

CURRENT THEOLOGY

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MISSION THEOLOGY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The development of mission theology is in its early stages and is still in the process of formation. It will be the purpose of this paper to survey what has been done and to evaluate these initial efforts. This will indicate the strivings of theologians to give shape and form to the doctrinal foundation of the entire missionary activity. These strivings point out two things: (1) the insistent return to theology for the solution to questions concerning the missions in general and also for missionary propaganda, and (2) the concrete difficulties to which these strivings have been exposed.

POSITIONS ON THE FOUNDATION OF A MISSION THEOLOGY

It is not easy to follow the various attempts of the recent past to elaborate a mission theology. Authors have engaged their efforts in different directions, and the development has been on the whole quite fragmentary. One of the first questions to settle is the starting point, what Perbal¹ termed the "point of departure" in the formation of an organic body of doctrine, which will reveal both the justification of the mission apostolate and its importance and urgency.

Joseph Schmidlin

Since there has been some discussion as to who deserves to be called the "father" of mission science, it will not be amiss to point out that the impetus for serious study of the mission apostolate came from Robert Streit, O.M.I. At a missionary conference in Berlin held on January 22, 1910, Fr. Streit proposed (1) a greater consideration of the missions in the programs of study of theological seminaries and Catholic universities, (2) the formation of specialists in mission science, and (3) the institution of a chair of mission science in a Catholic university.

In the preceding semester (1909-1910), however, Prof. Joseph Schmidlin had already given a course of lectures at the University of Münster on the Catholic missions in territories under German protection. In 1917 he published his *Einführung in die Missionswissenschaft*, and in 1919 his *Katholische Missionslehre*.² Schmidlin was primarily a historian. Since he was a pioneer

¹ Cf. Alberto Perbal, O.M.I., "La teologia missionaria," in *Problemi e orientamenti de teologia dommatica* (Milan, 1957); cf. Spanish translation, *La teología misionál* (Barcelona, 1960). Both editions list bibliography in mission theology.

² Joseph Schmidlin, *Einführung in die Missionswissenschaft* (Münster, 1917) and *Katholische Missionslehre im Grundriss* (Münster, 1919). Later editions were translated

in the field of Catholic missiology, or mission science, as he called it, he depended heavily upon the direction, scope, and method traced out by the German Protestant missiologists, especially Gustav Warneck, the master founder of Protestant mission science.³ Following in Warneck's footsteps, he proceeded in the same way, adapting and correcting his thought to Catholic doctrine.

As a result, Schmidlin founded mission theology on the dogma of the salvific will of God. Admitting with the Protestants that the "mission" does not exist except among pagans, and that one could not properly call that apostolate "missionary" which is directed toward the return of schismatics and heretics to the true Church of God, he had necessarily to be concerned with the salvation of infidels. The principal problem of the mission apostolate was for him the problem of the salvation of infidels. Protestants and other non-Catholic Christians could not properly be the object of missionary action, and so Schmidlin defined the mission as the propagation of the Christian faith to pagans, or the conversion of infidels.⁴

When he came to organize a dogmatic treatment of the missions, Schmidlin merely extracted from general theology those truths and theses capable of illustrating the mission question. Thus, he discussed the dogmas of the unity and personality of God, the salvific will of God and the universality of salvation, the necessity of baptism for salvation, the necessity of faith and of belonging to the Church, the necessity of the Church's activity for teaching and saving men; finally, he pointed out the relation of the missions to Christian eschatology.

Since he was a historian, Schmidlin quite naturally approached the formulation of mission theology after the manner of a historian, employing a methodology more proper to history than to theology. He merely rearranged and regrouped selected questions from general dogma, but at the expense of any bond of evident connection with one another or with the mission apostolate. His work amounts to an anthology of those Catholic dogmas which are more closely related to the mission apostolate, but he did not erect any body of systematic theology. The unification of these dogmas was rather artificial, inasmuch as his arrangement lacked a sufficient bond of unity. While there is

into English by Matthias Braun, S.V.D., *Catholic Mission Theory* (Techny, Ill., 1931) and *Catholic Mission History* (Techny, Ill., 1933).

³ Cf. Schmidlin, *Catholic Mission Theory*, pp. vi-vii. Schmidlin's dependence on Warneck has been noted more than once: e.g., Pierre Lefebvre, "L'Influence de Gustav Warneck sur la théologie missionnaire catholique," *Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire* 4 (1956) 288-94.

⁴ Cf. Schmidlin, *Catholic Mission Theory*, p. 36.

a connection among the questions he selected, it is rather remote. He entitled this anthology "The Basis of the Mission in the Truths of Faith."⁶

Without question, Schmidlin deserves much credit for having pioneered in the field of Catholic missiology. It is by no means to his discredit to note that his initial strivings were insufficient. Perhaps both the credit for, and the insufficiency of, his labor appear most clearly in his attempt to establish the aim of the missions.⁶ He noted that the missions serve an exalted and important, even an indispensable, purpose. Yet, strange to say, he did not find any systematic discussion or investigation of this fundamental point in ancient or modern writings, nor in the pronouncements of the Congregation of Propaganda or other mission authorities. Consequently, he had to blaze a new trail laboriously in the discussion of a question of such fundamental importance for all missionary action.

Schmidlin concluded his discussion as follows:

The task of the missionary is to announce to all men the doctrine of Christ and salvation in Christ; to preach the Gospel everywhere and extend the kingdom of God; to instruct individual souls and peoples and convert them to Christianity; to baptize them and thus make them sharers in the universal redemption and members of the Church of our Saviour, and also to dispense temporal blessings to fellow-men and to perform in their behalf works of mercy.

Then in a footnote he added:

In scholastic language, the rehabilitation of the glory and knowledge of God may be declared the *finis operantis primarius*, and the salvation and the sanctification of men the *secundarius*; the conversion of non-Christians the *finis operis primarius*, and the extension of the Christian religion and Church the *secundarius*.⁷

In the above, Schmidlin did not distinguish that which was specifically missionary from that which was common to the entire apostolate of the Church. Since others besides missionaries have these same tasks as the goal of their ministry, he did not give an adequate analysis of the problem. Nevertheless, Schmidlin began an avenue of investigation which was to be taken up later, and more successfully, by others.

