

A Time of Opportunity

Dean Bernard Dobranski

The recent midterm congressional election presages a great opportunity for those involved in life issues. With a pro-life president and a favorable Senate, there is a good chance that newly appointed federal judges and legislators will be able to overturn the legalized culture of death that has prevailed in America for the past 30 years. The U.S. Supreme Court is of particular interest because if any vacancies are created in the near future, President Bush will have an opportunity to appoint non-activist jurists who will interpret the Constitution according to the Founders' vision.

For the members of our Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, these developments present a confirmation of our efforts on behalf of justice and the sanctity of life. They also give us a new impetus to move forward in our efforts to shape America in the third millennium according to the principles of faith and reason which alone can bring human dignity to its fullest expression.

The great challenge of the Second Vatican Council is the call for all the baptized to integrate Christ into culture. Because we are scholars with varied jobs and talents, we have a unique opportunity for instructing others in the truth. We can help create a society based on the laws of God that are given in divine revelation and on those naturally written in the hearts of men. By our example, teaching, preaching, writing, praying, and remaining faithful to the Magisterium of the Church, we have obviously made a difference. Because of the potential that the present political climate presents we should be motivated more than ever to intensify our efforts at evangelization and to respond even more vigorously to Christ's call for us to be the salt of the earth and light to the world.

There is no doubt in my mind that the time is ripe for the membership to energetically and boldly proclaim the Gospel of Life and highlight Catholic social teaching. It seems that our nation is hungry for solid food. Indications are that moral relativism has had its day. In some recent studies researchers have found a growing religious orthodoxy among young people, along with a desire for traditional mo-

(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 25, Number 4 Fall 2002

CONTENTS

PRESIDENTS' PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM THE EDITOR	3
ARTICLES:	
On Keeping "The Last Things" To Be "The First Things."	6
Reproductive Science and the Incarnation.	11
A Catholic Physics?	26
MEMBERSHIP MATTERS	29
BOOK REVIEWS	36
BOOKS RECEIVED	45
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	47

(Continued from page 1)

rality and spirituality. As Catholic scholars, we are in a unique position to nurture this upcoming generation and thereby play a vital role in shaping a renewed America faithful to life, liberty, and human dignity.

It is my hope that our Fellowship will remain on the cutting edge of this newly dawning culture of life by increasing our personal efforts for spiritual growth as well as our intellectual pursuits. In doing so, we will be able to guide and

encourage our present leaders as well as those who follow them to create an America that will be a shining city on a hill for all the world to see.

AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW DEAN

HEADS FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

Ann Arbor, Mich. (November 15, 2002) -Bernard Dobranski, Founding Dean and President of Ave Maria School of Law, has been named Acting President of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars (FCS), an organization of Catholic educators, writers, and administrators from across the country.

Dean Dobranski, who was FCS vice-president, assumes the duties of president until the next meeting of the FCS board in April 2003. He replaces Rev. Tom Dailey of DeSales University, who stepped down due to other commitments.

"I am honored to serve as the president of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars," said. Dean Dobranski. "As Dean of a Catholic law school, I admire and heartily support the Fellowship's significant contribution to the intellectual life of the Church."

Established in 1977, the FCS studies and comments on church teachings. For example, the FCS has provided scholarship in support of papal documents ranging from *Humanae Vitae* to *Ex corde Ecclesiae*. Additionally, the FCS participated in preparing the English translation of the Catechism of the Catholic Church and provided legal analysis of issues stemming from the application of canon law to university personnel.

Dean Dobranski noted that his work with the FCS compliments and invigorates his work at Ave Maria School of Law. Just as the FCS is committed to exemplary scholarship, Ave Maria School of Law provides a rigorous legal education characterized by a commitment to justice, excellence, and the highest ethical and moral standards.

For more information, visit www.avemarialaw.edu, or call (734) 827-8063.

Catholic Identity and the American Catholic University

Dr. Larry S. Chapp
DeSales University

Recently the Pope spoke to a group of American college educators and reminded them in a very straightforward and unambiguous manner that faithfulness to the teaching of the Magisterium is absolutely essential to the identity and health of a Catholic university. My first reaction was sadness as I realized how appalling it is that they needed to be reminded of this at all (a feeling similar to the one I get when I need to remind my students to bring a pen to class). My sadness was compounded by the further suspicion, born out of years of experience that, more than likely, the Pope's words will be summarily ignored in a patronizing and condescending fashion as the ramblings of an autocrat who simply does not understand the more open and democratic "American situation." As Alice Gallin notes frequently in her book, *Negotiating Identity*, liberal American Catholics are constantly dismayed over Rome's ignorance of the unique American situation in higher education. As a clear *partisan* of the Hesburgh solution to the "problem" of Catholic identity on campus, Gallin gives a sympathetic reading to the many ways in which American Catholic universities have had to "negotiate" a series of compromises with the various "constituencies" they serve; from the federal government to the NCAA, to the alumni, students, and donors, the message is the same: these are groups and institutions that universities may legitimately allow to infringe somewhat on their "autonomy" for the sake of dialogue and diversity. There is only one institution that Gallin routinely insinuates must be kept at arms length because it is viewed as the preeminent threat to the freedom and autonomy of the university - - the Church.

