# A PLEA FOR SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

IT is with considerable diffidence that I venture to plead the cause of Scholastic Theology. To the popular mind in this country it suggests a tissue of subtle sophisms or a farrago of futile enquiries such as the question how many angels can dance on the point of a needle. For the more educated and better informed it is but an unwieldy mass of antiquated matter unfit for modern use, perverting or obscuring the truth, and employing a terminology unsatisfying and meaningless. Were Scholastic Theology what it is by many thought to be, it would certainly deserve all the antipathy felt towards it; but it is precisely because I believe it to be so widely and so thoroughly misunderstood that I am anxious to present it in what I conceive to be its true character. The simplest and most direct method will be to describe its function and scope. It is called Scholastic because it was the kind of theology that prevailed for a considerable period and occupied so important a position in the schools of Europe. This bare fact will not assist us to understand what Scholastic Theology is, unless we investigate the nature of the theology of the schools.

The function of theology in general is to treat of God and of what relates to Him. Supernatural theology, to which I now restrict my remarks, has for its subject-matter God's revealed word. For my present purpose I shall consider a twofold function which theology can exercise. It may examine God's revealed word or, as it is called, the deposit of faith, and may extract from it various revealed truths or articles of faith. It may shew how these articles are contained in the deposit. Thus it may shew that according to Holy Scripture God is one nature in three Persons; God the Son became man; without Baptism it is impossible to enter heaven; faith is necessary unto salvation. It places these truths before us and proves them to be Scriptural. Theology whilst exercising such a function is called Positive, and

admirable specimens of it are to be found in the works of the Fathers of the Church, who excelled as Positive theologians.

Positive theology is undoubtedly most important since it is fundamental. It holds a foremost and necessary position in the theological domain. Yet it performs only one function of theology, and that an initial one. It occupies the first and preliminary stage in the presentment of revealed truth. Consequently of itself it is incomplete, since there remains a further work to be accomplished. It brings forth from the deposit of faith and proposes to us revealed truths, and here its function ceases. There is consequently another function of theology we may consider. It is possible to collect, co-ordinate, and systematize revealed truths. It is possible to investigate them, to analyse them, to try to penetrate them, to increase our understanding of them. We may shew the relation of one to the other, their mutual dependence, their harmony. By arguments of analogy and congruity we may confirm them, and we may shew how conformable they are to reason and to natural truths. From the truths supplied us by Positive theology we may deduce others, and we may resolve them into their various consequences. This is the function of the theology we call Scholastic. It begins where the Positive leaves off, and its first principles are the truths which the Positive supplies to it.

The human mind is so constituted by God that it is ever eager to attain to its proper object, and it seeks to grasp it as fully and as completely as its capacity will allow. It endeavours to view truth in all its aspects, to illustrate it, to make it more acceptable by removing difficulties and by solving objections brought against it. As the instrument of Scholastic Theology it enables us to have a more intelligent appreciation of revealed truth, and its exercise imparts an especial pleasure in making acts of faith. Since God has entrusted to man a body of revelation, He does not mean that he should merely passively accept it and lay it up in a napkin. 'Therefore the apostle Peter[1] warns us that we ought to be ready to answer every one who asks us the reason of our faith and hope, because if an unbeliever ask the reason of my faith and hope and I see that before he believes he cannot

[1] 1 Pet. iii 15.

comprehend, I give him as a reason this fact itself, that therein he may see, if possible, how preposterously he asks, before he believes, the reason of those things which he cannot comprehend. But if one who is already a believer asks the reason, in order that he may understand what he believes, his capacity must be considered so that according to it, when the reason has been given, he may obtain as great an understanding of his faith as possible, a greater if he comprehends more, a less understanding if he comprehends less; provided, however, that until he arrive at the fullness and perfection of knowledge he depart not from the path of faith.'[1] The truths of revelation are not to be preserved as mere fossil remains. It is difficult to see how we can have a lively and fervent faith, a yearning after a greater knowledge of God and after a more intimate union with Him, and not embrace readily His sacred word and reverently exercise our intelligence upon it. 'But perhaps some one may say: Shall there then be no growth of religious doctrine in the Church of Christ? By all means let there be growth and that to the utmost. For who is there so hostile to men, and hateful to God as to endeavour to prevent it? But, notwithstanding, let it so be that it be truly a growth of faith and not a change. Since to growth it belongs that each thing be expanded to the full measure of itself, but to change that something be altered from one thing to another. Let there then be an increase and growth, a strong and exuberant growth, of understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, as well in individuals as in the community, as well in one man as in the whole Church by gradual lapse of ages and centuries, but only in their own kind, namely in the same doctrine, the same sense and same meaning.'[2] A religious body of men should not be an inert, lifeless mass, but a living, active, energetic organism. But Scholastic Theology imports activity of mind upon the truths entrusted to it. It displays revelation in all its beauty and splendour, and with a marvellous fecundity unfolds to us, so far as the limitation of the finite human intellect permits, the infinite depth and breadth of the Divine word.