The lack of any *ex professo* treatment of the finality of the mission apostolate before Schmidlin is very unusual. Seemingly, no one ever thought to determine precisely and specifically the purpose of this centuries-old apostolate. This is not to say that there was no understanding of the aim of missions, but simply that this aim was not studied consciously and professedly. *Operatio sequitur esse*. Logically, one ought to have a clear concep-

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-88.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 253-339.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 255-56.

tion of the *esse* and *finis* of an operation, in order to carry it out most correctly and perfectly. Yet, the historical fact is that we have engaged in missionary activity without inquiring into its precise nature and specific purpose. Schmidlin, in this century, was the first to attempt it. He instituted a school of thought, and his disciples have remained quite faithful to his teaching, with certain modifications which later developments showed were necessary.

Pierre Charles

The man most responsible for clarifying the basic issue of the finality of the mission apostolate is Pierre Charles, S.J., who taught missiology at the Gregorian University and later at Louvain.⁸ Considering the specific character of the mission activity, which is *in se* transient and provisory, and consists in the establishment of the normal conditions for the conversion of a particular country, Charles concluded that the specific objective of the mission apostolate is the establishment of the visible Church in those regions where it does not yet exist.⁹

It is perhaps too early to appreciate the profound revolution caused in mission thinking by "Charles's Theory," as it came to be known. Schmidlin failed to point out the specific character of the mission apostolate, and he did not carefully note the importance of the difference between the *finis operis* and the *finis operantis* of the mission apostolate. Charles, on the other hand, addressed himself to the *finis operis specificus missionum*.

In order to appreciate the bombshell that Charles threw into mission circles, one has but to recall that when the Propaganda was instituted in 1622, the name given to it was the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, emphasizing the spread of the faith. Moreover, for centuries, mission writers had appealed to the noble ideal of the salvation of souls in order to arouse mission interest and zeal. Consequently, the dominant idea prevailing among the missiologists of the early part of this century was twofold: the preaching of the gospel among pagans, and the conversion and salvation of their souls.¹⁰ But Charles went to the heart of the matter and gave a very simple and direct solution to the specific purpose of missions: the establishment of the visible Church.

His theory created much discussion and controversy.¹¹ Unfortunately, his

⁸ For a brief account of the life, some of the principal articles, and a bibliography of the missiological writings of this gifted missiologist, cf. *Etudes missiologiques* (Bruges, 1956).

⁹ Cf. Pierre Charles, S.J., *Dossiers de l'action missionnaire* (2nd ed.; Louvain, 1938-39) pp. 17-32.

¹⁰ Cf. Italo Paulon, S.X., *Plantatio ecclesiae: Il fine specifico delle missioni* (Rome, 1948).

¹¹ Cf., e.g., *American Ecclesiastical Review* 124 (1951) 272-89; 125 (1951) 170-76; 127

ideas were not always understood properly, and sometimes they were lamentably condensed to something like this: "The purpose of missions is not to save souls but to establish the Church." In point of fact, Charles never said or wrote any such thing; but those who understood him in that way considered it so strange that they argued there must be something wrong with the idea of establishing the Church. We can pass over the controversies, because this formulation of Fr. Charles has been canonized by its insertion in the *Evangelii praecones* of Pope Pius XII and in the *Princeps pastorum* of Pope John XXIII.¹²

Reacting against the position taken by Schmidlin, which he found too simple, Charles turned to the tract *De ecclesia*. For him, missionary action consists in the establishment of the Catholic Church, the *plantatio ecclesiae*. Ever since his time the mystery of the Church has come to receive more and more emphasis in mission theology, so that today it can be said to be of capital importance. No longer would anyone have recourse to the simple expedient of realigning the dogmatic and moral elements which are found scattered in traditional theology and which are proximately related to the mission apostolate. This would be to commit the error of those who call "mission law" an explanation of those canons in the Code which refer to the missions or missionaries, without bothering to consider the considerable and substantial amount of laws outside the Code which are also a part of mission law.

In the second edition of his *Dossiers de l'action missionnaire*, Charles presented the framework of a mission theology by utilizing the Scholastic system of the four causes: formal, material, efficient, and final. By applying these to the tract *De ecclesia*, he wrote, a branch of general dogmatic theology can be built up, which he called "the theology of the expansion of the visible Church."¹³ It has been suggested that a suitable title for this tract might be *De ecclesia Christi omnibus propaganda ubique constituenda*. It has yet to be written, however; for ecclesiologists have generally considered the Church only as a society already completely developed in its full maturity, perfectly constituted, dispensing to all its members the necessary means of sanctification and salvation.

The Church, however, can be considered in two ways: *in fieri* and *in facto esse*. The *ecclesia in fieri* is the object of mission theology, and the

(1952) 25-30, for an article attacking Charles's position, a reply to it, and a comment on the reply.

¹² Cf. Pius XII, *Evangelii praecones* (AAS 43 [1951] 507); John XXIII, *Princeps pastorum* (AAS 51 [1959] 837).

¹³ Charles, *Dossiers*, pp. 35-36.

expansive activity of the Church is its formal object. This is the study of the Church as a society which is being propagated, which is being extended, which is tending towards its complete development in a given region, but without the means at its disposal to live its own independent life. We can consider the Church as *ecclesia fundata* and *ecclesia missionalis*. A complete ecclesiology should consider the Church under both aspects. Our traditional ecclesiology has considered only the first.

Charles has the immense merit of having gone beyond the attempt of Schmidlin and his school in seeking the point of departure for a mission theology. He showed that it was not exact theologically to see in the missions an activity of the Church which would have for its scope the salvation of the souls of pagans; rather, the *raison d'être* of the missions is the establishment of the visible Church where it does not exist, especially by the establishment of a native hierarchy and clergy and by bringing about those normal conditions in which a well-organized Church functions. It is then for the native hierarchy and clergy even more than the foreign missionaries to seek to save the souls of their compatriots.

Charles had, logically, to go beyond the conception of Schmidlin, which excluded from the concept of mission all proselytizing activity among heretics and schismatics; even these are included in the conception of Charles, if they inhabit regions where the Church is not yet established. This, incidentally, accords with the actual practice of the Church in regard to the Scandinavian countries, which, being subject to the jurisdiction of the Propaganda, are considered by the Church to be mission lands. He also rejected the terminology "pagans, infidels, gentiles," and fell back upon the general term "non-Catholic." Missions are to non-Catholics, whether they accept any part of Christian revelation or not, provided they live in regions where the Church is not considered to be fully established.

