

The Power of the Pen!

Rev. Thomas Dailey, OSFS

My tenure as President has only just begun. But in the three short months since I have assumed this position, I've been asked by several different groups to be a signatory on public statements: on brain death, on cloning, on military action against terrorism, and on the culture of life. It seems that there is some kind of power to the presidential pen!

In our contemporary culture, where instant messaging and computerized graphics are the norm for communications, the signature still remains a potent expression of the persons we are. Whether signing checks or contracts, letters or memoranda, even Christmas cards – whenever we write our name in ink we “authorize” various kinds of sentiments or actions and thereby exercise our freedom in a conscious and deliberate way.

But there is more. Beyond the uniqueness that handwriting analysis will attribute to our signatures, putting pen to paper in this fashion is a distinctively personal act. No longer is the thought in question able to hide in anonymity. Instead, we stand behind and for that to which we have signed our name. To “sign on” to public statements or similar documents is thus to lend some measure of agreement and support to the thought being expressed.

It may not seem like much, this small act of signing one's name. After all, it's easy to wonder whether such public statements have any real impact, whether they are even read by those for whom they are intended.

Yet making such statements is what we do. It's one element of our intellectual advocacy as scholars. It's one means of our evangelization as faithful Catholics. To put one's self on the line by affixing one's name there is to say that we stand for something, that we believe in what is being written, that we think the world should know what we have to say.

The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars considers with courage and honesty the questions that are raised in our contemporary world. We will seek to deal with these questions in a way that is faithful to the truth always guarded in the

(Continued on page 2)

O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones, falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam profitentes circa fidem aberraverunt. Gratia vobiscum. 1 ad Timotheum 6

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly

Volume 24, Number 4 Fall 2001

CONTENTS

PRESIDENTS' PAGE: The Power of the Pen!.....	1
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.....	3
ARTICLES: The Ecumenism of John Paul II.....	5
Was Cardinal Newman the Ghost- Writer of <i>Ex Corde Ecclesiae</i> ?.....	16
Jesus and the Spiritual Equality of Women.....	24
MEMBERSHIP MATTERS.....	30
AROUND THE CHURCH.....	32
BOOK REVIEWS	38
ANNOUNCEMENT.....	42
BOARD OF DIRECTORS.....	43

(Continued from page 1)

Church by the Holy Spirit and that is sensitive to the needs of the family of faith. This is what we stand for. By signing on in support of public statements, the FCS seeks to give witness to our faith in the way our Holy Father encourages:

For Christian witness to be effective, especially in delicate and controversial areas, it is important that special efforts be made to explain properly the reasons for the church's position, stressing that it is not a case of imposing on nonbelievers a vision based on faith, but of interpreting and defending the values rooted in the very nature of the human person. In this way charity will necessarily become service to culture, poli-

tics, the economy and the family so that the fundamental principles upon which depend the destiny of human beings and the future of civilization will be everywhere respected. (Novo Millennio Ineunte, no. 51)

Our culture continues to need the service of faith and scholarship that the FCS has been providing now for 25 years. The pages of this *Quarterly* will be the primary place in which we give such witness, through statements that we issue and studies that we undertake. Hopefully, our pens will never run out of ink!

Dr. Ralph M. McInerny Appointed to Presidential Committee

President Bush has announced his intention to appoint University of Notre Dame philosophy professor Ralph M. McInerny to the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

McInerny, the Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies and director of the University's Jacques Maritain Center, is among 23 people the president intends to appoint to serve on the committee, according to a White House announcement earlier this week. The committee, established by an executive order in 1982, is charged with advancing public understanding of the arts and the humanities and forming new partnerships between the private sector and federal agencies to address critical issues in cultural life. First Lady Laura Bush is the honorary chair of the committee.

McInerny, who joined the Notre Dame faculty in 1955, is an internationally known scholar, author and lecturer. A specialist in Thomism, ethics and the works of Kierkegaard and Newman, he has written, edited and contributed to numerous books on philosophy and is author of more than 50 novels. He also is a fellow of the Pontifical Academy of Saint Thomas Aquinas, the founder of two Catholic magazines, *Crisis* and *Catholic Dossier*, and was the Gifford Lecturer at the University of Glasgow last year.

Notre Dame News
Released: December 6, 2001

To the Editor: Stem Cell Research: Recycling or Murder?

Who are they? These nameless people, the faceless hoards file by aimlessly. They say nothing as they pass in front of me. Muddy, hooded creatures, their vacuous expressions are as mute as the unformed words on their lips.

Who are they? The homeless? The untouchables in some cruel caste system? Suddenly the guide says, "They are the victims of selective destiny." As I hear those words, I understand. These unearthly people are victims of expedience, victims of convenience, victims of experimentation. Sentenced to non-existence, these are the souls selected for sacrifice, banished from the earth.

I awake from my dream but not from my nightmare, a living nightmare, more frightening than anything I could imagine. Selective destiny. They used to call it abortion." Now it has a second name: scientists call it "stem cell research."

At least some advocates of stem cell research have what seem to be kind motives; they hope to discover cures for a host of neurological disorders, such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. Their rationale is that experiments conducted on discarded embryos are a painless way to unlock medical secrets impossible to access any other way.

On the surface, the rationale is so logical, so admirable that it seems as if no one could object. Of what use is a discarded embryo? The proposal could be elevated to one of recycling; after all, no one objects to recycling as an alternative to dumping huge piles of embryos into the overcrowded landfills.

Of course, the underlying issue unaddressed by this line of thinking is the nature of the embryo--that of human life. After all, everyone has to admit that it is indeed a human embryo we are discussing. The grounds for disagreement is whether a human embryo has intrinsic value as such.

Legally, neither a fetus nor an embryo has any rights. One wonders how much longer that situation will remain unchanged, especially in light of the infamous "wrongful birth" Perruche case in France. Nicholas Perruche, 17, won a lawsuit against medical authorities for failing to diagnose his mother's rubella during her pregnancy because had she known of her condition, she could have chosen to abort the fetus. Rubella caused Perruche to be born deaf, brain-damaged and nearly blind.

Now others are following suit, and French courts find themselves forced to uphold one's right not to be born. Disabled individuals are suing their own mothers and medical authorities for allowing their births. And exactly when do those individuals assume that their rights began--during gestation or only after safe passage out of the birth canal?

The Bush administration's deliberations concerning making unborn children eligible for the Child's Health Insurance program is intended to encourage pregnant women to seek prenatal care. However, abortion advocates oppose such measures on the grounds that a precedent for fetal rights might be established.

Stem cell research performed on human embryos is much easier to justify if a person already condones abortion because the mindset is probably either that human life is expendable or that the unborn have no right to life.

Both sides of the controversy agree, however, that all the unborn, regardless of developmental stage, are human unborn. If embryos were not fully human, then they would be useless even for stem cell research. Similarly, both sides of the controversy agree that a fetus as well as an embryo is living, that is composed of living cells, living human cells. It is here that the impasse is reached because one side maintains that the unborn is not a human being or a human person, therefore unentitled to protection by law. The other side, led by the Catholic Church, maintains that the unborn, from the moment of conception, is fully human, a human being, regardless of a particular developmental stage. After all, when viewed from the broadest possible perspective, we humans are never free from developmental stages; from conception to death, we are always changing, becoming, growing older.

Life itself is an emergent property not fully grasped by scientists themselves. That is to say that life, much like consciousness, is something we recognize when we see it although everything about it is not wholly understood.

Chicago Tribune columnist, Steve Chapman, pointed out that when we arbitrarily decide when life begins, based on changing situational demands, we get into trouble. He wrote, "Hypocrisy is equally glaring among anti-abortion senators who somehow have found a way to endorse the destruction of embryos. 'Human life begins in a mother's womb, not in a petri dish or refrigerator,' insists Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah.

That is the same Mr. Hatch who in 1981 voted for an anti-abortion bill stating that life begins at conception, which has been the position of the pro-life community since

the beginning. Now, Mr. Hatch and some other anti-abortion senators dismiss conception as greatly overrated" ("Stem Cells' Other Side," Dallas Morning News, 17 July 2001, 11A).

Pope John Paul II in a public address on July 23rd said, "A free and virtuous society, which America aspires to be, must reject practices that devalue and violate human life at any stage from conception until natural death." The pope's statement embraces the following Biblical view: "For thou didst form my inward parts, thou didst knit me together in my mother's womb" (Ps. 139: 13, RSV). No one wants to see loved ones, or even strangers, suffering the ravages of birth defects or disabling conditions. However, we cannot choose who will live and who will die on the basis of alleviating suffering or for the sake of convenience.

Selective destiny. We must not follow in France's footsteps and mandate that only the healthiest, the most desirable babies should live. To do so is to adopt Hitler's motive of purification, even though in this case the cleansing is not motivated by race but by health. Nor can we in good conscience sacrifice embryos for the sake of the possibility of finding cures for diseases.

Selective destiny. One single human life is too great a price to end the suffering of another.

Sara McLaughlin
Texas Tech University

THE ECUMENISM OF JOHN PAUL II

By Kenneth D. Whitehead

*Keynote Address at the Reverend Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J., Memorial Foundation Symposium on the Encyclicals and Ecclesial Pronouncements of Pope John Paul II, Lincoln, Nebraska, November 2-3, 2001. Mr. Whitehead is the author, most recently, of **One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic: The Early Church Was the Catholic Church** (Ignatius Press, 2000).*

The "ecumenism" of John Paul II with which we shall be concerned here is that which pertains to relations among Christians. Relations with non-Christians represent an equally large topic today which, however, we cannot get into. We are particularly concerned with relations among Christians as John Paul II views them, namely, in the light of what he sees as an imperative need for Catholics to work for Christian unity.

Not all of the good, committed Catholics that I know are completely taken with the new ecumenism--*systematically* working for Christian unity--which the Catholic Church has been diligently pursuing ever since Vatican Council II. These Catholics don't necessarily oppose it; they are prepared to accept the Church's new, official emphasis on it; but they do not really see the value of it or consider it to be among the Church's greatest current needs or priorities.

A number of them no doubt even question how successful it has been: have all the numerous ecumenical dialogues, agreed-statements, prayers in common for unity, and the like, over the past 35 years, resulted in a single case where Church communion or Christian unity in a real sense has been restored? Perhaps more importantly, for some serious and knowledgeable Catholics, has engaging in all these ecumenical

efforts perhaps planted in the minds of least some people the suggestion--or perhaps even the suspicion--that the Catholic Church is no longer quite so sure of what she herself affirms? How can the Church possibly *debate* what she teaches as coming from God?

Certainly at least some of the people involved in at least some of the ecumenical efforts supposedly under Catholic auspices have *not* always seemed unduly disturbed that some Catholic teachings might get watered down, or even put aside, in the course of some of these ecumenical "dialogues" and relationships.

Or again: have regular ecumenical relations and dialogue with Catholics persuaded a single non-Catholic church or communion to hold back on what sometimes seems to be a headlong rush on the part of some of them to "baptize" certain politically correct positions in the culture at large as now somehow "Christian," or at least acceptable to Christians? We need think here only of current moves by some denominations to legitimize so-called "marriage" between active homosexuals or to ordain them. Then there is the question of the ordination of women, with respect to which practically every non-Catholic denomination west of the Orthodox world simply opposes the Catholic Church for what is considered her unjust and retrograde position that she is unable to ordain woman to the sacred priesthood.

Then there are those churches that have actively come out in favor of legalized abortion--or, more recently, in favor of such things as in-vitro fertilization, stem-cell research, and even cloning. This kind of disconcerting abandonment of the Christian tradition often today leaves the Catholic Church virtually alone out there in public opposition to some of these crying contemporary evils. Most other Christians--including, sadly, too many individual Catholics--seem actually embarrassed over the

Catholic Church's continuing--and, to most of our contemporaries, incomprehensible--condemnation of birth control. Some ecumenism!

And what about some of the pope's specifically "ecumenical" journeys: to Greece, Georgia, Ukraine, and even St. Catherine's Monastery at the foot of Mount Sinai? The Holy Father seems to have gotten a warmer reception on his trips to Israel, Morocco, or Syria than he got from some of his fellow Orthodox Christians on these trips. Some people have considered his once fervently announced goal of achieving reunion at least with the Eastern Orthodox by the beginning of the millennium to count among the greatest of John Paul II's failures--in a pontificate that has counted so many successes. Surely this pope set the bar on ecumenism way too high ever to be able to get over it.

Coming down to it, then, has the Catholic Church's post-conciliar emphasis on ecumenism--the search for Christian unity--even been worthwhile? What is the net result of all of the much ballyhoo-ed ecumenical effort and dialogue?

Let us leave the answers to these questions aside for the moment, and turn to a consideration of why the Catholic Church in general, and Pope John Paul II in particular, have been pursuing, and will continue to pursue, even in the face of some of the discouraging results we have mentioned, the kind of ecumenism to which the Church committed herself at Vatican II. An examination of the Church's and the pontiff's basic goals and motives here, as well as their methods, will perhaps yield better answers to these questions than simply looking at the ecumenical results to date.

II.

The Catholic Church's basic "charter" for today's ecumenism, of course, is Vatican II's watershed Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio* of December 21, 1964. This Decree

was supplemented by a *Directory Concerning Ecumenical Matters* issued by the Holy See in two parts in 1967 and 1970; and, in 1993, by a *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism*. These documents were all rather dramatically updated and extended by Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Ut Unum Sint* on Commitment to Ecumenism of May 25, 1995. This encyclical is the document that is chiefly going to concern us here. It is another one of a number of the epochal documents issuing from the pen of John Paul II which, as soon as they are issued, immediately come to seem indispensable. How did we ever get along without them before? One of the most amazing phenomena of our times, of course, is the number of such documents produced in the course of a single pontificate by the Polish pope.

What we might not realize until we get seriously into the standard Church documents on ecumenism, though, is what both Vatican II and Pope John Paul II make quickly and abundantly clear: namely, that the Church's ecumenical activity must be taken in conjunction with (and never apart from) the Church's missionary activity. The Church's missionary mandate includes reaching out to other Christians as well as reaching out to non-Christians. Thus, we must also mention, at least in passing, even if we cannot go into much detail about them, Vatican II's Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity, *Ad Gentes Divinitis*, of December 7, 1965, and John Paul II's encyclical, updating this document, on the Mission of the Redeemer, *Redemptoris Missio*, of December 7, 1990.

In this latter encyclical, John Paul II first quotes Vatican II's *Ad Gentes* (#2) to the effect that the Church is missionary by her very nature; he then notes that the mission of the Church "is still very far from completion"--adding that this is why he himself has "chosen to travel to the ends of the earth in order to show this missionary concern"; and after that he goes on to quote Christ's prayer to the Father, identifying the quotation he has selected

as the basis of both the missionary nature of the Church and the inspiration behind ecumenism as well: Christ prayed, it will be recalled, "that they all may be one...so that the world may believe that you have sent me" (Jn 17:21).

It is immediately obvious that the encyclical *Ut Unum Sint* goes back to this particular passage of Scripture. The Latin *means*, after all, "that they may be one." It is not as immediately obvious that the Church's missionary activity too is also fundamentally based on the same idea. We only glimpse this when we consider the reason Christ gives in his prayer to the Father *why* his followers ought to be one, namely: "So that the world may believe that you have sent me." The world's continuing lack of belief that Christ was sent into the world by God to redeem the human race is related to and partly consequent upon the disunity and division of Christians, who thus fail to present the Christian message to the world with one voice.

"As the second millennium after Christ's coming draws to an end," John Paul II writes in *Redemptoris Missio*, "an overall view of the human race shows that [the Church's] mission is only beginning" (RM #1). "The number of those who do not know Christ and do not belong to the Church is constantly on the increase. Indeed since the end of the Council it has almost doubled" (RM #5). And again, "Peoples who have not yet received an initial proclamation of Christ constitute the majority of mankind...the 'ends of the earth' to which the Gospel must be brought are growing ever more distant" (RM #40).