The point here is not to heap coals on the head of Gallin for her idiosyncratic approach to

Catholic higher education. Indeed, the point is rather the opposite; Gallin's voice is all too typical of the cast of mind that dominates Catholic colleges and universities, hence the need for the Pope's gentle reminder. The fact that the reigning point of view in these circles is that the Church is a threat to the search for truth is indicative of where the neuralgic point of this crisis of identity is to be located. Modern Catholic educators have bought into the secular model of higher education so thoroughly that they have also imbibed its putatively self-evident first principle: religious faith is a subjective and affective reality utterly devoid of public warrant and that it therefore distorts and curtails the public pursuit of objective truth - - a "truth" which has public warrant precisely insofar as it has purged itself of the biases created by religion. In short, religious faith is the enemy of truth, and the Catholic faith, with its long history of Inquisitions and book bannings, is to be feared most of all.

Of course, no Catholic educator will ever admit to thinking that the Faith is an impediment to the free pursuit of truth. The public rhetoric at admission's open houses, graduations, and other ceremonial events still pays lip service to the central importance of Catholic "values" - - whatever that may mean - - in higher education. And even if this public rhetoric itself has come to be attenuated over the years - - e.g. "education in the Jesuit tradition" - - there is still a broad consensus that the "Catholic card" still has some marketing potential left in it, since there are still many Catholic parents out there who think that Catholic universities are indeed offering a demonstrably Catholic product that is different from a secular university. And in a move more cynical than Clinton's finger-waving lie (more cynical because it is about something more serious), Catholic university administrators continue to play off of the simple faith of good Catholic parents, all the while fe-

MESSAGE FROM THE EDITOR

verishly pursuing the selling off of our Catholic heritage for a bowl of secular porridge.

However, as the old aphorism has it: actions speak louder than words. Despite the public rhetoric, many, if not most, Catholic universities have atomized the Catholic identity of the campus in the theology/religious studies department and in campus ministry. Whereas in an ideal setting, such as the one Newman describes in his nearly Platonic vision of education in his "Idea of a University", the Catholic character of the curriculum is insured by the fact that the majority of the faculty on campus will be practicing Catholics, in reality few, if any, universities bother any longer to even ask potential faculty about their religious affiliation. Indeed, as one academic dean of a Catholic college once asked me: "isn't that illegal?" I asked him if he had ever been to BYU. (I could be even more radical here and suggest that even if it is illegal, which it is not, why should that stop us from doing what we have to do to maintain the Catholic identity of our schools? Have we lost the feistiness of a "dagger" John Hughes, or the principled civil disobedience of a Thomas More? The fact of the matter is we don't care enough about these issues to engage in such public acts of defiance and/or martyrdom).

What all of this indicates is that many administrators at Catholic universities do not grasp the simplest of truths, well articulated by Jim Burtchaell in his book, *The Dying of the Light*: you cannot have a Catholic university without Catholics. The task of a Catholic university is to take every field of human academic endeavor and to hold it up in the light of the Gospel to see how its inner integrity becomes more enlivened even as it is engraced. Nothing is off limits for this task and nothing that is part of the human condition is shied away from. As anyone who has ever known someone who is both a profound Catholic and a devoted scholar will tell you, the faith makes one more open to the truth, not less, for two simple reasons: 1) because the faith makes one open to the idea of truth as such; and 2) because the faith itself is true. How can a non-Catholic, or even a nominal

Catholic, grasp this? And how can a Catholic university maintain its identity if it continues to hire people who do not get this? Finally, how can this integrated view of Catholic education be achieved when all of the Catholics are located on that most isolated of academic islands - - the theology department (and even here dissent from the Magisterium is often treated as a badge of honor). These are really rather simple points, easily grasped by even the simplest of minds, which is why I routinely smile when I see that a college or university has decided to devote a faculty seminar or two to exploring the "meaning" of the institution's Catholic identity. If there is one thing I know it is this: as soon as a university has to ask that question, the game is already up.

