

Gnostic, Humanism, Other definitions

Deism A philosophical view of God that posits God as a Creator who set the universe in motion and then stepped back, no longer actively engaging with creation. This view was popular in 17th and 18th century Europe among those opposed to the excesses of organized religion. Deism emphasized the use of reason over revelation for deciding religious questions.¹ Gnostic is associated with spiritual knowledge. On the other hand, **agnostic** refers to someone who is unaware of the existence of God, or someone who believes that it is impossible to know the existence of God.

Gnostic is associated with **spiritual** knowledge. This is derived from Greek and denotes knowledge. It is believed that the term was first used by Christian writers to refer to spiritual knowledge. This knowledge is not a **rational**, scientific form of knowledge, but knowledge or a firm belief in divine power. These forms of spiritual knowledge contrast with the rational knowledge because they cannot be observed, analyzed or studied. If a person still has a firm belief in **God**, higher power, and spiritual knowledge, such a person can be considered as a gnostic.

Agnostic refers to someone who is unaware of the existence of God, or someone who believes that it is impossible to know the existence of God. This word should not be confused with atheism. An **atheist** directly rejects or denies the existence of God; an agnostic does not completely reject the existence of God. He merely believes that there is no way of knowing whether God exists or not. Unlike the gnostic belief of divine power, an agnostic fails to completely have faith in a divine power. He requires scientific evidence. This is why an agnostic can be considered as **rational**.

Atheism is total disbelief in God.

Humanism is the name given to the **intellectual**, literary, and scientific movement of the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, a movement which aimed at basing every branch of learning on the literature and culture of classical antiquity. Humanism is a doctrine, attitude, or way of life centered on human interests or values; *especially* : a philosophy that usually rejects **supernaturalism** and stresses an individual's dignity and worth and capacity for **self-realization** through reason

¹ John D. Barry et al., eds., "[Deism](#)," *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

Humanism is a progressive lifestance that, without theism or other supernatural beliefs, affirms our ability and responsibility to lead meaningful, ethical lives capable of adding to the greater good of humanity.

– American Humanist Association

Humanism is a rational philosophy informed by science, inspired by art, and motivated by compassion. Affirming the dignity of each human being, it supports the maximization of individual liberty and opportunity consonant with social and planetary responsibility. It advocates the extension of participatory democracy and the expansion of the open society, standing for human rights and social justice. Free of supernaturalism, it recognizes human beings as a part of nature and holds that values—be they religious, ethical, social, or political—have their source in human experience and culture. Humanism thus derives the goals of life from human need and interest rather than from theological or ideological abstractions, and asserts that humanity must take responsibility for its own destiny.

– The Humanist Magazine

Humanism is a democratic and ethical lifestance which affirms that human beings have the right and responsibility to give meaning and shape to their own lives. It stands for the building of a more humane society through an ethics based on human and other natural values in a spirit of reason and free inquiry through human capabilities. It is not theistic, and it does not accept supernatural views of reality.

– The International Humanist and Ethical Union

Humanism is an approach to life based on reason and our common humanity, recognizing that moral values are properly founded on human nature and experience alone.

– The Bristol Humanist Group

Humanism is: A joyous alternative to religions that believe in a supernatural god and life in a hereafter. Humanists believe that this is the only life of which we have certain knowledge and that we owe it to ourselves and others to make it the best life possible for ourselves and all with whom we share this fragile planet. A belief that when people are free to think for themselves, using reason and knowledge as their tools, they are best able to solve this world's problems. An appreciation of the art, literature, music and crafts that are our heritage from the past and of the creativity that, if nourished, can continuously enrich our lives. Humanism is, in sum, a philosophy of those in love with life. Humanists take responsibility for their own lives and relish the adventure of being part of new discoveries, seeking new knowledge, exploring new options. Instead of finding solace in prefabricated answers to the great questions of life, humanists enjoy the open-endedness of a quest and the freedom of discovery that this entails.

– *The Humanist Society of Western New York*

Humanism is the light of my life and the fire in my soul. It is the deep felt conviction, in every fiber of my being that human love is a power far transcending the relentless, onward rush of our largely deterministic cosmos. All human life must seek a reason for existence within the bounds

of an uncaring physical world, and it is love coupled with empathy, democracy, and a commitment to selfless service which undergirds the faith of a humanist.