There are some revealed truths the human mind can understand, whilst there are others which surpass the natural comprehension of every created intellect. Nevertheless of them all,

[1] St Aug. *Ep.* 120 § 4.

[2] St Vinc. Lir. *Commonit.* c. xxiii § 55.

each according to its measure, the mind strives to have a deeper knowledge. Hence the precursor of Scholastic theologians exclaims: 'I do not try, O Lord, to fathom thy depth; because in no wise do I compare my intellect with thine, but I long to understand to some extent thy truth which my heart believes and loves. Nor indeed do I seek to understand in order to believe; but I believe in order to understand. For this too I believe, that unless I believe I shall not understand.'[1] It is the love of God's truth that prompts the desire to apprehend it more fully and completely. Scholastic Theology does not seek to rationalize faith by undermining or supplanting its formal object and by explaining its material object away, but to strengthen faith by indirectly confirming it, by shewing how compatible it is with our rational nature, and by enhancing and multiplying the inducements to believe. Of it may be said: 'With all diligence this one thing [the Church of Christ] strives after, that by treating faithfully and wisely the things that are old it may make them exact and smooth, if in any way they are previously unformed and inchoate; may confirm and strengthen them if they are already clearly expressed and developed.'[2] It depends upon Positive theology for the raw material which it humbly, lovingly, and reverently accepts, and which by activity, industry, subtlety, power, and skill it weaves into a vesture of marvellous beauty, shape, and symmetry for Christ's Mystical Body on earth.

So far I have spoken of the function of Scholastic Theology. Its scope is noble indeed and worthy of the highest faculty of man. But there is also the form to be considered. If we turn to the works of those who are generally acknowledged to rank as princes of Scholastic theologians, as St Thomas, St Bonaventure and Suarez, we shall be struck by certain characteristics. There is an entire absence of verbiage. No appeal is made to the feelings by the use of rhetoric. The language is perfectly simple and unadorned. There is nothing to move the mind except the sheer force of evidence of the bare truth. Men who are in search of truth are anxious to remove any hindrance whatever, whether it be beauty of language or exuberance of expression. Error or sophistry more easily conceals itself beneath

[1] St Anselm *Proslog.* c. i.

[2] St Vinc. Lir. *Commonit.* c. xxiii § 60.

multiplicity or complexity of words. Besides, the more that words abound, the more the argument is imbedded in them and the more difficult it is to extract it. Whereas if the argument is put before us in a jejune manner, the mind seizes it more quickly and more accurately, and is better able to appreciate its intrinsic worth. Hence occurs the frequent use of the syllogism, which employs no superfluous or redundant word.

Moreover there is a fixed terminology. Scholastic theologians were not wont to excogitate each for himself a new vocabulary or nomenclature and arbitrarily determine in what sense they would employ it. But they accepted the terminology handed down to them, which had been consecrated by continuous use and by time, and which had been polished and rendered more definite and accurate by the skilful handling and treatment of successive generations of the ablest and subtlest intellects. The Aristotelian philosophy no doubt enters largely into Scholastic Theology; but it does not constitute its essence and scope. It is used as a vehicle of thought and expression, and is adopted where theologians judge it to be true; for Scholastic Theology does not banish reason but exercises it upon the articles of faith.

I may be asked why am I so anxious to defend Scholastic Theology. It seems to me that if Anglican theologians would employ it, it would be a great gain for them as well as for others. The earlier Anglican divines spent much of their time and labour in protesting against, and in trying to refute, the errors of Papists. Of late years they have devoted themselves chiefly to Holy Scriptures and the Fathers. No one can deny that they have done excellent work in promoting and advancing Scriptural and Patristic studies. They deserve all praise in these special lines. On the other hand, it is to be regretted that they have not progressed further where progress is possible. They will not venture into the domain of Scholastic Theology; but they approach its confines and there they stop. Why should they not do for it what they have done for other branches? Why should they not endeavour to treat the articles of faith in a scientific manner, and to attain to a greater understanding of their full significance? It is quite true that at the present day Christian theologians are greatly absorbed in defending the fact itself of

revelation against unbelievers. But notwithstanding the necessity of Christian apologetics at this crisis of doubt and infidelity, some time may be spared for other duties, nor need all engage in fighting against the infidel.

