

THESIS V: QUESTION OF GOD

La questione di Dio: (a) la questione di Dio nella tradizione teologica: origini della teologia. La polemica anti-gnostica. La via apofatica del platonismo cristiano. L'aristotelismo cristiano nella teologia scolastica. Fideismo e razionalismo nell'epoca moderna; (b) alcuni aspetti del dibattito attuale: dalla teologia "liberale" alla teologia "dialettica". Rivelazione e storia nella "nouvelle theologie". Il metodo di "correlazione" e il metodo "trascendentale". Le teologie della modernità e della "morte di Dio". Le teologie della prassi e della liberazione; (c) logica dell'affermazione di Dio: presupposti e ipotesi preliminari. Assiomatica. Regole linguistiche del linguaggio cristiano su Dio. Teoremi teologici e corollari religiosi; (d) fondamento biblico del primo articolo di fede: l'enteismo arcaico e il monoteismo profetico. La teologia sapienziale e apocalittica. Il messaggio di Gesù e la fede della comunità. Aspetti dominanti del "teismo" biblico. Trascendenza e storia. Identità e realtà di Dio. Comportamento salvifico di Dio; (e) La fede in Dio nella Chiesa cattolica: il primo articolo della fede nei simboli e nei Concili. La dottrina di Dio nella prospettiva del Vaticano I e del Vaticano II.

I. HISTORICAL SURVEY

I. Background:

A. Scope: Our scope includes (1) the debated issues in current theology within the context of theological pluralism, (2) models of approach to the question of God that have arisen in the last forty years; (3) our synthesis, which includes the tradition and ecclesiology.

B. Quick overview:

1. There are four great models in traditional theology re: God:
 - a. apophatic
 - b. kataphatic
 - c. Fideism
 - d. rationalistic theology: idealistic or existentialistic
2. Key biblical evidence: God as Father; God as Hidden in religions and as revealed as Father (Acts 17).

C. Schema:

1. OBJECTIVE EMPHASIS: Problem of the being of God in patristic theology and medieval theology: Who is God? What char. can we give to God? Result: apophatic/kataphatic theologies.
2. SHIFT in contemporary theology: SUBJECTIVE EMPHASIS: If God is known, in what mode is he known by the subject? Result: language re: God is emphasized. How do we know God: "sola fide" or "sola ratio"? We must remember that theology uses the "spunti" available at the time.

II. History of the Problem (Emphasis on Objective Question)

Our question is particular within theology because all religions deal with it. We need a philosophical basis as the foundation of our discussion.

A. Kerygmatic Theology/Apologetic Theology

1. Kerygmatic theology is essential in the life of the Church but apologetic theology is necessary because: (a) it enters into dialogue and (b) answers objections of the current age.

2. Three systems answered:

a. **Stoicism** held a pantheistic materialism. **Epicureanism** held a deistic indifferentism. Christianity rejected both by affirming the divine reality as unique and ultimate, spiritual and transcendent, eternal and providential.

b. Gnosticism: The response to this is real start of a Christian theology of God. The battle with gnosticism raged in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Key figures in this age who gave apologetic responses to gnosticism include Irenaeus (Ad. Haer. IV); Tertullian; Origen (Contra Gen.).

Gnosticism was basically a **dualistic** system: It held to two beginnings to creation; two anima to the world from the start -- one good and the other bad. The result is two gods: two absolutes (Good and Evil).

3. First Christian Thesis regarding God:

Basic Apologetic response was that there is an **identity** between the God of creation (mysterious, transcendent) and the God of Abraham and Father of Jesus Christ.

Only **One** God - Of Both The Old And New Testaments

- Of Both Material And Spiritual Things

- Who Is Both Omnipotent And Merciful.

B. Apophatic Approach: Platonic Christianity

In relation to a theology of God, the “via apophatica” is a negative theology (easier to affirm what God is not or correct errors said about Him). It was used by the Cappadocian Fathers and Alexandrian school. Other existent schools were also the “via cataphatica” (affirm the divine names of God) and the “via mystica” (ecstatic union).

A. Greek Fathers:

1. View of God: as absolute and infinite reality, transcendent and superessential from whom all multiplicity comes and the historical Revelation in Jesus Christ.

2. Platonic roots: saw a balance and integration between reason and faith.

1. reason seeks faith (Ambrose)

2. result: a relationship between believing and understanding.

3. Human-Divine Relationship:

a. exitus (creation), reditus: all comes and returns to God.

B. Latin Fathers:

1. They highlighted the incomprehensibility of the salvific design of God’s will that is absolutely free and omnipotent.

2. “via interiore”: is the way in which divine truth is revealed in an illuminating, immediate and unconditional way, as truth that is loved, absolute and eternal.

Exemplary Ancient Theologian: Augustine:

a. Background: City of God and the Trinity. Augustine always affirms the value of reason but affirms the unique Revelation of Christianity and the Incarnation (ie. two main sections of the City of God).

b. Neo-Platonic apophatism: Theory of Divine Illumination: there is a mutual relationship between reason and faith. “Itinerarum mentis ad Deum” speaks of the ascent of the mind to God as a double movement -- return to oneself and rising above oneself.

c. Reason/Faith: faith seeks intelligibility of itself. Theology was the contemplative understanding of the mysteries held by faith. Reason points out what deserves faith and submits itself to the supreme authority of truth (eternal truth). Philosophers had a sense of the Trinity but did not recognize the way: Jesus Christ.

d. Trinity: psychological analogy: “I am, I know myself, I love myself.”

e. Three lasting contributions:

1. Psychological concept of procession for Trinitarian language: analogy with knowing and loving.

2. Aristotelean concept of relationship: (a) to express what each divine person has as proper to Himself (his relationship to the others) and common with the other divine persons (He is in Himself).

3. Theophanies are appearances of the whole Trinity.

C. Cataphatic Approach: (Aristotelian Scholasticism)

1. “Via deductiva” has as its method: reason at the service of and ordered to faith. It is the movement of the finite to the infinite. It emphasizes only one part of the Platonic system outlined above.

a. Faith Seeking Intelligibility: *philosophical reason is a servant in service of theology*. Faith is the negative norm for reason’s conclusion. This sows the seeds of modernity.

b. Man’s return to God (reditus) is Thomas’ five ways to God = (Aristotle’s three ways).

[NB: Anselm: God is He than Whom no greater can be imagined. The movement is from least, better to best. The point is that it is a movement from man to God.]

c. Thomas’ accent is on the logical/knowable aspects of what was part of the mystical elements of prior theology.

d. Summary: Scholasticism successfully united the ideas found in Platonic Christianity that God is origin and end of the universe in that He is the Highest Good and the idea of Aristotelian Christianity that God is the first efficient and necessary cause for the universality of creatures and the final cause of the perfection, found in the union of the Beautiful Vision.

2. “Via discesa”: of Platonic Augustinianism, which saw the principal movement of the Infinite to the finite, is found in Anselm, Bonaventure and Bernard.

D. Battle between Reason and Faith:

A constant in all the positions taken in this battle is the common starting point: man as either critical intelligence; ethical will; believing sentiment.

1. Fideistic Approach: Demise Of Reason

a. **Roots:** it arose in response to the difficulty in demonstrating the Infinite from the finite. It contended that reason was not sufficient to the task- only faith could do it. History is a theophany of God.

b. **Method:** Revert to faith; overemphasize historical Revelation

c. **Faith left reason weakened in two degrees:**

1. Moderate Position: reason is weakened

2. Extreme Position: reason is wrong or malicious

d. **Examples:** Descartes, Pascal, Luther, Kierk., [Tillich’s response: God of the philosophers is the God of theology].

e. **Vatican I** condemned absolute fideism but did **not** condemn **moderate** fideism. Why? because RCC teaches that one is to believe with the “grammar of faith”. The community of faith allows man to know God better with its common faith.

2. Rationalistic Approach: Autonomous Reason vs. Faith

a. This approach states that reason must be emphasized and faith is weak. It rejects historical, particular Revelation and speaks of the universality of a rationalistic religion.

1. Moderate Position: Faith is weakened but accepted.

2. Extreme Position: Faith is gotten rid of.

b. View of God: as Grand Architect; guarantee of the moral law, guardian of ethics.

c. Danger: philosophical Pantheism (of divine nature), religion as search for an honest morality.

d. Vatican I condemned **both** because they claim that faith is not necessary. All positions that theologians devalue faith are considered rationalistic.

e. **Nominalism:** is an offshoot of this position. It had a great influence and occurred between the MA and the Modern Age (Ockham). It completely separated reason and faith.

3. Idealistic Approach: (Fichte/Hegel)

a. Problem: they wish to address the difficulty in thinking simultaneously about the Absolute as both Infinite and personal.

b. Method: try to overcome difference between finite and infinite by addressing man's orientation as a finite self to the Absolute Infinite. Since you cannot conceptualize the Absolute, the result is complete apophatism. You must rely on religious sentiment alone. (Schleiermacher).

c. Danger: Idealism can be reduced to monistic pantheism because of unclear identity between the finite and infinite.

d. Schleiermacher and Liberal theology. Schleiermacher begins with religious experience. Religion is not a set of dogmas, nor is it moral sanction; he defines religion as an immediate self-consciousness and a feeling of absolute dependence. God is the "whence" of this creature feeling, that which accounts for it. God then is not an object of knowledge (a being that enters into consciousness from the outside) as He is the immediate referent to that feeling of dependence. God language, then, is the accumulation of descriptions of the content of religious consciousness. Christ is the model of God-consciousness.

4. Radical Existentialistic Approach:

a. This school of thought is existential in character: it values various aspects of man: in his concreteness in body and spirit; of feeling and reason; of alienation, sociality and historicity.

b. Forms include:

1. Atheism: (Marx and Feuerbach)

2. Pessimistic Existentialism (Nietzsche)

3. Kierkegaard: Leap of Faith

II. Contemporary Debate Re: God-Language: Subjective Emphasis

Key Issue: to establish the correct dialectical tension between contemporary and critical reason and faith in the God of religion and Revelation.