It might be noted that Charles explicitly rejected the consideration of the problem of the salvation of infidels from mission theology.¹⁴ This is ironic, because the very point which Charles explicitly rejected came to be for several decades the point most discussed by theologians in reference to the mission apostolate.¹⁵

Positions of Other Scholars

Some have spoken of schools of mission theology which can be distinguished according to nationality and the direction their formulators took.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹⁵ Cf. Angel Santos Hernández, S.J., *Salvación y paganismo* (Santander, 1960), which takes into account every Catholic writer on the problem of the salvation of the souls of infidels in the last fifty years.

Thus, Santos Hernández distinguishes the German school of Schmidlin; the Belgian school of Lange and especially of Charles; the French school of Glorieux, de Lubac, Durand, Daniélou, Perbal, and others; the Spanish school with the studies and publications of Cardinal Benlloch, Zameza, and Dominguez. This, however, seems a bit premature, not only because these different directions complement one another, but also because these speculations are still in an elaborative stage in trying to establish a body of doctrine which is completely satisfactory.

It does seem necessary, however, to separate the theologians of France from those of other regions. In 1933 a quasi-new epoch of theology opened in that country with the discussion of the question of the salvation of infidels. Alexandre Glorieux, Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Catholic Institute of Lille, began it when he published in the periodical of the Missionary Union of the Clergy of France an article on "The Necessity of Missions or the Problem of the Salvation of Infidels."¹⁶ Starting with the anguishing problem of the salvation of infidels, he tried to conclude that the mission apostolate was not a question of life or death for pagans but rather a question of the fulness of life.

That same year a Congress of the Missionary Union of the Clergy of France was held in Strasbourg, with this same problem as theme. There Glorieux defended his thesis, which was afterwards published in the acts of the Congress.¹⁷ The thesis provoked strong opposition from Etienne Huguency, O.P., who insisted that the missions really include for infidels the question of life or death, and a question of the fulness of life for all men.¹⁸ Later, Glorieux mitigated his thesis somewhat and wrote that while salvation is not radically impossible for infidels, it is very difficult and in fact often surpasses their powers or calls for a miracle in order to bring them to everlasting life. Consequently, the mission apostolate is necessary. The doctrinal basis of missionary action, he wrote, is the eternal salvation of millions of human beings, that is, the fulness of life for them. It is by means of the Church, and only by her, that the divine plan is truly fulfilled. Missionary work finds its culmination in the establishment of the Church, and so the true object of the mission apostolate is to implant and establish the Church.¹⁹

Glorieux had noted certain dangers to be avoided in mission theology.

¹⁶ Alexandre Glorieux, "De la nécessité des missions ou du problème du salut des infidèles," *Revue de l'Union missionnaire du clergé de France*, Supplément, Jan., 1933.

¹⁷ A. Glorieux, "Nécessité des missions ex parte infidelium," *UMCF*, Supplément, Oct., 1933, pp. 19-35.

¹⁸ Etienne Huguency, O.P., "Le scandale édifiant d'une exposition missionnaire," *Revue thomiste* 38 (1933) 217-42.

¹⁹ A. Glorieux, *Pourquoi tous les catholiques doivent être missionnaires?* (Lille, 1944).

He pointed out the falsity of the opinion that the salvation of infidels outside ecclesiastical activity is impossible, and also the falsity of the opinion that the infinite mercy of God and the salvific will of God are so universal and efficacious that the question of the missions is not urgent.

In opposing Glorieux's original presentation, Hugueny had noted that if the preaching of the gospel to infidels is not a question of life or death for them, then the Church is nothing other than a school of perfection for souls who have been called to the fulness of the Christian life, but not the normal way to salvation, which he held it to be. Glorieux was careful to clarify his position, agreeing that the question of the salvation of souls must be considered in reference to the Church, *extra quam nulla salus*.

Henri de Lubac, S.J., read a paper at the same Congress on the problem of the missions as deduced from the providential role of the Church in the salvation of souls, and later developed his ideas more fully.²⁰ He distinguishes between individual salvation and collective salvation. While rejecting the opinion that the missions are the only way of salvation for individuals, he nevertheless holds that they are necessary for mankind in general. Whereas each man, taken individually, can achieve salvation, the mass of mankind, taken collectively, will not obtain salvation outside the Church. The Church is necessary, with a necessity of means, in order that mankind as a whole may come to the kingdom of God. What is in question in the mission regions, he asserts, is not the expansion of the Church there but its very existence there. The Church cannot be conceived as other than missionary, and one does not possess an understanding of the Church without consciously and conscientiously trying to extend it throughout the world.

De Lubac begins with the mandate of Christ,²¹ which he considers the Magna Charta of the foundation of the Church and of the missions—an affirmation which would not be pleasing to Charles, who minimized the import of this text.²² He does not cite, except in a footnote, Jn 20:21: "Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos," a text which places the mission of Christ in direct relation to that of His Church; but he brings out very well the place of mission in its general function. For him, the missions are nothing more than the primary means whereby the Church fulfils its own mission. From the study of the Old Testament and the Fathers he was led logically to consider the missionary undertaking and the dynamic catholicity of the Church as one thing.

²⁰ Henri de Lubac, S.J., "Le problème des missions tiré du rôle providentiel de l'église visible," *UMCF*, Supplément, Oct., 1933, pp. 37-54. Cf. also his *Le fondement théologique des missions* (Le Puy, 1946).

²¹ Mt 28:16-20; Mk 16:15.

²² Cf. Charles, *Dossiers*, pp. 21-22.

As for the thesis of Glorieux, de Lubac does not hesitate to affirm that it is perfectly reconcilable with the most exacting and demanding theology, on the condition that it be properly expressed and understood. The fulness of life, he writes, far from constituting a luxury, ought to be considered as the very essence of salvation. In fact, this fulness of life itself can become, in a certain sense, a question of life or death. From this viewpoint, the conversion of infidels to Christianity cannot have any stated limits, but the Church must strive for the conversion of all men.

De Lubac observes that the solution which finds the theological foundation of the missions in the salvation of souls, considered both as "collective salvation" and as "individual salvation," does not grasp well the specific character of the mission apostolate, because it is an answer which is valid for every apostolate and which can still be invoked when the missionary phase is over but there still remain many to be converted and saved. For his part, he affirms that the proper fulfilment of the missions is to bring the essential means of salvation to those men who as yet do not have them at their disposal. These means are summed up in one: the presence of the visible Church. To establish the Church, therefore, is the specific purpose of the mission apostolate.