So long as we continue to buy into the secular bifurcation between faith and reason Catholic universities will feel free to maintain the status quo where the specifically "Catholic" components of an education are separate and distinct from the secular components. And so long as we continue to fixate on the *mandatum* for theologians as the sole barometer of a university's adherence to Catholic identity, we will continue to atomize that identity in a few isolated individuals rather than focus on the primary teaching of *ex corde* that the curriculum needs to be Catholic across the board. Certainly, the *mandatum* is a start, but a singular focus on this single canonical norm can lead to the bifurcated thinking it is meant to overcome. Typical of this way of thinking is the comment made to me by one priest-president of a Catholic college: "There is no such thing as Catholic computer science." I guess he meant by this that it wasn't important to worry about hiring Catholics for such jobs since it doesn't really matter anyway. But if that is true, then why have affirmative action for anyone? What is the difference between a computer science course taught by an African-American female or a white male? The fact that we care about the latter scenario more than the former shows that we care more about racial diversity on our campuses than we do Catholic identity. Such a position ignores the fact that a university is a community of dis-

course where the tone of the academic culture is set by the faculty - - regardless of the particular discipline a faculty member may teach. Faculty vote on curriculum issues and have a hand in all of the major decision making committees at the university. They are also looked up to as mentors and role models. To suggest that it is of no importance to hire Catholics for disciplines that have only a tangential relationship to the truths of the Faith betrays a sociological naiveté so deep that one wonders how such a view could have gained the currency it seems to have.

Finally, there are those who say that placing this much emphasis on hiring practicing Catholics will lead to an academic monoculture lacking diversity. My answer to this is that a Catholic monoculture would be preferable to the current secular monoculture. The big lie that has been foisted upon us is the idea that secularism values diversity and allows for a broad set of ideas to be debated. For Catholic universities to pursue secularization is to *decrease* the overall diversity of educational offerings that are out there, i.e. if we become just one more bland, homogenized, Americanized, consumerized, and vulgarized secular bastion of political correctness, how does that increase diversity? We need to be *in* the diversity representing a specifically Catholic outlook amidst a broad spectrum of differing institutions, rather than have the secular model of “diversity” in us, flattening out what is most unique about our heritage and rendering us pointless. But here is the kicker... the more genuinely Catholic we become the more authentically diverse we will be. The second big lie we have bought into is the idea that Catholicism is a monoculture. The simple truth is that the most multicultural, multilinguistic, transhistorical and grassroots organization the world has ever known is the Catholic Church. And the corollary to this truth is also simple: the most dehumanizing, aggressively oppressive and intolerant ideology the world has ever seen is modern Western secularism. Like an acid it corrodes whatever traditional culture it contacts. It is currently working its magic on our Catholic colleges and universities and has been doing so for some time.

Therefore, what is needed in order to turn our Catholic colleges and universities around is an aggressive affirmative action campaign to hire practicing Catholics who are proud of their faith and infectiously happy in its expression. We need true Christian humanists who live themselves, everyday, at the intersection of nature and grace and are able to communicate to a new generation of students something of the thrill and adventure that is a genuine Christian life. And finally, we need administrators who understand that a Catholic university exists in order to offer a specifically Catholic alternative to whatever else may be out there. And if we cannot survive following this model then so be it. Universities have come and gone before and they will continue to do so. Some Catholic colleges may need to die in order to make room for newer, more dynamic models. But one thing is certain. The path of secularization is killing Catholic higher education just as surely as if it all collapsed tomorrow in a heap of financial ruin.

ON KEEPING "THE LAST THINGS" TO BE "THE FIRST THINGS"

James V. Schall, S. J.
Georgetown University, DC, 20057-1200
www.moreC.com/schall

"So when I picked up my aunt's (Anna Balakian) best known book, *Surrealism: The Road to the Absolute*, I was a poet and editor seeking to understand her. In her preface, she proclaimed that French Surrealism was the revolutionary movement of the modern age, and brought us news that the world could be whole, harmonious, redemptive. It was a revolution in language and consciousness, and through the power of surrealist imagination humans could achieve a new zenith of being, a new mysticism for 'the here and now.'"

- Peter Balakian, 1997¹

"Higher fertility rates and immigration produce not only a larger population but a society that is younger, more mixed ethnically and, on balance, more dynamic. The simplest expression of this is the median age.... The median age in America in 2050 will be 36.2. In Europe it will be 52.7. That is a stunning difference, accounted for almost entirely by the dramatic ageing of the European population."

- *The Economist*, August 24, 2002.

I.

An old sentimental song in my youth began with the words, "what kind of fool am I?" We often read in the Psalms about the fool who says in his heart that "there is no God." And St. Paul suspects that, generally speaking, not a few philosophers are fools. I speak these words to an audience familiar with them. In these days of multi-culturalism and historic relativism, of clerical scandals and apparent episcopal incompetency, are we "foolish," as many people think, for holding what we do, for maintaining

that truth is in the Church and through Jesus Christ and Him alone?