The pope, like the Council before him, sees the problem of the Church's mission as inseparable from the problem of the unity of Christians. He several times refers to a point originally made in *Ad Gentes*: "The division of Christians is injurious to the holy work of preaching the Gospel to every creature and deprives many people of access to the faith" (AG #6). Vatican II's Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio* makes the same point even more strongly: Christian disunity "contradicts the will of

Christ, scandalizes the world, and damages that most holy cause, the preaching of the Gospel to every creature" (UR #1).

We need not dwell further on the missionary question as such, since we have more than enough to cover with regard to ecumenism itself. But we must not forget that the Church sees ecumenism and the Church's missionary mandate as two prongs of the same fork. And in moving on from *Redemptoris Missio*, we shouldn't forget the key importance of this encyclical in the overall approach of John Paul II to what is one of the key themes of his pontificate: namely, evangelization. For him evangelization is indistinguishable from preaching the Gospel to every creature.

It is in this 1990 encyclical on the Church's missionary mandate, written five years before *Ut Unum Sint*, that the pope articulated one of the basic principles fundamental to his whole approach to evangelization through both missions and ecumenism: "*The Church proposes*," John Paul II insists. "*She imposes nothing*. She respects individuals and cultures, and she honors the sanctuary of conscience. To those who for various reasons oppose missionary activity, the Church repeats: *Open the doors to Christ!*" (RM #39; italics in the original).

III.

Christ prayed, then, "that they all may be one... so that the world may believe that you have sent me" (Jn 17:21). It was no doubt inevitable that Pope John Paul II would pick up on this passage from the Gospel of John when writing his encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*. The pope himself explains one meaning of the passage by noting that "this unity, which the Lord has bestowed on his Church, and in which he wishes to embrace all peoples, is not something added on, but stands at the very heart of Christ's mission" (UUS #9).

We should note too that the English subtitle of the encyclical is: "On the Church's Commit-

ARTICLES

ment to Ecumenism." *Commitment!* The Holy Father does not get far into his subject before he reminds us that "at the Second Vatican Council the Catholic Church committed herself *irrevocably* to following the path of the ecumenical venture" (UUS #3; italics in the original). Ecumenism, he adds later on, "is not just some sort of 'appendix' which is added on to the Church's traditional activity"--although this is often the way some Catholics today tend to treat it, among them some of the most committed and serious Catholics. Rather, the pope says, "ecumenism is an organic part of her life and work" (UUS #20).

It would be hard to put it more strongly that, according to Pope John Paul II, ecumenism is an integral part of the Catholic thing; it should long since have been practiced more diligently in the way that it has been practiced since Vatican II. However that may be, though, it is definitely here to stay now. It is not merely a fad or a frill.

The pope ascribes the Church's firm decision about this to the Council. Throughout the encyclical he constantly refers back to the Council. The first third of the encyclical, and more, is practically a tissue of conciliar quotations strung together. If anyone needs proof that John Paul II is the pope of the Second Vatican Council *par excellence*, the proof can be found here as clearly as it can be found anywhere. It would not be inaccurate to say that the ecumenism of John Paul II is, in fact, the ecumenism of Vatican II.

Interestingly enough, though, when we look at the Council's Decree on Ecumenism, we find in it Vatican II's strongest and clearest statement that the Catholic Church is what we used to call "the one, true Church." Far from muting the Church's claims in the interests of harmony among Christians, the Decree makes a point instead of affirming the Church's maximum claims. Just as the Council's strongest reiteration of the truth of the Catholic faith, perhaps ironically, comes in its Declaration on Religious Liberty, *Dignitatis Humanae*,* so the Council's strongest affirmation that the Catholic Church is, indeed, as all previous generations of the faithful have believed, the one, true Church of Christ--

"God's only flock," the Council declares at one point (UR #2)--comes in its Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*, as follows:

For it is through Christ's Catholic Church alone, which is the universal help towards salvation, that the fullness of the means of salvation can be obtained. It was to the apostolic college alone, of which Peter is the head, that we believe Our Lord entrusted all the blessings of the New Covenant, in order to establish on earth the Body of Christ into which all those should be incorporated who belong in any way to the people of God (UR #3).

If "all those who belong in any way to the people of God" should simply be "incorporated" into the Catholic Church, according to Vatican II, then what has changed from the days when the Catholic attitude towards ecumenism was more or less to wait around until everybody saw the light and decided to return to the one, true fold?

This is an attitude that persists among Catholics, in fact, in spite of the Church's new, official emphasis on ecumenism: if we have the full truth, as we do have; and if the Church Christ established for all his disciples is indeed the Catholic Church, as is also the case--then why *should* we have to be bothered with all the dialogue, the agreed statements, the prayers for unity, and such?

Similarly, why should the Vicar of Christ have to subject himself to the calculated and deliberate discourtesy, not to say outright insults, from, for example, Greek monks or Russian churchmen (whom some say may even have been KGB agents)? Why should there be all these "apologies" for the admitted past sins of Catholics when so few others seem disposed to acknowledge *their* past sins and faults in the matter of Christian disunity? Weren't they the ones that broke away, after all? If we possess the fullness of the truth, why should any of us have to endure the condescension of our sophisticated contemporaries, who are so sure they know so much better than we do?

subject much closer to most of us here in the United States. Again, time forbids saying more than that Pope John Paul II believes that the near universal Christian recognition and acceptance of the sacrament of baptism provides a basis for further dialogue--as does the celebration of the Lord's Supper in at least some of the Protestant denominations (UUS #66). I hope I have said enough, though, to motivate you to read this remarkable encyclical for yourselves and pick up on many of its points which I of necessity have only been able to touch upon very cursorily.

It could be, in God's Providence, of course, that unity with members of the Churches of the Reformation, lacking as they do, valid priesthood and sacraments, may come about more through old-fashioned individual conversions. Yet here again we must take note of the case of the Protestant minister in Michigan who recently brought his entire congregation into the Catholic Church with him! However that may be, the better relations among Christians which have been encouraged since Vatican II, cannot but enhance prospects for individual conversions too! Serious believers in Christ whose denominations are currently busy casting off essential features of traditional Christianity surely need someplace to go. We must pray and strive that *we* will never be the obstacle to their seeing the Catholic Church as the place to go.

One final short point before we move to the conclusion of this talk by looking at the Roman primacy in ecumenical perspective: I was much moved by Pope John Paul II's remark in the encyclical that, in the bloody century of totalitarianisms and their victims that has recently ended, all Christians, according to John Paul II, at least "already have a common Martyrology" (UUS #84). The pope stressed the same theme in one of his sermons in Armenia in September, 2001: "You understand that where Christians were suffering," the pope said, "though divided among themselves, there already existed a profound unity." The modern totalitarian persecutors of Christians have gen-

erally *not* distinguished between Catholics, Orthodox, and Protestants! *That* ought to constitute as least some kind of a basis for Christian unity! So the pope profoundly believes.

V.

We have saved the most difficult question until last: the primacy of the Roman Pontiff over the universal Church. Practically the only thing that even many well-informed Catholics do know about *Ut Unum Sint* (and some of them do not approve!) is that, in the encyclical, the pope actually raised the question of how "to find a new way of exercising the primacy" (UUS #95). What is wrong with the old way? Some might immediately ask. The Holy See, after all, has succeeded in preserving, handing down, and developing in a unique way over some twenty centuries the faith committed by Christ to the apostles.

Nevertheless, the pope has offered to engage in what he called "a patient and fraternal dialogue" with "pastors and theologians" of other churches (UUS #96) to find a way of perhaps satisfying their rather well-known and often expressed objections to the position occupied by the pope in the Catholic Church. We should not imagine that the pope is anything but utterly serious about the dialogue he thus proposes to the leaders of other churches about his own role and position in the Catholic Church, and how he is to exercise his unique authority. He repeated, and quite emphatically, the same offer in Armenia in September, 2001: "Conscious of the relevance of the ministry of the Bishop of Rome in the search for Christian unity," he told the Armenians, "I have asked--in my encyclical letter *Ut Unum Sint*--that the bishops and theologians of our churches to reflect on the 'forms in which this ministry may accomplish a service of love recognized by all concerned'" (Address during the Ecumenical Liturgy in Yerevan, September 26, 2001, quoting UUS #95).

The reaction of many Christians to the first media reports of what the pope seemed to be pro-

ARTICLES

posing in *Ut Unum Sint*, though--I know it was my initial reaction--was: how can he do this? Everybody knows that the primacy of the pope was *defined*, and thus surely settled for all time, at the First Vatican Council in 1870. How could the pope ever think of trying to get around this?

Moreover, the launching of the pope's proposal seemed to go over with practically everybody like that often-mentioned lead balloon. Who can deal with this man and his proposals? Few or none of the leaders or theologians of other Christian Churches seemed at all interested or prepared to take the pope up on his proposal. The principal public reaction to the proposal, in fact, seems to have come from a retired American Catholic archbishop, critical no doubt of what he considers undue Vatican micro-management of certain affairs of the Catholic Church in the United States. He therefore responded to the pope's proposal in a rather ostentatious Oxford lecture, followed by a book, advocating greater "decentralization" of Church authority. *That* was the way the pope ought to be exercising his primacy differently, we were given to understand!

The same theme was echoed at the Synod of Bishops in October, 2001, where a number of bishops, chiefly from North America or Europe--bishops from the Third World tend to be grateful for Roman interventions-- again complained about the "centralization" of authority in Rome and called for greater "subsidiarity" in the Church.

This kind of response to the pope's initiative by Catholic leaders, of course, misses the whole point and purpose of what the pope has been trying to do. The pope is trying to get the leaders of other Christian Churches and communions to address again with new seriousness the question of why they are *not* in communion with the Catholic Church. What are their reasons for *not* responding to Christ's solemn prayer? Custom or inertia *cannot* be considered valid reasons.

And in any case, though, when Catholic bishops or a bishops' conference fail to carry out their responsibilities--say, with respect to popular current ideologies which can undermine the faith and practice of Catholics such as, for example, radical feminism, the so-called "gay" agenda, or academic liberalism--then it precisely *is* the pope's job to step in as the "moderator" to deal with such questions, and even to micro-manage the answers, if you will. If bishops in a particular country seem prepared to accept vernacular scriptural or liturgical translations in so-called "inclusive language," for example, or seem ready to believe that the canon law of the universal Church is somehow not supposed to apply to Catholic universities in the United States, then they should not be surprised when the successor of Peter steps in and insists on doing *his* job!

We in the United States can only rejoice, in fact, at some of the actions the Holy See has taken in this regard over the past generation in the United States. And not incidentally, some of our fellow Christians, viewing the disintegration of traditional Christian doctrine in some of their denominations, have even reached the point of envying us *because* we have a pope, *habemus papam!* Speaking generally and broadly, the popes in our day have not failed to offer a number of convincing proofs of why Christ *needed* to assign to Peter and his successors the task of safeguarding the faith and practices of the faithful, who might otherwise go or be led astray.

Nevertheless, in spite of this--and as in the case of some other initiatives of John Paul II's--the pope's proposal in *Ut Unum Sint* for ecumenical "dialogue" specifically about how to "exercise" the papal primacy, has not borne much tangible fruit to date. Yet we should not for all of that think the pope's proposal was off base or ill-considered. On the contrary, once again the Holy Father has probably *disarmed his critics* with this proposal! The burden has been shifted from what Catholics are supposedly trying to impose, to what other Christians

think can or should be done to achieve a center of unity in accordance with the will of Christ. "If you object so much to the Roman primacy," the pope is saying, in effect, to sincere, non-Catholic Christians, "then tell us how *you* think the unity for which Christ prayed so fervently is supposed to come about."

All the business about apologies for past sins applies here as well: the pope is admitting that the primacy has *not* always been well or effectively exercised down through history. And so the logical question should arise in the minds of all Christians desirous of Christian unity: how *should* it be exercised then? We should not forget that merely to ask the question means to assume the existence of the primacy.

Meanwhile, the pope's own discussion of what he calls in his encyclical "the Ministry of Unity of the Bishop of Rome" (UUS ##88-96) gives nothing at all away of the Church's defined doctrine on the primacy of the See of Peter over the whole Church of Christ. The pope did not give any of this away for the simple reason that he could not give any of it away. He plainly states that the doctrine is *unchangeable*, that the primacy is here to stay (UUS #97). His proposal deals only with the practical question of how to manage the primacy--which the pope takes for granted is irrevocably established in the Church.

Meanwhile, his discussion of the question in these sections of the encyclical constitute one of the most eloquent and persuasive short descriptions that I have ever read of the Church's *need* for a center of unity, as well as of the *fact* that Jesus Christ did indeed establish such a center of unity in the mission he confided to the Apostle Peter and his successors in the See of Rome.

This whole discussion of John Paul II's is yet another part of the encyclical that you have to read for yourselves. I can quote only a brief sample:

Among all the Churches and Ecclesial

Communities, the Catholic Church is conscious that she has preserved the ministry of the Successor of the Apostle Peter, the Bishop of Rome, whom God established as her "perpetual and visible principle and foundation of unity" (*Lumen Gentium* #23) and whom the Spirit sustains in order that he may enable all the others to share in this essential good. In the beautiful expression of Pope Saint Gregory the Great, my ministry is that of a *servus servorum Dei* ["servant of the servant of God"]. This designation is the best possible safeguard against the risk of separating power (and in particular the primacy) from ministry. Such a separation would contradict the very meaning of power according to the Gospel: "I am among you as one who serves" (Lk 22:27) (UUS #88).

Thus, the pope presents the primacy not as a form of power--say, power accumulated illegitimately by the medieval popes, as some believe--but rather as a charge given by Christ to Peter, as the New Testament attests, and faithfully handed down in the Church ever since. John Paul II reviews the ancient evidence that the Church of Rome is the Church of Peter and Paul, and he does not fail to cite the scriptural passages about Peter as the Rock on whom the Church is built (Mt 16:13-19); the apostle whom Satan demanded to have but for whom Jesus prayed and who is to confirm his brethren when he has "turned again" (Lk 22:31-32); and the apostle from whom Christ elicited the threefold profession of love and gave the command to feed the sheep (Jn 21:15-17).

There is not the slightest suggestion in John Paul II's treatment of the subject that the primacy could ever be anything else but what it manifestly is. The point and purpose of his discussion is: how can we get non-Catholic Christians to *see*--and accept!--what it is. The pope does not propose to give up or get around anything; he proposes only to give over possi-

ble past Catholic habit, custom, prejudice, or even blindness that may historically have contributed to the rejection of the primacy by some Christians--and may at present still be preventing them from accepting it as coming from Christ. There is, after all, a fair amount of past *non-Catholic* habit, custom, prejudice, and even blindness that have to be overcome as well, and that is what the pope is trying to do: he is trying to get non-Catholic Christians at least to consider whether the Roman primacy does not make sense. At the same time, he believes, and says in the encyclical, that more and more of them *are* coming to this conclusion (UUS #89).

All in all, it is quite a performance--and one from a man from whom we have grown accustomed to seeing some rather unprecedented virtuoso performances!

The point of the pope's proposal, then, is that, if Christians truly desirous of Christian unity cannot say what *else* or where else the primacy, or the Church's center of unity, might possibly be, then they too have seriously got to consider what the Roman primacy historically has been and is. The pope's proposal for ecumenical dialogue concerning the exercise of the primacy, then, is surely one more of this remarkable pontiff's heroic efforts--an effort which in the nature of things can surely only yield results over the course of time--in the noble cause for which Christ prayed, namely: "That they all may be one...so that the world may believe that you have sent me..." (Jn 17:21). Let us too, then, pray and work as well towards that same aim of Christian unity in whatever way it may be given us to do so.