Alexandre Durand, S.J., founded his understanding of mission theology on the fact of the Incarnation, from which is derived the Church sent by the Incarnate Word.²³ The Church ought to increase constantly in order to continue adequately the mission and work of Christ. The missions construct the visible Church and thus form an essential structural element of the economy of redemption. Durand finds the theological basis for the mission apostolate in the Incarnation and in the institution of the Church, the "sacrament" of the Incarnate Word, instituted in order to prolong His mission and destined to a becoming without end, to an unending development. The Church ought to increase in its exterior and visible reality as well as in its soul, until Christ will be "complete" in that all peoples will belong to His Mystical Body. As a consequence, the Church is *per naturam suam* a mission, i.e., a missionary activity; it ought to seek for itself progressive extension, both in its soul and in its body. Thus, Durand arrives at the general position of Charles: missionary dogma is nothing other than the theology of the expansion of the visible Church.

Durand rejected the solution of the missionary problem treated from the point of view of the salvation of infidels for three reasons: (1) because this solution admits certain substitutes for missionary action and so diminishes the rigorous obligation of the missions; (2) because there is the danger of

²³ Alexandre Durand, S.J., *Le problème théologique des missions* (Le Puy, 1942).

giving the impression that the missions have for their scope to render salvation merely easier or more secure, at the expense of generosity, which is the consequence of the Christian life; (3) because God subordinates secondary causes without subordinating Himself to them, and consequently He remains free to save souls outside any visible connection with the visible Church, if He so wills. For all these reasons he concludes that to base the mission apostolate on the salvation of souls, and thus to show that it has a necessity which is only relative, is to condemn oneself to examine nothing more than its "spiritual usefulness." One must search elsewhere, therefore, for the point of departure of mission theology. For Durand, that point is the Incarnation of the Word.

De Lubac held that in the mission of the twelve apostles the whole Church was sent, yet individual Christians are to be considered as sent only according to their capacity. Durand rather notes that the Church is made up of members and that a law of supernatural solidarity directs the relations of Christians with the Church. For this reason there also exists a law of supernatural responsibility. Each Christian, by reason of the sacrament of the missions, i.e., confirmation, ought to propagate the kingdom of Christ both in himself and in his environment.

Louis Capéran published a competent and celebrated work in 1934 on the problem of the salvation of infidels.²⁴ Later on he presented in a synthesis the positions taken by de Lubac, Durand, and Glorieux. He noted that today one tends to justify the mission apostolate, not by appealing to the misery and needs of the pagan world, but by the internal exigency of the Church itself. He was preoccupied with reconciling the practical point of view which predominated in the solutions of Schmidlin and Glorieux with the speculative point of view which inspired Charles, de Lubac, and Durand. He found this reconciliation in the identification of the visible Church with the Mystical Body of Christ: to implant the Church is to extend the universal redemption and to bring it about that men, who were saved first by the gospel through the interior illumination of the Word and the irradiation of grace, are now incorporated into Christ and live His life within the Church, which is His Body.²⁵

Capéran was favorable to the inclusion of the problem of the salvation of infidels in a theology of the missions. He recognized that the study of this problem had fallen into discredit, especially as a result of the decline caused by the thesis of Billot.²⁶ He pointed out that the extraordinary means

²⁴ Louis Capéran, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (Toulouse, 1934).

²⁵ Cf. L. Capéran, "La mission de l'église et les missions dans le plan providentiel du salut," *UMCF*, Oct., 1945, pp. 172-79; Jan., 1946, pp. 21-28; April, 1946, pp. 65-72.

²⁶ Billot had taught that infidels, especially primitives in jungle areas, were likened to

of salvation for those not belonging to the visible Church are but a provisory supplement in the economy of salvation, which definitely looks to the spread of the faith and the achievement of grace for salvation through missionary work.

Alberto Perbal, O.M.I., in his *Premières leçons de théologie missionnaire*,²⁷ used the same methods as did Charles for the same reasons and with the same, or almost the same, end results. There are some differences. Charles had derived everything from the tract *De ecclesia*; he excluded the problem of the salvation of infidels and seemed to reject all influence of the mandate "Euntes docete."

Perbal thought it necessary to go back further, i.e., to the mission of Christ, the Founder of the Church. He considered that the mandate of Christ ought to have its proper place in the missionary apostolate; also, the problem of the salvation of infidels should be considered under both the formal and the material causes. With Charles, however, he admitted that the purpose of the missions consists in the establishment of the Church. Perbal saw in the mission of the Divine Word into this world the type and cause of every mission in favor of the salvation of souls. Thus, he connected the mission of the Church with that of the Word.

He showed the difficulties that Protestants have in connection with the subject of the mission. They have no central organism for missions; indeed, given their doctrine of individualism, such cannot logically be had. According to Protestant doctrine, the Holy Spirit calls individual men to salvation. This is not so in the Catholic Church, in which the pope, bishops, clergy, and faithful are agents of the mission, each in his own way.

Unlike de Lubac, who considered the precept of Christ a sufficient motive for the mission apostolate, Perbal rejected the idea that a mere positive mandate could be the foundation of the mission apostolate. He rather taught that the virtue of religion was at the root of the missionary endeavor. The scope of the missions consists in the establishment of the Church, the construction of the kingdom of God; and this pertains to the virtue of religion. It pertains to the Church, the Spouse of Christ and the continuator of His mission, to sanctify and save souls.

The missions, however, serve a preparatory function; they are the initial ministry whose purpose is to build up or establish the visible Church and hierarchy in infidel regions. Perbal held as the generic end of the apostolate

infants who had not yet come to the age of reason and who, for this reason, were consigned to limbo rather than to hell if they died without baptism.

²⁷ A. Perbal, *Premières leçons de théologie missionnaire* (Paris, 1935); see also *Prime lezioni di teologia missionaria* (Florence, 1941). Cf. supra n. 1 for two other works of Perbal on mission theology.

the glory of God and the salvation of souls, although he did not exclude the material good of the faithful achieved by a culture which has been elevated by Christian doctrine. The direct and immediate end is the conversion of individuals, ending with the erection of the visible society of the Church, ruled over by the local hierarchy.