– *Bette Chambers, former president of the AHA*

Topic	Secular Humanist	Christian	Questions
God	Humanists usually do not believe that God even exists. Humanists believe mankind is the highest entity. (“Man is the measure of all things.”)	God is the highest Entity. He is perfect in wisdom, power, might, and love. He created us. He is to be worshipped. We love Him because He first loved us.	How is my worship life? Do I live day-to-day talking with and praising and serving God? Or do I basically ignore Him, as a humanist would?
God’s Name	Uses God’s name as a byword. God’s name means nothing to the humanist, because he does not believe God exists.	Reverences God’s name. Uses God’s name only when speaking respectfully about God or when talking to God in prayer. (Ex 20:7)	Have I gotten careless with God’s name as a result of movies, TV, or people around me? Do I get as close to the humanist behavior as possible without "crossing a line"? (e.g., saying “Gah” or “Jeez”)
Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ, if He existed at all, was a mere man. He may have been an interesting teacher, but when he died, he stayed dead like any other man.	Jesus Christ is God, come in the flesh. He was born of the Virgin Mary. He lived a perfect, sinless life. He died on the cross to pay for our sins. He rose from the dead to prove He had conquered sin, death, and hell. He lives forevermore. When we repent of our sins and receive Him as Savior and Lord, He comes to live in our lives, giving us His peace, joy, righteousness, purpose for living, forgiveness of sins, and eternal life.	Have I personally received the Lord Jesus Christ into my life? Am I living for Him and worshipping Him as Savior and Lord? Or do I basically ignore Him as a humanist would do?
Creation	Acts and talks as if evolution is a scientific fact and that anyone who disagrees is ignorant. Evolution is the only way he knows of to explain the existence of life, since he denies the existence of God.	Acts and talks in light of the truly scientific evidence (as well as Biblical revelation) that God is the Creator. Often speaks of “the creation” and not just “nature.”	Have I been intimidated by humanists who try to make me feel ignorant or uneducated if I disagree with them? Do I talk about creation freely?
The Bible	Considers the Bible of little interest. Believes the Bible to be the work of men (perhaps with a religious ax to grind). Certainly does not accept it as the Word of God.	Reverences the Bible as the Word of God. Since he believes it is God’s Word, he believes it is worth taking time to read and study it.	How much time do I spend reading and studying the Bible? Do I treat it like a humanist?

Self-Esteem	Sees man as basically good. Thinks that people should feel good about themselves regardless of their behavior. Tries to deal with guilt by positive self-talk.	Realizes that man has a sin nature and tends to do evil things. Realizes that people have great value and worth because we are created in the image of God and for God's glory. Believes that God has made each person very unique and special and for His glory. Realizes that God has a great purpose for each of us. Believes that through repentance and faith in Christ we can have our sin forgiven and be made into new creatures.	Do I try to make others and myself "feel good" about ourselves in spite of what may be sinful behavior? Or do I realize that my value is based on Who Christ is and what He has done for me?
Sanctity of Life	Since man is a merely highly evolved animal, some human life is not so special. Supports abortion, euthanasia, and even infanticide in some cases.	Since man is created in the image of God and for the purposes of God, all life is precious. Abortion, euthanasia, and infanticide are considered to be horrific sins.	Have I grown complacent about the existence of abortion in our country? Do I take a stand against these evils against human life?
Sin	Rejects the idea of a "sin nature." Believes that whatever I want to do is ok, as long as it "doesn't hurt anyone else." (But is often shortsighted in deciding what may hurt someone else!) Tendency to rationalize that all behavior that I wish to do is acceptable.	We are all guilty of violating God's standards. All of us have sinned. But we can be forgiven and cleansed in Christ. God declares me to be forgiven and gives me His righteousness as a gift when I agree with Him about my sin.	When I sin, do I rationalize it away? Or do I confess it to God and receive His forgiveness?
Goals	Since this physical life is all there is, my goal is to get as much happiness and gain as many things as I can before time runs out and I cease to exist.	Lives in light of Eternity. Makes decisions on the basis of what will bring God the most glory. Realizes that this life is ultimately very brief compared to eternity. (As a by-product of living to bring God glory, experiences great joy, peace, contentment, and fulfillment)	Do my decisions indicate that I'm all wrapped up in the physical things of this life alone? What do I do differently that proves that I am interested in bringing God glory? What do I do that proves I am thinking in terms of eternity?
Sex	Since man is only a highly evolved animal, sexual gratification is not to be denied as long as it "doesn't hurt anyone." (Again, the humanist	Realizes that sex is a gift from God, who created us as sexual beings. Realizes that, when used as God intended (i.e., within a marriage relationship), sex can	Am I absolutely and totally committed to reserving sex for marriage? Have I made arrangements to stay out