"The Catholic Church is by the will of Christ the teacher of truth. It is her duty to proclaim and teach with authority the truth which is Christ and, at the same time, to declare and confirm by her authority the principles of the moral order which spring from human nature itself...in forming their consciences the faithful must pay careful attention to the sacred and certain teaching of the Church" (DH #14).

Was Cardinal Newman the Ghost-Writer of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*?

A Paper delivered by the Reverend Peter M. J. Stravinskis, Ph.D., S.T.D., to the Conference on the Philosophical Legacy of John Henry Newman at Franciscan University of Steubenville, on 20 October 2001.

Having taught courses in the philosophy of education in two of the largest Catholic universities of the country for twenty years, I have more than a passing interest in the field. When the invitation came to consider presenting a paper to this Conference to commemorate the bicentennial of Cardinal Newman's birth, I immediately thought of his magisterial work, *The Idea of a University*, written exactly 150 years ago, referred to by Cardinal Bevilacqua as "a work of great subtlety."¹ Fresh in my mind also was that our episcopal conference just completed a decade-long effort to bring Pope John Paul II's *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* to life in our nation. Could there be a connection between the visions of Newman and Wojtyla?

Both men spent considerable portions of their lives as university professors and chaplains. Both wrote only major work on the nature of a Catholic university: Newman to prepare for the opening of the Catholic University of Ireland; John Paul II to prevent the collapse of Catholic higher education worldwide. Both struggled to see their vision implemented: Newman failed; the jury is still out on Wojtyla.

Many have noted that Cardinal Newman was the "unseen father" at Vatican II, and I don't think that is much of an exaggeration. The present Holy Father, like every single one of his predecessors from the nineteenth century forward, has made no secret of his esteem for the Venerable convert on numerous occasions. One could highlight the fact, for instance, that aside from popes, councils and the beatified or

subject much closer to most of us here in the United States. Again, time forbids saying more than that Pope John Paul II believes that the near universal Christian recognition and acceptance of the sacrament of baptism provides a basis for further dialogue--as does the celebration of the Lord's Supper in at least some of the Protestant denominations (UUS #66). I hope I have said enough, though, to motivate you to read this remarkable encyclical for yourselves and pick up on many of its points which I of necessity have only been able to touch upon very cursorily.

It could be, in God's Providence, of course, that unity with members of the Churches of the Reformation, lacking as they do, valid priesthood and sacraments, may come about more through old-fashioned individual conversions. Yet here again we must take note of the case of the Protestant minister in Michigan who recently brought his entire congregation into the Catholic Church with him! However that may be, the better relations among Christians which have been encouraged since Vatican II, cannot but enhance prospects for individual conversions too! Serious believers in Christ whose denominations are currently busy casting off essential features of traditional Christianity surely need someplace to go. We must pray and strive that *we* will never be the obstacle to their seeing the Catholic Church as the place to go.

One final short point before we move to the conclusion of this talk by looking at the Roman primacy in ecumenical perspective: I was much moved by Pope John Paul II's remark in the encyclical that, in the bloody century of totalitarianisms and their victims that has recently ended, all Christians, according to John Paul II, at least "already have a common Martyrology" (UUS #84). The pope stressed the same theme in one of his sermons in Armenia in September, 2001: "You understand that where Christians were suffering," the pope said, "though divided among themselves, there already existed a profound unity." The modern totalitarian persecutors of Christians have gen-

erally *not* distinguished between Catholics, Orthodox, and Protestants! *That* ought to constitute as least some kind of a basis for Christian unity! So the pope profoundly believes.

V.

We have saved the most difficult question until last: the primacy of the Roman Pontiff over the universal Church. Practically the only thing that even many well-informed Catholics do know about *Ut Unum Sint* (and some of them do not approve!) is that, in the encyclical, the pope actually raised the question of how "to find a new way of exercising the primacy" (UUS #95). What is wrong with the old way? Some might immediately ask. The Holy See, after all, has succeeded in preserving, handing down, and developing in a unique way over some twenty centuries the faith committed by Christ to the apostles.

Nevertheless, the pope has offered to engage in what he called "a patient and fraternal dialogue" with "pastors and theologians" of other churches (UUS #96) to find a way of perhaps satisfying their rather well-known and often expressed objections to the position occupied by the pope in the Catholic Church. We should not imagine that the pope is anything but utterly serious about the dialogue he thus proposes to the leaders of other churches about his own role and position in the Catholic Church, and how he is to exercise his unique authority. He repeated, and quite emphatically, the same offer in Armenia in September, 2001: "Conscious of the relevance of the ministry of the Bishop of Rome in the search for Christian unity," he told the Armenians, "I have asked--in my encyclical letter *Ut Unum Sint*--that the bishops and theologians of our churches to reflect on the 'forms in which this ministry may accomplish a service of love recognized by all concerned'" (Address during the Ecumenical Liturgy in Yerevan, September 26, 2001, quoting UUS #95).

The reaction of many Christians to the first media reports of what the pope seemed to be pro-

ARTICLES

posing in *Ut Unum Sint*, though--I know it was *my* initial reaction--was: how can he do this? Everybody knows that the primacy of the pope was *defined*, and thus surely settled for all time, at the First Vatican Council in 1870. How could the pope ever think of trying to get around this?

Moreover, the launching of the pope's proposal seemed to go over with practically everybody like that often-mentioned lead balloon. Who can deal with this man and his proposals? Few or none of the leaders or theologians of other Christian Churches seemed at all interested or prepared to take the pope up on his proposal. The principal public reaction to the proposal, in fact, seems to have come from a retired American Catholic archbishop, critical no doubt of what he considers undue Vatican micro-management of certain affairs of the Catholic Church in the United States. He therefore responded to the pope's proposal in a rather ostentatious Oxford lecture, followed by a book, advocating greater "decentralization" of Church authority. *That* was the way the pope ought to be exercising his primacy differently, we were given to understand!

The same theme was echoed at the Synod of Bishops in October, 2001, where a number of bishops, chiefly from North America or Europe--bishops from the Third World tend to be grateful for Roman interventions-- again complained about the "centralization" of authority in Rome and called for greater "subsidiarity" in the Church.

This kind of response to the pope's initiative by Catholic leaders, of course, misses the whole point and purpose of what the pope has been trying to do. The pope is trying to get the leaders of other Christian Churches and communions to address again with new seriousness the question of why they are *not* in communion with the Catholic Church. What are their reasons for *not* responding to Christ's solemn prayer? Custom or inertia *cannot* be considered valid reasons.

And in any case, though, when Catholic bishops or a bishops' conference fail to carry out their responsibilities--say, with respect to popular current ideologies which can undermine the faith and practice of Catholics such as, for example, radical feminism, the so-called "gay" agenda, or academic liberalism--then it precisely *is* the pope's job to step in as the "moderator" to deal with such questions, and even to micro-manage the answers, if you will. If bishops in a particular country seem prepared to accept vernacular scriptural or liturgical translations in so-called "inclusive language," for example, or seem ready to believe that the canon law of the universal Church is somehow not supposed to apply to Catholic universities in the United States, then they should not be surprised when the successor of Peter steps in and insists on doing *his* job!

We in the United States can only rejoice, in fact, at some of the actions the Holy See has taken in this regard over the past generation in the United States. And not incidentally, some of our fellow Christians, viewing the disintegration of traditional Christian doctrine in some of their denominations, have even reached the point of envying us *because* we have a pope, *habemus papam!* Speaking generally and broadly, the popes in our day have not failed to offer a number of convincing proofs of why Christ *needed* to assign to Peter and his successors the task of safeguarding the faith and practices of the faithful, who might otherwise go or be led astray.

Nevertheless, in spite of this--and as in the case of some other initiatives of John Paul II's--the pope's proposal in *Ut Unum Sint* for ecumenical "dialogue" specifically about how to "exercise" the papal primacy, has not borne much tangible fruit to date. Yet we should not for all of that think the pope's proposal was off base or ill-considered. On the contrary, once again the Holy Father has probably *disarmed* his critics with this proposal! The burden has been shifted from what Catholics are supposedly trying to impose, to what other Christians

think can or should be done to achieve a center of unity in accordance with the will of Christ. "If you object so much to the Roman primacy," the pope is saying, in effect, to sincere, non-Catholic Christians, "then tell us how *you* think the unity for which Christ prayed so fervently is supposed to come about."

All the business about apologies for past sins applies here as well: the pope is admitting that the primacy has *not* always been well or effectively exercised down through history. And so the logical question should arise in the minds of all Christians desirous of Christian unity: how *should* it be exercised then? We should not forget that merely to ask the question means to assume the existence of the primacy.

Meanwhile, the pope's own discussion of what he calls in his encyclical "the Ministry of Unity of the Bishop of Rome" (UUS ##88-96) gives nothing at all away of the Church's defined doctrine on the primacy of the See of Peter over the whole Church of Christ. The pope did not give any of this away for the simple reason that he could not give any of it away. He plainly states that the doctrine is *unchangeable*, that the primacy is here to stay (UUS #97). His proposal deals only with the practical question of how to manage the primacy--which the pope takes for granted is irrevocably established in the Church.

Meanwhile, his discussion of the question in these sections of the encyclical constitute one of the most eloquent and persuasive short descriptions that I have ever read of the Church's *need* for a center of unity, as well as of the *fact* that Jesus Christ did indeed establish such a center of unity in the mission he confided to the Apostle Peter and his successors in the See of Rome.

This whole discussion of John Paul II's is yet another part of the encyclical that you have to read for yourselves. I can quote only a brief sample:

Among all the Churches and Ecclesial

Communities, the Catholic Church is conscious that she has preserved the ministry of the Successor of the Apostle Peter, the Bishop of Rome, whom God established as her "perpetual and visible principle and foundation of unity" (*Lumen Gentium* #23) and whom the Spirit sustains in order that he may enable all the others to share in this essential good. In the beautiful expression of Pope Saint Gregory the Great, my ministry is that of a *servus servorum Dei* ["servant of the servant of God"]. This designation is the best possible safeguard against the risk of separating power (and in particular the primacy) from ministry. Such a separation would contradict the very meaning of power according to the Gospel: "I am among you as one who serves" (LK 22:27) (UUS #88).

Thus, the pope presents the primacy not as a form of power--say, power accumulated illegitimately by the medieval popes, as some believe--but rather as a charge given by Christ to Peter, as the New Testament attests, and faithfully handed down in the Church ever since. John Paul II reviews the ancient evidence that the Church of Rome is the Church of Peter and Paul, and he does not fail to cite the scriptural passages about Peter as the Rock on whom the Church is built (Mt 16:13-19); the apostle whom Satan demanded to have but for whom Jesus prayed and who is to confirm his brethren when he has "turned again" (Lk 22:31-32); and the apostle from whom Christ elicited the threefold profession of love and gave the command to feed the sheep (Jn 21:15-17).

There is not the slightest suggestion in John Paul II's treatment of the subject that the primacy could ever be anything else but what it manifestly is. The point and purpose of his discussion is: how can we get non-Catholic Christians to *see*--and accept!--what it is. The pope does not propose to give up or get around anything; he proposes only to give over possi-

ble past Catholic habit, custom, prejudice, or even blindness that may historically have contributed to the rejection of the primacy by some Christians--and may at present still be preventing them from accepting it as coming from Christ. There is, after all, a fair amount of past *non-Catholic* habit, custom, prejudice, and even blindness that have to be overcome as well, and that is what the pope is trying to do: he is trying to get non-Catholic Christians at least to consider whether the Roman primacy does not make sense. At the same time, he believes, and says in the encyclical, that more and more of them *are* coming to this conclusion (UUS #89).

All in all, it is quite a performance--and one from a man from whom we have grown accustomed to seeing some rather unprecedented virtuoso performances!

The point of the pope's proposal, then, is that, if Christians truly desirous of Christian unity cannot say what *else* or where else the primacy, or the Church's center of unity, might possibly be, then they too have seriously got to consider what the Roman primacy historically has been and is. The pope's proposal for ecumenical dialogue concerning the exercise of the primacy, then, is surely one more of this remarkable pontiff's heroic efforts--an effort which in the nature of things can surely only yield results over the course of time--in the noble cause for which Christ prayed, namely: "That they all may be one...so that the world may believe that you have sent me..." (Jn 17:21). Let us too, then, pray and work as well towards that same aim of Christian unity in whatever way it may be given us to do so.

"The Catholic Church is by the will of Christ the teacher of truth. It is her duty to proclaim and teach with authority the truth which is Christ and, at the same time, to declare and confirm by her authority the principles of the moral order which spring from human nature itself...in forming their consciences the faithful must pay careful attention to the sacred and certain teaching of the Church" (DH #14).

Was Cardinal Newman the Ghost-Writer of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*?

A Paper delivered by the Reverend Peter M. J. Stravinskis, Ph.D., S.T.D., to the Conference on the Philosophical Legacy of John Henry Newman at Franciscan University of Steubenville, on 20 October 2001.

Having taught courses in the philosophy of education in two of the largest Catholic universities of the country for twenty years, I have more than a passing interest in the field. When the invitation came to consider presenting a paper to this Conference to commemorate the bicentennial of Cardinal Newman's birth, I immediately thought of his magisterial work, *The Idea of a University*, written exactly 150 years ago, referred to by Cardinal Bevilacqua as "a work of great subtlety."¹ Fresh in my mind also was that our episcopal conference just completed a decade-long effort to bring Pope John Paul II's *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* to life in our nation. Could there be a connection between the visions of Newman and Wojtyla?

Both men spent considerable portions of their lives as university professors and chaplains. Both wrote only major work on the nature of a Catholic university: Newman to prepare for the opening of the Catholic University of Ireland; John Paul II to prevent the collapse of Catholic higher education worldwide. Both struggled to see their vision implemented: Newman failed; the jury is still out on Wojtyla.

Many have noted that Cardinal Newman was the "unseen father" at Vatican II, and I don't think that is much of an exaggeration. The present Holy Father, like every single one of his predecessors from the nineteenth century forward, has made no secret of his esteem for the Venerable convert on numerous occasions. One could highlight the fact, for instance, that aside from popes, councils and the beatified or

canonized, Newman is the only person cited in *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* – and on three occasions, no less. Of course, the Pope also concluded his homily at the latest consistory by evoking the memory of Cardinal Newman and by presenting him as a model for cardinals of the third millennium.

So, I don't think it far-fetched to suppose a Newmanian influence on the composition of *Ex Corde*; in fact, a glance at the footnotes surfaces three direct quotes. I submit, however, that closer examination of the document reveals distinct and loud echoes of Newman's voice, as well as a tone which is unmistakably suffused with the thought and spirit of John Henry Newman. Permit me to serve as your guide through this investigation by moving back and forth between the Cardinal and the Pope.

1. What is a Catholic university?

Newman launches into this matter with all deliberateness: “. . . when the Church founds a University,” he says, “she is not cherishing talent, genius or knowledge, for their own sake, but for the sake of her children, with a view to their spiritual welfare and their religious influence and usefulness, with the object of training them to fill their respective posts in life better, and of making them more intelligent, capable, active members of society.”²

The title of Pope John Paul II's apostolic exhortation is carefully chosen; in fact, he has been referring to Catholic schools as “the very heart of the Church” at least since 1981, if my tracking has been accurate.³ The Holy Father sets the stage by locating the university as having been “born from the heart of the Church.” Indeed, he makes a point which most commentators, Catholic and secular alike, fail to recall: that it was the Catholic Church which created not Catholic universities but the entire concept and system of university education. So much for George Bernard Shaw's snide remark that speaking of “a Catholic university is a contradiction in terms.”