Jean Daniélou approached the question of mission theology from a quite different point of view. He was not so much concerned with the finality of missions as with the understanding of the mystery bound up in them. In *The Salvation of the Nations* he is concerned with the Catholic faith in order to sort out what is essential in it from what belongs only to the Western world in which the main stream of its life has flowed.²⁸ Secondly, he is concerned with non-Western peoples, to see what elements in them are favorable to the faith (the grasp, for instance, that the Hindus have on the reality of the unseen) and what unfavorable (their comparative contempt for material things). He points out that the problem which was true of the first few centuries of the Christian era may be true today with respect to those lands that are still, vis-à-vis Christianity, in the same stage as were the Greek and Roman worlds at the time of our Lord. He suggests that there may well be many aspects of Christianity which we have not yet discovered and which we shall not discover until Christianity has been refracted through every facet of the prism of human civilization. It has been refracted only through the Greek and Roman worlds, but it will have to be refracted through the Chinese facet and the Hindu facet in order to attain its total fulfilment; and this total fulfilment will not come through the conversion of individual men, but through the Christianization of all the civilizations of the earth. Thus, he illustrates the possibility of finding everywhere in the world some sincere religious mentality upon which we can and ought to capitalize.

Desirous of bringing out the current importance of the missionary question, which he characterizes as being "most urgent," he develops an original and perhaps psychologically efficacious motive for intensifying missionary action. It is the Parousia of our Lord. As long as the gospel is not yet preached to all peoples, the Parousia cannot occur. In order that our Lord may come as soon as possible, all should participate in missionary action.

Also very significant was Daniélou's attention to the necessary and fundamental principle of accommodation, which presents so many intricate ques-

²⁸ Jean Daniélou, *The Salvation of the Nations*, tr. Angeline Bouchard (New York, 1950). Cf. also his *Advent*, tr. Rosemary Sheed (London, 1950); *God and Us*, tr. W. Roberts (London, 1957); *The Lord of History*, tr. Nigel J. Abercrombie (London, 1958).

tions. He asks: How should Christianity present itself in other regions? What can we receive from other religions? In answer, he gives two general principles: all things which can be assumed by Christianity and cultivated should be permitted to live; whatever is diabolical should die. In support of his conclusions, Daniélou points out that just as Christ was a Jew of His time, so Christianity should accommodate itself to this or that people. On the other hand, just as in the life of Christ all things were directed towards eternal transfiguration, so also whatever Christianity assumes from other cultures should be transfigured by it.

Still another approach to the theology of the mission apostolate is that taken by José Zameza, S.J., former Dean of the Faculty of Missiology at the Pontifical Gregorian University. Fr. Zameza produced a very fine little work on the conversion of the infidel according to St. Augustine's conception of the *totus Christus*.²⁹ In it he brings forth some of the beautiful and profound theological ideas of Augustine concerning missions. According to Augustine, Christ can be considered in three ways: (1) *ut Verbum solum*, as a Divine Person possessing the fulness of divinity; (2) *ut Verbum incarnatum*, as a Divine Person possessing also the fulness of humanity; (3) *ut Verbum incarnatum cum ecclesia*, the *totus Christus*.

This third concept involves a number of totalities: not only that mentioned above, but also all men on earth (past, present, and future), all men in heaven, and the angels in heaven. The whole world, all the earth, all regions, all men, all peoples, all tribes, all nations—all of this is required to make up the *totus Christus*. Christ (and the Church) ought to be everywhere; there ought to be no place on earth where the Church is not found. This is necessary because the prophecy of truth cannot lie, and the prophecies tell us that "all nations will adore Him."

So, the world and all men in it, all nations, all races, are an inherited right of Christ; this legacy Christ transferred entirely to His Church, in order that the Church might place it in the effective possession of Christ, even as the Church is His possession. Missionary activity, then, is ordained to this end.

What is the bond between Christ and the infidel world? It is a living bond, and this brought Augustine to the consideration of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, in order to explain this bond between Christ and infidels. Zameza then goes on to develop the thought of Augustine, in which missionary action is shown to be that vital function of the Body of Christ going out to the infidel world in order to bring the infidels into the Church.

²⁹ José Zameza, *La conversión del mundo infiel en la concepción del "totus Christus" de San Agustín* (Burgos, 1942).

In his opusculum Zameza notes the twofold *valores* found in the history of Catholic mission endeavor, one of which is absolute and consubstantial with the Church, the other relative and circumstantial. The first is that vital dynamic energy *ad extra*, which Zameza calls *lex incrementi vel lex fecunditatis*. It is that vital force characteristic of every living organism to grow and develop in size and strength. The second he termed *lex elasticitatis vel lex adaptationis*, which is also characteristic of every living organism, i.e., the tendency to adapt itself or accommodate itself and its activity to different conditions of time and space. In this we find in germ the important principle of accommodation, which has sound theological foundations. Without any pretense at exhausting Augustine's ideas on missionary action as the vital action of the Mystical Body of Christ, Zameza nevertheless presents his most beautiful concepts on this theme, which touch at once both the intelligence and the heart.

A work which must be taken into account here is that of Edouard Loffeld, C.S.Sp., a solid piece of investigation into the "cardinal problem," as the author calls it, of missiology and of the Catholic missions.³⁰ In it Loffeld examines theologically the notion of mission and of missionary activity, going back into their foundations in Scripture and tradition. After an analysis of what mission is and how it is carried out, Loffeld proceeds to synthesize, taking into account both theological considerations and present-day sociological problems. The work is richly documented and represents an ambitious attempt to take into account previous theological speculation and current sociological teaching, in order to solve the cardinal problem of the missions.

Something of a similar nature has been undertaken by Charles Couturier, S.J.³¹ His aim is modest: to clarify the theological principles and sociological laws which combine to govern missionary action, to trace the elaborate linkage of its different facets, and to set each problem in the context of the whole life of the Church. The decisive principle on which Couturier bases his solutions to problems of a cultural, social, and political nature is the supernatural character of the goal of missionary activity. Thus, he writes as a theologian, but one taking into account the concrete social problems which face the Church today in her mission apostolate. His treatise is purposely brief, in order to permit the reader to embrace the missionary Church in a single view and come to see the detailed and complex problems in their true light.

³⁰ Edouard Loffeld, C.S.Sp., *Le problème cardinal de la missiologie et des missions catholiques* (Rheden, Holland, 1956).

³¹ Charles Couturier, S.J., *The Mission of the Church*, tr. A. V. Littledale (Baltimore, 1960).

