), pp. 356 ff.

C. Boyer, S.J., in *Gregorianum*, xxvii (1946), 139.

'La nouvelle théologie, où va-t-elle ?' by R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *Revue Angélique*, 23 (1946), pp. 126 ff.

'Théologie de la grâce,' by P. Gillon, O.P., *Revue Thomiste*, xlvi (1946), pp. 603 ff.

'Théologie de l'Église,' by P. Nicolas, O.P., *Revue Thomiste*, xlvi (1946), pp. 356 ff.

'La théologie et ses sources : Réponse aux *Études critiques* de la *Thomiste* (May-August, 1946),' in *Revue de science religieuse*, xxxiii (1946), pp. 385-401."

Reply to P. Labourdette, O.P., by P. Bouillard, S.J., 'A propos de la théologie actuelle chez saint Thomas d'Aquin,' *Recherches de science religieuse*, Lxi. (1946), pp. 92-115.

*Corpus Mysticum : L'Eucharistie et l'Église au moyen âge* (ThiA 1946), by H. de Lubac, S.J. Reviewed by P. Nicolas, O.P., in 'Théologie de la science religieuse,' *Revue Thomiste*, xlvi (1946), pp. 385-89; by P. Glorieux in *Mélanges de science religieuse*, ii (1945), pp. 370 ff.; and by P. Chenu, O.P., in *Dieu Vivant*, i (1946), pp. 141-43.

*Surnaturel : Études historiques* [ThA 1946], by H. de Lubac, S.J. Reviews and critiques of this major work listed by P. Deman, O.P., in '«  
those by : J. de Blic, S.J., *Mélanges de science religieuse*, iv (1947), pp. 385-89; B. Romeyer, S.J., *Archives de Philosophie*, vol. 17, cap. 2; L. Malebranche, *Revue thodogique*, 79 (1947), pp. 3-31; C. B. y-r. S.J., *Patristic*

,1947; pp. 379-95 ; P. Gillon, O.P., *Pctvle Thomiste*, xlv (1947). pp. 304-10; G. Frenaud, O.S.B., *La Pensée catholique*, cap. 5 (1948), pp. 25-47 ; G. de B.-oghe. S.J., *De Fine Ultimo Vitae Humanae*, Paris, 1948, app. iii. pp. 245-64 ; Philippe de la Trinité, O.C.D., *Éludes carmclitâifcs*, xxvii: *Satan* (1948). pp. 44-85 ; H. Rondet, S.J., *Recherches de Science religieuse*, τπν (1948), pp. 481-521; R. Garrigou-Lagrangc, O.P., *Ai-gelicum*. 25 (1948), pp. 294-8 : V. IVLim, O.P., *Dominican Studies*, il (1949). pp. 62-73.

'Autour d'une controverse,' *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, xlviii (1947), pp. 1-17, by Mgr. de Solages and P. Nicolas, O.P., being an exchange of letters concerning 'La théologie et ses sources,' by P. Labourdette. O.P.

Jl. Labourdette, M. J. Nicolas, R.-L. Bruckberger, Dominicams, *Dialogue Tl 'jlogique : Piles du débat entre 'La Revue Thomiste' d'une part et des R.R. P.P. de Lybac, Daniéïou, Bouillard, Fessard, von Balthasar, S.J., d'autre part.* (Les Arcades, Saint-Maximin, Var, 1947), a reply to 'Réponse' in *Richerchrs île science religieuse*, xxxiii (1946), pp. 385-401.

Mgr. B. de Solagos. 'Pour l'honneur de la théologie,' *Bulletin de littiratre, cP'Antique* (January-March, 1947). reply to P. Labourdette, O.P. *iRevue Thomiste*).

Also 'Pour l'honneur de la théologie,' *ibid.* (April-June, 1947), pp. 65-84, reply to R. Garrigou-Lagrangc's criticism of PP. de Lubac, Teilhard de Chardin, Daniéïou, Bouillard, Fessard, M. Blondel.

R. Garrigou-Lagrangc, O.P., 'Vérité et immutabilité du dogme,' *Angelicum*, 24 (1947), pp. 124-139, reply to Mgr. de Solages.

'Les notions consacrées par les Conciles,' *Angelicum*, 24 (194J). pp. 217-30.

'Le relativisme et TinmiutaLilité du dogme,' *Angelicum*, 21 (1950), pp. 213-46.

P. Yves and M. J. Congar, O.P., 'Bulletin d'ecclésiologie,' *Revue des sciences phUosophiques et théologiques*, 21 (1947), a general survey.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER *HUMANI GENERIS*

T» Or R Venerable Brethren, Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishop»,  
Bishops and other. Local Ordinaries in Peace and Communion  
with the Holy ^ee

POPE PIUS XII

VENERABLE BKETHREN.

Heath and Apostolic Benediction.

ONCERNING SOME FALSE OPINION» WHICH THR-tfL" ■ UNDERMINE  
THE FONDATIONS OF F'ITHOLIC DOCTRINE

(i-13)

Occasion of the Encyclical. General observations on errors of our

time regarding religion and morality.

ration to

L (14). Human reason, morally  
tacover natural religion and morality (1-3),

t Xblish the divine  
to

origin of the Christian religion (4).

, io matters