Is not any claim of truth today looked upon as "fanaticism," the next step to the al-Queda or fundamentalism? I believe there was a film that won the recent Venice festival with that very thesis that Catholics and the Taliban are the same. Is our only protection in the fact that everyone, including ourselves, is wrong, that democracy is based in skepticism and relativism, not natural law or reason? The Holy Father himself has often worried about precisely this claim that any claim to truth is "undemocratic."

And what about all the scandals? Surely, these are a cause for doubt, even if we know about Judas and the denials of Peter? Why do obviously fallible beings keep showing up in positions of ecclesiastical authority? Are the personal failures of Christians an argument for or against the truth of Christianity? Was Christ sent because of sinners or because we were already perfect? Why did Christ say that we should be forgiven not just seven times, but seven times seventy times -- a passage I noticed in the Gospel for the Twenty-fourth Sunday of the Year? Why is God more tolerant of human failure than we are -- or is He? In any case, if someone is worried about the condition of the Church in our time, or any time, I might suggest his reading H. C. Crocker's book *Triumph* or the new St. Augustine's Press translation of Josef Pieper's book, *The Concept of Sin*.

After we read those scripture scholars, theologians, and anchor-men who tell us that hell is nothing particularly to worry about, that it is an outmoded idea, is it? Do we dare bet on it? I have a thesis about hell, for what it is worth, namely, that whenever the doctrine of hell is minimized or eliminated from popular or theological consciousness, it turns up again as a

worldly project, usually political, claiming to eliminate the cause of evil by human means. Not a few good thinkers maintain that this latter shift is the cause, or one of the causes, of modern ideological terrorism. Some of this was already in Plato, in fact. One can, I think, take it as an operative, practical principle, that whenever any truth or doctrine is denied, it will show up in another way in some distorted form, now much more dangerous because unrecognized.

II.

If we look at the geo-politics of the world today, surely the case for Christianity looks almost hopeless. After two thousand years, the vast majority of the heathen are not converted. Christians of all varieties are maybe a billion, the Chinese are a billion, the Indians a billion, the Muslims a billion, the Buddhists maybe a half-billion, and the rest a combination of everything else. The press is full of theologians who think that it is not necessary that such peoples, including the Jews, should be converted or even that any attempt to do so be made. The idea that we have something that someone else does not is in bad taste. "All nations" evidently do not need to be "taught" anything.

Indeed, especially in the case of Islam, but also of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Shintoism, the difficulty of conversion is so great and so dangerous that many have given up trying. Modern governments simply do not allow it, in spite of religious liberty theses that are not upheld by every culture or government. Some thinkers have instead tried to figure out theological or philosophical reasons why such religions can be salvific without their changing anything.

Tolerance, therefore, now does not mean simply allowing only peaceful means of social intercourse about long controverted and serious topics among diverse religions or ideologies. Rather it means a theoretical position that God or the state wants nothing to be disturbed. Everyone can be "saved" as he is. Everyone just has to be more or less "sincere." Missionaries are to be withdrawn, at least Christian ones. In

Europe and America, new mosques seem to be built every day, often with the help of Saudi money. The most active proselytizing groups on college campuses today are the Muslims. A Baptist minister in England thinks that England will become Muslim, in fact, due in part because of its emptiness on giving up Christianity. The ancient religions have missionaries in the West, in a dramatic turn of historical events. Other religions, in imitation of Christianity perhaps, have suddenly become rather "apostolic," if I might use that word.

III.

The two citations that I have chosen to begin these remarks are from very different sources. The first is from an Armenian-American writer speaking of French surrealism, an artistic movement early in the 20th century. For a Christian, it has a familiar, yet strange sound. A new zenith of "being," in the "here and now?" Such words should cause us to pay attention; they are again misapplied theological words. In general, whenever we hear talk of "revolutionary" movements that will solve the problems of man in the "here and now," we know we are listening to theological ideology.

We do not doubt, of course, that things can be improved, nor do we doubt that things can become worse. They can go either way. What we must be attentive to is the notion that "by the power" of whatever "imagination," we can attain a new "zenith" of being. To be careful here, we do not need to deny the importance of imagination in order to be concerned with just what is imagined. The new book of Dennis Quinn, *Iris Exiled: A Synoptic History of Wonder*, puts the whole issue in proper perspective.

Orthodox Christianity does not deny that things might improve; it encourages them, in fact, not the least of which being that it has a vivid and penetrating notion of the will. But Christianity does reject the idea that this world is our home and can be made perfect. Hebrews 13:14 reads, "Here we have no lasting city. We seek a home that is yet to come." The abiding temptation of

man is to seek to achieve the kingdom of God in this world by intellectual theories and radical practices that have origins only in man.

Whether we call this pride, or revolution, or ideology, the essence of the issue is the same — the claim that we know what we are by our own powers. We claim that we can deal with any problems that we have solely by our own capacities.