As can be seen from the foregoing, some writings have been concerned with presenting the theological foundation of the missions by borrowing from traditional dogma, whereas others have attempted to explore new questions and areas which were not developed by older theologians. An attempt has been made by Catarzi to effect a quasi synthesis. In 1958 he published two volumes, which together are intended to constitute one work: *Lineamenti di dommatica missionaria: Parte generale*, and *Teologia delle missioni estere: Aspetti specifici*.³² Together they form a compromise in methodology. The first volume deals with the generic aspects of theology regarding the missions. It is similar to Schmidlin's approach, but with this improvement: Catarzi tries to follow a more logical order by a better grouping and aligning of the theses chosen, and with some further elaboration of them in the light of missiological studies. The second volume deals with the specifically missionary aspects of theology and attempts a systematic presentation of specifically missionary questions according to the four causes. The one outstanding characteristic of Catarzi's treatment is that he utilizes the divine missions within the Blessed Trinity as the point of departure for his mission theology.

A number of other works could be referred to here,³³ but the above will suffice to give an idea of the various approaches taken by different authors in writing treatises in the field of mission theology. André Seumois gives a brief historical profile of these various strivings to develop a mission theology in a volume which is exceedingly rich in documentation.³⁴ He also presents therein a plan for a theology of the missions which is very detailed and can serve as the basis for further studies.

It can be said that today the great majority of the authors writing on mission theology have accepted the theory of Fr. Charles and are striving to perfect it through more profound studies on the catholicity of the Church, on the relationship between this note of catholicity and the principle of accommodation, on the Mystical Body, on the universal salvific will of God, and on the salvation of infidels.

EVALUATION OF THE VARIOUS POSITIONS

It is not easy and perhaps not yet possible to evaluate completely the foregoing positions. Mission theology is still in its incipient stages, although

³² Danilo Catarzi, S.X., *Lineamenti di dommatica missionaria: Parte generale* (Parma, 1958) and *Teologia delle missioni estere: Aspetti specifici* (Parma, 1958).

³³ Cf. the bibliography in Perbal, *La teologia missionaria* (supra n. 1).

³⁴ André Seumois, O.M.I., *Introduction à la missiologie* (Schöneck-Beckenried, Switzerland, 1952). His plan for mission theology is found on pp. 207-37 and has two hundred explanatory notes.

much progress has been made since Streit uttered his complaint in 1907. It will be easy to understand if its precursors were not free from errors in methodology, or if they were guilty of oversights and lacunae. Consequently, we will present here only a brief and inconclusive critique.

Schmidlin approached the theology of the missions as a historiographer, using the textbooks of theology as the sources. Moreover, given the circumstances of the age in which he lived, he was forced to undertake the practical end of developing an apologia for the Catholic mission apostolate. Just as Warneck's method was unsuited to any systematic probing into profound theological doctrine, so too was Schmidlin's. He erred, therefore, by oversimplifying a problem which ought to have been studied in depth and by not sufficiently analyzing the specific notes of the mission apostolate.

His procedure was superficial, no doubt because his purpose was pragmatic. He limited himself, in his missionary doctrine, to gathering together those questions which were capable of justifying the missions. He was a pioneer in the field of missiology, and the matter of missionary co-operation had an outstanding place in his writings as well as in his life. Consequently, he left aside all that which had relation to the theological study of native cultures (matter very vast, yet useful), as also that which had a relation to the efficient cause of the missions over and above human co-operation.

For Schmidlin, the scope of the missions is to announce the gospel to infidels; since Protestants and other non-Catholic Christian groups had the gospel, he excluded them from the material cause of the apostolate. Nevertheless, he did recognize the importance of establishing a local self-sufficient church as the social corollary of the primary end of preaching. He did not, however, emphasize this or single out this latter point as being the specific task of the missionary apostolate.

Charles pointed out the insufficiency of Schmidlin's approach. A man of keen intellect and vast erudition who could speak and write in an incisive manner, he was a theologian who saw the importance and fruitfulness of applying the Scholastic method in order to thrust mission theology into new and unexplored fields. Perhaps, as Perbal suggests, he did not intend to give theological directives as such, but rather to animate theologians to develop a theology of the missions. If this be true, then he can be excused for not using exact theological language in his *Dossiers* and in his other theological writings.³⁵ As a result, however, his thought is not always clearly expressed and is sometimes exaggerated.

³⁵ Edward Murphy, S.J., points out that Charles did not write his *Dossiers* for theologians but for the laity, and consequently one should not look for precise theological terminology in them. Murphy adds that in his theological lectures at the Gregorian Uni-

For example, some of his arguments in denying the proposition, "the purpose of the missions is to save souls," are proofs *ex absurdo*, according to Perbal.³⁶ It is said that some have never forgiven Charles for having explicitly excluded the question of the salvation of infidels from mission theology. That many did not agree with his point of view on this is all too clear from the interest this topic aroused among the theologians of France especially. Many were disconcerted by the apparent opposition which he placed between two ideas which are connected and which must necessarily be taken into account: the salvation of souls and the glory of God through means of universal worship.

His critics say (and rightly) that the ultimate end of everything in this world is the glory of God through the extension of His kingdom. Theologians generally assign to the constituted Church ("adult," as Charles would put it) the scope of saving souls, a scope subordinated to the glory of God. It cannot be excluded in the order of finality. Granted that he did not formally exclude it, he nevertheless gave the paradoxical impression of rejecting it as if it did not regard the mission apostolate.

Likewise, he *seemed* to hold as of little account the virtue of charity as an underlying motive of the mission apostolate. At least one theologian deplored the influence of such a presentation in this language upon young clerics, who are so much disposed by nature to adopt occasional irreverences by authors in vogue. Perbal argues that it is not exact to say that "charity, precisely because it is universal, cannot suffice of itself to render an account of particular activity."³⁷ If this were admitted, then the same would be true of the virtue of religion, which Charles places as the underlying motive of the mission apostolate. It must be granted, however, that the opposition *seemingly* affirmed by Charles between the "salvation of souls" and the "sanctification of the earth," in order to prove that the missions and the Church tend to something higher than convert-making, is rather an opposition of words than of things. Yet, even if his expressions are not unexceptionable, the influence of Charles on the development of mission theology cannot be minimized. Though it may be too early to assess the exact nature of this influence, one should note the acceptance of his theory that the specific purpose of the mission apostolate is the establishment of the Church, especially after its insertion in *Evangelii praecones* and in *Princeps pastorum*. No single concept has been so important both in mission thinking and in actual mission activity.

versity in Rome, Charles's terminology was theologically precise. Cf. "The Purpose of the Missions: A Reply," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 125 (1951) 170.

