

parafferty

From: parafferty [parafferty@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 7:22 PM
To: 'R.F.Vasa'

Bishop
Vasa

Subject: is the human person reducible to the union of his body and soul?

Greetings Bishop Vasa : I have a question for you (and your theologian?).The person of the Son of God became a true human being-possessing a human soul united to a human body. Yet, it seems that he never became a human person because he already was a person-the person of the Son of God and, by definition, a person is always a singularity-meaning: there can never be two or more persons in one person. So, what happened to the would-be human person of the human being Jesus? To suggest that this would-be human person of Jesus was suppressed by the Holy Spirit would seem to attribute an act of violence to God- but I would think that any act of violence is foreign to the nature of God. So, I am beginning to think that a human person is not reducible to the simple joining of his body and vital or rational soul. Is it non-reducible period-not even to the human soul? I know who I am, but I haven't a clue as to the what of the who. God knew and loved me before I came into created existence-so does this mean that " who I am " (the person of philip a rafferty) cannot be reduced to anything other than to a creative-loving thought of God?

Vty, but very perplexed- am I failing to see some thing?
 parafferty

✓ if a human person comes into existence "merely" by virtue of the union of rational soul & organized human body (or unorganized human concepts, as the case may be - see my book at pp. 51 (Chas Leslie quote) & 203 (Chas merton quote)), then

parafferty

From: parafferty [parafferty@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 2010 3:15 PM
To: 'R.F.Vasa'

Subject: RE: is the human person reducible to the union of his body and soul?

Bishop Vasa, thank you for your kind response. I'm amazed that you would find the time to even respond. I am very grateful.
Vty, parafferty

From: R.F.Vasa [mailto:bpvasa@dioceseofbaker.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 2010 12:05 PM
To: parafferty@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Re: is the human person reducible to the union of his body and soul?

parafferty: I can only reply to your question by searching Saint Thomas who writes: (Pt. III, Q.2 Art. 5: Hence, from the union of the soul and body in Christ a new hypostasis or person does not result, but what is composed of them is united to an already existing hypostasis or Person. Nor does it therefore follow that the union of the soul and body in Christ is of less effect than in us, for its union with something nobler does not lessen but increases the virtue and worth; just as the sensitive soul in animals constitutes the species as being considered the ultimate form, yet it does not do so in man, although it is of greater effect and dignity, and this because of its union with a further and nobler perfection, viz. the rational soul, as has been said above (A. 2 ad 2)

I suspect a more thorough reading of other elements of Saint Thomas would provide other discussions. I am not a theologian but there does not appear to be any "necessary" creation of another "person" with the union of soul and body. Thus the "person" who would normally have been created is simply not created and the existing Person of Christ becomes the human being. This does no "violence" to anyone since God is not bound to create and I suspect there are many things or natures which He could create which He, for His own reasons, has chosen not to create and this does injustice to no one. He never, for instance, created unicorns even though there are many fanciful tales about these mythic "creatures". This does no "violence" or injustice to unicorns since non-beings cannot be the subject of "rights".

Just a few errant thoughts. Saint Thomas seems to have pondered this already. God bless +RFV

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 9.0.872 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/3302 - Release Date: 12/06/10 23:34:00

What Vasa says here is true only if a new human person being does not "automatically" come or "pop into existence by the mere union of body & soul"

His answer & have assumed soul the wrong thing

For OPR 2pp. Total

So his quote of ST. THOMAS does not answer or apply to question

Phil Rafferty

From: Dr J.C.A. Nichols <jcan2@hermes.cam.ac.uk> on behalf of Dr J.C.A. Nichols <jcan2@cam.ac.uk>
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2012 8:12 AM
To: Phil Rafferty
Subject: Re: FW: Your question

Yes, exactly so.

fr Aidan On Mar 25 2012, Phil Rafferty wrote:

> I say that " he" (the Person of the Son of God) began to exist as
> the human being JC of Nazareth, but not as the person JC of Nazareth-
> because " he " already was a person, albeit, a divine one parafferty
>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Dr J.C.A. Nichols [<mailto:jcan2@hermes.cam.ac.uk>] On Behalf Of Dr
>J.C.A. Nichols
>Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2012 10:24 PM
>To: Phil Rafferty
>Subject: RE: Your question

>

> Dear Philip, I mean the divine person of the Word took to himself a
> complete example of human nature, i. e. soul (including mind) and body
> with all their powers, in the moment of the Incarnation (the
> Annunciation). As human he has everything we have ('totus in nostris'
> as St Leo put it in his letter to the Council of Chalcedon, 451). Of
> course it follows from that that he did then begin to exist in our
> created world as one of its component creatures, as well as being
> continually present to that world as (with the Father and the Holy
> Spirit) its Creator. fr Aidan OP

>

>

>

>On Mar 24 2012, Phil Rafferty wrote:

>

>>Professor, what do you mean when you say that the Word [already a
>>person, albeit a Divine one?] incarnate is a [Divine?] person "in
>>human
>>nature"?