	is often shortsighted about what kinds of behavior “hurt” others.)	bring great joy to a husband and wife. But also realizes that when used in ways God did not intend that it can lead to great harm. Even though sex outside marriage may “feel good” for the moment, it inevitably leads to disappointment, frustration, and deep emotional pain and regrets.	of situations that could lead to sexual temptations? Do I really believe what God has said about sex?
Sexual Deviancy	Since man is merely an animal, no sexual acts should be considered improper as long as “it doesn’t hurt anyone.”	Since God created sex to be a holy picture of the relationship between Christ and the church, only heterosexual sex between a husband and wife is acceptable to God. Other sexual behaviors are perversions of that picture.	Have humanists gradually persuaded me that some sexual activities are acceptable even though God says they are sinful?
Moral Relativism	Humanists believe some things are right for some people and some situations that may be “wrong” for other people and other situations. There is no absolute right and wrong. Everything depends on the situation.	Believes that God has established some things as absolutely right and others as absolutely wrong. If God says that certain behavior is sin, it is wrong for us to convince ourselves that the behavior is really ok.	Do I resist the temptation for me to rationalize behavior that God says is wrong? Do I assume that because other people that are supposed to be Christians are doing it that it must be ok?
Tolerance	Believes that values, morals, and ethics are determined by each person for him or herself. Therefore, to tell someone else that their behavior is “wrong” or “sinful” is considered to be intolerant. “Intolerance” (defined this way) is not tolerated!	Believes that values, morals, and ethics are determined by God and revealed in His Word, the Bible and given to us for our benefit. Therefore, to tell someone else that their behavior is wrong may be one of the greatest blessings we can give them. Christians certainly believe that we should all be very tolerant of other people, allowing them the freedom to believe and worship as they see fit. But we believe that to excuse and overlook sin in our society, in the name of “tolerance” is to do great harm to our society in general and individual people in particular.	Do I know what the Bible teaches about the major issues of our day? Am I willing to take an unpopular stand because it is right? Do I recognize the “anything goes” in the name or “tolerance” attitude that is so common in our society?
Family	Secular Humanists prefer to think of “family” in larger groups of perhaps unrelated	Christians see the traditional family unit (father, mother, and children) as created by God to	Do I recognize my parents (or foster parents) as my primary

<p>people. Many secular humanists would affirm the legitimacy of same-sex marriages or civil unions. Many would deny the importance of fathers, encouraging "single parenting by choice." Many secular humanists trust schools more than parents to know what is best for children. Some humanists believe that the child's first responsibility is to a representative of the state, not necessarily to the parents. (For example, humanists often support the right of a child to an abortion without parental consent.)</p>	<p>represent our relationship with Him. Christians believe that, with some exceptions (e.g., abusive parents), parents do a better job at raising children than government organizations. Christians believe children are to be responsible to and submissive to their parents (unless the parent is requiring the child to commit sin). Of course, Christians recognize the importance of foster parents and stepparents in family units.</p>	<p>caregivers, supporters, and authorities? Do I try to appeal to others in an attempt to bypass their authority?</p>
--	--	---

Theism is broadly defined as the belief in the existence of the [Supreme Being](#) or [deities](#).

Deism derived from [Latin "deus"](#) meaning "[god](#)") is a philosophical position that posits that [God](#) (or in some cases, [gods](#)) does not interfere directly with the world; conversely it can also be stated as a system of belief which posits God's existence as the cause of all things, and admits its perfection (and usually the existence of [natural law](#) and [Providence](#)) but rejects divine revelation or direct intervention of God in the universe by [miracles](#). It also rejects [revelation](#) as a source of religious knowledge and asserts that [reason](#) and [observation](#) of the [natural world](#) are sufficient to determine the existence of a [single creator](#) or [absolute principle](#) of the [universe](#).^{[3][4][5]}

Deism gained prominence among intellectuals during the [Age of Enlightenment](#), especially in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. Typically, these had been raised as [Christians](#) and believed in [one God](#), but they had become disenchanted with [organized religion](#) and orthodox teachings such as the [Trinity](#), [Biblical inerrancy](#), and the [supernatural](#) interpretation of events, such as [miracles](#).^[6] Included in those influenced by its ideas were leaders of the [American](#) and [French Revolutions](#).^[7]

Atheism

(*a* privative, and *theos*, God, i.e. without God).