A. Trends in Protestant theology:

1. Theology of transcendence (reaction against liberalism).

a. Neo-Orthodoxy: Barth

1. Barth affirms the transcendence of God in relation to all human knowledge and every human work (including religion). Man stands before God with empty hands; even his concepts and categories are useless. The authority is divine Revelation, the Word made flesh in Jesus, the Word in Scripture. The infinite distance of an unknown God who comes to us in Jesus Christ.

2. Method: Dialectical Method emphasizes the **abyss** between hidden God of religion and the revealed God who justifies in grace. Neo-Fideism of Barth's theology has as its starting point God's Revelation of self in Jesus Christ. Faith, therefore, does not take part with philosophy. In this respect, Barth is a severe reaction against Kant, Hegel and the rationalistic approach.

3. Barth's polemic against the analogia entis: He claims that the Catholic concept of the analogy of being is "anti-Christian." It is reductionistic of divine transcendence to human and limited categories. Barth contends that the only kind of God-language is God's language, namely Revelation. God has bridged the gap by addressing his word to us, and all is to be understood in relation to that word. Hence, instead of an analogy of being, where human experience is the referent, Barth speaks of an **analogy of faith**, where the referent is God's word addressed to man. It is called an analogy of faith because it is only in faith that we ourselves recognize that we are that word addressed by God in his free act of selfcommunication.

4. Critique: Faith as foundational is correct. However, its arguments against reason are exaggerated. More specifically, how does one take account of the Scriptural testimony that man can reach God with reason? This is a datum of Christian Faith. The result is an ironic contradiction: Fideism is contrary to the faith!

[Kerygmatic School of Germany, Nouvelle Theology School are other examples of this accent upon the God of Revelation.]

b. Theology of the Word (Bultmann)

c. Theology of correlation (Tillich): (the profound identity between the God of the experience of transcendence in the dimension of the absolute and the God of the sacred, in the experience of Christian Revelation. He is for man both Foundation and abyss).

1. Overview: Paul Tillich wants a via media between protestant liberalism and neo-orthodoxy of Barth. Like liberal theologians, Tillich begins with the human experience, defining God as the "object of ultimate concern." Man, seeks within himself the truth -- he is threatened by the anxiety of non-meaning; in this he finds himself an openness to the infinite, perfect, eternal. From God, there is real Revelation -- God has revealed himself to us.

2. Method: Correlational which sees Christianity as both a critical and positive Paradox

a. Two Foci = Dialectic between

a. MAN who asks the question

b. GOD who answers.

b. In this approach, God says NO and also YES to man (i.e. I will justify you). [Rahner is in this school among Catholics and Tillich among Protestants.]

2. Theologies of Immanence:

a. Theology of Secularization:

1. These theologies see salvation as liberation in Christ who is Lord of the world. They wish to overcome every anthropomorphism in the expression of religious experience.

2. The world is autonomous (but still seen with the perspective of faith)
3. Theology of the Cross: God is revealed as one who abandoned self for us.

b. Death of God Theology:

1. These theologies substitute the “transcendence” of Platonic Christianity and the “dialectic of contingency” of Aristotelistic Christianity.
2. God = God of immanence revealed in Jesus Christ. His transcendence is disparaged.

c. Theology of Hope or History:

1. Moltmann: The starting point is the cross of Christ as the manifestation of what God is about. In some sense, it is a rejection of the greek notion of God who cannot “suffer”. He takes seriously that it is God who suffers on the cross -- that it is God the Son who suffers alienation -- from God the Father himself. Atheism, alienation from God, is then integrated into the reality of God; no one can ever be a-theos again! The eschatological implications: the hope is then not just a pie-in-the sky; God has promised that the earth’s pain will be overcome. The promise is based upon the historical reality of the cross. But the full manifestation of the overcoming of alienation will take place in that promised future where God will be fully revealed.

b. Bloch: discovers the revolutionary potential in Christianity. Hope in the absolute future motivates a commitment to an infra-historical future.

B. Trends in Catholic theology:

Modernism: Revelation is a universal human experience, an ever-evolving personal knowledge of God attained in the ordinary course of life. Doctrines are expressions of internal religious experience -- Strong emphasis on subjectivity. Dogmatic formulas have no reference to the “real” -- they express subjective states, inner religious experiences, not objective realities. The reality of God in Himself is ineffable.

1. Theology of transcendence:

a. Nouvelle theologie: (deLubac, Danielou, von Balthasar). This is the Catholic development in line with Barth. Their main ideas include: (a) recovering the idea of mystical religious experience; (b) emphasis on the God of biblical Revelation; (c) “history of salvation” as interpretive of nature of liturgical action, etc.

1. They begin with the Thomistic thesis: man has a natural desire for the Beatific vision. However, an antinomy is created: If God, in freedom, withheld the Beatific Vision from natural man, God then has created a “human nature” which will ultimately be frustrated: this conclusion would diminish God’s goodness. However, on the other hand, if the desire for the Beatific Vision must be fulfilled, then the order of grace is diminished. How is Thomas to be interpreted? de Lubac and others insist upon the gratuitousness of the supernatural order; God has freely ordained us toward Himself -- he has made us for Himself. “Pure nature” in that sense and a corresponding hypothetical “natural” end of man are rejected. God has created man as a spiritual creature who “naturally” desires the Beatific Vision as gift [vs. two orders of gratuity]. Of course there is the theoretical possibility that God might have created ungraced natural man and ordained him toward a natural end. But, man as we know him, has as his only possible goal, the Beatific Vision.

b. Transcendental Thomism: Similar to the theology of correlation in Tillich. Rahner’s anthropology: What is the ground of the possibility of knowing and willing? All affirmation of beings is an implicit affirmation of Being. In this pre-apprehension of Being (Vorgriff), the

reality of God is implicitly affirmed. The unthematic experience of God thus occurs with the transcendental necessity in every spiritual act, even the act of denying God (atheism). The pre-thematic is thematized through the downward movement of God's Revelation in grace.

2. Theology of Immanence:

a. Theology of Modernity:

1. Method: integrative of exigency of the critical rationality of the secular culture with the believing tradition of the Christian community.

2. Secularization: - (i.e. Kung, Schillebeeckx). Kung attempts to dialogue with secularism and nihilism in contemporary thought. Nihilism not only is possible -- it is not disprovable; however, one also has to say that nihilism is not provable. The fundamental choice (which cannot be proved or disproved) is to choose whether we believe that reality is trustworthy or it is not. But then, are there no rational grounds for theism? Kung would say yes. **[Presumption of Meaning]**. I cannot prove that the world makes sense -- but, as I give myself over to the world, that is, in the very act of trust itself, I discover that the world makes sense. If I really trust reality, then, I cannot deny God, for to deny God is to have a groundless trust in reality. If I give myself over to God, I will perceive in the act of surrender itself, that in fact God does exist.

b. Theology of praxis or liberation. Reflection upon the praxis of the faith. Foundation in a God who reveals himself as Liberator. Reaction against a privatization of theology found in transcendental theology.

Exemplary Modern Theologian: RAHNER

1. The meaning of the word *God*: In one sense, the word has no content, it says nothing about God and therefore it reflects what the word refers to, namely the ineffable one, the nameless one. If the word were to disappear, man would not be brought face to face with the single whole of reality and the single whole of his own existence. The result: he will cease being a man for to be a man is to be that one who can place the totality of the world and of his own existence before him in question, even if he were to become silent before the very mystery of being.

2. The knowledge of God: All knowledge of God is a posteriori, coming to us through encounter with the world. Yet, such knowledge is transcendental, pre-thematic and only later becomes categorical. The three traditional ways of knowing God (by light of natural reason, in the Christian Revelation of the Word and in God's self-revelatory, salvific activity in history) are united in that concrete, original historically constituted and transcendental knowledge of God which is inevitably present in us as spiritual subjects. It is at once both natural knowledge and knowledge in grace. (We are always engraced nature. Yet, it is encountered as infinite horizon, and therefore incomprehensible and ineffable. Since this ultimate horizon is the ground of the possibility of all categorical knowledge, it itself cannot become another categorically distinct object among other objects. The encounter with Mystery not only occurs in those moments when I grasp myself as a thinking subject, but also-in the reflexive grasp of myself as a willing, loving, free subject. the ground of willing and loving is absolute love and freedom. Therefore, we call the term of transcendence **Mystery** (insofar as it is the incomprehensible ground of knowing); to this we add the term "**Holy**" since the term of loving and willing is absolute Love and Freedom.

3. Categorical “God-talk”: Analogy in its structure of similarity-dissimilarity represent to us the tension of the very process by which we come to know God -- from the categorical starting point to the transcendental term as ground. When I speak of God as Person, I speak analogously, yet make a real affirmation. In its very constitutions, a finite spirit always experiences itself as having its origins in another and as being given to itself by another. What accounts for personal subjectivity can itself only be understood as both personal and as subject.

4. Immediacy to God as mediated immediacy. The presence of God as the transcendental ground and horizon of all that exists and knows takes place precisely in and through the finite existent. The individual existent in its categorical individuality and limitations can mediate God to the extent that in the experience of it, the transcendent experience of God takes place. The Christian interpretation of the transcendental experience of God consists in the fact that the holy mystery is present not only as a remoteness and distance which situates us in our finiteness, but also in the mode of an absolute and forgiving closeness and of an absolute offer of Himself, all of which takes place only by grace and in the freedom of God’s self-communication.