One reason which may prevent the cultivation of Scholastic Theology is the want of unanimity in the articles which are to serve as first principles of Scholastic Theological science. There must first be agreement in these. This may be an objection, but only a partial one, nor is it insuperable. Combined labour in the same line usually supposes a common starting-point. Nevertheless there are certain revealed doctrines which Anglicans generally hold, and from these they may commence. If they would only combine and carry on a united work in the developement, evolution, and illustration of Christian dogma, the result would be an immense gain.

In many minds there is a dislike of the Scholastic system, which they identify with the syllogism. They tell us that faith does not depend upon the syllogism and no one is convinced by it. But such an assertion is irrelevant here; for I am not speaking of the motives of credibility nor of faith and its ultimate analysis. I am supposing faith, and faith in truths which have been arrayed before us by the special function of Positive theology. I am speaking of the exercise of reason upon what the deposit of faith has yielded up to us. Just as we can reason from the first principles of a purely natural science, so can we employ ratiocination upon those first principles which in Scholastic Theology are the articles of faith. If a person take exception to observing the laws of logic in Scholastic Theology, he should take the same exception, if he is consistent, in his advancement of every natural science. With such a one it would be idle to pursue the discussion further, unless he divest himself of such a misconception.

Then there are many who do not wish to be restricted to modest proportions in arguing or reasoning. They fill page upon page with excellent English. They introduce happy and pleasing illustrations. They display a vast amount of erudition and general reading and culture. But if all that really constituted the argument were stripped of superfluities and were stated in its strictly essential form, pages would be reduced by such

condensation to a few lines and then the true strength or weakness of the reasoning would be made manifest in its bare reality. Unfortunately we have grown so accustomed in this country to the diffuse and literary style that it would inflict quite a shock upon our taste and feelings to be suddenly confronted with such a revolutionary proceeding. Under the present circumstances I doubt if theology will ever make much progress in the line of developement. We are so accustomed to a loose style of argument and to literary effect, that we often fail to discover fallacies and ambiguities and also waste time in wading through a vast amount which in reality is not to the point or is unnecessary. A trained Scholastic theologian would first propose the question, and then he would marshal in its defence various arguments or proofs in a clear, concise, unadorned, logical, and unimpassioned form. He would solve the principal arguments brought forward in support of the contradictory doctrine. He would use the terminology which other theologians would accept and employ in exactly the same sense. He would not distract the mind by idle words or useless matter. When arguments are examined by theologian after theologian, a consensus will finally arise as to their cogency and validity, and then the doctrine which rests upon them, if they are recognized as valid, will become a common theological opinion. Thus by degrees opinion after opinion is firmly established, and such a process indicates advance.

In this country we are too apt to confound the history of theology with theology itself. No one should underrate the importance of the history of dogma or of theological opinions. It is of the greatest use and value both for the proper equipment of every theologian and for the purposes of teaching. Nevertheless it has its own special sphere and should never be made to do duty for theology. A serious defect in philosophy at the present day is that we have men giving us the views of others and holding nothing themselves. They will propound the different opinions, and so far they act as historians; but they not unfrequently fail to do the real and critical work of philosophy by examining, analysing, and weighing the arguments upon which these opinions are based. They seem afraid to commit themselves. Moreover, if they are to train the minds of

others, they should propose something definite which they themselves are prepared to maintain, and they should not allow their pupils to drift over a sea of opinions without chart, without compass, and towards no settled port. If they hold no definite body of doctrine which they are able to communicate, they should not attempt to teach. Let us then duly appreciate Positive theology and the history of theology, but let us also whilst using them both strive to advance in the peculiar sphere of Scholastic Theology.