Atheism is that system of thought which is formally opposed to theism. Since its first coming into use the term *atheism* has been very vaguely employed, generally as an epithet of accusation against any system that called in question the popular gods of the day. Thus while Socrates was accused of atheism (Plato, *Apol.*, 26, c.) and Diagoras called an atheist by Cicero (*Nat. Deor.*, I, 23), Democritus and Epicurus were styled in the same sense impious (without respect for the gods) on account of their trend of their new atomistic philosophy. In this sense too, the early Christians were known to the pagans as atheists, because they denied the heathen gods; while, from time to time, various religious and philosophical systems have, for similar reasons, been deemed atheistic.

Though atheism, historically considered, has meant no more in the past than a critical or sceptical denial of the theology of those who have employed the term as one of reproach, and has consequently no one strict philosophical meaning; and though there is no one consistent system in the exposition of which it has a definite place; yet, if we consider it in its broad meaning as merely the opposite of theism, we will be able to frame such divisions as will make possible a grouping of definite systems under this head. And in so doing so we shall at once be adopting both the historical and the philosophical view. For the common basis of all systems of theism as well as the cardinal tenet of all popular religion at the present day is indubitably a belief in the existence of a personal God, and to deny this tenet is to invite the popular reproach of atheism. The need of some such definition as this was felt by Mr. Gladstone when he wrote (*Contemporary Review*, June 1876):

By the Atheist I understand the man who not only holds off, like the sceptic, from the affirmative, but who drives himself, or is driven, to the negative assertion in regard to the whole unseen, or to the existence of God.

Moreover, the breadth of comprehension in such a use of the term admits of divisions and cross-divisions being framed under it; and at the same time limits the number of systems of thought to which, with any propriety, it might otherwise be extended. Also, if the term is thus taken, in strict contradistinction to theism, and a plan of its possible modes of acceptance made, these systems of thought will naturally appear in clearer proportion and relationship.

Thus, defined as a doctrine, or theory, or philosophy formally opposed to theism, atheism can only signify the teaching of those schools, whether cosmological or moral, which do not include God either as a principle or as a conclusion of their reasoning.

The most trenchant form which atheism could take would be the positive and dogmatic denial existence of any spiritual and extra-mundane First Cause. This is sometimes known as dogmatic, or positive theoretic, atheism; though it may be doubted whether such a system has ever been, or could ever possibly be seriously maintained. Certainly Bacon and Dr. Arnold voice the common judgment of thinking men when they express a doubt as to the existence of an atheist belonging to such a school. Still, there are certain advanced phases of materialistic philosophy that, perhaps, should rightly be included under this head. Materialism, which professes to find in matter its own cause and explanation, may go farther, and positively exclude the existence of any spiritual cause.

That such a dogmatic assertion is both unreasonable and illogical needs no demonstration, for it is an inference not warranted by the facts nor justified by the laws of thought. But the fact that certain individuals have left the sphere of exact scientific observation for speculation, and have thus dogmatized negatively, calls for their inclusion in this specific type. Materialism is the one dogmatic explanation of the universe which could in any sense justify an atheistic position. But even materialism, however its advocated might dogmatize, could do no more than provide an inadequate theoretic basis for a negative form of atheism. Pantheism, which must not be confused with materialism, in some of its forms can be placed also in this division, as categorically denying the existence of a spiritual First Cause above or outside the world.