5. God’s activity in and through secondary causes: Aquinas asserted that God works through secondary causes. The “special” interventions of God can only be understood as the historical concreteness of the transcendental self-communication of God which is already constitutive of the concrete world. God as the transcendental ground of the world has, from the outset, embedded Himself in the world as its self-communicating ground. To say that God appears in the world in a tangible way doesn’t mean that what is immediately tangible in this intervention does not exist in a functional relation with the world or that it could not be explained causally. For example, a good decision, an idea out of the blue, along with everything it presupposes as its mediation, has the character of an intervention of God, even though this takes place in and through human freedom, and hence can be explained functionally.

6. Theological Anthropology: Rahner’s theology begins with the transcendental conditions that are a-prior necessary for man to know transcendence. Man’s reflections upon his own openness to the Infinite Horizon (supernatural existential; open in acts of knowing and loving) reveals himself as a spirit-in-the-world and a hearer of the Word (as open open to hear a possible word of Revelation). “Man is open to mystery, destinator of a possible autocommunication of the divine, that will overcome and repair the evil in history and recovering the supernatural dimension of the divine design; receives in the history of salvation of Revelation and grace the free autocommunication of the mercy of the Father, who is revealed as absolute truth in the Son the absolute mediator, and as sanctifying goodness in the Holy Spirit.” (Pastor, 322.) Augustine saw grace as the a-priori transcendental condition necessary for the act of faith. Augustine also used the transcendental method of theology.

7. Economic and Immanent Trinity: Christ would have been incarnated in the world even if there had not been sin. That is: Economic Trinity leads to the Immanent Trinity because it was always the divine intention to **self-communicate to creation**. Thus the Trinitarian persons are **modus existenti** and **not modus apparenti** of the modalistic heresy.

D. The Secular Crisis of Christian Theism:

1. Systematic analysis of Christian theism.

a. The divine attributes: (metaphysical transcendentals)

1. God is one: Unicity of God, attested to scripturally, has metaphysical implications -- SIMPLICITY (Pure Act, Subsistent Being itself) and PERFECTION.

2. God is true: For the Christian Platonists, God is supreme truth. For the Magisterium, the truth of God implied his INFINITY, his IMMUTABILITY and his INTELLIGENCE.

3. God is good: the implication of his being the highest goodness makes him ALL-PERFECT.

4. In terms of space, tradition speaks of the IMMENSITY of God and his OMNIPRESENCE.

5. The biblical notion of the divine wisdom and **power** of God translate to the metaphysical attributes of his OMNISCIENCE and OMNIPOTENCE.

b. The Hellenization of Christian theism:

The post-Apostolic Church used Hellenist philosophy as a metaphysical foundation to speak of the divine reality that was transcendent, one and free -- overcoming pagan and pantheistic notions of the deity. The need to emphasize God's transcendence accounts for the apophatic theology of the early centuries. Reactions:

a. The evangelical theology today has problems with the process of Hellenization of the biblical message; accent for them is the primacy and the originality of Christian theism; theology has the duty to present the God of Revelation, not the God of metaphysics! The biblical categories of holiness and love, Lord and Father are more expressive of the divine reality as it is communicated in the Revelation and salvation of Christ. Therefore, the dogmatic treatment of God must return to Revelation, to Scripture.

b. Transcendental Catholic theology has reacted against the excessively hellenized image of Christian theism. They distinguish between the divine attributes (and the perfections which can be affirmed as deductions from these attributes -- known in light of the order of creation), and the God who has freely disclosed himself to us in the history of salvation. The latter can only be affirmed in the *lumen fidei* or *analogia fidei*.

c. Theological judgment toward secularization today:

a. It is anti-Christian according to the Protestant fundamentalists and the Catholic integralists.

b. It is religiously neutral according to some theological eclectic Anglo-Saxon Protestants as well as some of the representatives of the *nouvelle theologie*: a cultural rejection of the prescientific models of thought.

c. The action of God is actually taking place within the process of secularization (Teilhard, Bonhoeffer, Gogarten). The OT narrations were desacralizing and revolutionary back then. Today's secularizing process has given man the experience of responsibility, openness towards the truth (wherever it can be found) a notion of personal autonomy and an anthropological vision of things.

d. Secularization and Atheism:

a. Marxist critique of religion: opiate of the people.

b. Empirical and positivistic trends in philosophy -- reduction of the supernatural to the natural. God talk is nonsense.

e. Crisis of Theism

a. God as monarche -- doesn't speak to a liberalized, democratized civilization

b. Confessional theism has led to intolerances and fanaticism -- injustices committed in the name of religion.

f. Theological alternatives:

a. need to destroy the false images of God that have crept into Christian theism throughout the centuries.

b. need to consider Revelation -- where we really come to know God.

c. Attention to the existential situation, the crises of life, the problem of evil. These crises need not deny the existence of God but become the beginning of an affirmation of the God who co-suffers (*compassio*) with us (the Cross of Jesus Christ).

d. The need to seek the point of relevance of faith to life -- attention to the problems of praxis.

II. OUR CATHOLIC PROPOSITION:

I. The Logic of Faith:

A. Four fundamental hypothesis:

These are hypothesis concerning the possibility of a religious affirmation of faith/language of God.

1. **First:** Affirmation of God is **not** possible in either the immanence of history or transcendence of the spirit.

2. **Second:** Affirmation of God is **only** possible in the **transcendence** of the world (mysticism).

3. **Third:** Affirmation of God is **only** possible in the **ethical** act in the immanence of history.

4. **Fourth:** the religious experience of Christians supposes the **dialectical synthesis** between transcendence and immanence of the reality of God in the life of the believer.

B. Eight General Axioms:

These are postulates of general/fundamental character, linked to the logic of the affirmation of the believer and the structure of the significance of the religious act of affirmation of God.

1. **Fundamental Axiom:** "The revealed God is the hidden God" (ie.resolves tension bet. the revealed God as also the transcendent Creator)

2.**Epistemological Axiom:**"The known God is the incomprehensible God." (Resolves tension between knowability of God and his incomprehensibility)

3. **Ontological Axiom:** "The immanent God is the transcendent God." (allows logic of equality between transcendent and immanent language for God).

4. **Axiom of Identity:** "God is God and only God is God."-- *tautologia significante*.

5. **Axiom of Reality:** "God must be thought of necessarily as real." (God as absolute and unconditional).

6. **Ethical Axiom:** "The God of trust is the God of fear and viceversa". (Idea of meeting God with "fascinans" and "tremendum")

7. **Axiom of Relationship:** "Theological Language supposes a religious relationship between man and God."

8. **Concluding Axiom:** "The holy and eternal God reveals self as the Lord of the covenant and the Father of fidelity and goodness." (i.e. The God of experience = God of liturgy = God of Bible).

C. Six Linguistic Rules:

1. Fundamental Rule: “Language about God must never forget that its referent is always the ineffable God.” (ie. Language is always limited; mystery)

2. Rule of Linguistic Use: “Christian language about God cannot be reduced to a single type of linguistic use.”

3. Rule of Meaning: “The hermeneutic of the language about God must pay attention to the multiple important semiotics of that language.”

4. Rule of Function: “In the interpretation of the sense of religious language, it is useful to consider the diverse linguistic functions that are present in each process of communication.” (ie. emission, recitation, repetition, etc.)

5. Rule of analogy: “The existence of dogmatical and orthodox language legitimates the use of analogy in the discourse on God.”

(Analogy is an intermediate way between equivocal and univocal speech: as a moderate form of apofatism or moderate equivocalism.)

6. Rule of Paradox: “Language about God expresses the paradoxical character of the believer’s affirmation.” (This is found in both the analogy of being which claims to express the unconditional by the conditioned and the analogy of faith which claims that man as sinner is saved- unmerited and unlooked for and the analogy of symbol).

D. Five Theological Theorems:

These refer to the content of Christian language about God.

1. Fundamental Theorem: (Possibility of a real but limited affirmation about God) “God reveals Himself* to all men while remaining incomprehensible* mystery, strictly ineffable*.” Corollary: Numinous Act: every theological language supposes a religious experience, as a personal encounter with the God of faith, incomprehensible and ineffable.

2. Theorem of Divine Sanctity (Divine Reality as is): “God reveals Himself as being* infinitely Holy, *necessary and omnipotent, absolutely *singular and unique.” Corollary: Sacramental act: religious experience also means existential meeting with the holiness of God.

3. Theorem of Divine Presence: (Revealed God as living) “God reveals Himself as the *eternal living one, *omnipresent and immense; the divine presence manifests itself as *spiritual and personal.” Corollary: Mystical Act: in the existential encounter with the presence of God, the believer experiences the mystical moment of a living religious experience.

4. Theorem about the Divine Justice: (Revealed God as spiritual & personal) “God reveals Himself as *omniscient and omnipotent, even in his *justice and in his* judgment of condemnation of evil.” Corollary: Moral Act: The believer lives the ethical moment when he personally confronts the justice of God.

5. Theorem about Divine Fidelity: (Divine Reality as it refers to its works in creation and salvation history). “God reveals Himself as *the good creator in his mysterious providence and holiness; as the* faithful Lord, in the universal covenant of salvation; as *merciful Father, filled with fidelity and goodness.” Corollary: Paradoxical Act: In the existential encounter with the merciful fidelity of God, which gives the grace of justification to the sinner without merit, the converted believer can live the “paradoxical” moment of the Christian religious experience.

6. Religious Corollary: Dialectic between Identity and Difference. Language of God involves both Identity (mystical experience; in the tension between the finite and infinite) and difference (ethical actions; tension between the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man). The paradox finds its expression and paradoxical resolution in **grace**.