“It is the honor and responsibility of a Catholic university to consecrate itself without reserve to *the cause of truth* [n. 4, emphasis in original],” teaches the Pope.⁴ And then, directly quoting Cardinal Newman, he speaks of the Church's “intimate conviction that truth is its real ally. . . and that knowledge and reason are sure ministers to faith.”⁵

One cannot gainsay the centrality of truth in the educational process, and here the Pope's admiration for Newman knows no bounds, having referred to him as an “ardent disciple of truth.”⁶ Indeed, Newman made the battle for truth the *cause célèbre* of his life, fighting against “liberalism” in religion, which he defined as the belief that “there is no positive truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another.”⁷ Quite movingly does Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua describe Newman's commitment to this cause:

Cardinal Newman's life is a testimony to the liberating power of the truth and a warning about the slavery awaiting those who exalt freedom above all. Unless our freedom is built on the rock of truth, our poor wills will be, as the Apostle says, “tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the cunning of men, by their craftiness in deceitful wiles” [Eph 4: 14]. Without the kindly light of truth, human freedom gets lost amid the encircling gloom.⁸

The Holy Father goes on to identify four “*essential characteristics*,” to use his terminology, qualities that must be present in any university which wishes to be known as Catholic; they are worth citing in full:

- “1. A Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the university community as such;
- “2. A continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic Faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seeks to contribute by its own research;
- “3. Fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church;
- “4. An institutional commitment to the service of the People of God and of the human family

in their pilgrimage to the transcendent goal which gives meaning to life.”⁹

Then follows counsel for all who make up the university community, which community must be, he says, “animated by the Spirit of Christ.” The Pope further argues that no true community can exist without “a common dedication to the truth, a common vision of the dignity of the human person and, ultimately, the person and message of Christ.” This last element, he maintains, is precisely what “gives the institution its distinctive character”[n. 21]. University teachers are thus not merely providers of academic formation; they are called to be “witnesses and educators of authentic Christian life.” Most importantly, the Holy Father says, it should be evident that these men and women have achieved an “integration between faith and life and between professional competence and Christian wisdom”[n. 22]. Nor should one expect that because many of them are members of the laity that this dimension would be less apparent or even totally lacking [n. 25].

Students, having been introduced to the meaning of Christian wisdom and having seen clear, consistent and living examples of it in their professors, will logically be able to assume their roles as “the trained ‘leaders’ of tomorrow, of being witnesses to Christ in whatever place they may exercise their profession”[n. 24].

2. Why a Catholic university?

Cardinal Newman explains it thus: “. . . it is a matter of deep solicitude to Catholic prelates that their people should be taught a wisdom, safe from the excesses and vagaries of individuals, embodied in institutions which have stood the trial and received the sanction of ages. . . .”¹⁰

Ex Corde puts it this way: “In the world today, characterized by such rapid developments in science and technology, the tasks of a Catholic university assume an ever greater importance and urgency. . . . Its Christian inspiration enables it to include the moral, spiritual and religious dimension in its research, and to evaluate the attainments of science and technology in the perspective of the totality of the human person”[n. 7]. John Paul II continues:

. . . I turn to the whole Church, convinced that Catholic universities are essential to her growth and to the development of Christian culture and human progress. For this reason, the entire ecclesial community is invited to give its support to [them] and to assist them in their process of development and renewal. It is invited in a special way to guard the rights and freedoms of these institutions in civil society.

. . . [n. 11]

Along similar lines, it has been noted that Newman “urges the priority of literature over science in education,” lest the Church’s educational institutions produce little more than a generation of “technocrats”.¹¹ That does not mean that Newman was opposed to science; by no means. In fact, following in the mentality of his fellow-Oratorian of the sixteenth century, Cardinal Baronius, Newman – like Wojtyla today – had a profound respect for science and its autonomy and even contended that “many scientists have been hostile to religion because theologians have often overstepped their mark.”¹²

The Pope goes on with very practical applications of these general principles, talking about the “integration of knowledge”[n. 16] and the need to promote “dialogue between faith and reason”[n. 17]. He underscores the critical necessity for all research to be grounded in ethical and moral standards, both in “its methods and discoveries”[n. 18] because of the requirement to safeguard the dignity of the human person in all circumstances.

3. Does a Catholic university have a distinctive curriculum?

John Paul II would seem to think so, and it is what we might call “the *humanum*.” Sounding an awful lot like the old pagan Roman poet Terence, with his “*nihil humanum mihi alienum est*,” the Holy Father argues that “there is only one culture: that of man, by man and for man.” He goes on: “And thanks to her Catholic universities and their humanistic and scientific inheritance, the Church, expert in humanity, . . . explores the mysteries of humanity and of the world, clarifying them in the light of Revela-

tion"[n. 3]. Even more boldly, he declares: "By means of a kind of universal humanism, a Catholic university is completely dedicated to the research of all aspects of truth in their essential connection with the supreme Truth, Who is God" [n. 4], with the result that Catholic institutions of higher learning "are called to explore courageously the riches of Revelation and of nature, so that the united endeavor of intelligence and faith will enable people to come to the full measure of their humanity"[n. 5]. And here the Pope sounds a great deal like Irenæus with his "*gloria Dei vivens homo.*"

Having mentioned Irenæus, one is immediately led to consider Newman. What does he envision for a Catholic university curriculum? The Cardinal observes the although Pope St. Gregory the Great was not particularly fond of the literature of the pagan Greeks and Romans [although he knew it all very well] was said, by his biographer, "to have supported the hall of the Apostolic See upon the columns of the Seven Liberal Arts."¹³

As Newman presented his ideas for the founding of the Catholic University of Ireland, he applied this generic concept to a model for a curriculum:

. . . Civilization too has its common principles, and views, and teaching, and especially its books, which have more or less been given from the earliest of times. . . . In a word, the classics, and the subjects of thought and the studies to which they give rise, or, to use the term most dear to our present purpose, the Arts, have ever, on the whole, been the instruments of education which the civilized *orbis terrarum* has adopted; just as inspired works, and the lives of the saints, and the articles of faith, and the catechism, have ever been the instrument of education in the case of Christianity. And this consideration, you see, . . . invests [our project] with a solemnity and moment of a peculiar kind, for we are but reiterating an old tradition, and carrying on those August methods of enlarging the mind, and cultivating the intellect, and refining the feelings, in which the process of civilization has ever consisted.¹⁴

The venerable Cardinal also spoke specifically about "Catholic literature," for which he offers a definition: ". . . by 'Catholic literature' is not to be understood a literature which treats exclusively or even primarily of Catholic matters, of Catholic doctrine, controversy, history, persons, or politics; but it includes all subjects of literature whatever, treated as a Catholic would treat them, and as he only can treat them."¹⁵

Newman is advocating an approach to education grounded in the classics. How does one determine whether an author fits the bill? "A great author," he says, "is not one who merely has a *copia verborum*, whether in prose or verse, and can, as it were, turn on at his will any number of splendid phrases and swelling sentences; but he is one who has something to say and knows how to say it."¹⁶ He gets even more specific and even lyrical in expounding his vision:

. . . if by means of words the secrets of the heart are brought to light, pain of soul is relieved, hidden grief is carried off, sympathy conveyed, counsel imparted, experience recorded, and wisdom perpetuated, – if by great authors the many are drawn up into unity, national character is fixed, a people speaks, the past and the future, the East and the West are brought into communication with each other, – if such men are, in a word, the spokesmen and prophets of the human family, – it will not answer to make light of literature or to neglect its study; rather we may be sure that, in proportion as we master in whatever language, and imbibe its spirit, we shall ourselves become in our own measure ministers of like benefits to others, be they many or few, be they in the obscurer or the more distinguished walks of life, – who are united to us by social ties, and are within the sphere of our personal influence.¹⁷

Few commentators have missed how Newman was most impressed by the role "personal influence" played in the lives of people, as is the Pope, who stresses the critical importance of having faculty and administrators provide appropriate role models for the student population. John Paul II also underscores the "irreplaceable lay vocation" in the University apostolate [n. 25]. Yet again, the Holy Father relies on Newman's apprehension here: "Cardinal Newman

describes the ideal to be sought in this way: 'A habit of mind is formed which lasts through life, of which the attributes are freedom, equitableness, calmness, moderation, and wisdom.'"¹⁸ "The *humanum*" comes across loud and clear again.

4. What is the place of theology within the curriculum?

Is there a place? Cardinal Newman framed it as a syllogism:

A university, I should lay down, by its very name professes to teach universal knowledge. Theology is surely a branch of knowledge: how then is it possible to profess all branches of knowledge, and yet to exclude from the subjects of its teaching one which, to say the least, is as important and as large as any of them? I do not see that either premiss of this argument is open to exception.¹⁹

He presses the point the point even further: "Religious doctrine is knowledge, in as full a sense as Newton's doctrine is knowledge. University teaching without theology is simply unphilosophical. Theology has at least as good a right to claim a place there as astronomy."²⁰

When Newman tries to understand and explain why theology found itself being slowly but surely driven to the margins of academia, he offers a fascinating insight. He suggests the reason was rather simple, namely, that theology had become classified as little more than "taste and sentiment,"²¹ with everything reduced to subjectivity. In other words, the great irony is that theology's Enlightenment-influenced movement away from objective truth has been its own undoing.

Cardinal Newman also realized the possibility for excessive claims on the part of theology, and so he warned theologians and other scholars as well: "... according as we are only physiologists, or only politicians, or only moralists, so is our idea of man more or less unreal."²² Tunnel vision is bad for everyone, which is why he went on to say that what would make him a poor academic would be if "I carried out my science irrespectively of other sciences."²³ Why? Because

"all knowledge forms one whole, because its subject-matter is one."²⁴ Without fear of contradiction, Newman maintains "that the systematic omission of any one science from the catalogue prejudices the accuracy and completeness of our knowledge altogether."²⁵ And when we do, we shall see without a doubt how theology is "the soul of the university." Here he waxes eloquent:

In a word, religious truth is not only a portion, but a condition of general knowledge. To blot it out is nothing short, if I may so speak, of unravelling the web of university teaching. It is, according to the Greek proverb, to take the

Spring from out of the year; it is to imitate the preposterous proceeding of those tragedians who represented a drama with the omission of its principal part.²⁶

Ex Corde notes the central place for theology in a Catholic institution of higher learning and the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to the various subjects, such that the unity of all truth is acknowledged and becomes apparent. Therefore, we read that theology "serves all other disciplines in their search for meaning, not only by helping them to investigate how their discoveries will affect individuals and society but also by bringing a perspective and an orientation not contained within their own methodologies." However, this is not a one-way street, for the "interaction with these other disciplines and their discoveries enriches theology, offering it a better understanding of the world today, and making theological research more relevant to current needs"[n. 19]. Hence, the need for every Catholic university to "have a faculty, or at least a chair, of theology." Needless to say, the Pope observes that Catholic theology must be "taught in a manner faithful to Scripture, Tradition and the Church's Magisterium"[n. 20].

5. What is the relationship between the Catholic university and the Church?

The Pope tackles this core problem of the past few decades, begun with the "Land o' Lakes Statement" in 1967.²⁷ In the most unequivocal terms possible, he asserts that such a relationship "is essential to [the university's] institutional identity." Furthermore, he declares that non-

Catholic members of the university community “are required to respect the Catholic character” of the institution, even as the university “respects their religious liberty” [n. 27]. Bishops have an indispensable role to play in Catholic colleges, engaging in “close and consistent cooperation and continuing dialogue” with the university authorities. Because of the nature of this relationship, bishops cannot under any circumstances be regarded “as external agents” to the life of a university which wishes to be Catholic; in truth, they are active “participants in [its] life” [n. 28]. John Paul II also reminds us that Catholic theologians have a right to academic freedom like all other professors. A critical part of that right, however, is also concerned with being faithful to the principles and methods proper to the discipline of theology, which is to say, fidelity to the Church’s Scripture, Tradition and Magisterium [n. 29].

Rightly, then, does the Code of Canon Law stipulate: “In Catholic universities it is the duty of the competent statutory authority to ensure that there be appointed teachers who are not only qualified in scientific and pedagogical expertise, but are also outstanding in their integrity of doctrine and uprightness of life” [c. 810]. The Code goes on to require of presidents and those entrusted with teaching in areas related to faith and morals a profession of faith, which has been drawn up by the Apostolic See [cf. c. 833].

But more than a century before the present Holy Father, Cardinal Newman – that great advocate of academic freedom – was capable of stating in the strongest language: “Hence a direct and active jurisdiction of the Church over [a Catholic university] and in its necessary, lest it should become the rival of the Church with the community at large in those theological matters which to the Church are exclusively committed.”²⁸ And there is more: “It is no sufficient security for the Catholicity of a university, even that the whole of Catholic theology should be professed in it, unless the Church breathes her own pure and unearthly spirit into it, and fashions and molds its organization, and watches over its teaching, and knits together its pupils, and superintends its action.”²⁹ Interestingly, Newman brings forth as an example of an institution which ran amok,

precisely because of the lack of a direct link to the institutional Church, the Spanish Inquisition.³⁰

A theology of *communio* underlies *Ex Corde*’s³¹ notions of how everything fits together in a Catholic university. In this regard, the Pope once more cites Newman directly as he writes: “Cardinal Newman observes that a university ‘professes to assign to each study which it receives its proper place and its just boundaries; to define the rights, to establish the mutual relations and to effect the intercommunion of one and all.’”³² Was it Cardinal George of Chicago who suggested that the issue was not the place of the Church in the university but the place of the university in the Church?

Some concluding considerations

The Holy Father has much more to say on other significant issues, but time does not permit adequate attention to be given to such things as how the Catholic university serves both the Church and society; what kind of pastoral ministry should be exercised on campus; the unique contribution which should be made to contemporary culture by Catholic colleges; and the central place of evangelization in university priorities, goals and objectives. In this context, it is worth looking to Newman’s thoughts on University preaching, for they are reflective of his overall approach to pastoral ministry for University students.

Allow me now to highlight a few of the more salient points of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* and *The Idea of a University*.

1. Notice that Pope John Paul II, like Newman a century earlier, stresses the existence of the Catholic university for the advancement of truth. That should be the case for any institution of higher learning, but in this post-Enlightenment period in which we find ourselves, academia has lost its moorings in its abandonment of belief in truth. Truth as been replaced by opinion and/or ideology – at least as far as religious matters are concerned, although we note with fascination

ARTICLES

that in math class two plus two still equals four, regardless of personal opinion or fancy and regardless of anyone's suggestion that such a position might be "authoritarian".

2. I hope you did not miss the Pope's appeal to an interdisciplinary approach to learning – another "Newmanian" echo. Indeed, the Catholic philosophy of education is rooted in our belief that all truth is one, causing us to operate from a unified vision of reality. No unhealthy compartmentalization for us! For we recall that the word "university" itself means that the various disciplines are presented and studied in such a manner as to "turn toward the one," converging in what the Pope calls "a single reality,"³³ that is, bringing all the little truths of the several sciences into unity in the one great Truth, Who is the Inspiration and Source of all academic inquiry. Therefore, what is learned in one department of a university should eventually mesh in a holistic way with what is gained in another. And while there is no such thing as a Catholic brand of math or a Catholic take on science, our ethical and moral reflection must necessarily undergird it all. Therefore, we should be able to say with confidence that in a truly Catholic university the truths of the Catholic Faith will never be contradicted in any forum, if for no other reason than the simple fact that all truth is one and mutually reinforcing. Way back in the third century, Tertullian asked what he thought was a rhetorical question: "What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" By which, he meant to imply that theology and humanistic sciences had little or nothing to do with each other. The Church disagreed in a definitive fashion and, in the midst of the Age of Faith, she began the university system.

3. Both Newman and Wojtyla place in clear relief the fact that in a Catholic university the local bishop and the teaching authority of the Church can never be perceived as extrinsic, let alone oppressive, realities. Since the Catholic educational institution comes into existence because of faith, is sustained because of faith, and has its only valid rationale because of faith, it is patently absurd to regard matters of faith as foreign or alien to its life.

4. The Pope obviously expects great things from Catholic colleges, something besides mere cosmetic changes in many instances. More than crucifixes on classroom walls and collars on the clergy is being sought – although these two are certainly steps in the right direction. What the Pontiff has in mind is an educational establishment which breathes Catholic air, and that can come from nothing less than a total permeation of the curriculum and every other program with a fully Catholic spirit. And this philosophy of education jumps off every page of Cardinal Newman's *Idea of a University*.