A second form in which atheism may be held and taught, as indeed it has been, is based either upon the lack of physical data for theism or upon the limited nature of the intelligence of man. This second form may be described as a negative theoretic atheism; and may be further viewed as cosmological or psychological, according as it is motivated, on the one hand, by a consideration of the paucity of actual data available for the arguments proving the existence of a super-sensible and spiritual God, or, what amounts to the same thing, the attributing of all cosmic change and development to the self-contained potentialities of an eternal matter; or, on the other hand, by an empiric or theoretic estimate of the powers of reason working upon the data furnished by sense-perception. From whichever cause this negative form of atheism proceeds, it issues in agnosticism or materialism; although the agnostic is, perhaps, better classed under this head than the materialist. For the former, professing a state of nescience, more properly belongs to a category under which those are placed who neglect, rather than explain, nature without a God. Moreover, the agnostic may be a theist, if he admits the existence of a being behind and beyond nature, even while he asserts that such a being is both unprovable and unknowable. The materialist belongs to this type so long as he merely neglects, and does not exclude from his system, the existence of God. So, too, does the positivist, regarding theological and metaphysical speculation as mere passing stages of thought through which the human mind has been journeying towards positive, or related empirical, knowledge. Indeed, any system of thought or school of philosophy that simply omits the existence of God from the sum total of natural knowledge, whether the individual as a matter of fact believes in Him or not, can be classed in this division of atheism, in which, strictly speaking, no positive assertion or denial is made as to the ultimate fact of His being.

There are two systems of practical or moral atheism which call for attention. They are based upon the theoretic systems just expounded. One system of positive moral atheism, in which human actions would neither be right nor wrong, good nor evil, with reference to God, would naturally follow from the profession of positive theoretic atheism; and it is significant of those to whom such a form of theoretic atheism is sometimes attributed, that for the sanctions of moral actions they introduce such abstract ideas as those of duty, the social instinct, or humanity. There seems to be no particular reason why they should have recourse to such sanctions, since the morality of an action can hardly be derived from its performance as a duty, which in turn can be called and known as a "duty" only because it refers to an action that is morally good. Indeed an

analysis of the idea of duty leads to a refutation of the principle in whose support it is invoked, and points to the necessity of a theistic interpretation of nature for its own justification.

The second system of negative practical or moral atheism may be referred to the second type of theoretic atheism. It is like the first in not relating human actions to an extra-mundane, spiritual, and personal lawgiver; but that, not because such a lawgiver does not exist, but because the human intelligence is incapable of so relating them. It must not be forgotten, however, that either negative theoretic atheism or negative practical atheism is, as a system, strictly speaking compatible with belief in a God; and much confusion is often caused by the inaccurate use of the terms, *belief*, *knowledge*, *opinion*, etc.

Lastly, a third type is generally, though perhaps wrongly, included in moral atheism. "Practical atheism is not a kind of thought or opinion, but a mode of life" (R. Flint, *Anti-theistic Theories*, Lect. I). This is more correctly called, as it is described, godlessness in conduct, quite irrespective of any theory of philosophy, or morals, or of religious faith. It will be noticed that, although we have included agnosticism, materialism, and pantheism, among the types of atheism, strictly speaking this latter does not necessarily include any one of the former. A man may be an agnostic simply, or an agnostic who is also an atheist. He may be a scientific materialist and no more, or he may combine atheism with his materialism. It does not necessarily follow, because the natural cognoscibility of a personal First Cause is denied, that His existence is called in question: nor, when matter is called upon to explain itself, that God is critically denied. On the other hand, pantheism, while destroying the extra-mundane character of God, does not necessarily deny the existence of a supreme entity, but rather affirms such as the sum of all existence and the cause of all phenomena whether of thought or of matter. Consequently, while it would be unjust to class agnostics, materialists, or pantheists as necessarily also atheists, it cannot be denied that atheism is clearly perceived to be implied in certain phases of all these systems. There are so many shades and gradations of thought by which one form of a philosophy merges into another, so much that is opinionative and personal woven into the various individual expositions of systems, that, to be impartially fair, each individual must be classed by himself as atheist or theist. Indeed, more upon his own assertion or direct teaching than by reason of any supposed implication in the system he advocated must this classification be made. And if it is correct to consider the subject from this point of view, it is surprising to find to what an exceedingly small number the supposed atheistic ranks dwindle. In company with Socrates, nearly all the reputed Greek atheists strenuously repudiated the charge of teaching that there were no gods. Even Bion, who, according to Diogenes Laertius (*Life of Aristippus*, XIII, Bohn's tr.), adopted the scandalous moral teaching of the atheist Theodorus, turned again to the gods whom he had insulted, and when he came to die demonstrated in practice what he had denied in theory. As Laertius says in his "Life of Bion", he "who never once said, 'I have sinned but spare me—

Then did this atheist shrink and give his neck
To an old woman to hang charms upon;
And bound his arms with magic amulets;
With laurel branches blocked his doors and windows,
Ready to do and venture anything

Rather than die.”