II. God of Revelation:

A. The knowability of God in the OT: Transcendence and Immanence

1. OT doctrine concerning the affirmation of God:

The fundamental question of the OT person was not the existence of God, as such, but His identity. Is this God, whom we believe to exist, the God of the universe? Eventually, the people of Israel came to profess a universally salvific monotheism (not a national savior -nor a kind of “cosmic” salvation, but personally individual and universal. Three phases:

a. Archaic -- (covenant; divine freedom) Yahweh, the God of creation is also the God of covenant election who freely calls this people to be his own. The one who is free (can't be controlled like the pagan gods of nature) and yet personally involved in the fate of his people. It involved a link between religious transcendence and salvific immanence.

b. Deuteronomic reform of the covenant: (Israel as the light to all nations) The prophetic phase and the beginnings of religious universalism. Purification of the covenant religion from the dangers of syncretization, divinizing nature, etc. As Israel interacts with its neighbors as a political unit, the prophetic hope is that Israel, God's servant, can be a light to the nations -- the instrument through which God's shalom will reign forever. Yet, God too is concerned with the individual, particularly the poor and downtrodden. This is the beginning of a theism that is transcendent and personal

c. The post-exilic phase: (cosmic) apocalyptic and sapiential. The hope of Israel expands from nationalistic goals to a more cosmic-eschatological future. God is Lord of the Universe; yet, God is still concerned with the individual (Wisdom 3: the son of God who remains faithful to God despite persecution. Wisdom reflects on the silence of God and the sufferings of the just).

2. Attitudes toward Atheism in the OT:

There is a **fundamental identity** of the **Lord of Creation** and the **God of the Covenant**. The one who revealed himself in Sinai can also be seen in creation -- “The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament proclaims his handiwork.” Because God can be known through his works, naturally, idolatry is inexcusable (idolatry = culpable ignorance of God) Wisdom 13-15 judges the Egyptians culpable.

3. The knowability of God in Revelation:

God has manifested himself through the history of redeeming his people and establishing a covenant with them. While there are theophanies of his saving power, Israel knows that God is beyond their grasp -- he is incomprehensible (JOB); no one can see God's face and live (MOSES); the Temple cannot contain his presence; and so his presence is through symbol and image, dream and theophany.

B. The knowability of God in the New Testament:

1. NT consciousness that we are in the last times, the eschatological age, when we have received the fullness of God's Revelation: the key text is Hebrews 1:1-2 -- “In times past, God spoke in partial and various ways to our ancestors through the prophets; in these last days he

spoke to us through a son, whom he made heir of all things and through whom he created the universe.”

2. The problem of unbelief:

For Paul, there is no excuse for our lack of knowledge of God since God has revealed himself in creation Rom 1:18-23. The Johannine literature denounces existential atheism -- those who do not believe stand already condemned -- the signs of unbelief are fraternal hatred. Only he who does the truth, knows the truth.

3. Concerning the knowability of God:

Christ is the fullness of that Revelation (Christ’s repeated affirmation concerning those who longed to see this day. “I give praise to you, Lord God of Heaven and earth -- for what you have hidden from the learned and the clever, you have revealed to the merest children.”) Even though God has fully made himself manifest in the person and the saving work of Jesus Christ, the NT community is aware that its knowledge yet is imperfect and that there is a need to grow in this knowledge:

a. Marcan community and the Messianic secret -- we only come to a gradual insight into the identity of Jesus as the Son of God; experiential knowledge is gained as we too face the scandal of the cross.

b. Pauline affirmation: “We see in a mirror dimly what we shall one day see God face to face.”

c. Johannine community: the knowledge is made complete through the Spirit of Truth.

C. Systematic analysis of Biblical Theism

1. Old Testament Theism:

a. **Four basic characteristics** about the the affirmation of God in the Old Testament: tension between (a) mystery and theophany; (b) history and transcendence; (c) exclusivity and universality; (d) absoluteness and personality.

b. **Historical and Transcendence: Salvific immanence of the Transcendent is summed up in the notion of covenant.**

a. The covenant in creation: Creation is the work of the free and transcendent God who enters into a covenant relationship with Adam. “See, I give you every seedbearing plant.” I give it all to you. Man’s response: to trust. Failure to trust is in the first sin -- seeking to be God and exercise absolute dominion. Still, God remains committed to humanity, despite the sin -- the promise of a redeemer.

b. The covenant of Sinai: The manifestation of Yahweh’s name speaks both Immanence (I am here) and transcendence (Who Am). Incomprehensibility and yet disponibilitate. Israel becomes not only God’s partner, but now God’s possession (I ransomed you - you belong to me). Man’s response: keep the commandments. (and of religion and ethics).

c. Kingdom and Grace: God is King -- he rules history and will judge it (the theme of the prophets). Yet, the judgment and justice of the King is exercised with great tenderness, compassion and mercy (Kindness and truth shall meet, justice and peace shall kiss).

Result: A Transcendent Personal Monotheism:

a. **Monotheism:** The conviction of the unicity, veracity, and exclusivity of God of Israel was affirmed progressively. The prophets were the great dogmatists of monotheism. I am the Lord -- there is no other.

b. Transcendentality: Nothing can contain him. He is Free, he is utterly Other and Holy.

c. Personality: Anti-pantheistic. The otherness of God is not something abstract but utterly personal. Expressed in the concept of *emeth* (covenant fidelity) and *hesed*. Even the *orge theou* must be seen in relation to the personal vested interest that God takes concerning the destiny of the world. God is neither capricious nor is the world ruled by fate.

2. New Testament Theism:

Basically, there is an intensification of the same themes present in the OT. The NT represents a **radical tension between Transcendence and History**. The basic message -- “The Kingdom of God is at hand.” The Salvific Immanence is radically made real in the Incarnation-Life-Death-Resurrection of God’s son. However, the believer participates in the reality of that salvific-immanence. The Father-Son-Spirit indwell in the believer. Through Jesus and in the power of the Spirit, we are caught up into the very life of the One God in a way that surpasses all other forms of participation in the past. Likewise, there is an incredible intensification of the personal accent of transcendental monotheism. God’s justice (his *emeth* and *hesed*) are fully made manifest in the paschal mystery -- that justice extends to us (justification of the sinner) through a participation in that paschal mystery.

III. The Faith of the Catholic Church:

A. History of Magisterial Teaching:

1. Three basic Magisterial affirmations in early creeds:

- a. First article of faith affirms belief in one God who is **both** Father and Creator.
- b. Both “divine sovereignty” and hypostatic trinity and interpersonal trinitarian equality in the one undivided divine essence are affirmed.
- c. God is infinite and incomprehensible: primordial apofatism affirmed.

2. Lateran IV: affirms the analogy of being against (a) the pantheism of Amalrico of Bene who said that God was identifiable with the creature and (b) the dualism of Albigenses and the Cathars. It chose to speak of the analogy of being as a mediation between Identity and Difference: between the Creator and creature there is a similarity and dissimilarity, where the dissimilarity is always greater than the similarity. The result: Moderate Apofatism (DS 806).

3. Three Summary Statements of Magisterial Teaching:

a. Balance between Identity and Difference:

Identity: between mysterious, transcendent God of Creation of the OT and the God revealed in the NT as Lord of salvation history and the Father of Jesus Christ and Difference: there is simultaneously a difference between God and the world, between Creator and creature.

b. Balance between divine transcendence in a creational and salvific immanence

c. Opposition to all language that undermines faith in divine justice and divine goodness.

4. Historical Dangers:

a. First Millennium: Dualism, with loss of identity.

b. Second millennium: Pantheism or atheism, with the loss of difference.

5. Modern age: has lost the integration between reason and faith and led to rationalism and fideism.

B. The Affirmation of God as a Theological problem in the Christian tradition up to Vatican I & II.

a. Lumen Rationis -- Lumen Fidei:

Christian tradition has constantly proclaimed a knowledge of God which is certain and mediated through both the order of grace and the order of reason. While the knowledge of God is imperfect and analogical, there is still a certain knowledge which is indefectibly true. On the other hand, the Tradition has always proclaimed the radical incomprehensibility of God which itself is grounded in the divine infinity . Vatican I proclaims that there are **two** ways in which God is known -- the **via supernaturalis** which renders to us the mysteries of faith and the **“naturale lumen”** which renders us a natural knowledge of God. Cf. Dei Filius, Ch IV (DS 3015): “The perpetual common belief of the Catholic Church has held and holds this: there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct not only in its principle but also in its object;

a. in its principle, because in the one we know by natural reason, in the other by divine faith;

b. in its object, because apart from what natural reason can attain, there are proposed to our belief mysteries that are hidden in God. “

b. Observation about the doctrine of Vatican I:

Vatican used the neo-scholastic distinctions of nature and grace to establish a doctrine that did not fall into fideism or rationalism. Between the two orders there exists the relationship of “obediential potency--gratuitous actualization. “ What Vatican I is **not** affirming is that there are **two independent ways** of arriving at the same knowledge of the divine reality, namely reason and faith. Rather, what the council wishes to secure (principally against fideism and traditionalism) is that there is a possibility of objective and certain knowledge of God from created reality that is open to us through reason. The active potency to recognize and accept God is, in fact actualized, not through reason but through faith.

c. The analogy of Being and the analogy of faith.

1. Analogy itself presupposes identity and diversity; in God-talk, there is something that we can say, and yet it is always qualified by the otherness of God.

2. The analogy of Being as established in **Lateran IV: “For between Creator and creature, no similitude can be expressed without implying a greater dissimilitude. “**

3. Barth’s objection (see above)

4. The relationship between the analogy of being and the analogy of faith: The analogy of being is found within and grounded upon the analogy of faith. What does this mean? The created order is the order that is destined for covenant -- in other words, everything that was made was made for the event of God’s self-communication to us in Christ. Therefore, the created order not only anticipates the order of grace but in some way is the stage created for grace. It is the ground (divinely chosen) of the possibility of an engraced encounter. The natural order of creation and being is the ontic and epistemological presupposition of God’s self-communication in nature and grace. Grace presupposes nature, Revelation presupposes reason, world of faith presupposes the world of being, the analogy of faith presupposes the analogy of being. If we speak of God through the analogy of being, our speech is not idolatrous principally because the created order has been taken into the greater order of grace. Yet, the analogy of faith completes, corrects and repairs the “analogy of being” because the order of creation has been obscured by Sin.

d. The knowledge of God and his moment of ineffability:

The tension between knowledge and incomprehensibility, or between language and ineffability. All categorical knowledge and subjective judgment presupposes a transcendental, infinite, unlimited horizon, indirectly and mediately present in our conceptual knowledge. our affirmation of God in the present also implies our hope for the future. Just as the analogy of being is always placed within the analogy of faith, so too does religious knowledge of God place itself into the ever greater Mystery of God's incomprehensibility. For this reason, the *via negativa* predominates in theology.