In sum, could we argue, basing ourselves on Newman and Wojtyla, that the only true university is a Catholic university, *pace* George Bernard Shaw?

The Holy Father issued *Ex Corde* on the Solemnity of the Assumption in 1990. Throughout his pontificate, he has consistently presented the *Sedes Sapientiae* as the model for Catholic scholars. Once more, we find a connection to Cardinal Newman here, for it was Newman, who said that Our Lady was a model for simple believers and for theologians alike because she operated from faith and reason at one and the same time. The great convert wrote:

Thus, St. Mary is our pattern of faith, both in the reception and the study of Divine Truth. She does not think it enough to accept, she dwells upon it; not enough to submit to the Reason, she reasons upon it; and not indeed reasoning first, and believing afterwards, with Zacharias, yet first believing without reasoning, next from love and reverence, reasoning after believing. And thus she symbolizes to us, not only the faith of the unlearned, but of the doctors of the Church also, who have to investigate, and weigh, and define, as well as to profess the Gospel; to draw the line between truth and heresy; to anticipate or remedy the various aberrations of wrong reason; to combat pride and recklessness with their own arms; and thus to triumph over the sophist and the innovator.³⁴

May the Virgin who guided the steps of Cardinal Newman to the fullness of truth, as she has guided Pope John Paul II, ensure for us a Catho-

lic Academy of the third millennium which is wholly directed toward her Son, Who is Truth Incarnate.

Endnotes

¹"Ecclesia – Magistra Veritatis, Mater Universitatis," *The Nature of Catholic Higher Education* (Steubenville, Ohio: The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, 1995), 9.

²*The Idea of a University* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947), xii.

³"Pope: Schools Are Heart of Church," *Catholic Standard and Times*, 26 November 1981, 12.

This is what St. Augustine in his *Confessions* calls the *gaudium de veritate* [X, xxiii, 33]. Indeed, a Catholic university is uniquely situated for this task since the Church is "the place of truth," as Walter Cardinal Kasper has put it in his contribution to *Theology and Church*, [New York: Crossroad, 1989, 129-147].

⁵*Idea*, xi.

⁶*Osservatore Romano* (1990), n. 18, 11.

⁷His "Biglietto Speech" in W. P. Neville [ed.], *Addresses to Cardinal Newman with His Replies, etc.* (New York: ----, 1905), 64.

⁸Bevilacqua, 6. This was the Keynote Address given to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars in 1995, meeting in Minneapolis on the nature of Catholic higher education; interestingly, 13 of Cardinal Bevilacqua's 55 citations are to Newman.

⁹The Pontiff has actually made his own criteria found in the final document of the Second International Congress of Delegates of Catholic Universities, which had met in Rome during November of 1972.

¹⁰*Idea*, xxii.

¹¹Frank Turner [ed.], *The Idea of a University* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), xvi.

¹²Turner, xvii.

¹³*Idea*, 261

¹⁴*Idea*, 256.

¹⁵*Idea*, 296.

¹⁶*Idea*, 291

¹⁷*Idea*, 293f.

¹⁸*Ex Corde*, footnote 23 (*Idea*, 101f).

¹⁹*Idea*, 18f.

²⁰*Idea*, 38. Way back in 1929, Pope Pius XI saw it all most lucidly when he wrote in *Divini Illius Magistri* that "the so-called neutral school form which religion is excluded is contrary to the fundamental principles of education. Such a school

moreover cannot exist in practice; it is bound to become irreligious." Even Thomas Jefferson, in founding the University of Virginia recognized the necessity of including theology in the curriculum

²¹*Idea*, 26.

²²*Idea*, 43.

²³*Idea*, 45.

²⁴*Ibid.*

²⁵*Idea*, 46.

²⁶*Idea*, 62.

²⁷In 1967, representative officials of nearly every major Catholic institution of higher learning in the United States met to discuss the future course of their endeavors. Their vision was enshrined in their now-famous "Land o' Lakes Statement," in which we find the clarion call: "To perform its teaching and research functions effectively, the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself."

²⁸*Idea*, 215.

²⁹*Idea*, 216.

³⁰Cf. *Idea*, 215f.

³¹Particularly *ad rem* is the observation of the Reverend Joseph Komonchak: Both the Pope and the Church look at the Catholic university as being *in* the Church; the relationship, then, is internal and not adversarial [Cf. "The Catholic University in the Church," in John P. Langan [ed.], *Catholic Universities in Church and Society: A Dialogue on Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1993). The Most Reverend James Malone likewise identifies this notion as part of the Church's theology of *communio* [Cf. "Sharing Responsibility: University and Bishop," *Origins*, 16 February 1995, 582]. The Reverend J. A. DiNoia, O.P., handles the same topic in "Communion and Magisterium: Teaching Authority and the Culture of Grace," *Modern Theology*, October 1993, 403-418. Also instructive in this regard is Edward J. Miller's "How Cardinal Newman Might Understand *Ex Corde's* *Communio*," *The Newman Newsletter*, August 2001, 2+.

³²*Ex Corde*, footnote 19 (*Idea*, 457).

³³Cited by him in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* at footnote 20.

³⁴Sermon XV, "The Theory of Development in Religious Doctrine," *Oxford University Sermons* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909), 313f.

Jesus and the Spiritual Equality of Women

by Catherine Brown Tkacz

Jesus with loving care and thoroughness demonstrates the spiritual equality of men and women.¹ In his preaching as recorded in the Gospels, he repeatedly provides male and female examples in parables and prophecy. In his ministry of teaching and healing he interacts with men and with women so that persons of each sex are able to approach, to converse with, to misunderstand, alas, but also to learn from, to seek healing from, to obtain forgiveness from, and to intercede for others with God incarnate. His disciples are at the very least encouraged by him to have respect for the spiritual equality of the sexes, and more likely they learn it from him. Certainly Sts. Paul and Peter in their letters show the same balanced treatment of the sexes as does Jesus, and also the same care to provide male and female examples.² This serves two pastoral ends, providing women with female examples with which they can identify, and demonstrating to everyone that truly the sexes are spiritually equal. A consideration of the evidence from throughout the Gospels showing spiritual equality of the sexes leads to the natural question, "Why did Jesus intend by demonstrating this equality?" The question is of some moment now, when there is considerable interest in declaring women capable of being ordained Catholic priests.³ And the answer does pertain, powerfully and movingly, to the sacraments.

Men and Women in Jesus's Teachings

Jesus gives paired male and female examples frequently often enough to suggest a deliberate emphasis of male and female equality in moral and spiritual matters. He gives new prominence to the balance sometimes found in the Old Testament (e.g., Ecclesiasticus 17.1-3). For instance, Jesus explains that he came "to set at variance a man against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law" (Matt. 10.35). One must love

Christ more than any family member, male or female, father or mother, daughter or son (Matt. 10.37, 19.29). The tax collectors and the harlots believed John the Baptist when the chief priests and elders rejected him (Matt. 21.31-2). Jesus tells his disciples that a man who puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery, and that a woman who puts away her husband and marries another commits adultery (Mark 10.11-12).⁴ Giving examples of faith outside of the Jews, Jesus cites the widow of Zarephath, to whom Elijah was sent, and then Naaman the Syrian whom Eli healed (Luke 4:24-27). Moral authority can reside in both men and women: he prophesies that the Ninevites and the Queen of the South will rise up and condemn those who do not acknowledge Christ (Matt. 12.41-2, Luke 11:29-32). Jesus's description of the coming of the Son of Man is rich in male and female examples: the man on the housetop and the man in the field are not to turn back but to remember Lot's wife. Of two men in bed, only one will be taken; of two women grinding, only one will be taken; of two men in the field, only one will be taken. Woe to those who give suck in those days (Matt. 24.17-19, 40-41; Luke 17:30-35).

While most parables use male examples, Jesus also devises pairs of parables that together show sexual balance. The kingdom of heaven is like a mustard seed that a man plants (Matt. 13.31-2, Luke 13.18-9), like leaven that a woman mixes in the dough (Matt. 13.33, Luke 13:20-1). The five wise and five foolish virgins (Matt. 25.1-13) represent all the faithful, male and female; so do the various servants to whom the talents are entrusted (vv. 14-29). Rejoicing over one repentant sinner is like the joy a man leads his friends in when he has found his one lost sheep (Luke 15:4-7), or like the joy a woman leads her friends in when she has recovered her one lost coin (vv. 8-10). Thus Jesus offers both male and female examples with which his people may identify. At the same time he also expects them to see the moral point regardless of the sex of the example.

For instance, to the Pharisee at whose home he is dining Jesus explains his reception of the woman who washes his feet by means of the parable of the debtors (Luke 7:37-50). Sometimes the femaleness of his example is meant to chide his auditors, because men are failing to do what a lone woman simply accomplishes: for instance, in contrast to the rich men with gifts that are not sacrifices, given their wealth, the widow offers her mite, true generosity (Luke 21:1-4).⁵

In his encounters with individual persons, too, one sees that men and women are equally treated. Jesus heals a man with an unclean spirit, and then a woman, Peter's mother-in-law.⁶ The woman with the flux of blood seeks Jesus for her own healing (Matt. 9:20-2, Mark 5:25-34). Jairus intercedes for his daughter, and Mary and Martha intercede for their brother Lazarus, and in each case Jesus resuscitates their loved ones.⁷ The woman of Canaan intercedes for her daughter (Matt. 15:22-8, Mark 7:25-31). Jesus forgives the woman taken in adultery and directs her to sin no more (John 8:2-11), and he forgives the sins of the paralytic before healing his body (Matt. 9:1-8, Mark 2:1-12, Luke 5:17-26), though in neither case did the person ask for forgiveness. He loves all three siblings of Bethany, Lazarus, Mary, and Martha (John 11:5).

Men and women are also alike in their human tendency to misunderstand Jesus. Peter's first refusing to allow Jesus to wash his feet, and then asking him to wash not just his feet but his hands and head also, provide a notable male example of misunderstanding (John 13:1-10). The mother of the sons of Zebedee asks inappropriate advancement for them (Matt. 20:21-22), yet she is present at the crucifixion (Matt. 27:55-6). The Samaritan woman at first misunderstands what Jesus means by living water (John 4:10-5), and the multitude misunderstands what he means by "the true bread from heaven" (John 6:30-4). Notably, it is the Samaritan woman who moves beyond incomprehension to faith, while many of the multitude depart.⁸

The contrast between how the Samaritan woman and the Pharisees respond to Jesus is striking. Jesus asks water of the woman at Jacob's well, and in their ensuing conversation he reveals himself as the living water and discloses her own history to her, so that she asks outright if he is the Messiah. He answers in the powerful phrase of God's self-revelation to Abraham and Moses, "I am" (John 4:26; Exod. 3:14). She reports to the community that he is the Messiah (v. 28), they come to see him, for many believed her testimony (v. 39), and Jesus stays with them for two days (vv. 40-43). In contrast, the Pharisees at the Temple try to elicit blasphemous statements from Jesus in a long dialogue that culminates in his again iterating that powerful phrase—now with emphasis by final position in the entire lengthy dialogue: "Before Abraham was made, I am" (John 8:58). But the Pharisees' response is to try to stone him. If memory serves, this is the only biblical instance of God's self-revelation as "I am" that is despised. Thus the unnamed woman at Jacob's well shares with Moses the role of receiving God's self-revelation. This woman, who as a Samaritan is an outsider and as an adulteress is a sinner, recognized Jesus as Christ and evangelized her town, while the men, Jews in Jerusalem itself, in the Temple, hate him. Similarly, the true neighbor in Jesus's parable is not the priest or the Levite but the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37).

Moreover, the Holy Spirit evidently arranged for both sexes to acknowledge and accompany Jesus at signal moments in his life. Face-to-face professions of faith will be considered last. At the Visitation, both Elizabeth and her unborn son John acknowledge the unborn Christ and the Theotokos (Luke 1:40-5). Indeed, one may argue that Elizabeth and John are the first of the older and younger "generations" that Mary then proclaims will call her blessed (v. 48).⁹ Again, both Mary, pregnant with Jesus, and Zachariah, immediately upon the birth of his son John, utter canticles of praise and prophecy (Luke 1:46-56, 67-79). Both Simeon and Anna are inspired to recognize the infant Jesus as the Messiah (Luke 2:29-32, 34-38).

The words of these witnesses, male and female, become the perennial prayers of the faithful, who echo Mary's *Magnificat* and, in the *Ave Maria*, Elizabeth's inspired pronouncement, as well as Zachariah's *Benedictus* and Symeon's *Nunc Dimittis*.

During the Passion of Christ and at his Resurrection, his female followers become more visible and active than the male ones. In the Passion of Christ, women are among those who receive some of the last prophetic words of Jesus: as he carries the cross he addresses the grieving women following him as "Daughters of Jerusalem" and prophesies (Luke 23.27-31). Although the men, all but John, are evidently hiding, women are present at the crucifixion: "There were also many women there, looking on from afar, who had followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering to him; among whom were Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joseph and the mother of the sons of Zebedee" (Matt. 27.55-6). John records as present Jesus's mother, her sister Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene (John 19.25).

Women are the first persons to hear of the resurrection, and to speak of it. They go to the sepulchre of Christ to prepare his body for burial. Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and other women (Matt. 27.61, Luke 24:10, Mark 16.1). John recounts Mary Magdalene's journey to the sepulchre, meeting with Christ, and announcing his resurrection (John 21.1-2, 11-8), while the synoptic Gospels relate that other women as well are commissioned by the angel to witness the empty tomb and to announce the resurrection to the disciples (Matt. 28.5--10, Luke 23:55-24:11). On the road to Emmaus again the testimony of the women is recalled by Cleopas and his fellow disciple, who add that other disciples confirmed the women's report of the empty tomb (Luke 24:22-24). The women's actual words are not recorded in scripture, but ancient Byzantine tradition imaginatively supplies direct discourse for the women's witness to the Resurrection. On Easter Sunday the following

troparion is sung during matins and again as a hymn during communion at Divine Liturgy:

O Women, be the heralds of good news and tell what you saw, tell of the vision and say to Sion: "*Accept the good news of joy from us, the news that Christ has risen.*" Exult and celebrate and rejoice, O Jerusalem, seeing Christ the King coming from the tomb like a bridegroom.¹⁰

The Confessions of Peter and Martha

Comparing the professions of faith in Jesus by different men and women show that the fullest confession is by a woman, Martha of Bethany; Peter's profession is prior, but hers is fuller. Other professions include that of the man born blind, after he has been healed (John 9.38), and Thomas, after physically seeing and touching the wounds of the resurrected Christ (John 20.28). But Peter and Martha each profess Christ in stressful circumstances that test faith. All four Gospels record Peter's profession of faith.¹¹ The Johannine account alone provides the context: Peter and the other disciples have heard the astounding declaration by Jesus that they are to eat his flesh and drink his blood (John 5.48-52), horrific statements to Jews who religiously avoid consuming any creature's blood (Lev. 7.26). Many followers depart, and Jesus asks the twelve if they, too, will go. John's account presents Peter replying on behalf of the disciples, in the plural, with a double predicate—"we know and we have learned that you are the Holy One of God".¹² Following Peter's affirmation of faith, Jesus declares him the Rock on which Jesus will build his church.

Martha's profession of faith is associated with the raising of her brother Lazarus. Now, one may note a progression in the evidential power of the miraculous resuscitations Jesus performs: Jairus' daughter died moments before Jesus revived her (Matt. 9.18-9, 23-25; Mark 5.21-24, 35-43). The widow of Naim's son had been dead longer, and his body was being

taken for burial when Jesus resuscitated the boy (Luke 7:11-14). But Lazarus had actually been dead and buried for four days before Jesus recalled him to life (John 11:39). The most dramatic miracle of resuscitation is thus the third, the one performed in the suburbs of Jerusalem shortly before Christ goes to his Passion and to his Resurrection after three days. Surely the raising of Lazarus calls for a more thorough profession of faith in Jesus.