Sometimes it happens that an Anglican theologian may hold certain articles of faith which Catholic theologians hold, and yet he may make statements which Catholic theologians declare to be inconsistent with those articles. I venture to assert that if he had cultivated Scholastic Theology, he would have refrained from making those statements, since he would have perceived their inconsistency. The fact is, he has not worked out the articles of faith to their legitimate conclusions. Consequently he has not that definite, consistent, and guiding system which such a developement or evolution produces. If he had caused the articles of faith to germinate, to produce the various deductions which naturally follow from them, and to put forth explicitly by evolution what is latent or implicitly contained in them, a system would be evolved with its ramifications and would disclose what a theologian could consistently affirm or deny. Thus he would not be betrayed through lack of this system into asserting what, from his own standpoint or position, would be illogical or inconsistent. For instance, if a theologian accepts as an article of faith that God the Son has become incarnate and is substantially man, or in other words that our Blessed Lord is God the Son made man, he cannot logically allow that our Blessed Lord could sin. At one time there were those who theoretically admitted such a possibility; but by degrees truth became more manifest, so that now the common opinion of theologians excludes this possibility. This is an instance of progress in the attainment of truth. At present therefore no Catholic theologian would maintain as probable that Christ whilst on earth could have committed sin. Also some Anglican theologians speak of the knowledge of Christ's human intellect in a way they would avoid, had they, after the method of the schools, analysed the

nature and exigency of the hypostatic union and followed this analysis to its logical and legitimate consequences.

Likewise in discussions on free will in man, some divines, I am told, enuntiate opinions which are at variance with their belief in the redemption of man and his co-operating in it by satisfying and meriting. This is to be regretted; for it is to build up and destroy the same edifice. A logical system carefully worked out would be an inestimable gain to such men. They may have all the qualities to fit them to be able theologians; but they lack that very instrument which would enable them to use those qualities efficiently and successfully.

There is another point I submit for consideration. The cultivation of Scholastic Theology, besides leading Anglican divines to a greater unanimity amongst themselves and to a deeper and fuller appreciation of revealed truth, would aid them to understand better the developement of doctrine in the Catholic Church. If Peter and Paul both believed as a revealed truth that God the Son is perfect man, Paul might well be astonished if, when he asserted God the Son to have a human intellect and a human will, Peter denied it. Had Peter analysed the predicate *perfect man*, he would have seen that this involved the two essential faculties of man. In a similar way when Catholic theologians deduce conclusions with all the rigidity of logic, they are accused of having altered revealed truths or of having imported new ones. The principle of developement is admirably expressed by Vincent of Lerins: 'Let the religion of souls imitate the manner of bodies which, although in process of years they unfold and fill out their parts, yet remain the same as before. There is a great difference between the flower of youth and the maturity of old age, but nevertheless the very same become old men who had been youths; so that although the state and condition of one and the same man be changed, still there abides one and the same nature, one and the same person.... Thus also it is fitting that the doctrine of the Christian religion follow these laws of growth, namely, that it be strengthened by years, amplified by time, attain to its full stature by age, yet remain incorrupt and unimpaired, and be complete and perfect in the entire proportions of its parts and, so to say, in all its own members and senses; and that, moreover, it admit of no change, undergo no loss of its

own special character, no alteration of its essential nature.'[1] The recognition of this principle ought to make those hesitate who are inclined to reproach Catholic theologians with having introduced novelties. It seems strange that men should deny to the deposit of faith what they are obliged to admit in a deposit which is merely natural. For instance, in that truly admirable, monumental, and sympathetic work, *The American Commonwealth*, Mr. Bryce informs us[2] that the American Constitution has developed in three ways, by amendment, by interpretation, and by usage. The first means a change in the constitution; the second, an unfolding of the meaning implicitly contained in it; and the third, an addition consistent with its spirit. With the first and last we are not here concerned. The second way is parallel to the theological developement of which I am speaking. We might even adapt to some eminent theologian, to De Lugo for example, Mr. Bryce's description of Chief-Justice Marshall: 'He grasped with extraordinary force and clearness the cardinal idea that the creation of a national government implies the grant of all such subsidiary powers as are requisite to the effectuation of its main powers and purposes, but he developed and applied this idea with so much prudence and sobriety, never treading on purely political ground, never indulging the temptation to theorize, but content to follow out as a lawyer the consequences of legal principles, that the Constitution seemed not so much to rise under his hands to its full stature, as to be gradually unveiled by him till it stood revealed in the harmonious perfection of the form which its framers had designed.'[3]

It may be objected that the Anglican Church is not congenial soil for Scholastic Theology or its method, otherwise they would have been introduced and cultivated long before now. In fact the Anglican temperament is utterly antagonistic to them. Many Anglicans dislike dogma, or at any rate such an excessive form of it as is presented in Scholastic Theology. They prefer to be unhampered and untrammelled by the hard and fast cramping Scholastic system. That the soil of the Anglican Church was formerly not congenial is beside the purpose. That it is not con-

[1] *Commonit.* c. xxiii §§ 56 and 57.