C. The Problem Of The Affirmation Of God In Vatican I And II

A. Vatican I: Key: Against Rationalism and Fideism

(against deism and agnosticism)

(against atheism and pantheism)

1. God, the Creator of All Things: Dei Filius, I:

“The holy, Catholic Roman Church believes and confesses: there is one God, true and living, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, mighty, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in his intellect and will and in all perfection. As he is one unique and spiritual substance, entirely simple and unchangeable, we must proclaim Him distinct from the world in existence and essence, blissful in Himself and from Himself, ineffably exalted above all things that exist or can be conceived besides Him.” (DS 3001)

2. Other canons-DS 3021-3024:

a. If anyone denies the one true God, Creator and Lord of things visible and invisible, *anathema sit*.

b. If anyone is not ashamed to assert that nothing exists besides matter, *anathema sit*.

c. If anyone says that the substance and essence of God and all things is one and the same, *anathema sit*.

d. If anyone says that finite beings, the corporeal as well as the spiritual, or at least the spiritual ones, have emanated from the divine substance; or that the divine essence becomes all things by self-manifestation or self-evolution; or lastly that God is the universal or indefinite being which, by self-determination, constitutes the universality of beings, differentiated in genera, species and individuals, *anathema sit*.

3. Vatican I is taking a stand against 19th century errors: **materialism and **pantheism**. In the face of these two movements, it emphasized the fact that God is spirit, he is absolutely perfect and infinite in all his perfections, and he is totally other, distinct from the world. In his relation to us, his transcendence is formulated in terms of his being ineffable and incomprehensible. He is entirely simple -in Him there is no composition, either physical (matter and form, substance and accidents) or metaphysical (potency to act, essence and existence). **Now the problem: If he is transcendent, if he is ineffable and incomprehensible, how is he knowable?****

4. Revelation, Dei Filius II:

The same Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the beginning and end of all things, can be known with certainty from the things that were created through the natural light of human reason, for “ever since the creation of the world, His invisible nature has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made.”(Rom 1:20); but that it pleased His wisdom and bounty to reveal Himself and His eternal decrees in another and supernatural way, as the

apostle says: “In many and various ways, God spoke of old through to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by the Son” (Heb 1:1-2). (DS 3004)

It is to be ascribed to this divine Revelation that such truths among things divine as of themselves are not beyond human reason can, even in the present condition of mankind, be known by everyone with facility, with firm certitude and with no admixture of error. [This “moral necessity” of Revelation] It is, however, not for this reason that Revelation is to be called absolutely necessary, but because God, in his infinite goodness has ordained man to a supernatural end, viz., to share in the good things of God which utterly exceed the intelligence of the human mind, for “no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God prepared for those who love Him” (I Cor. 2:9) [the “absolute necessity of Revelation”]-- [DS 3005]

“If anyone says that the One true God, our creator and Lord, cannot be known with certainty with the natural light of human reason, through the things that are created, anathema sit.” (DS 3026)

5. What is the point here? This article of faith, the knowability of God from the created order and yet the need for special Revelation, combatted on the one hand the errors of fideism with its distrust of human reason and total reliance on Revelation (really, a logical consequence of placing God in the Kantian noumenon), and, on the other hand, rationalism which considers human reason as the only source or measure of human knowledge. Vatican I left open the question as to the possibility of knowing God, whether through proof, intuition, or a postulate of practical reason, could be realized. While we affirm, man’s natural capacities to be able to know God, in fact, that capacity has never been realized -- it has not been needed to be realized --since, from the very beginning, God has opened himself to us in self-communication in grace and has promised to give himself to us in direct encounter. The history of man has always been a salvation history.

a. Against Fideism and Traditionalism: Louis Bautain who underrated the powers of reason and Catholic Traditionalism (Louis de Bonald, de Laménais) - God made a general Revelation at the beginning of time and the human race has been “living off” this Revelation ever since. The doctrine of Vatican I, in insisting upon the power of reason is of immense importance: through it, we see more clearly

(1) **who man is:** by his very nature, an openness to God, an obediential potency as a constitutive element of his being -- he always is a potential hearer of God who decided in freedom to communicate himself. (2) Beyond this, however, the natural ability to know God **preserves the goodness of God.** If God gave us the capacity to know the truth, and he is the supreme truth, how could God remain totally hidden from man without man, for his part, being denied a participation in the truth which he is ordered to know (man would be always frustrated). The structures of creation must be preserved in the order of redemption and grace.

b. Against Rationalism: On the other hand, rationalism insisted that man’s reason is the measure of intelligibility. Spinoza, for example argued that Revelation can add nothing to our knowledge that has not already been attained by reason. Theologically, in the 19th century, Georg Hermes accepted Revelation as valid but maintained that reason also could independently establish all the truths of Revelation. Vatican I insists that, while some truths could have been grasped apart from Revelation, without Revelation they would have been grasped with great difficulty. Accordingly, Revelation is **morally** necessary for most of us to

come to a knowledge of religious truths of the **natural** order (for example the immortality of the soul) and it is **absolutely** necessary for truths of the **supernatural** order (e.g., the Trinity). Nevertheless, both truths of the natural order that God has revealed and truths of the supernatural order that had to be revealed are consonant with human reason -- God does not communicate nonsense to us.

NB: An acceptance of a natural theology does not equal theological rationalism or exaggerated cataphatic theology.

KEY: The God groped for by religious reason is the same God revealed to and obeyed by faith.

B. The Teaching of Vatican II:

Vatican II balances the tension between Transcendence and History. It is significant in that it addresses three key concepts:

(a) **the discussion of the causes and response to atheism (Gaudium et Spes)**

(b) **rediscovery of religious experience as a “search for the divine” with re-evaluation of value of other religious traditions (Nostra Aetate)**

(c) **the nature of divine Revelation as divine self-communication (Dei Verbum)**

1. Dei Verbum , 6:

“Through divine Revelation, God chose to show forth and communicate Himself and the eternal decisions of His will regarding the salvation of men. That is to say, He chose “to share those divine treasures which totally transcend the understanding of the human mind.” This sacred Synod affirms, “God, the beginning and end of all things, can be known with certainty from created reality by the light of human reason” (cf. Rom 1:20); but the Synod teaches that it is through His Revelation “that those religious truths which are by their nature accessible to human reason can be known by all men with ease, with solid certitude, and with no trace of error, even in the present state of the human race.” This particular paragraph of Dei Verbum repeats what has been written in Vatican I with **one major difference** -- the notion of Revelation as a communication of divine ordinances or propositions is replaced by a notion which sees Revelation in far more personalistic terms. **Replacing *revelare* is *manifestare ac communicare*.**

[NB: **shift is from a propositional idea of Revelation to Revelation as the divine self-communication.**

Vatican I: *revelare* (propositional truth)

Vatican II: *manifestare ac communicare* (Comm. of self).

2. Gaudium et Spes, 19: The Forms and Roots of Atheism:

“An outstanding cause of human dignity lies in man’s call to communion with God, From the very circumstance of his origin, man is already invited to converse with God. For man would not exist were he not created by God’s love and constantly preserved by it. And he cannot live fully according to truth unless he freely acknowledges that love and devotes himself to his creator.

Still, many of our contemporaries have never recognized this intimate and vital link with God, or have explicitly rejected it. Thus, atheism must be accounted among the most serious problems of our age, and is deserving of closer examination.

The word atheism, is applied to phenomena which are quite distinct from one another. For while God is expressly denied by some, others believe that man can assert absolutely

nothing about Him. Still others use such a method so to scrutinize the question of God make it seem devoid of meaning. Many, unduly transgressing the limits of the positive sciences, contend that everything can be explained by this scientific reasoning alone, or, by contrast, they altogether disavow that there is any absolute truth.

Some laud man so extravagantly that their faith in God lapses into a kind of anemia, though they seem more inclined to affirm man than to deny God. Again, some form for themselves such a fallacious idea of God that when they repudiate this figment they are by no means rejecting the God of the gospel. Some never get to the point of raising questions about God, since they seem to experience no religious stirrings nor do they see why they should trouble themselves about religion.

Moreover, atheism results not rarely from violent protest against the evil in this world, or from the absolute character with which certain human values are unduly invested, and which thereby already accords them the stature of God. Modern civilization itself often complicates the approach to God, not for any essential reason, but because it is excessively engrossed in earthly affairs.

Undeniably, those who willfully shut out God from their hearts and try to dislodge religious questions are not following the dictates of their consciences. Hence, they are not free of blame.

Yet, believers themselves frequently bear some responsibility for this situation. For, taken as a whole, atheism is not a spontaneous development but stems from a variety of causes, including a critical reaction against religious beliefs, and in some cases, against the Christian religion in particular. Hence, believers can have more than a little to do with the birth of atheism. To the extent that they neglect their own training in the faith, or teach erroneous doctrine, or are deficient in their religious, moral, or social life, they must be said to conceal rather than reveal the authentic face of God and religion.”