Epicurus, the founder of that school of physics which limited all causes to purely natural ones and consequently implied, if he did not actually assert, atheism, is spoken of as a man whose “piety towards the gods and (whose) affection for his country was quite unspeakable” (ib., *Life of Epicurus*, V). And though Lucretius Carus speaks of the downfall of popular religion which he wished to bring about (*De Rerum natura*, I, 79–80), yet, in his own letter to Henaeeus (Laert., *Life of Epicurus*, XXVII), he states plainly a true theistic position: “For there are gods: for our knowledge of them is indistinct. But they are not of the character which people in general attribute to them.” Indeed, this one citation perfectly illustrates the fundamental historic meaning of the term, atheism.

The naturalistic pantheism of the Italian Giordano Bruno (1548–1600) comes near to, if it is not actually a profession of, atheism; while Tomaso Campanella (1568–1639), on the contrary, in his nature-philosophy finds in atheism the one impossibility of thought, Spinoza (1632–77), while defending the doctrine that God certainly exists, so identifies Him with finite existence that it is difficult to see how he can be defended against the charge of atheism even of the first type. In the eighteenth century, and especially in France, the doctrines of materialism were spread broadcast by the Encyclopedists. La Mettrie, Holbach, Fererbach, and Fleurens are usually classed among the foremost materialistic atheists of the period. Voltaire, on the contrary, while undoubtedly helping on the cause of practical atheism, distinctly held its theoretic contrary. He, as well as Rousseau, was a deist. Comte, it will be remembered, refused to be called an atheist. In the last century Thomas Huxley, Charles Darwin, and Herbert Spencer, with others of the evolutionistic school of philosophy, were, quite erroneously, charged with positive atheism. It is a charge which can in no way be substantiated; and the invention andonism of Ernst Hackel, goes far towards forming an atheistic system of philosophy. But even the last named admits that there may be a God, though so limited and so foreign to the deity of theists that his admission can hardly remove the system from the first category of theoretic atheism.

Among the unscientific and unphilosophical there have from time to time been found dogmatic atheists of the first type. Here again, however, many of those popularly styled atheists are more correctly described by some other title. There is a somewhat rare tract, “Atheism Refuted in a Discourse to prove the Existence of God by T.P.”—British Museum Catalogue, “Tom Paine”, who was at one time popularly called an atheist. And perhaps, of the few who have upheld an indubitable form of positive theoretic atheism, none has been taken seriously enough to have exerted any influence upon the trend of philosophic or scientific thought. Robert Ingersoll might be instanced, but though popular speakers and writers of this type may create a certain amount of unlearned disturbance, they are not treated seriously by thinking men, and it is extremely doubtful whether they deserve a place in any historical or philosophical exposition of atheism.

Sources

REIMMAN, *Historia atheismi et atheorum ...* (Hildesheim, 1725); TOUSSAINT in *Dict. de theologie*, s.v. (a good bibliography); JANET AND SEAILLES, *History of the Problems of Philosophy* (tr., London, 1902), II; HETTINGER, *Natural Religion* (tr., New York, 1890); FLINT, *Anti-theistic Theories* (New York, 1894); LILLY, *The Great Enigma* (New York, 1892); DAURELLE, *L Atheisme devant la raison humaine* (Paris, 1883); WARD, *Naturalism and Agnosticism* (New York, 1899); LADD, *Philosophy of Religion* (New York, 1905); II; BOEDDER, *Natural Theologh* (New York, 1891); BLACKIE, *Natural History of Atheism* (New York, 1878); *The Catholic World*, XXVII, 471; BARRY, *The End of Atheism in the Catholic World*, LX, 333; SHEA, *Steps to Atheism in The Am, Cath. Quart. Rev.*, 1879, 305; POHLE, *lehrbuck d. Dogmatik* (Paderborn, 1907) I; BAUR in *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Munich, 1907), s.v. See also bibliography under AGNOSTICISM, MATERIALISM, PANTHEISM, and THEISM. For the refutation of ATHEISM see the article GOD.)²

² Francis Aveling, "[Atheism](#)," ed. Charles G. Herbermann et al., *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church* (New York: The Encyclopedia Press; The Universal Knowledge Foundation, 1907–1913).