[2] Vol. i p. 362, 3rd ed.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 385.

genial now is the point in question. That many Anglicans would find no sympathy with it I am quite willing to admit. That there are at least some who would excel in it and by its adoption would promote the cause of revealed truth is what I am now specially maintaining. I have tried to explain how Scholastic Theology would be a fit instrument for the purpose, and from my acquaintance with Anglican divines I am persuaded that there are those amongst them who, if they applied their talents and ability, sincerity, earnestness, and energy to its cultivation, would do for it what others have done so well for Holy Scriptures and the Fathers.

To accept revelation and to reject dogma is a contradiction in terms. To accept or believe in revelation is to assent to a truth or body of truths on account of the authority of God revealing. This means to embrace dogma. How can a man embrace and reject dogma *in sensu composito*? When men talk about being intellectually unhampered and untrammelled, if they logically mean anything, they mean they do not wish to know the truth; for so long as they remain in ignorance they are at liberty to affirm or to deny as they please, and are not constrained by the evidence or manifestation of truth. What happens in natural sciences, happens likewise in the sphere of revelation. In natural sciences a man's intellect is determined by a natural truth made clear to it or by the evidence of truth. He is no longer free with regard to it. In this sense he may be said to be hampered or tied down. But he would be unreasonable to folly who would object to such a curtailment of liberty. If God besides speaking through nature should speak to us by revelation and present to us a truth to be accepted upon His authority, would not that man be equally unreasonable who, although he saw it was evidently his duty to yield assent to it, would yet refuse on the plea that he wished his intellect to remain untrammelled? Such a liberty is like that which can be seen inscribed upon the public monuments of France. It is licence, not liberty. In reality natural physical sciences do not of themselves give any scope for the exercise of liberty; since a scientific man is forced to accept that which is intrinsically evident or demonstrated. He deals not with supernatural faith but with natural knowledge. But the theologian exercises both reason and liberty when he assents to those first

theological principles from which Scholastic Theology begins to proceed by reasoning. He exercises his reason in so far as he demonstrates to himself as evident not the truth to be believed, but his duty to believe it. 'Let no one suppose, I say, that we believe so that we may not receive or seek a reason, since we could not even believe unless we had reasonable souls.'[1] Since, however, the intellect cannot determine itself, and since it is not determined by the evidence of the revealed truth, the will comes to the rescue, and compels the intellect to assent to the truth to which it sees it is its evident duty to assent. Thus he who believes in revelation is eminently rational and eminently a man of duty, and he offers to God that whereby he is specifically distinguished as a rational animal enjoying free will; he offers the submission and homage of his intellect and of his will.

Nevertheless, I cannot help thinking that men who inveigh against dogma must not be understood as using dogma in the strictly theological sense. What they object to is not the obligation to accept what they believe God wishes to impose upon them. They know quite well that even in daily life they are required to exercise human faith just as a child accepts its food from its mother, believing it on her authority to be good and wholesome. Also they know quite well that God, being truth itself and omniscient, possesses the requisite authority to be believed. Were they convinced that He was speaking to them, they would admit on His authority to be true what He spoke. Hence St Thomas takes for granted in the third difficulty (quaestiuncula 2) that 'nullus est ita infidelis quin credat quod Deus non loquitur nisi verum' (3. dist. 23. q. 2. a. 2.). But they repudiate the obligation to accept as revealed truth what they regard as merely human opinion proposed to their assent by a merely fallible institution. If a Church does not profess to be divine and infallible any man may reasonably object to being called upon to assent to whatever she may propose merely on her own authority. Such an imposition would be intellectual tyranny. In this sense they are averse to what they call dogma. Yet before reprehending Catholics they should strive to understand the Catholic position. The Catholic does not assent to a truth upon the authority of the Catholic Church as if that authority were the formal object of divine faith;

[1] St Aug. *Ep.* 120 § 3.

but he assents to the truth on the authority of God, and he accepts it when proposed to him by the Church because he believes the Church to be the infallible custodian and interpreter of the deposit of faith. At least the Catholic acts consistently with his position, whether that position be right or wrong.