3. Gaudium et Spes, 20: Systematic Atheism:

“Modern atheism often takes on a systematic expression, which, in addition to other arguments against God, stretches the desire for human independence to such a point that it finds difficulties with any kind of dependence on God. Those who profess atheism of this sort maintain that it gives man freedom to be an end unto himself, the sole artisan and creator of his own history. They claim that this freedom cannot be reconciled with the affirmation of a Lord who is author and purpose of all things, or at least that this freedom makes such an affirmation superfluous. . . . Not to be overlooked among the forms of modern atheism is that which anticipates the liberation of man especially through his economic and social emancipation. This form argues that by its nature religion thwarts such liberation by arousing man’s hope for a deceptive future life, thereby diverting him from the constructing of an earthly city.”

4. Gaudium et Spes 21: The Church’s Attitude toward Atheism:

In her loyal devotion to God and men, the Church has already repudiated and cannot cease repudiating, sorrowfully but as firmly as possible, those poisonous doctrines and actions which contradicts reason and the common experience of humanity, and dethrone man from his native excellence. Still, she strives to detect in the atheistic mind the hidden causes for the denial of God. . . . The Church holds that the recognition of God is in no way hostile to man’s dignity, since this dignity is rooted and perfected in God. For man was made an intelligent and free member of society by the God who created him. . . .She further teaches that a hope related

to the end of time does not diminish the importance of intervening duties, but rather undergirds the acquittal of them with fresh incentives. By contrast, when a divine substructure and the hope of eternal life are wanting, man's dignity is most grievously lacerated, as current events often attest. The riddles of life and death, of guilt and of grief go unsolved, with the frequent result that men succumb to despair. Meanwhile, every man remains to himself an unsolved puzzle, however obscurely he may perceive it. To this questioning only God fully and most certainly provides an answer as He summons man to higher knowledge and humbler probing.

The remedy which must be applied to atheism, however, is to be sought in a proper presentation of the Church's teaching as well as in the integral life of the Church and her members. For it is the function of the

Church, led by the Holy Spirit who renews and purifies her ceaselessly, to make God the Father and his Incarnate Son present and in a sense visible.

This result is achieved chiefly by the witness of a living and mature faith. . . . This faith needs to prove its fruitfulness by penetrating the believer's entire life, including its worldly dimensions, and by activating him towards justice and love, especially regarding the needy. What does the most to reveal God's presence however, is the brotherly charity of the faithful **[communio caritatis]**; who are united in spirit as they work together for the faith of the gospel and who prove themselves a sign of unity.

While rejecting atheism, root and branch, the Church sincerely professes that all men, believers and unbelievers alike, ought to work for the rightful betterment of this world in which all alike live. Such an ideal cannot be realized, however, apart from sincere and prudent dialogue.

Notes from Pastor's class

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY - THE PROBLEM OF GOD

AT:Ex 3,1-15: el nombre de Dios - 4 opciones

1. Yo soy quien soy. (anacronístico)
 2. Yo hago ser lo que llega a ser. (Creador)
 3. Yo estaré contigo, en poder. (la preferencia de Murray) cf. Is 52,6.
- Yo estaré ahí como quien yo soy estaré ahí.

Visita de Dios, fidelidad, libertad, infabilidad, poder salvífico, se puede conocer.

4 preguntas:

Existencial: ¿Está Dios aquí con nosotros?

Funcional: ¿Qué es Dios?

Noética: ¿Cómo reconocer/conocer este Dios que salva y juzga?

Onomástica: ¿Cómo nombrarlo?

Lo que importa es “reconocer” a Dios, es una experiencia histórica-existencial y relacional, tengo culpa si no lo reconozco. No es una cuestión intelectual, sino de vida y muerte.

NT: Las mismas preguntas, una nueva sustancia del problema: Jesucristo.

Dios = Dios del AT = Padre = Ho Theos

Jesucristo = Dios, Nuestro Señor

Espíritu Santo = Señor con nosotros, Señor dador de vida

No desaparece el misterio, sino que se hace más fuerte al reconocer la Trinidad.

Época Patrística: 3 temas:

1. Cristianismo v. Judaísmo v. Helenismo

2. la naturaleza de la realidad

3. exégesis, el uso de las SS. SS.

Monarquía (activo - Pantokrator) se convierte en monoteísmo (ontológico); errores de Tertuliano (“imaginación”) y Orígenes (subordinación); Arrio sigue esta pista al extremo.

Atanasio: Lo que se dice del Padre apartiene al Hijo, con la excepción de ser el Padre. La plenitud de la Encarnación -- necesidad soteriológica. Homoousion no = una nueva revelación; es misma verdad de las SS. SS. expresada de una nueva forma de tal modo de poder contestar el arrianismo.

“Arcaísmo” querer quedarse con el lenguaje del pasado no garantiza la protección de la verdad, e.g., Eusebio. Se establece el lenguaje “ontológico.” ¿Qué crees del “homoousios”? La pregunta ecuménica.

Eunomismo: Querer conocer a Dios como el se conoce: “En las cosas de Dios, confesar no saber es saber mucho” (San Cirilo de Jerusalén).

Tomás de Aquino: Analogía; la razón afirma la existencia de Dios.

El hombre sin Dios:

En la Biblia: “el necio” (Salmo 14,1); “los pueblos” (Jer 10,25) -- en el NT -- “sin excusa” (Rom 1,20); el “filósofo” (Sab 13, 6-7).

En la modernidad: El hombre de la “academia” ateo, el hombre del “mercado” ateo.

En la pos-modernidad: El hombre del “Teatro,” el “Marxista.” El gran cambio es de la negación de Dios (“Je n’avais pas besoin de cette hypothèse.”) v. odio - no puede existir.

SATNO TOMAS DE AQUINO -- SUMMA THEOLOGICA

5 vías: I, 2, 3: Primer motor inmóvil; primera causa no causada; el ser necesario no causado; la máxima perfección (ser, bondad, etc.); el gobierno del mundo.

Dios: simple, perfecto, infinito, inmutable, uno, conocible (y no), nombrable (y no)

Analogía

PASTOR -- “HUMAN BEINGS AND THEIR SEARCH FOR GOD”

Primer artículo de la fe, siempre defendido en los credos: Un Dios, Padre y Creador: de los Apóstoles, Niceno, Constantinopla, Quiercy (851) y Valencia (855) contra la necesidad del mal, Sens (1140) contra el optimismo teológico de Pedro Abelardo, Reims (1148) contra la

distinción de Gilberto de Poitiers entre la esencia divina y la Trinidad, IV Letrán (1215) contra el dualismo de los Albigenses y Cátaros propone la única Soberanía de Dios -- analogía entre Creador y creatura, pero *Deus semper maior* y contra el panteísmo, II Lyons (1274) repite lo mismo, Juan XXII (1329) contra un apofatismo radical en Meister Eickart, Florencia (1442) Dios Soberano, Trento (1564) repite el Credo Niceno-Constantinopolitano.

Relación entre fe y razón:

Platonismo Agustiniano: la razón contemplativa integrada con la fe religiosa

Aristotelianismo Tomista: subordinación moderada de la razón contemplativa por la fe.

Racionalismo: subordinación de la fe por la razón crítica.

Fideísmo: subordinación exagerada de la razón por la fe. Estos últimos rechazados por el Magisterio, en particular por Vaticano I (1870). Resultados equivocados: Panteísmo, Ontologismo, panteísta, la negación de la libertad divina en la creación, ateísmo, agnosticismo.

San Pio X y Pio XII reafirman la posibilidad de conocer a Dios por una teología natural; pero sigue siendo necesaria la fe y la revelación; no excluye a aquéllos que buscan a Dios sinceramente.

Vaticano II: Testimonio de Dios en la creación y en la revelación. *Nostra aetate* (1965) llama la atención sobre el valor teológico de la experiencia religiosa de Dios como Creador providente y Padre misericordioso. Ateísmo, puede ser culpable, pero con frecuencia el “Dios” que se niega no es el Dios del Evangelio, por culpa de la predicación o del ejemplo de los cristianos. Posibilidad de la salvación de los no creyentes (*Lumen gentium, Ad gentes*) es posible de una manera sólo conocida por Dios, en la cual Él comunicaría la gracia.

La dialéctica absolutamente insuperable: entre revelación y misterio, comunicación/inefabilidad, trascendencia/historia, incondicionado/personalidad, identidad/diferencia, Dios de Israel/Dios de las naciones, compromiso con la historia/escatología (Dios soberano/cooperación humana). Las antinomias son paradójicas, pero no antitéticas. Dios se puede conocer, pero no comprender.

PASTOR -- “DIO” in DIZIONARIO DI TEOLOGIA FONDAMENTALE

El lenguaje teológico nace del encuentro entre el Evangelio y la filosofía griega. El Dios de los Cristianos **ES** el Dios que esperaban los pueblos (Hechos 17,23 ss). La filosofía ayuda en la construcción del lenguaje teológico, hasta para combatir el dualismo y el panteísmo. Vía catafática (los nombres divinos), apófatica (negativa), mística (unión con Dios)

Después de Santo Tomás, el encuentro con la razón autónoma (Descartes, Leibniz, Newton), Deísmo - religión racional (Diderot, Voltaire, Hume), panteísmo (Spinoza), religión puramente moral (Kant), fideísmo (Pascal, Lutero, Jacobi) -- en todo esto estamos en el subjetivismo humano. Viene después el idealismo (Fichte, Hegel) que no podían aceptar infinto/personal, apofatismo absoluto -- Dios se puede aceptar como el Sujeto absoluto (Schelling) del cual dependemos absolutamente (Schliermacher), siempre el peligro de acabar en el panteísmo. Después vienen los que se preocupan más de la existencia concreta: alienación e historia (Feuerbach, Marx), nihilismo (Nietzsche), diferencia absoluta (Kierkegaard).

“LA CUESTIÓN APOFÁTICA” en LA LÓGICA DE LO INEFABLE

Los Padres encuentran en el Platonismo una ayuda en visión teísta, la eternidad del alma. También Aristóteles. Interés y problemas también con: Epicúreo -- Dios trascendente, pero desinteresado, estoicismo -- demuestra la existencia de Dios, pero, tiende a ser panteísta, agnosticismo escéptico.