³⁶ Perbal, *La teología misional*, p. 21. ³⁷ *Ibid.*

Each of the other authors has contributed to a clarification of the important question of the finality of the missions, either positively or negatively. From the healthy discussion of this question, the centrality of the Church in mission theology has appeared more and more clearly. It happily and fortunately coincides with events in the world today, in which a deeper understanding of the catholicity and unity of the Church is necessary in order to understand and appreciate better the role the Church has to play in the modern world on a global scale.

Daniélou's approach was quite original and, in focusing attention upon the cultural problems in the mission apostolate, brought out the present urgency of the missionary problem for the entire Church. Zameza's study of Augustine's thought on the expansive activity of the Mystical Body highlights another very important doctrine. A number of authors have considered the Mystical Body as the foundation of the mission apostolate and of the mission obligation of all members of the Body, but few have gone further and viewed the whole work of the missions as originating in and defined by the vital expansion of the Mystical Body. Further explorations into the missiological implications of this doctrine will no doubt prove fruitful. Finally, the attempts to synthesize the various efforts in the field of mission theology are laudable.

One thing which emerges from these various speculations is the spotlighting of the basic problem: What method of development should be followed in order to give an effective structuring to a theology of the missions? As Catarzi points out, three tendencies are clearly indicated by these efforts. The first finds it more useful to remain faithful to the order followed by general dogmatic theology by pointing out in each tract those particular questions which directly regard the missions. The second, adopting a criterion which is more logical but not without its difficulties, tries to define mission theology according to the four Scholastic causes: material, formal, efficient, and final. The third attempts a compromise solution by trying to eliminate the fragmentary nature of the first method, and at the same time to develop logically and integrally the material more or less according to the second method, so that the connection of the various questions treated will be more readily seen in their presentation.

This is not an easy matter. It is not easy to find a solution which will take into account the logical nature, clarity, and completeness in the distribution of the various dogmas and theses to be treated. The steps taken toward the establishment of a theology of the missions cannot be said to be finished.

TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A THEOLOGY OF THE MISSIONS

Up to this point we have been using "mission theology" and "theology of the missions" indiscriminately, believing that a distinction prior to this point would have little meaning. But now we would like to suggest that the term "mission theology" (or "missionary theology") be used to signify that body of doctrine assembled by the selection of those truths and dogmas which are related to the mission apostolate in a general way but are not specifically missionary, and the term "theology of the missions" be used for that portion of theology, developed or to be developed, which refers specifically to the mission apostolate.³⁸ What follows here refers to the "theology of the missions," especially that theological development which took place after the impulse given to it by Charles.

Some might object that all theology is mission theology. This is true in the sense that all theology pertains to the mission apostolate in some way, although some dogmas are more closely related than others. For example, the universal salvific will of God is of greater significance than the exact number of the sacraments; likewise, the necessity of grace is more "missionary" than the elevation of angels to the supernatural order. Consequently, we can divide theology into that which is of immediate missionary application and that which is only of remote application to the missions. Understood this way, not all theology is mission theology.

As for a theology of the missions, it would be a mistake to think that it could be composed only of the present content of theology. A complete theology of the missions would include (1) some of the contents of our traditional theology without further elaboration, i.e., that which is of immediate application to the missions and has been sufficiently developed by theologians in the past, e.g., the necessity of grace, of baptism, of the Church; (2) some of the contents of our traditional theology but with some further elaboration, i.e., that which is of missionary application but has not been sufficiently developed, or at least not with the right method, e.g., the universal salvific will of God presented within the framework of salvation history, thus showing the progressive manifestation and realization of this will from the beginning down to the present day; (3) new matters which were not discussed by the Fathers, Scholastics, or later theologians, e.g., the theological nature of missionary action, its finality, the theology of missionary accommodation, the relation between secular history and salvation history in the light of modern world conditions.

³⁸ As far as the writer knows, no one has made such a distinction; it is merely suggested here in order to clarify the discussion.

The structuring of a true theology of the missions is not yet an accomplished fact, for its development has been up to now mainly of a fragmentary character. Charles indicated the direction and furnished a schema for it and the themes to be developed in the second edition of the first volume of his *Dossiers*.³⁹ He had in mind to prepare another volume; World War II interfered and it was never published. The first volume is nothing more than a small missiological encyclopedia, as Charles himself calls it,⁴⁰ destined for those interested in the missions and willing to instruct themselves through personal study and labor. His small work merely points out the topics and subjects to be studied, but it does not explore them in depth.

Charles stated that a theology of the missions will not be complete and satisfactory save on condition of following a rigorous method, i.e., the classical and Scholastic method of employing the four causes. This method has the merit of grouping logically the questions which depend upon the concept of mission, not by chance or by caprice, but by a treatment according to the order of their dependence, more or less direct, on this fundamental concept. Nothing could be more simple or orderly.

When Charles enumerated the questions destined to form the framework of such a tract, he pointed out that none of these questions are developed in general theology and that all are strictly subordinated to the formal object of mission dogma, which is, of course, the establishment of the Church. As he saw it, the problems studied by traditional theology should be left aside; thus, besides excluding the problem of the salvation of infidels, he also excluded the proof of the catholicity of the Church and its necessity.

Others have felt, however, that it is useful to treat these questions in relation to the mission apostolate and not simply pass over them in silence. There are a number of questions, they say, which are closely related to the mission apostolate and might be studied with profit if this were undertaken from a missiological point of view. Thus, there are certain lacunae in Charles's scheme. Granted that he made considerable progress over Schmidlin, still he did not utter the last word on a schema of a theology of the missions. Some theologians after Charles have considered it quite proper to re-examine the various theses which are studied and proven in general theology and developed at length in the manuals, as long as they are considered in their relation to the missions. No doubt this could be fruitful, either because they have been touched on only lightly by the authors, or because they have been studied (even in depth) with a different attitude and mentality, which did not include the problems of the mission apostolate.

³⁹ Cf. Charles, *Dossiers*, pp. 35-36. ⁴⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 8.