Also I maintain that the cultivation of Scholastic Theology by Anglican divines would cause them to tend to greater union with those from whom they are now separated. It is obvious that Scholastic theologians differ among themselves; but it is only in matters in which the revealed doctrine has not been explicitly proposed by the authentic teaching body or *magisterium* of the Church or in which they are allowed to differ. Yet even in such matters by degrees they may arrive at unanimity. How frequently it has happened that opinions of theologians were divided on some question about which in course of time a *consensus* has at last arisen! For instance, some theologians used to hold that the priest was the minister of the Sacrament of Christian Marriage. Gradually theologians, by discussing the various arguments for and against this view, arrived at a common consent that the contracting parties themselves and not the priest administered the sacrament. Another example is the case of original sin. It is now generally held that its essence consists in a twofold element, the first being the privation of sanctifying grace caused by Adam's actual sin, the second being the imputation of that sin until it be forgiven. De Lugo[1], in treating the more general question of habitual sin, maintained the essence of habitual sin to be the actual sin morally persevering and being imputed until forgiven. But in spite of De Lugo's subtle arguments the common opinion has triumphed and prevails. Such cases may be multiplied indefinitely. Yet there are many new questions arising and many old ones remaining unsettled. There are some that will most probably never be conclusively answered in this life; because we lack sufficient data to enable us to form conclusive arguments. For instance it is doubtful whether the habit of the theological virtue of charity is the same as sanctifying grace. Some theologians deny that it is. Others affirm that one and the same infused habit of charity is both a *habitus operativus* and a *habitus entitativus*. As the former it is the virtue, as the latter it is the quality or accident which is

[1] *De Poenit.* disp. vii, sect. v, n. 48.

called habitual or sanctifying grace. How shall we ever be able to determine with certainty that even if Adam had not prevaricated, God the Son, on account of the excellence of the Incarnation itself, would have assumed human nature although not in its present passible state? So far as we can judge there is no likelihood that a genius will arise who will be able to excogitate some conclusive argument which has hitherto escaped the ingenuity or wisdom of all preceding theologians respecting either of these two questions.

The differences which divide Christendom are far greater and more radical than these. Nevertheless, I think that if we all pursued the same system and method, there would be a greater approximation to union and certainly we should understand each other better. Surely it is good and pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity. In His last address on earth to His apostles our Blessed Lord[1] exhorted them to union, and He prayed that they might be one as He and His heavenly Father were one. There may be union of hearts where there is divergence of minds; but the bond of perfection is strengthened, drawn together more closely and made more secure where there is not only one heart but also one mind. No theologian worthy of the name in its truest and fullest sense can go his own way through life little recking whether he agrees with others or not in matters of serious moment. Our Lord's prayer must have been efficacious not inasmuch as His heavenly Father would do violence to the wills and intellects of men and force them to be one, but in so far as He would obtain those graces which would enable men to be one if they chose to co-operate with them. Consequently each theologian should have at heart an earnest desire to lessen the gulf which separates men, to try to have some common ground, to enter into the views of others, and to see as they see and thus to understand them. I do not entertain so idle a dream as to fancy all this will be done by Scholastic Theology. Yet I do think that Scholastic Theology will contribute its share to that end, and therefore I am urging this plea. Perhaps few indeed may have the least sympathy with my idea, or perhaps still fewer may care to put it into execution. Nevertheless, when we imagine we see

[1] John xvii 22.

a remedy, however inadequate, to bring men's minds together, we should not refrain from pleading its cause and urging its acceptance. Unfortunately the disunion of Christendom may continue for long weary years. Scandals must needs come[1]; ravening wolves will enter in among us, not sparing the flock[2]; and of our own selves shall arise men speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them; there must be schisms amongst us and there must be heresies[3]. But each man who has the welfare of Christ's Mystical Body at heart should labour strenuously, unceasingly, and courageously to heal the wounds of Christendom so far as it is given him to do. He must sanctify himself and he must pray; but also he must act so as to affect directly his fellow men. Action may be manifold, and I humbly suggest that one phase of it may be the cultivation and promotion of Scholastic Theology by men of intellectual aptitude and apostolic zeal.

J. O'FALLON POPE, S.J.

[1] Matt. xviii 7. [2] Acts xx 29. [3] 1 Cor. xi 19.