Dios espiritual, anti-gnóstico, anti-dualista, el apofatismo griego llega al ápice con Dionisio - el divino emanentismo. En Occidente el apofatismo es menos ontológica, más enfocado en la incomprendibilidad del plan salvífico de Dios. San Agustín -- Vía interior -- se puede llegar a una certeza de la verdad, la cual permite toda ciencia. Un ser, bien, y voluntad.

Boecio -- precencia divina v. libertad humana; Dios = “‘forma pura’ de quien todo recibe su ser.”

Vía Catafática -- San Anselmo, Santo Tomás, Francescanos de Oxford -- se empieza a pensar que se puede decir más de Dios.

Pier Damiani - voluntarismo exagerado

Dominicanos -- Vía desde abajo -- usando Aristóteles. S. Tomás privilegia la vía exterior y la mediación de las criaturas, mientras Agustino privilegia la vía interior.

B. Duns Scotus enfatiza la contingencia del mundo, subrayando la voluntad divina. Ockam elimina toda analogía eliminando la vía catafática.

Debate moderno:

Teologías de la Trascendencia --

Dialéctica: Bultmann - desmitizar la SS. El conocimiento de Dios es posible sólo a través de la Palabra, Cristo. Se diferencia entre Jesús histórico y el Kerygma de Cristo. de la Correlación: Tillich (a continuación).

Inmanencia:

Muerte de Dios: 1) empírico; 2) “concentración cristológica” - el Dios inmanente 3) praxis.

Históricas: Moltmann - acentúa el “todavía no,” el compromiso por cambiar el mundo de hoy, no sólo obrar al nivel personal.

Católicos:

Trascendencia:

Nouvelle Theologie -- regreso al Tomismo original y subrayar el carácter inmediato de la revelación.

Método trascendental -- Rahner - el hombre abierto al Misterio recibe la libre comunicación de la gracia divina

Inmanencia:

de la secularización: Schillebeeckx -- confianza de fondo, o empeño práctico como nueva base para la trascendencia. Puede caer en racionalismo.

Teología Política: Metz -- crítica de la “reserva escatológica” que impide la acción comprometida y enfatiza a “diferencia ética.”

Teología de la Liberación: ver abajo.

Tillich:

(de TILLICH PAUL, en DIZIONARIO DI TEOLOGIA FONDAMENTALE)

Busca crear una “filosofía teónoma.” Su tema central es el “Ultimate Concern” del hombre. Se ve en todos sus escritos esta preocupación, la de crear una filosofía teónoma de la cultura y de la sociedad. Su filosofía política socialista quiere ser teónoma y aplicar una ética cristiana. Tillich hace todo su estudio desde la perspectiva del “Incondicionado.” Lo encuentra presente paradójicamente en toda realidad. Su antropología la elabora desde el punto de vista del ser humano que tiene la valentía de buscar su sentido último. Siempre se preocupa por la presencia del Incondicionado en la historia (muy) contingente.

Defendía el dudo metódico de la razón filosófica, reconocía la experiencia religiosa como una irrupción del Incondicionado en la historia, y el aspecto pardojal del cristianismo. Hay una relación entre religión y cultura, en la cual la religión le da a la cultura su sentido último, y la religión recibe de la cultura la posibilidad de expresarse simbólicamente. Su filosofía está en el umbral entre el idealismo y el existencialismo. Empieza con el idealismo, que ve que existe lo que no debe existir. Aquí la “corrección existencial” ayuda a resolver el “principio de la diferencia.” Usa la psicoanálisis y el análisis marxista para identificar la situación actual, a nivel personal y social.

El concepto de “kairos” lo ayuda a ver la distinción entre el “ya” y “todavía no.” Aquí su socialismo es completamente teónomo.

Los 2 puntos de enfoque de la “elipsis” teológica de Tillich son la razón crítica y extática y la revelación. El hombre le pregunta a Dios, el Cual responde. Va en contra de Lutero cuando dice que el *Deus revelatus* es el *Deus absconditus* y por lo tanto es imposible llegar al primer sin el segundo. Subraya toda la paradoja de la cual hemos hablado a través del curso. El lenguaje humano sobre Dios es siempre ontológico, paradójico y simbólico.

Siempre enfatiza la primacía de lo teónomo sobre lo autónomo y lo eterónomo. Donde entra en problemas con la perspectiva católica es en su visión de la Iglesia. Quiere superar la religión moderna. La Iglesia visible puede caer en el pecado y la Iglesia latente puede ser la verdadera. Aquí no está respetando la misma paradoja que para él es tan importante, aplicada a la Iglesia como Cuerpo de Cristo en la cual siempre existe identidad y diferencia, pero que siempre es el Cuerpo de Cristo.

Teología de la Liberación (de ORTOPRAXIS Y ORTODOXIA):

La Iglesia de los Pobres: Opción fundamental por los pobres: denunciar, anunciar, empeñarse.

Iglesia y sociedad: Católica, desigual, emarginada. Identidad y pluralismo: identidad -- 1)

Reino de Dios, 2) Cristo, profeta de liberación, 3) renovación eclesial, 4) inculturación.

Debates: tendencias -- trascendencia, conciliación, inmanencia.

Teología de la Liberación: 4 modelos: 1) Iglesia como sujeto, 2) el pueblo como sujeto, 3) los militantes cristianos como sujeto, 4) las comunidades eclesiales de base como sujeto. 1&4 más enfocados en el Dios de la Alianza y en la gracia, 2&3 más en el Dios de la creación y en la naturaleza.

Método: 1) desafío y respuesta - no es nuevo, la Iglesia lo tiene que hacer, si bien no ofrece la solución práctica. 2) Razón teológica v. razón política: parece predominar la segunda, por lo menos en el primer paso de ver (más adelante). 3) Método inductivo - ver, juzgar, actuar -- el problema viene cuando este proceso se hace no a la luz de la fe (como insisten los documentos Vaticanos) sino a la “luz” del análisis marxista. 4) Socialización - la existencia

determina la esencia cuando se busca superar un lenguaje teológico demasiado abstracto. 5) El uso del marxismo.

Teología: Con frecuencia se cae en racionalismo al buscar hacer un análisis de la situación. Predomina la R sobre la F (o puede).

Cristología: En general no hay problema. Se enfatiza Jesús qua libertador, pero no al precio de un nestorianismo.

Eclesiología: Iglesia = Comunidad del E.S., pero ¿cuál Iglesia? Puede reducirse la Iglesia en un antítesis (como Tillich).

Los documentos: 1984/86 -- el segundo más moderado. El primero (*Libertatis nuntio*): La T. de la L. es en sí un proyecto bueno y necesario. No es admisible el racionalismo en el “ver.” Hace falta repetir más el magisterio, la analogía de la fe. El marxismo: no es aceptable ni de la forma leninista ni como un método de análisis, porque sus presupuestos no son aceptables a la visión cristiana de Dios y de la hombre o absoluta o relativamente. Excepción - si el M. no fuera ya M. Ortopraxis: *nobilis pugna pro iustitia* (Pio XI) es buena, pero la praxis marxista de la lucha de clases se basa en una verdad distinta, una bondad distinta, y la violencia necesaria. Afectaría entonces la “ortodoxia”, causando división en la Iglesia, y secularizando la escatología y eclesiología, e.g. Se hace sólo inmanente la vida cristiana. Dice SÍ a una T. de la L. dentro de la Iglesia y que respete la analogía de la fe.

El segundo (*Libertatis conscientia*): Una visión más positiva de la necesidad de una T. de la L. 1) Proceso de liberación integral debe de nacer de la reflexión cristiana. 2) Existe el pecado en formas gravísimas en sus efectos sociales. 3) El Evangelio es de liberación y gracia (cf. profetas y Magnificat).

Si hay ortodoxia, debe haber ortopraxis, pero no una al precio de la otra, ni al precio de la trascendencia.

PUEBLA (1979): Números 2-3 del “Mensaje Introductorio” describen un proceso de ver, juzgar, y actuar (si no en tantas palabras); el Capítulo III de la Primera Parte (72-161) sigue el mismo esquema; en la Segunda Parte, Capítulo II (321-339) se ve este esquema específicamente unido a las dimensiones de creación, pecado y gracia.

TEOLOGÍA ECOFEMINISTA HOLÍSTICA

Punto de comienzo: la bruja

1. Se descubre la mujer que sufre en la sociedad y en la Biblia patriarcal.
2. Usando Boff, busca ontologizar los aspectos femeniles de Dios, “Si Dios es macho, no hay lugar para la mujer.” Se sospecha todo lenguaje bíblico/tradicional
3. El nuevo sistema ecofeminista holístico desvincula el cristianismo del sistema patriarcal opresivo.

Presupuestos:

1. Pretende ser “vitalista,” no racionalista
2. Pasa del idealismo al existencialismo (la teología es ideológica).
3. Usa el método de la Teología de la Lib.

Acaba en una especie de racionalismo, aunque no lo quiera ver así.

La Teología:

Naturalista: el gran organismo vivo es el cosmos. Se busca siempre la igualdad. El misterio mayor es un energía viva que sufre la evolución y, por lo tanto, el Misterio cristiano llega a ser un misterio menor. Elimina la teología de S. Pablo. El juicio = el juicio de la historia. La Resurrección nos habla del regreso a la vida, “pro me” no “in se.”

¿Y el Dogma?