But Martha makes her affirmation before the miracle. Martha professes Jesus while grieving at the very threshold of her brother's tomb. She affirms her faith in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus then asserts—again with the ringing “I am” of the Burning Bush—“I am the resurrection and the life” (John 11:25-26). As with Peter, so now with Martha Jesus elicits a profession of faith, for he asks if she believes. She might have simply answered, “Yes.” Instead her profession is the Gospels' most complete statement affirming faith in Jesus. Martha asserts: “Yes, Lord, I know that you are the Christ, the Son of God who has come into the world” (John 11:27).¹³ Immediately after her affirmation of faith, Jesus performs his most dramatic miracle, and the one typologically most powerful, for Lazarus' being raised is a type of the hope of all the faithful to be raised by our merciful Lord on the Last Day.

Jesus elicited from a woman the fullest statement of faith that the Gospels record a human being to have made face-to-face with the Lord. Martha's capacity to receive and to articulate this faith epitomizes women's equality with men spiritually: both sexes are fully capable of the understanding and virtue needed for holiness. Peter and Martha both profess Jesus as Messiah, and Martha more fully than Peter. Yet Martha is not one of the twelve, while Peter is the head of the church. This difference is itself important evidence of Jesus's intentions in forming the new church.

Jesus transformed much. In order to begin to realize the original promise made to the patriarchs, that through them all nations would be

blessed,¹⁴ Jesus expanded upon the positive prior contacts with Gentiles, such as Naaman the Syrian, and Ruth the Moabite, to preach to Samaritans and send the disciples first to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles. Whereas the priesthood established on Sinai was assigned to men descended from Levi,¹⁵ God chose the house of David—who was descended from Judah, not Levi¹⁶—as the lineage of the foster-father of Jesus. Without reference to their tribes, Jesus called twelve men as his disciples (e.g., John 1:38-44, 6:68-71, 20:24). Women he showed over and over again to be spiritually equal with men, yet he did not call them to be of the twelve. The twelve male disciples were at the Last Supper, the First Eucharist with him, by his arrangement (Matt. 26:17-20). After his Resurrection, he appeared to Mary in the garden, and commissioned her to announce his Rising to the disciples. But to the disciples alone did he bestow his peace and the priestly power to forgive sins (John 20:22-3). Them did he commission to baptize and teach all nations (Matt. 28:18-20, Mark 16:15-6). Jesus reserved the priesthood to men, men whom he called.

Then what is implied by the clear demonstration by Jesus of the spiritual equality of men and women? He did nothing in vain, and the thoroughness with which he taught, healed, resuscitated, forgave, and loved both men and women shows the importance of the teaching that men and women are spiritually equal. The point seems to be that the sexes are equal, not in the capacity to be called to administer the basic sacraments, but in the essential capacity to receive them and to be transformed by them.

At the remove of two millennia from Jesus's Resurrection, we may easily neglect to consider how ambiguous the Last Supper could have seemed as a model for the transformed Church's new liturgy. How easy it would have been to construe the all-male complement at the Last Supper as indicating that more than the priesthood was restricted to men, that the very reception of the eucharist was also intended exclusively for men, or perhaps only for

priests. Jesus had said, "Unless you eat of the flesh of the son of man, you will not have life within you," but how were the twelve to know to whom "you" referred? After all, following his self-revelation as the Bread of Life, only the twelve remained, and they were the men at the Last Supper.

Moreover, the eucharistic types that Jesus had spoken of and that the New Testament evokes and discusses point to different possible relationships that the faithful might have with the sacrament. After feeding the multitude miraculously, some of his followers speak of the manna from heaven, and he teaches that he is the bread of life, in language that reiterates the Old Testament descriptions of the manna.¹⁷ Jesus himself chose to make the actual celebration with his disciples of the traditional Pascha, with its lamb, to initiate the new Pascha of himself, using the bread and wine. The Gospel narratives further pair the death of the paschal lamb with the death of Jesus, for instance, by noting that the bones of neither were broken.¹⁸ Elsewhere other types are discussed, notably showing that Jesus fulfils and surpasses the prefiguration of the high priest (e.g., Heb. 4.14-15.10) and his blood sanctifies as the prior sacrifices of bulls and goats and heifers could not (Heb. 9.13-4, Lev. 16, Num. 19). The paschal lamb was eaten by everyone; the manna in the wilderness was consumed by everyone. But sacrificial animals offered as holocausts were consumed by no one.

From the outset of the Incarnation, by emphasizing that women are spiritually equal with men, God had acted to prevent the Church from the mistake of restricting reception of the eucharist to men alone. The Holy Spirit had directed that both male and female persons would acknowledge even the gestating Jesus and then the infant presented in the Temple. Jesus through his teaching and parables and interactions with people had made it clear that the sexes are spiritually equal. A precious result of this consistent demonstration of the spiritual equality was that women had, and

have, equal access to the sacraments of life: Baptism, Eucharist, Confession, Anointing. While the priesthood is reserved in mystery to men, from the start women have been recognized as full participants in the sacramental life of the Church.

Endnotes

¹ See also Patricia Ranft, *Women and Spiritual Equality in Christian Tradition* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998).

² From Jesus, his disciples learn this moral and spiritual equality of the sexes. St. Peter even augments the proverb of the dog returning to its vomit with a female example from the natural world, a washed sow returning to the mire (2 Pet. 2.20, citing Prov. 26.11). St. Paul, in his famous advice regarding marriage, treats of the reciprocal responsibilities in love of both spouses (Eph. 5.22-3). Augustine was to build on this and take a revolutionary stand against the prevalent Roman view of adultery as heinous in a woman but no fault in a man, preaching and advising instead that it was equally wrong in a husband or a wife; Katherin A. Rogers, "Equal Before God: Augustine on the Nature and Role of Women," pp. 169-185 in *Nova Doctrina Vetusque: Essays on Early Christianity in Honor of Fredric W. Schlatter, S.J.*, ed. Douglas Kries and Catherine Brown Tkacz, American University Studies VII: Theology and Religion (New York: Peter Lang, 1999); see p. 177 and n. 17, with regard to St. Paul's original advice. Perhaps even Jesus's example of using maternal imagery for himself (Matt. 23.37, Luke 13.14) suggested to St. Paul his comparison of himself to a nurse caring for children (1 Thess. 2.8); certainly St. Paul's image is fittingly subordinate to Jesus's. James gives two examples of faith with works, Abraham and Rahab (James 2.20-26, perhaps with wordplay on their names).

³ Valuable critiques of the arguments made for the ordination of women include Francis Martin, *The Feminist Question: Feminist Theology in the Light of Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmann's, 1994); and Benedict Ashley, *Justice in the Church: Gender and Participation* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996).

4. See also Paul's teaching that a believing wife or husband can sanctify a non-believing spouse; 1 Cor. 7.10-6.
5. In the Old Testament, too, women are often among the unexpected victors: the shepherd boy David over Goliath, Jael over Sisera, Judith over Holofernes.
6. Mark 1.23-26, 29-31; the latter in Matt. 8.14-5, Luke 4:38-39. Other healed women include the "daughter of Abraham" he heals on the sabbath from infirmity of eighteen years' duration (Luke 13:11-116), and Mary Magdalene (Luke 8:2).
7. Jairus's daughter: Matt. 9.18-9, 23-25; Mark 5.21-24, 35-43; Luke 8:41-56. Lazarus: John 11.1-45 esp. v. 3.
8. In the early Christian community Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5.1-11) demonstrate the equality of the sexes in the capacity for self-destruction by sin.
9. In heaven all generations, including those born before Mary and not just those born later, call her blessed. Elizabeth and John represent the generations immediately prior and after to Mary, the first concentric circle of the generations acknowledging her.
10. *Byzantine Liturgical Chant*, comp. John Ver-noski (Annandale, Virginia: Epiphany Byzantine Catholic Church, n.d.). Italics added.
11. Mark and Luke simply give the pith of Peter's profession— while Matthew gives the fuller affirmation: (Matt. 16:16).
12. Not surprisingly, some manuscripts and authors assimilate to this explicit affirmation found in John's account the fuller wording of the profession as recorded in Matthew, yielding: This full variation is found in the Byzantine Lectionary as well as the writings of Basil, Cyprian, and Chrysostom. See the apparatus of Aland, cited in note 3.
13. Her declaration incorporates a phrase used earlier, when the people seeing the miraculous multiplication of loaves thought Jesus must be "the one coming into the world" (John 6.14).
14. Gen. 12.1-3 (Abram), 26.1-5 (Isaac), and 28.12-5 (Jacob).
15. Exod. 28.1, 40.12-5; Num. 16.40, 18.1-8.
16. Matt. 1.2, Luke 3.23-38.
17. John 6.31-52, Exod. 16.13-4, Num. 11.7, Ps. 77.24, Wisd. 16.20.
18. Matt. 27.35, John 19.36, Exod. 12.46, Num. 9.12.

Send Address Changes to:
Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly
 Box 495
 Notre Dame, IN 46556
 E-mail to: Alice.F.Osberger.1@nd.edu

MEMBERSHIP MATTERS

Membership Matters

by THOMAS F. DAILEY, O.S.F.S.

As we roll into our 25th anniversary year, the members of the FCS continue to be active in the promotion of faith and scholarship. These are just some of the many activities in which our members have been engaged.

In terms of ADVOCACY, two members of the board have recently made public appearances, at least in print:

Prof. **Gerard Bradley** filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights in an historic case concerning the constitutionality of school vouchers. He also co-authored a public statement on military action against terrorism.

William Saunders, of the Family Research Council, authored a statement on the culture of life and published an article on the continuing problems of life in Sudan.

ARTICLES written by FCS members on a variety of topics have appeared in several different scholarly and applied journals.

John Grondelski penned two works in *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*: one on "popular devotions" (June 2001) and one on "Mary's Assumption" (July 2001).

Robert C. Jeffrey, of Wofford College, published an essay entitled "Our New Non-Political Order: The Eros of Enterprise" in the Fall 2001 issue of *Perspectives in Political Science*.

Fr. John Kobler, C.P. has a pen that never runs out of ink! In the Sept/Oct issue of *Social Justice Review* he has an article on "Michel Schooyans: Catholic Demographer" and in the Nov/Dec issue is his review of Monsignor George Kelly's book, *The Second Spring of the Church in America*.

Gerald Maring, of Washington State University, recently authored a piece on "cybermentoring" which appears in volume 4/10 (May 2001) of *Reading Online*.

Rev. Michael Orsi, chaplain at the Ave Maria School of Law, published an article about "A Law School Forum on Human-Cell lines and Frozen Embryos" in *The Linacre Quarterly* (68/2).

Cynthia Toolin announces the forthcoming publication of two articles: "From Descriptive Label to Defining Statement: The Awareness of Catholic Identity and the Universal Call to Holiness," in *Catholic Dossier*; and "Restoring Community: The Church's Urgent Task," in *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*.

And **Joseph Varacalli**, director of the Nassau Community College Center for Catholic Studies, wrote a guest article on the life of Catholic college freshmen that was published in the summer 2001 issue of *The Turnaround*, the newsletter of the Cardinal Newman Society.

FCS members have also been engaged in the publication of BOOKS:

Thomas C. Reeves chronicles *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen* (Encounter Books).

Dick Rolwing published volume 1 of his two volume revised edition of *Israel's Original Sin: A Catholic Confession* (XLIBRIS, Philadelphia). Volume 2 will be out in January.

Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki collaborated in the publication of the *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, commissioned by the Canon Law Society of America and published by Paulist Press.

And, thanks to the tireless efforts of **Kenneth Whitehead**, the 2000 Proceedings from the FCS convention in Atlanta have been published. *John Paul II – Witness to Truth* is now available from St. Augustine's Press.

On the LECTURE circuit, former FCS board member **Mary Shivanandan** has been globe-trotting. In August she delivered a lecture on "The Pope, Man and Woman" at Oxford University's celebration of John Paul II, and in October she gave a joint paper entitled "The Person as Substantive Relationship and Reproductive Technologies" at the Society of Catholic Social Scientists' conference in Ann Arbor (MI).

News from our INTERNATIONAL CHAPTERS attests to the ongoing work of members in those countries.

The FCS chapter in **Australia** held its second national conference in November. The theme was "Evangelizing the Culture: A Progress Report." The chapter also announced the launch of a web site (www.meaninglessness.org/index1.html) for the publication of **Michael Casey's** *Meaninglessness: The Solutions of Nietzsche, Freud and Rorty*. In addition, **Patrick Quirk**, the chapter's director, penned a reflection on the Timothy McVeigh case entitled "Does 'Public' Execution Include

Broadcast?" that appeared in *Annals Australasia: The Journal of Catholic Culture*.

The FCS chapter in **Canada** is planning a national conference on "Evangelization and the Media" scheduled for May 25, 2002 at the University of Guelph. For more information contact the chapter's director, **Douglas McManaman** (dougmcma@enoreo.on.ca). And congratulations to the chapter's executive secretary, **John E.G. Stone**, on the completion of his first book, entitled *Hoc Sacrificium Vivum*.

Finally, congratulations are in order for one of our long-standing FCS members. The **Most Reverend John P. Foley**, president of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications, recently received the *2001 Award for Outstanding Catholic Leadership* from the Catholic Leadership Institute in Philadelphia. Noted in the award was the Archbishop's leadership in the publication of "Ethics in Advertising" (1997) and "Ethics in Communication" (2000).

In early Spring of 2002, members should be on the lookout for information about renewing membership dues. Remember that the payment of dues is what allows the FCS to function, so please keep current!

And, as always, any questions about any Membership Matters, or information about activities, should be directed to the Office of the Executive Secretary (call 610-282-1100 ext. 1464 or fax to 610-282-2254 or send email to Thomas.Dailey@desales.edu).

Around the Church

By Dr. James Hitchcock.

Proposals to diminish papal authority in favor of semi-autonomous national episcopal conferences were a major feature of the Synod of Bishops in Rome in September. Bishop Norbert Brunner of Sion, Switzerland, proposed that the synodal structure, with delegates "freely chosen to meet regularly with the Pope," should become the normal machinery of church governance, with few issues "resolved centrally." Archbishop Ruben Salazar Gomez of Barranquilla, Colombia, said the task of the bishop is "to listen to the Spirit Who lives in His people, confirming the people in that same Spirit and leading them to achieve what that Spirit has aroused and confirmed in His Church." Bishop Jaime Henrique Chermello, president of the Brazilian bishops conference, said the Holy See's method of selecting bishops is "a source of constant suffering...a dark process, full of surprises and disappointments, in which those who are the most interested are those who influence the process the least." There were strong criticisms of papal authority from some Asian and Eastern European prelates. Archbishop Tadeusz Kondrusiewicz of Russia and Bishop Louis Pelatre of Istanbul cited Eastern Orthodox ecclesiology as a

model for the relationship between the Holy See and regional episcopal conferences. The apostolic faith has been preserved in the East despite the absence of "a humanly powerful and organized structure," Bishop Pelatre asserted.

His Beatitude Nerses Bedros XIX Tarmouni of the Armenians warned that "an excessive centralization by Rome could suffocate the riches of the particular churches," while His Beatitude Gregoire III Laham, patriarch of Antioch, asserted that "with all due respect to the Petrine ministry, the Patriarchal ministry is equal to it....Until this is taken into account in Roman ecclesiology, no progress will be made in ecumenical dialogue." The Eastern patriarchates have authority to discharge all the responsibilities currently discharged by the Papacy, according to Patriarch Gregoire. Archbishop Henry D'Souza of Calcutta dismissed both the Latin language and "Roman culture" as "dead" and insisted that they have no relevance to India, which needs "a free version" of the Bible and liturgical books, reflective of "dynamic creativity."