Such a position usually entails also the position that claims of divine revelation or instruction or grace are alienating to us, counter to a “humanism” that guides only itself by its own powers. Our god is more Prometheus than Christ. Yet, as Chesterton and Tolkien tell us, knowing that we have no home here does not mean that we do not need homes as the very heart of what we are even in this world. If we do not know what a home is, we have great difficulty in imagining properly what might be meant by a “heavenly home.”

IV.

For some time, we have been struck by the fact that it is the very people who have rejected the home and in it the ends of marriage as they have been elaborated in the Christian tradition who are the very ones disappearing from among us. Birth control and abortion were invented to “help” the poor, or so it was said. What they have ended up doing is debilitating or even wiping out the rich, not the least of whom are the Christians and Catholics (French, Italians, and Spanish in particular) who dutifully have freed themselves from any moral restrictions in these matters. If a people needs labor but rejects their own children, their only alternative is to import other people’s children -- the proof of which among us is simply to go out into the streets of any of our cities and note who is doing the physical labor, or to note the nationalities of those gaining doctorates in our scientific and medical schools.

The face of Europe and to a lesser extent the face of America, is being radically changed by doctrines that convinced a world that it was

overpopulated and that children were a cause of poverty. As it turns out, those who practiced the family limitations proposed as a cure for the problems of others find themselves being replaced by other people’s children, even by other people’s religions and ideologies. The old popes were in fact more prophetic than even they realized at the time they wrote.

V.

Aristotle remarks that the first thing in intention, the end we seek, is the last thing in execution, the thing we obtain. The execution of our intention requires our establishing means whereby we might achieve what we seek. A further question is whether what we seek is really what we want. I am fond of citing a sentence from Henry Kissinger who once remarked that the saddest thing in the world is not wanting something but not getting it. Rather it is wanting something, getting it, then finding out we do not want it. This query means that it is indeed possible to attain something only to find out, on having it, that we do not want it, to find out that we wanted the wrong thing.

C. S. Lewis gives the amusing image of a convoy of ships, all in perfect formation, all in ship-shape and functioning properly, which sets out from Southampton scheduled to arrive in San Francisco, only to find that, on arrival, it has somehow landed in Calcutta. Everything was fine but the end. This seems to be our condition. We are arriving at all sorts of exotic places except that one for which we are intended. Aristotle further says that we do not deliberate about ends only about means. We might wish for something that is impossible for us to achieve — the example Aristotle uses, interestingly, is immortality. But when we act, we are always seeking something that appears possible for us. When we seek what is impossible, we claim to be in control of the limits of human nature. We simply “imagine,” in other words, with no basis in *what is*.

In our literature and religion, the term “the last things,” has usually referred to the famous “four

last things," heaven, hell, death, and purgatory, though it also means in philosophy the final decision before we put something into being, or that which we finally achieve in a series of acts for an end. There is something existential about these "four last things." They refer to final states beyond which there is no return, though traditionally purgatory is meant to disappear into the blessed state. The "last things," moreover, are conceived to be the necessary consequences of the human condition, of human actions.

Even though, say, Ted Williams, the famous baseball player, on his recent death, presumably wanted his body frozen in hopes that it could be defrosted and fixed up some day with the help of science, his current status is basically that he is "dead." We need not worry ourselves, I think, about whether his final judgment is postponed because he is current frozen at - 374 degrees in Phoenix.

Plato, in a way, had already dealt with this topic at the end of *The Republic*. We only have one life to choose. We would not choose a better one if given a second or third time around. A defrosted Ted Williams will be the same slugger that was frozen. The Christian question is always: "is there anything greater in our destiny than a series of defrosted or re-incarnated selves all pretty much in the same sad state that we find ourselves in?" Is this world enough, when we have had enough of it?

VI.

In the present context, what we might worry about, no doubt, is whether we will exist at all, especially if we are Europeans with the threat of universalized euthanasia looming over an aging native population and foreigners replacing us in the work force. The European birthrate is so low that most countries will not be able to continue in their present populations without substantial immigration, which will change them to something else. They seek to prevent immigration without attending to their own birth dearth and its reasons. This decline of births is largely true in the United States but we do have the enormous immigration, both legal and illegal. We all live in

an ironic time. High Muslim birthrates are changing the face of Europe and to a lesser extent America. We are changed more by high Latin birthrates, and, to a lesser extent, by Chinese politics. Muslim militancy is changing both Europe and America. The Chinese and Indians have become vast sources of labor and of high-tech.