>>Do you mean he has a human nature or that he exists really in our
>>created world?

>>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Dr J.C.A. Nichols [<mailto:jcan2@hermes.cam.ac.uk>] On Behalf Of
>>Dr J.C.A. Nichols
>>Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 10:05 PM
>>To: philiprafferty1@gmail.com
>>Subject: Your question

>>

JN 10:10

Phil Rafferty

From: Phil Rafferty <philprafferty1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2012 11:10 AM
To: 'Rausch, S.J., Thomas P.'; Hanink, James G. (James.Hanink@lmu.edu); sepprice@aol.com; Dr J.C.A. Nichols (jcan2@cam.ac.uk)
Subject: RE:

Father, all that we believe regarding a human being "from God's perspective" (and which should be the only perspective that we [and which "we" would include, of course, pro-choice practicing Christians] should try to attain) is that He ultimately created us "human beings" to experience ~~the~~ everlasting life ~~or~~ "life in abundance" (or eternal life). Now, if in truth (and we don't know one way or the other whether this is true) the human fetus or embryo is not yet a human being (but it is certainly true that it is on its way to becoming one), and is aborted, then, and as far as we know, this not-yet-a human being, aborted human fetus (which, if let alone from being aborted, would almost certainly have developed into a human being) loses its opportunity to be received into or to gain eternal life, for the simple reason that it never became a human being (because it was deprived of becoming so by virtue of being aborted). On the other hand, if in truth the aborted fetus is indeed a human being (and again, we don't know whether or not that this is true), then it still has or possesses the opportunity, by virtue of its "being" a human being, to be received into eternal life (because it retains its status as a human being-which is created for eternal life). As a believing Christian I would much rather be murdered or be killed as an already "existing" human being than as one "not yet" existing as a human being because, in the former scenario, I have not, by being murdered or killed, lost my opportunity to gain life eternal, whereas in the latter scenario, it may very well be the case that I have-since I never became a human being. And I recall that JC advised against fearing more one who only can take away one's life; rather, he says: fear more the one who can take away eternal life. Also-but this is not really in point, Aquinas was of the opinion that the human being-or formed, living fetus that is killed in its mother's womb gains eternal life by the merits of JC. He did not say that that would apply also to the not-yet formed fetus existing in the womb of its mother. *See IV sent., dist. 2*

Does this help any? 43, q. 1, a. 1, quest. 2 ad 5 "X1"-below

Dear Philip,
I have difficult following your argument in its entirety. Why is an aborted fetus denied the opportunity of eternal life (is it because, on your argument's assumption here, that it may not yet be a person?), why does abortion has far greater adverse consequences than the deliberated killing of a human being because the aborted human fetus is deprived of the opportunity to "live divinely," and why Pro-Roe Catholic politicians, acting in effect, and in the name of Jesus Christ? I don't follow the argument here and am not sure I agree with it.

Also, the Catholic Church has not decided when a fetus becomes a person, but argues out of respect for what is at least potential human life that it has the right to life. I have little expertise in this area, but these are my questions. That said, I don't see anything contrary to Catholic doctrine in what you have written.

Best wishes in your efforts on behalf of the unborn.
Tom Rausch

Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.
T. Marie Chilton Professor of Catholic Theology
Loyola Marymount University
One LMU Drive, Suite 3700
Los Angeles, CA 90045
310-338-2931

From: Phil Rafferty [mailto:philprafferty1@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2012 8:05 PM

sequence
X1: the formed child who dies in the womb of his mother... will rise in conformity of the nature that he has received with the nature of Jesus Christ.

To: Rausch, S.J., Thomas P.; sepprice@aol.com; Hanink, James G.

Subject:

Dear Father Rausch, after considering what you so kindly and patiently related to me on abortion/infallibility, I am so glad that in my book I refrained from arguing that the Church's teaching meets the criteria of infallibility. Although I believe it would have been a truthful statement, the fact remains, arguing so could have very readily distracted fatally from what ultimately I wanted to convey. What a waste it would have been, to argue so, particularly since the infallibility argument was not material really to what I want to convey.

I have one more request: if you will, please read pp.33-35 (up to the 1st para. of that page 35), and then tell me whether (and if so, then why) you find some fault in the argument put forth there (and which argument, of course, presupposes the truths of our Catholic faith).

Vty, parafferty