Bishop Paul Yoshinao Otsuka of Kyoto, Japan, told the Synod that the Japanese bishops do not "insist that the only correct answer and resolution for problems comes from a Catholic point of view" but present a message intended to stimulate

people to "think." Western delegates who questioned the present system of church governance invoked the democratic principle.

Father David Fleming, superior general of the Marianists, pointed to the "collaborative model" of governance followed in religious orders since the Second Vatican Council as now applicable to the whole Church.

Cardinal Walter Kasper, prefect of the Council for Promoting Christian Unity, asserted that ecumenical activity has the highest priority, therefore "we must create a better balance between the particular Churches and the universal Church."

Other speakers defended the authority of the Holy See, and the Synod's final recommendations, sent to Pope John Paul II, did not contain any radical proposals.

Cardinal Francis Arinze, president of the Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, acknowledged that such dialogue is obligatory but warned that "Orthodox practice has to be based on orthodoxy. The bishop is above all the teacher of the doctrine of the faith....he has to feed his people with rich doctrine..."

Cardinal Juan Sandoval Iniguez of Guadalajara, Mexico, asserted that preaching the faith is the bishops' highest duty and that "the bishop is the custodian of healthy doctrine, attentive to the correction of errors, and warning against dangers."

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger,

4. See also Paul's teaching that a believing wife or husband can sanctify a non-believing spouse; 1 Cor. 7.10-6.
5. In the Old Testament, too, women are often among the unexpected victors: the shepherd boy David over Goliath, Jael over Sisera, Judith over Holofernes.
6. Mark 1.23-26, 29-31; the latter in Matt. 8.14-5, Luke 4:38-39. Other healed women include the "daughter of Abraham" he heals on the sabbath from infirmity of eighteen years' duration (Luke 13:11-116), and Mary Magdalene (Luke 8:2).
7. Jairus's daughter: Matt. 9.18-9, 23-25; Mark 5.21-24, 35-43; Luke 8:41-56. Lazarus: John 11.1-45 esp. v. 3.
8. In the early Christian community Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5.1-11) demonstrate the equality of the sexes in the capacity for self-destruction by sin.
9. In heaven all generations, including those born before Mary and not just those born later, call her blessed. Elizabeth and John represent the generations immediately prior and after to Mary, the first concentric circle of the generations acknowledging her.
10. *Byzantine Liturgical Chant*, comp. John Vernoski (Annandale, Virginia: Epiphany Byzantine Catholic Church, n.d.). Italics added.
11. Mark and Luke simply give the pith of Peter's profession— while Matthew gives the fuller affirmation: (Matt. 16:16).
12. Not surprisingly, some manuscripts and authors assimilate to this explicit affirmation found in John's account the fuller wording of the profession as recorded in Matthew, yielding: This full variation is found in the Byzantine Lectionary as well as the writings of Basil, Cyprian, and Chrysostom. See the apparatus of Aland, cited in note 3.
13. Her declaration incorporates a phrase used earlier, when the people seeing the miraculous multiplication of loaves thought Jesus must be "the one coming into the world" (John 6.14).
14. Gen. 12.1-3 (Abram), 26.1-5 (Isaac), and 28.12-5 (Jacob).
15. Exod. 28.1, 40.12-5; Num. 16.40, 18.1-8.
16. Matt. 1.2, Luke 3.23-38.
17. John 6.31-52, Exod. 16.13-4, Num. 11.7, Ps. 77.24, Wisd. 16.20.
18. Matt. 27.35, John 19.36, Exod. 12.46, Num. 9.12.

Send Address Changes to:
Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly
 Box 495
 Notre Dame, IN 46556
 E-mail to: Alice.F.Osberger.1@nd.edu

MEMBERSHIP MATTERS

Membership Matters

by THOMAS F. DAILEY, O.S.F.S.

As we roll into our 25th anniversary year, the members of the FCS continue to be active in the promotion of faith and scholarship. These are just some of the many activities in which our members have been engaged.

In terms of ADVOCACY, two members of the board have recently made public appearances, at least in print:

Prof. **Gerard Bradley** filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights in an historic case concerning the constitutionality of school vouchers. He also co-authored a public statement on military action against terrorism.

William Saunders, of the Family Research Council, authored a statement on the culture of life and published an article on the continuing problems of life in Sudan.

ARTICLES written by FCS members on a variety of topics have appeared in several different scholarly and applied journals.

John Grondelski penned two works in *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*: one on "popular devotions" (June 2001) and one on "Mary's Assumption" (July 2001).

Robert C. Jeffrey, of Wofford College, published an essay entitled "Our New Non-Political Order: The Eros of Enterprise" in the Fall 2001 issue of *Perspectives in Political Science*.

Fr. John Kobler, C.P. has a pen that never runs out of ink! In the Sept/Oct issue of *Social Justice Review* he has an article on "Michel Schooyans: Catholic Demographer" and in the Nov/Dec issue is his review of Monsignor George Kelly's book, *The Second Spring of the Church in America*.

Gerald Maring, of Washington State University, recently authored a piece on "cybermentoring" which appears in volume 4/10 (May 2001) of *Reading Online*.

Rev. Michael Orsi, chaplain at the Ave Maria School of Law, published an article about "A Law School Forum on Human-Cell lines and Frozen Embryos" in *The Linacre Quarterly* (68/2).

Cynthia Toolin announces the forthcoming publication of two articles: "From Descriptive Label to Defining Statement: The Awareness of Catholic Identity and the Universal Call to Holiness," in *Catholic Dossier*; and "Restoring Community: The Church's Urgent Task," in *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*.

And **Joseph Varacalli**, director of the Nassau Community College Center for Catholic Studies, wrote a guest article on the life of Catholic college freshmen that was published in the summer 2001 issue of *The Turnaround*, the newsletter of the Cardinal Newman Society.

FCS members have also been engaged in the publication of BOOKS:

Thomas C. Reeves chronicles *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen* (Encounter Books).

Dick Rolwing published volume 1 of his two volume revised edition of *Israel's Original Sin: A Catholic Confession* (XLIBRIS, Philadelphia). Volume 2 will be out in January.

Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki collaborated in the publication of the *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, commissioned by the Canon Law Society of America and published by Paulist Press.

And, thanks to the tireless efforts of **Kenneth Whitehead**, the 2000 Proceedings from the FCS convention in Atlanta have been published. *John Paul II – Witness to Truth* is now available from St. Augustine's Press.

On the LECTURE circuit, former FCS board member **Mary Shivanandan** has been globe-trotting. In August she delivered a lecture on "The Pope, Man and Woman" at Oxford University's celebration of John Paul II, and in October she gave a joint paper entitled "The Person as Substantive Relationship and Reproductive Technologies" at the Society of Catholic Social Scientists' conference in Ann Arbor (MI).

News from our INTERNATIONAL CHAPTERS attests to the ongoing work of members in those countries.

The FCS chapter in **Australia** held its second national conference in November. The theme was "Evangelizing the Culture: A Progress Report." The chapter also announced the launch of a web site (www.meaninglessness.org/index1.html) for the publication of **Michael Casey's** *Meaninglessness: The Solutions of Nietzsche, Freud and Rorty*. In addition, **Patrick Quirk**, the chapter's director, penned a reflection on the Timothy McVeigh case entitled "Does 'Public' Execution Include

Broadcast?" that appeared in *Annals Australasia: The Journal of Catholic Culture*.

The FCS chapter in **Canada** is planning a national conference on "Evangelization and the Media" scheduled for May 25, 2002 at the University of Guelph. For more information contact the chapter's director, **Douglas McManaman** (dougmcma@enoreo.on.ca). And congratulations to the chapter's executive secretary, **John E.G. Stone**, on the completion of his first book, entitled *Hoc Sacrificium Vivum*.

Finally, congratulations are in order for one of our long-standing FCS members. The **Most Reverend John P. Foley**, president of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications, recently received the *2001 Award for Outstanding Catholic Leadership* from the Catholic Leadership Institute in Philadelphia. Noted in the award was the Archbishop's leadership in the publication of "Ethics in Advertising" (1997) and "Ethics in Communication" (2000).

In early Spring of 2002, members should be on the lookout for information about renewing membership dues. Remember that the payment of dues is what allows the FCS to function, so please keep current!

And, as always, any questions about any Membership Matters, or information about activities, should be directed to the Office of the Executive Secretary (call 610-282-1100 ext. 1464 or fax to 610-282-2254 or send email to Thomas.Dailey@desales.edu).

Around the Church

By Dr. James Hitchcock.

Proposals to diminish papal authority in favor of semi-autonomous national episcopal conferences were a major feature of the Synod of Bishops in Rome in September. Bishop Norbert Brunner of Sion, Switzerland, proposed that the synodal structure, with delegates "freely chosen to meet regularly with the Pope," should become the normal machinery of church governance, with few issues "resolved centrally."

Archbishop Ruben Salazar Gomez of Barranquilla, Colombia, said the task of the bishop is "to listen to the Spirit Who lives in His people, confirming the people in that same Spirit and leading them to achieve what that Spirit has aroused and confirmed in His Church."

Bishop Jaime Henrique Chelmo, president of the Brazilian bishops conference, said the Holy See's method of selecting bishops is "a source of constant suffering...a dark process, full of surprises and disappointments, in which those who are the most interested are those who influence the process the least." There were strong criticisms of papal authority from some Asian and Eastern European prelates. Archbishop Tadeusz Kondrusiewicz of Russia and Bishop Louis Pelatre of Istanbul cited Eastern Orthodox ecclesiology as a

model for the relationship between the Holy See and regional episcopal conferences. The apostolic faith has been preserved in the East despite the absence of "a humanly powerful and organized structure," Bishop Pelatre asserted.

His Beatitude Nerses Bedros XIX Tarmouni of the Armenians warned that "an excessive centralization by Rome could suffocate the riches of the particular churches," while His Beatitude Gregoire III Laham, patriarch of Antioch, asserted that "with all due respect to the Petrine ministry, the Patriarchal ministry is equal to it...Until this is taken into account in Roman ecclesiology, no progress will be made in ecumenical dialogue." The Eastern patriarchates have authority to discharge all the responsibilities currently discharged by the Papacy, according to Patriarch Gregoire. Archbishop Henry D'Souza of Calcutta dismissed both the Latin language and "Roman culture" as "dead" and insisted that they have no relevance to India, which needs "a free version" of the Bible and liturgical books, reflective of "dynamic creativity."

Bishop Paul Yoshinao Otsuka of Kyoto, Japan, told the Synod that the Japanese bishops do not "insist that the only correct answer and resolution for problems comes from a Catholic point of view" but present a message intended to stimulate

people to "think." Western delegates who questioned the present system of church governance invoked the democratic principle.

Father David Fleming, superior general of the Marianists, pointed to the "collaborative model" of governance followed in religious orders since the Second Vatican Council as now applicable to the whole Church.

Cardinal Walter Kasper, prefect of the Council for Promoting Christian Unity, asserted that ecumenical activity has the highest priority, therefore "we must create a better balance between the particular Churches and the universal Church."

Other speakers defended the authority of the Holy See, and the Synod's final recommendations, sent to Pope John Paul II, did not contain any radical proposals.

Cardinal Francis Arinze, president of the Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, acknowledged that such dialogue is obligatory but warned that "Orthodox practice has to be based on orthodoxy. The bishop is above all the teacher of the doctrine of the faith....he has to feed his people with rich doctrine..." Cardinal Juan Sandoval Iniguez of Guadalajara, Mexico, asserted that preaching the faith is the bishops' highest duty and that "the bishop is the custodian of healthy doctrine, attentive to the correction of errors, and warning against dangers."

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger,

required for entry into American seminaries, according to a survey by the National Association of Hispanic Priests, and half say they have been exposed "to a host of doctrinal and liturgical errors," including denial of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and of the virginity of Mary. Three-quarters say that regular prayer in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament was a major factor in inspiring their vocations.

* * *

Catholic adolescents are more likely than Protestants to support the idea of homosexual "marriage," according to a poll by the Zogby Group. About two-thirds of recent high-school graduates support the idea, with Catholic support about 80 percent. Three-

quarters of evangelical Protestant adolescents oppose such unions.

* * *

Catholics in the diocese of Ogdensburg (N.Y.) who protested the appearance of a controversial speaker at the diocesan seminary say that they have been forbidden by diocesan officials to serve as lectors, extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist, or in other liturgical offices. The controversial speaker was a California priest, Paulist Father Richard Sparks, who at a catechetical conference last Spring urged religious educators to speculate about the sex life of Mary and Joseph and about the relationship between Jesus and Mary Magdalen.

* * *

Many priests in the Netherlands administer the last rites to Catholics planning to be euthanized, according to a survey by Allen in the NCR. A poll shows that 80 percent of priests are willing to officiate at homosexual "weddings" and that Catholic pastoral workers distribute condoms to prostitutes and needles to drug users.

* * *

Correction: The institutional affiliation of canon lawyer Father James Coriden was inaccurately given in the Fall issue of "Around the Church." He is a professor at the Washington Theological Union.

TENURE-TRACK POSITION:

Thomas Aquinas College, in Santa Paula, CA, is seeking to fill a full-time, permanent teaching position for the 2002-2003 academic year. All teachers at the College are expected to teach across the range of academic disciplines represented in our curriculum. Classes are conducted as seminars on "great books," not as lectures by a "professor."

Thomas Aquinas College has a fixed commitment to the magisterium of the Catholic Church. In accord with this commitment, philosophy and theology at the College are studied according to the method, principles, and doctrine of Thomas Aquinas. The dependence of St. Thomas on Aristotelian philosophy dictates the College's further commitment to Aristotle, including his work on the basic principles of natural philosophy, especially as found in his *Physics* and *On the Soul*. Consequently, the College looks for teachers who are willing and able to teach the entire range of an integrated "great books" curriculum as disciples of St. Thomas and Aristotle.

Further information about the curriculum and character of the College can be found at

www.thomasaquinas.edu.

Inquiries may be sent to the following address:

Dean Glen Coughlin
Thomas Aquinas College
10000 N. Ojai Rd.
Santa Paula, CA 93060



BOOK REVIEWS

Diamond, Dr. Eugene F.
**A Catholic Guide to
Medical Ethics** (Linacre
Institute, 2001) pp.393

Dr. Eugene F. Diamond, who has been a pediatrician for 48 years and a professor in bio-Ethics at Loyola University and Rush Medical School, has recently authored this work on medical ethics. This book is readable, reliable, and for the vast majority, it will be very reassuring. Readers will readily realize that Dr. Diamond has never been beguiled by the Nicolaitan heresy of the first century, which taught that Christianity in order to survive had to alter its message to be in accord with the fads of the time.

The perennial principles that give a solid foundation to the philosophy and theology of this book are these: God has created us according to His image and likeness, thus giving dignity to each person; God, through the commandments and the Spirit of Christ in our Church, teaches us; God's laws are also given to us through natural law; Morals are not relative to times and places; The end can never justify the means.

All of the conclusions in this work are based on the use of these principles by common sense, which is constantly being helped by our living teacher – the Magisterium of our church. With each chapter we discover that the teach-

ings of our church are reasonable, and that reason with the help of God's grace leads us to accept these teachings. This is not a loss of freedom, but a gain of wisdom and liberty. In his introduction Dr. Diamond states that "through the study and acceptance of our Church's teaching, the physician is liberated to observe the highest standards of his Profession."