In a recent interview, Francis Fukuyama remarked, on being questioned about his thesis about a "post-human future," that, "many already support my campaign to regulate technological research. It is a minefield. When science can offer a father or a mother a prenatal examination of the genetic patrimony of their child and the possibility of modifying it, human nature itself and, what is more, the very dignity of our species, will be at stake" (Zenit, 09/08/2002). When our babies are both better designed and more intelligent than we are, will we recognize them, want them? Fukuyama's statement implies that our species has a dignity, a standard of what it is to be human. Again, as in the surrealist revolution, it is implied that we can "create" or "develop" something better than ourselves. Presumably, the parents with a genetically upgraded child may not recognize the little guy as their own. He will go about looking for the source of the genes that made him so different from his hapless parents who were only trying to "do good." All evils are chosen on the grounds that good is being done.

VII.

The term "first things," besides being the title of a journal, and previously a book by Hadley Arkes, is a philosophical term. In Greek, it is *arche*, those things beyond which we cannot go and still be coherent. There are, as St. Thomas said, things that are first to us, and first in themselves. They are not necessarily the same, though the things that are first to us will point to what is first in itself. Thus, to give an example, it may well be that the last being to appear in the cosmos was man. However, it may also be that man was the first thing intended in the creation and structure of the universe itself, the so-called anthropomorphic principle which argues that the events in the physical universe are uncannily ordered in such a way that they point to the coming into being of a

creature very much like man. The evidence seems to suggest that there is design in the universe and, if design, order. Stanley Jaki makes these points in a number of his books, as does William Wallace, in his *Nature of Science and the Science of Nature*.

St. Thomas had already remarked in his Proemium to Aristotle's *Ethics*, that we could in fact find four sorts of order in the universe – the order of things to each other, the order of our artifacts to what we intended to make, the order of the concepts in our mind, and the order of our actions. The reason all this talk of order and design makes us nervous is because it implies that we are not the cause of our own cosmos or our own being within it. One does not have to be a Christian to rejoice in these indications of order that we did not make, but which we can discover. On the other hand, if all these orders point to a certain incompleteness both in our cosmos and in ourselves, we cannot help but wonder something further is addressed to us other than what we can trace to our own making.

VIII.

Charlie Brown is on the mound when it begins to rain hard. He yells at the team to stay put, the rain will stop. He thinks the sun is “breaking through,” but it isn't. Still soaked on the mound, Linus comes out under an umbrella to ask, “Why are you standing here in the rain, Charlie Brown? It's not going to stop.” Charlie with his cap on, a frown, listens as Linus continues, “This is one of those all day rains.... We'll never finish the game. So why are you standing here in the rain?” The next scene shows Charlie, still on the mound, with a very perplexed look on his face. Linus in silence watches. Finally, in the last scene, Charlie, still being pelted by rain, but now with a determined look on his face, replies to Linus, “Ask me something else....”

I sometimes wonder if that is not our lot – refusing to face the facts. We do not want to be asked the “why” of them. We always talk about

“something else.” The whole intellectual process of how we do right or wrong and are responsible for it, something found in the seventh book of Aristotle's *Ethics*, is contained in this very wet scene in which Charlie Brown reflects on his first things.

What does it mean to keep “last things” to be “first things?” I will end with two remarks, one from C. S. Lewis, one from Samuel Johnson. Lewis notices in *Mere Christianity* that God, for some odd reason, created things, beings, with free will. He explained:

This means creatures that can go either right or wrong. Some people think they can imagine a creature which was free but had no possibility of going wrong; I cannot. If a thing is free to be good it is also free to be bad. And free will is what made evil possible. Why, then, did God give them free will? Because free will, though it makes evil possible, is also the only thing that makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having (52).

So this free will is a “first thing.” When we worry about the clerical scandals, let us not forget about the alternative. The alternative is not a sinless world, let alone a sinless clergy. The alternative is no world at all.

On Thursday, April 7, 1778, Boswell and Johnson were at breakfast. Boswell praised a Scotsman he knew because he was always “content.” Johnson doubted that anyone was always content. Even the man in question was thinking of some plan for the future. Johnson's proof of this point was that the man was once a widower but remarried again -- the “triumph of hope over experience,” as Johnson once humorously called it.

The question shifted to whether we could be content with “little things,” rather than “first” or “last” things. Johnson remarked that if he had once learned to play the fiddle and was then content with it, “I should have done nothing

else.” Boswell next asked him if he ever played a musical instrument. Johnson replied that “I once tried the flageolet, Sir, a small instrument.” Boswell, however, thought that Johnson’s instrument should have been, presumably because of his great size, the “violoncello.” To this, Johnson replies, “Sir, I might as well have played on the violoncello as another; but I should have done nothing else. No, Sir; a man would never undertake great things, could he be amused with small (things).”