1. Dios -- un pluralismo, el Dios cristiano es un arquetipo.
2. Monoteísmo -- patriarcal; ella es panteísta.
3. Dios personal -- la analogía la pone al revés; la personalidad de Dios se basa en la nuestra.
4. Liberación del Patriarcalismo
5. La Palabra de Dios -- También se sospecha la Biblia, que es patriarcal, contiene la Palabra de Dios, pero es sólo palabra humana, para leer la Biblia, la luz viene de mí.
6. Cristo -- Un hombre símbolo. Lo que lo hace importante es el poder del Imperio Romano -- le da al Cristianismo la posibilidad de crecer.
7. Eclesiología -- el movimiento de Jesús se reduce a un magisterio patriarcal; el Evangelio es no quedarse en la tumba.
8. Mariología -- simbólica, el niño es señal de esperanza.
9. Episcopado -- ataca la Nueva Ev. porque la Biblia es un libro importado que ya no puede enseñar a los pueblos de A.L. como amar.

LA LÓGICA DE LO INEFABLE

Método: Problema, teoría, juzgarla

Teoría del lenguaje sobre Dios a la luz del Primer Artículo de la Fe

Problema: ¿Es posible hablar de Dios?

Ipótesis inaceptables: 1 -- No es posible. 2 -- Se puede hablar sólo del Dios trascendente o del Dios inmanente.

Ipótesis: Dios inmanente = Dios trascendente.

Axiomas:

1. Fundamental: Revelado = Escondido
2. Gnoseológica: Conocido = Desconocido
3. Ontológica: Inmanente = Trascendente
4. Identidad: Dios = Dios y sólo Dios = Dios
5. Realidad: Dios necesariamente es Dios y necesariamente debe ser pensado como Dios
6. Ético: Dios de la confianza = Dios del temor (vice versa)
7. Relación: El lenguaje presupone la relación entre Dios y hombre
8. Dialéctica: Dios escondido de la religión místico-sacramental = Dios revelado de la religión profética (denuncia del pecado/anuncio de la salvación)

Reglas lingüísticas:

1. Fundamental: no olvidar que siempre se “habla” del Dios “inefable.”
2. del Uso lingüístico: variedad -- analogía, doxología, homología.
3. del Significado: atender a los distintos significados del lenguaje.
4. de las Funciones: la complejidad del proceso de comunicación.
5. de la Analogía: la A. es el síntesis dialéctico entre apofatismo y catafatismo.

6. de la Paradoja: no se puede romper.

Teoremas:

1. Fundamental: Dios se revela a todos los hombres, hasta si sigue siendo inefable.
2. Santidad: Santo, actualísimo, omniperfecto, absolutamente singular y único.
3. Divina Presencia: Eterno viviente, inmenso y omnipresente, espiritual y personal.
4. Justicia: Inteligente y omnisciente, libre y omnipotente, también en su juicio.
5. Fidelidad: Bueno, providente (misterioso), Señor fiel, Padre misericordioso.
6. Corolario religioso: La tensión entre mística y ética, la dialéctica de la identidad y la diferencia, sólo se resuelve paradójicamente en la teología de la gracia.

EL LENGUAJE BIBLICO SOBRE DIOS (Examinación bíblica)

(p. 66)

AT “Henoteísmo arcaico”

Dios de Abraham es distinto a los otros dioses. 'El = Dios universal, misterioso, benévole. Dios (revelado) de los Padres. La tensión se resuelve en IDENTIDAD. Ya el Dios eterno y trascendental = el Dios histórico y inmanente. No se pueden oponer ética y culto. Dios de confianza = Dios de temor.

Conquista-Reino: Crece la certeza de la unicidad de Dios. Yahvé = 'El. “Monoteísmo teórico”: Profetas - Reino juzga la historia. La divina monarquía se proclama. Salvación/juicio. Óptica mística = óptica ética de la diferencia. Deuteronomio-monolátrico, profetas - universalistas. La imagen de Dios - siempre mayor / siempre más personal. Sabiduría: divino temor (Prov), gloria divina (Si), silencio de Dios (Job), absurdo (Qoh), conocimiento de Dios (Sab) -- algo que los paganos pudieran haber hecho (Sab 13ss). A causa del pecado los paganos no llegaron a conocer a reconocer la analogía y la proporción que los hubiera llevado a reconocer a Dios. Apocalíptica: Dios guía la historia.

Sab 13, 1-9: (v.9) “Si llegaron a adquirir tanta ciencia que les capacitó para indagar el mundo, ¿cómo no llegaron primero a descubrir a su Señor?”

NT “El Teísmo Cristiano”

Dios “Padre”/”Abba.” “Señor” que tiene que ser servido e imitado. “Dios de la resurrección.” **1 Cor 15,28:** “Cuando hayan sido sometidas a Él todas las cosas, entonces también el Hijo se someterá al Padre, para que Dios sea todo en todo.” Panenteísmo escatológico/trascendencia absoluta. Divina elección. Divina justicia mostrada en el amor de Cristo en la cruz (cf. Lutero). La justicia y la misericordia no se pueden separar. **Rom 1:18** “cólera ... injusticia.” Texto clásico: S. Pablo en el Areópago -- **Hech 17, 22-34.** “‘Al Dios desconocido.’ Pues bien, lo que adoráis sin conocer, eso os vengo yo a anunciar.” El Dios revelado = el Dios escondido; el Dios esperado = el Dios de Jesucristo. El Dios trascendente entra en la historia. El Dios de la Creación = El Dios de la Alianza. Le tomó 1,000 años a Israel reconocer esto plenamente. En el cristianismo hay un monoteísmo absoluto.

LA EXAMINACIÓN DOGMÁTICA

2 PREMISAS BÁSICAS: DIOS = DIOS (IDENTIDAD).

DIOS ≠ hombre (DIFERENCIA).

Se ve en los símbolos, concilios, textos magisteriales de los 2 milenios cristianos.

Primer Milenio: proteger contra el dualismo. Segundo milenio: contra panteísmo/ateísmo.

Todos los símbolos/credos: “Creo en un solo Dios Padre todopoderoso, creador del cielo y la tierra, de todo lo visible e invisible” (más o menos) Nicea DS 125, Constantinopla DS 150.

Dionisio de Roma a Dionigi de Alejandría (262 - DS 115): Trinidad ≠ 3 dioses; Creer en Dios Padre omnipotente.

Sínodo de Constantinopla (543) anti-origenista: omnipotencia, eternidad de Dios.

Dios infinito, incompresible, eterno e ingénito, santo, omnipotente =
Dios Padre del Hijo eterno y divino e Ispirador activo del E.S.

Quiercy (853) DS 623 - Dios quiere la salvación de todos.

Valencia (855) DS 626-7 Presciencia v. Predestinación al castigo.

Sens (1140-41) DS 726 Libertad de Dios de actuar (contra Pedro Abelardo)

Reims (1153) DS 745 Gilberto divide esencia y persona en la Trinidad; condenada la idea.

Letrán IV (1215) Contra el dualismo de los cátaros y los aligenses, el panteísmo de Amalrica: Hay un Dios Creador y Salvador, Padre santo omnipotente, distinto del todo universal. Tensión entre conocer/no comprender; analogía/inefabilidad. **DS 806“quia inter creatorem et creaturem non potest tanta similitudo notari, quin inter eos maior sit dissimilitudo notari.”** Deus sempre maior!

DS 808 Panteísmo más bien loco que erético.

Vaticano I reza el fideísmo absoluto y el racionalismo. Afirma la realidad e identidad de Dios y su diferencia esencial del mundo. Vat. I, Pio X, Pio XII - la posibilidad de un conocimiento racional/natural de Dios. No se puede poner la fe debajo de la razón. La razón puede conocer a Dios por la “lumen rationis;” la fe por la “lumen fidei.”

Gaudium et Spes (1965): El ateísmo deja al hombre sin respuestas por sus preguntas básicas. Con frecuencia el Dios negado no es el verdadero Dios, sino una caricatura. Se quiere afirmar la autonomía del hombre. Se traba el hombre en la inmanencia.

Nostra Aetate (1965): La posibilidad de conocer a Dios en las religiones. Ratzinger- se canonizan no las religiones, sino el hombre religioso.

Analogía: Gracia supone naturaleza; rev. supone razón; Dios de la Alianza supone el Dios de la creación, *analogia fidei* supone *analogia entis*.

Dios es Dios. El hombre no es Dios.

CATECISMO DE LA IGLESIA CATÓLICA

199 Todo el resto depende del Primer artículo de la fe. El Nombre (203), Dios vivo (204), misericordioso, fiel (210). Sólo Dios ES (212-13; cf. Murray -no es su definición preferida).

Dios = verdad, amor (214-221). Omnipotencia misteriosa (268ss). Creador (279ss).
Providencia (302ss).

CONFESIONES DE SAN AGUSTÍN

Dios tiene todas las cualidades supremas de las cuales hemos hablado. El hombre depende de Él absolutamente. Todo lo que tiene el hombre es don de Dios.

God the Creator (M. Hunt)

“We believe in one God the Father all powerful, maker (poihtvvn) of all things both seen and
unseen...”

*Profession of Faith of the 318 Fathers
Council of Nicaea (325)*

V. Bibliography

A. Sources

John Paul II, *Laborem exercens*. Chapter in Baum, Gregory. *The Priority of Labor*. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Irenaeus of Lyon. *Adversus Haereses*. In *The Early Christian Fathers*. Edited by Henry Bettenson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

B. Literature

Baum, Gregory. *The Priority of Labor*. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Bromiley, Geoffrey W., ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Abridged in One Volume*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985. S. v. “poiéo,” by H. Braun.

Hawking, Stephen. “The Edge of Spacetime.” Chapter in *The New Physics*. Edited by Paul Davies. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Jaki, Stanley L. *The Only Chaos and Other Essays*. Intercollegiate Studies Institute: University Press of America, 1980.

King, Thomas, SJ. *Teilhard de Chardin*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1988.

Polkinghorne, John. “God’s Action in the World.” *Cross Currents* 41/3 (1991): 293-307.

Rahner, Karl, SJ., editor. *Encyclopedia of Theology - The Concise Sacramentum Mundi*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1975. S.v. “Creation,” by Pieter Smulders.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, SJ. *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1959.