It is rather difficult to think of any topic on medical ethics, which is not treated in this book. Among Dr. Diamond's observations are these: That life begins at conception is an unquestionable fact. Parents should exert their prerogative as the primary sex educators of their children. There is no consensus in our nation, even after *Roe v. Wade* 1973, for abortion on demand, except for a shaky consensus within the Supreme Court. There should be a moratorium on in vitro fertilization. Great caution should be taken concerning orders not to resuscitate. Fetal experimentation should always be accompanied by reasonable control. Concerning abortion, there can be no position of compromise. The stringent criteria for judging the cures at Lourdes indicate the healing power of the Lord. We should make better use of our natural resources. For instance, we have two billion acres of land in the United States, but only 5 per cent is used for residential purposes. If a politician is personally

opposed to abortion, he should also be publicly opposed. There is every reason to hope that every homosexually attracted person who seeks help from the church can find freedom from sinful behavior and much more. Careful consideration should be given to the moral and medical aspects of boxing. All Pro-lifers should help in obtaining a constitutional amendment, which would protect human life at every stage.

For each explanation and observation Dr. Diamond gives references from the writings and lectures of experts in each field. Because this book is carefully documented it can be used as a reference work, and it also can be read from cover to cover. Since the author moves from the case to the principle, and from the principle to the case, teachers may find the book could be used as a simple, interesting and informative textbook. The entire work is an excellent example of the theological methodology of Cardinal Newman. Newman wrote that great theologians take the doctrines and principles in Scripture and Tradition, and then apply their research to the problems of our day. IN the Development of Christian Doctrine Newman stated, "Old principles appear under new forms" (p. 41).

*Rev. James Lyons
Mundelein Seminary*

Valliere, Paul, **Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov. Orthodoxy in a New Key.**

(Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.)

Alexander Bukharev (1824-71), Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900) and Nikolaevich Bulgakov (1871-1944) represent three phases of recent Russian theological thinking. Bukharev was the first to face the challenges of modernity, Soloviev's thinking takes shape as Marxism is being ushered into Russia, while Bulgakov, "born in a stole", is the speculative cleric whose writings represent the culmination of faith and reason in Orthodoxy. Valliere's work proceeds chronologically, providing the reader with an excellent biography of each theologian while highlighting major themes found within his thought. Valliere begins by providing the context for any look into Russian theology, by first introducing the pivotal concept of *bogochelovechestvo*.

Translated here as the "humanity of God", *bogochelovechestvo* bespeaks both divine kenosis and human deification, principles which provide the basis of Orthodox cosmology, ecclesiology and humanism. So exactly what are the distinctive principles and contributions of Russian theology? Two major themes run throughout

each thinker: the ongoing interplay between Creator and creation and, subsequently, the Church's essential role in the world.

First, each Russian theologian stresses the good news that not only does God become human in the Incarnation, but that all things human become divine in the Spirit. As Valliere so nicely writes, "Inquisitors look for heresy and apostasy everywhere, while the church should look for incarnation everywhere." Latently present throughout Bukharev's thought, this receives systematic expression in Soloviev's *Lectures on the Humanity of God*, as well as in Bulgakov's reliance upon *Sophia*. A misunderstood and thus condemned concept in Bulgakov's writings, *Sophia* is a process which unites God and world, not in a necessary or pantheistic way, but such that it is impossible for creatures to think of God as some isolated monad. What Soloviev would define as "Christ's Body", Bulgakov's notion of *Sophia* insists that God must always be conceived in relation, always as a lover of the beloved.

Accordingly, the second major strand of thought running through these pages is the role of the Church in the world. Of course, each thinker equates *ecclesia* with the visible Russian Orthodox Church. Seeing in Rome unbridled lust for power, and in

Protestantism the unchallenged sovereignty of the individual, Orthodoxy claims to have preserved Christ's message, although hints of it maybe found elsewhere. As the chosen messenger, then, the Orthodox Church advocates a universal theocracy. Interestingly enough, Soloviev looks upon the triumvirate of the Russians, Poles and Jews as possessing the needed features to constitute a free theocracy in the modern world: the tsar of Russia, the autonomy of ecclesial authority in Poland, and the "proper use of creation" maintained by the Jews. Situated within this discussion of ecclesiology, are also each theologian's understanding of progress and social reform.

The treasure that is Russian theological thought is only recently being uncovered in the West. John Paul has brought our attention to this tradition by highlighting the insights of Pavel Florensky and Soloviev, for example, as instances of harmony between the sciences (e.g., *Fides et Ratio* §74). English readers are thus indebted to Paul Valliere, the McGregor Professor in the Humanities at Butler University in Indianapolis, for making the thought of three Russian theologians accessible. An otherwise excellent work, it is unfortunate that he juxtaposes such rich theological thought with only Protestant thinkers such as Barth and Tillich, while so many themes, e.g.,

BOOK REVIEWS

grace and nature, would be more accurately and more richly elucidated when set alongside thinkers of the *nouvelle theologie*, such as Congar, de Lubac and von Balthasar. As such, however, this very helpful volume is highly recommended for those interested in discovering the riches of Russian theology as well as those already at work in the field.

David Vincent Meconi, S.J.
University of Innsbruck

* * *

George A. Kelly, **The Second Spring of the Church in America** (St. Augustine's Press, South Bend, 2001, 195 pp., clothbound, \$25).

Monsignor Kelly is likely the best qualified person to write this critique of dissent in the Church in the United States. Members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars will not be surprised at most of the material put together here by a founder of the Fellowship or they would not be members of the Fellowship. But they will be shocked once again, and perhaps more than before, by the vivid picture of the gravity of the crisis in the Church.

Monsignor knows that somewhere the Church will have a second spring, and no doubt he hopes for, and prays for, a second spring in the United States, but he nowhere says

that he is sure that there will be one. What is necessary is for "bishop and pope opening doors that have been closed to them by those under their jurisdiction who reject their teaching or defy their laws."

What exists, he says, is **war**, "within the Church between the pope and national hierarchies, within various national Churches, even at certain diocesan and parochial levels." And "it is bad enough not to see war coming; it is far worse not to know that an enemy is already inside the gates." And, "to win it, you must know (1) that you are at war, (2) who your enemy is, and (3) what weapons or strategies will likely defeat him. To lose it, you simply (1) sew peace banners on the battlefield, (2) fight civil wars against your allies, and (3) use the wrong weapons."

"The dilemma of twenty-first-century bishops is this: How will they recover their mastery of the Church's priorities? And where will Rome find bishops capable of reinforcing Roman policy? Will bishops find ways to bring their own bureaucrats to the 'obedience of faith'? And when is the Pope going to return to the 'autonomy' of National Episcopal Conferences? On the right answer to these questions rests the recovery of the Church?"

It is made crystal-clear that the answer lies with bishops. "It is common knowledge

that, since Vatican II, parish priests have been reprimanded by bishops for bucking the directives of this or that diocesan agency, even when the pastor wanted Roman norms obeyed The reason the American Church is in trouble today is that forces of disunity – religious superiors, college presidents, and professional academics – have held fast in their 'no' to hierarchy, while the bishops and Rome in response have been at odds with each other, one side belatedly prepared to pay some price of defiance, the other still fearful of the consequences of law enforcement The Holy See must insist, once universal policy or law is established, that every National Conference of Catholic Bishops, as well as each diocesan bishop, apply the policy or law without equivocation, or 'benign neglect' of enforcement Appointment of dissenters as advisors to bishops, or as lecturers in episcopal assemblies, workshops, clergy conferences, seminaries, or as drafters of Church documents, with *Origins* giving more than ample dissemination to their views, have created the impression that a counter-magisterium (John Paul II's term) has achieved a certain legitimacy Today virulent critics of Catholic faith and moral norms insist on holding office in the Church and making bishops bow to them – no matter what this reversal of roles does to the faith or the faithful."

BOOKS RECEIVED

The appendix to the book contains the reply of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith to the American Bishops' document *Doctrinal Responsibilities*, outlining what bishops should do in case of disagreement with theologians. The Sacred Congregation offers objection after objection to the document, showing that the bishops had given away their divinely given authority in matters of faith. The reply can be found in *Origins*, Nov. 24, 1988.

Monsignor Kelly lays special stress on the defection of most of the Catholic universities, very much at the heart of dissent. "Catholics who manage Catholic colleges and universities are major offenders So long as rebellion rules those campuses, so long as the NCCB inhibits the individual bishop's authority over the teaching in his own diocese, so long will the young suffer the diminution of their faith, perhaps irreparably, and their parents as well, perhaps to the point of bitterness or alienation. The unity, the holiness, the Catholicity of the Church, are tarnished, and her apostolicity can be called into question."

We can thank God that the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars exists, and that Monsignor Kelly is still inspiring it to fight the good fight.

*Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.
Toronto, Canada*

If you are interested in reviewing one of the **Books Received** please contact:

Dr. Larry Chapp
Editor in Chief
DeSales University
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, Pa 18034
610-282-1100 ext. 1264
Larry.Chapp@desales.edu

Bottum, J. **The Fall & Other Poems**
(St. Augustine's Press, 2001)
69 pp. ISBN 1-58731-250-6

Drake, Timothy. **There We Stood, Here We Stand, Eleven Lutherans Rediscover Their Catholic Roots.** (1st Books Library, 2001) 140 pp. ISBN 0-75961-320-6

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. **The Arians of The Fourth Century**
(Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1996)
204 pp. ISBN 0-9653517-2-6

Edited by Olsen, Glenn W. **Christian Marriage - A Historical Study** (The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2001)
359 pp. ISBN 0-8245-1886-1

Schall, James V. **On The Unseriousness of Human Affairs**
(ISI Books, 2001)
196 pp. ISBN 1-882926-63-3

Stravinskias, Reverend Peter. **Advent Meditations Helps to 'Wait in Joyful Hope'**
(Newman House Press, 2001)
75 pp. ISBN 0-9704022-1-X

Stravinskias, Reverend Peter. **The Bible and the Mass**
(Newman House Press, 2000)
109 pp. ISBN 0-9704022-0-1

Edited by Stravinskias, The Reverend Peter M. J. **Priestly Celibacy Its Scriptural, Historical, Spiritual, and Psychological Roots**
(Newman House Press, 2001)
172 pp. ISBN 0-9704022-2-8

The John Paul II Newman Center, The Catholic Medical Association & The Society of Catholic Social Scientists present a symposium on:

Human Dignity & Reproductive Technology

Welcoming Remarks

Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I., Archbishop of Chicago

The Dignity of the Human Person and the New Eugenics

Jean Bethke Elshtain, PhD, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor, University of Chicago

The Magisterium on the Cutting Edge: Evangelization & Culture

John Haas, PhD, Director, The National Catholic Bioethics Center

The Moral Status of the Human Embryo

Patrick Lee, PhD, Professor, Franciscan University of Steubenville

Pastoral Implications

Steven Bozza, MA, Director, Office of Family Life, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey

Afternoon Session, Opening Reflections

Paul Griffiths, PhD, Schmitt Chair of Catholic Studies, University of Illinois at Chicago

What is Wrong with Biology and Biologists: The Remote Roots of the Moral Crisis

Daniel P. Toma, PhD, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, The Neurosciences Institute

Recent Pro-Life Legislation

Gerard Bradley, JD, Professor, Notre Dame Law School

Retrospective and Prospective: The Public Policy Debate

Richard M. Doerflinger, PhD, Associate Director, Secretariat for Pro-Life Activities, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Begetting vs. Making Babies

William May, PhD, Michael J. McGivney Professor of Moral Theology, John Paul II Institute

**The conference will be held at the University of Illinois at Chicago,
Illini Union, 828 S. Wolcott, Chicago, IL 60612, on
Monday, March 4, 2002, 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.**

To register, send your name, address, fax & phone number to the John Paul II Newman Center, 700 South Morgan St., Chicago, IL 60607. Please enclose a \$25 registration fee. The registration deadline is 2/25/2002. For more information, please contact Nicholas C. Lund-Molfese at NCLM@UIC.EDU or 312.355.3336.

Co- Sponsored by: Catholic Studies at UIC, Catholic Medical Student's Organization, Catholic Nursing Student's Organization, UIC Student Coalition for Life & the Respect Life Office of the Archdiocese of Chicago

BOARD OF DIRECTORS – 2001

OFFICERS

President

**Rev. Thomas F. Dailey,
O.S.F.S.**

DeSales University
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, PA 18034
Thomas.Dailey@desales.edu

Vice-President

Dr. Bernard Dobranski

(Ave Maria School of Law)
6225 Webster Church Road
Dexter, MI 48130
bdobranski@avemarialaw.edu

Executive Secretary

(not yet named)

Editor of FCS Quarterly

Dr. Larry Chapp

DeSales University
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, PA 18034
Larry.Chapp@desales.edu

PAST PRESIDENTS

Prof. Gerard V. Bradley

University of Notre Dame
219 Law School
Notre Dame, IN 46556
Gerard.V.Bradley.16@nd.edu

Dr. James Hitchcock

(St. Louis University)
6158 Kingsbury Drive
St. Louis, MO 63112
hitchcpj@slu.edu

Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly

107-10 Shore Front Parkway
Rockaway Beach, NY 11694

**Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM
Cap.**

St. Francis Friary
2905 Castlegate Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15226

Dr. William May

John Paul II Institute
415 Michigan Ave, NE - #290
Washington, DC 20017
wmay975874@aol.com

Prof. Ralph McInerny

Jacques Maritain Center
714 Hesburgh Library
Notre Dame, IN 46556
Ralph.M.McInerny.1@nd.edu

Rev. Msgr. William B. Smith

St. Joseph's Seminary,
Dunwoodie
201 E. Seminary Avenue
Yonkers, NY 10704-1896

Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.

Loyola University
6525 N. Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60626-5385

ELECTED DIRECTORS

(1999-2002)

Dr. J. Brian Benestad

University of Scranton
Scranton, PA 18510
benestadj1@uofs.edu

Dr. Stephen Krason

Franciscan University
Dept. of Political Science
Steubenville, OH 43952

Rev. John Rock, S.J.

Gonzaga University
Spokane, WA 99258-0001
jjmr74720@aol.com

Rev. James Schall, S.J.

Georgetown Jesuit Community
Washington, DC 20057
schallsj@gusun.georgetown.edu

(2000-2003)

Dr. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese

(Emory University)
1487 Sheridan Walk
Atlanta, GA 30324
efoxgen@bellsouth.net

Dr. Christopher Janosik

Villanova University
304 St. Augustine Center
Villanova, PA 19085
Christopher.Janosik@villanova.edu

Rev. J. Michael Miller, CSB

University of St. Thomas
3800 Montrose Boulevard
Houston, TX 77006
jmmiller@stthom.edu

Sr. Mary Judith O'Brien, RSM

St. John Vianney Seminary
1300 S. Steele Street
Denver, CO 80250-1645
sjobrien@archden.org

(2001-2004)

Prof. Stephen Barr

(University of Delaware)
9 Wynwyd Drive
Newark, DE 19711
sbarr@bartol.udel.edu

Rev. Peter Ryan, S.J.

Mount St. Mary's Seminary
Emmitsburg, MD 21727-7700
pryan@msmary.edu

Mr. William Saunders

(Family Research Council)
3201 Wisconsin Ave, NW - #408
Washington, DC 20016
wls@frc.org

Announcing a New Publication

With Mind and Heart Renewed ...

Essays in Honor of Rev. John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S.

*Winner of the 1998 Cardinal Wright Award
from the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*

This book features essays by these FCS members:

Dr. JUDE DOUGHERTY
Msgr. MICHAEL WRENN
Rev. JOHN CROSSIN
Dr. WILLIAM MAY

Msgr. GEORGE KELLY
Rev. BENEDICT GROESCHEL
Dr. DIANE IRVING
Rev. W. JEROME BRACKEN

to obtain a copy (at \$38, which includes shipping & handling)
make check payable to "DeSales University" and send to

Rev. Thomas F. Dailey, O.S.F.S.
FCS Executive Secretary
DeSales University
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, PA 18034

**Fellowship of Catholic Scholars
Quarterly**

DeSales University
Larry S. Chapp, Ph.D.
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, Pa 18034

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Center Valley PA
Permit No. 8

**Fellowship
of Catholic
Scholars
Quarterly**