In the end, I cite this passage not to denigrate small things, for, as Johnson himself says elsewhere, much of our happiness is contained in small things, but to remind us of our end, of the great things, of the first things, of the last things. If we set out on a ship from Southampton to San Francisco and, on arrival, we find ourselves in Calcutta, we know something is wrong. If we are on the mound in an all day rain storm, we need to ask ourselves “why?” If we find our population aging and few children around, it is best to begin to think, at long last, of the last things, for they will be here before we know it. Freezing ourselves at -374 degrees in Phoenix probably won’t save us from being asked how we have lived, from the last things. Beware of revolutionary mysticisms that promise only the “here and now.” After all, as the song goes, “what kind of a fool *am* I?” “Here we have no lasting city. We seek a home that is yet to come.” “No, Sir, a man would never undertake great things, could he be amused with small.”

Footnote

¹ Peter Balakian, *Black Dog of Fate* (New York: Broadway Books, 1997), 129.

Reproductive Science and the Incarnation¹

Catherine Brown Tkacz

Scientific understanding of human reproductive biology has significantly developed in recent decades.² In contrast to the sensational news of *in vitro* fertilization, cloning, and the Genome Project, the quieter advances in the analysis of female fertility and of human conception have produced a more sophisticated appreciation of natural biological processes. Physicians who learn the new gynecological and reproductive science can now offer greatly improved diagnoses to women using the Creighton Model FertilityCare System^{TM3} and, as a result, can identify and treat many female conditions, such as hormonal imbalances,⁴ which, since the money-making invention of the contraceptive pill, have been routinely ignored: it has been easier to mask the women’s symptoms by prescribing the Pill than to determine their cause. Moreover, the scientific advances by Thomas W. Hilgers, M.D., and others have made achieving pregnancy possible for many couples, using natural techniques that are in accord with the teachings of the Catholic Church and as effective as *in vitro* fertilization.⁵ For his contributions to medical science and to the practical living of the Christian life, Dr. Hilgers, the founder and director of the Pope Paul VI Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction, was awarded the Cardinal Wright Award in 2001 by the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars.

The modern advances in biological science can also be brought into the consideration of theology, rather in the way that Robert J. Spitzer, S. J., brings the theoretical developments of quantum physics to bear in discovering new proofs for the existence for God.⁶ Specifically, the more sophisticated analysis of human reproduction allows a renewed consideration of the im-

plications of the historical act of the Incarnation.⁷ That act can be considered both as divine act and, through Mary, human act. Jesus Christ could have elected suddenly to appear, an adult, but he willed to experience human life from its very beginning and to share with us the personal origin of life in its tiniest physical form, from the instant of conception within his mother's body. As the Church has taught from the start, Jesus and Mary in their perfect holiness endow men and women with renewed male and female images of God. Now the new understanding of reproductive science allows recognition of another means of God's self-revelation as Father and as Son, and also discloses that the earliest moments and days of the life of Christ, from zygote to his implantation in utero, as well as his birth and infancy have much to say about God's renewed blessing of women in particular. The implications drawn from a scientifically informed meditation on the Incarnation and from appreciation of the processes involved clarify more fully the sign which Isaiah foretold in the eighth century B.C. Significantly, the scientifically based insights are consonant with what the Church has taught for two thousand years, and indeed they serve to highlight the wisdom and perceptiveness of the Church.

Traditional Teaching about the Incarnation

By becoming incarnate in the manner in which he did, God hallowed both of the sexes anew. Christ became human. He who had made man, male and female, in his own image— that is, with the capacities to know, to love, and to choose the good⁸— then himself became a human, incarnated in our image. He looked at his people through human eyes, he spoke with a human voice, he touched with a human hand. Ever since, human beings are privileged to live in the same form that God himself hallowed through his Incarnation.

Further, by becoming human as a male, Jesus consecrated all that is biologically male in a man. He confirmed dynamically the pronouncement of Genesis that the male human

image of God is good, very good (Gen.1:31). In Jesus there exists uniquely one who is a human male and who is perfectly sinless. Jesus exerted his human will to remain sinless in accord with his divinity,⁹ so that he is a practical model of holiness for everyone. Being male, he is also a practical model of male holiness, for every man.

At the same time, by becoming human through the cooperation of a woman, the Virgin Mary, and by receiving through her bodily maternal love his conception, gestation, birth, and the nourishment of the milk of her breasts, God also consecrated all that is biologically female in a woman. He confirmed dynamically the pronouncement of Genesis that the female human image of God is good, very good. Nor is this a merely passive goodness of form: For in Mary there exists uniquely one who is a human female and who is perfectly sinless.