It is readily granted that it is unnecessary to go through the entire tract *De ecclesia* and prove the theses contained therein all over again. Missionary dogma, insisted Charles, just as any other science, ought to be derived from its fundamental principle, which is, in his view, the fact that the Church ought to be propagated throughout the world—and this as a result of its very nature. From this beginning the consequences should be traced out, but not proven.

Others, however, take the position that the fact of the Church can be accepted as treated by authors, but no reason prevents them from examining the Church in relation to its Founder and seeking the bonds which exist between the mission of Christ and the mission apostolate of the Church. Theologians have generally abstained from this. Having defined the generic term "mission," it is useful to consider next religious missions; this will lead to a consideration of our mission in relation to the mission of Christ, according to the words of Christ, "Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos."⁴¹ There has been much discussion and dispute over the interpretation of this text, as over the text "Euntes docete."⁴² Nevertheless, the mission apostolate is contained in them, as well as other activity not exclusively missionary. In point of fact, the Church does distinguish and single out missionary activity from nonmissionary activity, according to the conditions of times and places, and a theological investigation of these activities is quite in order.

Seumois believes that the method of investigation and development should be systematic and in a strictly theological manner. It should begin with a complete definition of the mission in its four causes: above all, it ought to determine precisely the material object, then the formal objects both in their general and specific elements, then the efficient cause in general, and finally the ends, both generic and specific. Seumois offers his own plan, not as complete and definitive, but as one which can be either enriched or changed in its detailed parts.⁴³ The following is a brief outline of his plan. (1) A *definition* of missionary action: its history and various connotations. (2) The *subject* of this activity: its nature, extension, and comprehension; non-Catholic religious systems and the religious factors contained in them; non-Catholic cultural systems and the religious life of those who are not Catholic. (3) The *object* of missionary action: the apostolate, implantation and its nature, the material and formal elements and proper characteristics of this implantation. (4) The *motive* of missionary action: positive law, theological justification based on the spatial catholicity of the Church, the foundations of this spatial catholicity. (5) *Agents* of missionary action:

⁴¹ Jn 20:21. ⁴² Mt 28:16–20; Mk 16:15. ⁴³ Cf. Seumois, *op. cit.*, pp. 207–37.

(a) principal: Christ, the Church, the Holy Spirit, and the Blessed Virgin, the missionary function of the Church as a principal cause, and the missionary obligation; (b) instrumental: the missionary in the field and missionary co-operation at home, both direct and indirect. (6) The *end* of missionary action: (a) primary: the implantation of the Church and conversions to it; (b) secondary: civilization and culture; (c) accidental: connected and subjective (the missions and the Mystical Body); (d) ultimate: the glory of God.

Perbal offers another schema, more strictly ordered according to the four causes:⁴⁴

1) *Material Cause, or Mission Object*: (a) Nature of the mission object: the meaning of the concepts "non-Catholic" or "non-Christian." (b) Its extension: all peoples, studied according to their position relative to Christianity, i.e., whether they are proximate or remote in relation to acceptance of the Christian faith; all peoples, taken collectively, along with their civilizations and considering them as grounds for hope in the propagation of the faith; all peoples, taken individually, for it is to individuals that apostolic action is directed in the final analysis. (c) Their status: by going through the gradation given above according to their position relative to Christianity and showing that, just as no single person in any place in the world is so completely devoid of spiritual value that he cannot receive grace and be saved, so the same is true of peoples and cultures. It will be necessary to insist upon the action of grace, upon the "light" shed by the mission action, the thesis of original sin, of fallen nature and its incapacity per se for salvation; but at the same time it will be necessary to insist upon the natural gifts which prepare the way for grace, upon both the individual and collective possibilities for salvation, and upon the forces which, despite their deficiency, can be considered as providential preparations for grace and redemption.⁴⁵

2) *Formal Cause*: Under this heading one would study missionary action itself, the meaning of "mission," and its proper character. Also, one would study the Church itself from a missiological point of view and define in a missionary sense the Church and its catholicity, its nature and status during the missionary phase, its familial and communal notes. Perhaps this will turn out to be the richest part of mission theology; perhaps new insights will be discovered in traditional dogma, which were not even suspected by older authors who never considered the Church from this point of view. The doctrine of the Mystical Body, e.g., opens up vast horizons on this

⁴⁴ Cf. Perbal, *La teología misiona*, pp. 31-34.

⁴⁵ Cf. Perbal, *Premières leçons de théologie missionnaire*, pp. 107-11.

matter; the field of patristic theology has been practically unexplored from a missiological point of view. Perhaps the theology of the sacraments, explored from a missiological viewpoint, will present new insights.⁴⁶

3) *Efficient Cause*: This regards the subject of the mission: God, Jesus Christ, the Church, the pope, the episcopacy, missionaries and their auxiliaries (e.g., catechists), the faithful, and the part played by grace. All of these present complex questions and merit particular attention. Likewise, the missionary vocation and the formation of missionaries; the missionary duty considered hierarchically from pope to faithful; laws regarding mission co-operation; finally, mission tactics and methods. (Perhaps, says Perbal, one might say that these are pastoral questions rather than theological. On the contrary, he replies, it is just as easy to think the opposite, especially when one realizes the discussion that the following have provoked: "He has sent me to preach to the poor." "Woe to me if I do not evangelize." "We will be instant in prayer and in the ministry of the word." "He sent them to preach and to heal the sick.")

When one takes account of the problem of accommodation, it will be realized that it is primarily a theological question and not merely a practical question of methodology, despite those who think of it and consider it as merely a simple tactical process. Then, too, the discussions surrounding the catechumenate (and the divergent views held on this subject) are properly theological and spring from a theological viewpoint rather than that of methodology.

Charles placed the problem of conversion under the efficient cause. Perbal, however, thinks it better to place it under the formal cause, because it is truly by means of conversion (a question little studied by classical authors) that one enters the Church and is prepared to enter it. In what does conversion consist? In the baptism received or in the adhesion of the spirit and will to Christian belief?⁴⁷

4) *Final Cause*: Here one would study those questions concerning the scope of the missions, both general and particular, the secondary ends, the practical terminus of missionary action, its successive development in different parts of the world, the theories arising from Christian eschatology and the hypotheses constructed in this regard. The problem of the salvation of infidels, after having been touched upon lightly in the study of the providential preparation under the material cause, might here receive a fuller treatment under the final cause. In fact, it would seem better to treat it here.⁴⁸