Her sinlessness is professed in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. By gift of grace in anticipation of Jesus's sacrifice, Mary "was redeemed from the moment of her conception."¹⁰ This belief has been implicit in Christian teaching since antiquity. The very term "immaculate" has traditionally been used of Mary in the various languages of the faithful to indicate her purity, in parallel with the purity of Christ the "immaculate" lamb.¹¹ For instance, in Anglo-Saxon over a thousand years before the doctrine was formally expressed, the term ungewemmed translated Latin immaculata and indicated the spotless holiness of Mary,¹² the same meaning being conveyed by immaculata in Latin and amoma in Greek. Formal affirmation of this doctrine came in 1854, when Pope Pius IX proclaimed: "The most Blessed Virgin Mary was, from the first moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of almighty God and by virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, Savior of the human race, preserved immune from all stain of original sin."¹³ God, in choosing to be incarnate, deserved to have as mother one who was without sin, and therefore, because of the infinite merit of Jesus, the effects of his redemption were granted in advance to

the one who was to become his mother. As Mary grew, it was of her own free will that she chose to act virtuously and to avoid sin; in the Eastern tradition, Mary is therefore called *Panagia* 'All-Holy.'¹⁴ As a result, in her there exists uniquely one who is a human female and who is perfectly sinless. She is a practical model of holiness for everyone.¹⁵ Being female, she is also a practical model of female holiness, for every woman.

Thus the Incarnation blessed anew the male and the female images of God.

Christ the new Adam, Mary the new Eve

Traditional Church teaching also holds that, in mystery, the Incarnation brought about a new creation, for once again a perfect man and a perfect woman came into existence. This time neither one fell; both chose not to sin and therefore remained perfect. Moreover Jesus Christ became the spotless sacrifice who redeemed sinners and by grace restores the baptized soul, the shriven soul, the person nourished by the Eucharist to become the true image of God. This is the mystery which prompted St. Paul to acknowledge Jesus as the New Adam—“For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive” (1 Cor. 15:22, see also Rom. 5:12-19). Likewise St. Peter taught that Christ has made it possible for us to become “partakers of the divine nature.”¹⁶ This teaching continues through the centuries, in both East and West, with St. Athanasius in the fourth century explaining, “The Son of God became man so that we might become God,” and St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century concurring, “The only-begotten Son of God, wanting to make us sharers in his divinity, assumed our nature, so that he, made man, might make men gods.”¹⁷

Christ as the new Adam underlies the patristic understanding of the piercing of Christ's side on the Cross. In an Easter homily, Theodore of Stoudios (759-826) explains: “Christ was also pierced on the side (whence flowed the divine blood and water which signify the drink of immortality and the recreating baptism) so that the

side of Christ may cure the pain of Adam's side, i.e., Eve. Through this Christ demonstrated that his Passion achieved salvation not only for men, but for women as well.”¹⁸

Mary as the new Eve became the blessed and blessing mother of all mankind. The New Catechism affirms this patristic teaching: “As St. Irenaeus says, ‘Being obedient she became the cause of salvation for herself and for the whole human race.’ Hence not a few of the early Fathers gladly assert. . . : ‘The knot of Eve's disobedience was untied by Mary's obedience: what the virgin Eve bound through her disbelief, Mary loosened by her faith.’ Comparing her with Eve, they call Mary ‘the Mother of the living’ and frequently claim: ‘Death through Eve, life through Mary.’”¹⁹ In tenth-century England, Ælric preached on Christmas that “Our primeval mother Eva locked the gate of heaven's kingdom against us, and this holy Maria opened it to us again.”²⁰ In Latin the relation of the two women is epitomized in the word play of *Ave* / *Eva*, for *Eva* in her fall is balanced by Mary in her response to the angel's greeting of *Ave*. *Eva* brought death, but Mary by actively accepting the news announced with *Ave* brought life. In Greek Mary as redress for Eve is presented eloquently in the Fourth Sticheron for Great Compline on Christmas Eve:

Rejoice, Jerusalem; exult all you who love Sion. Today the temporary bond of Adam's condemnation is dissolved; paradise is opened to us and the serpent is crushed; for woman, whom he first deceived, he now perceives as mother of the Creator. O abyss of divine wealth, wisdom, and intellect! She who had been a sinful vessel conveying death to all flesh has become through the Mother of God the means of salvation to the whole universe, for of Her is born a Child, ever perfect God, Whose birth confirms virginity; loosening the bonds of sins with swaddling clothes, and through His in-

fancy healing Eve's care-laden pains.
May the whole universe exult and
leap with joy, for Christ has come to
regenerate it, and to save our souls.²¹

In the Gospel of Luke, Gabriel is recorded as greeting Mary, not by name, but by words that essentialize her redress of Eve: "Hail, O Woman full of Grace" (*Ave, gratia plena*).²² Eve is called "woman" throughout the account of the creation, temptation, fall, and punishment, being named only afterward (Gen. 3:20). Pope Pius XII discusses the Virgin Mary as the new Eve in the apostolic constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* and points to the parallels between her and Christ as the new Adam, culminating in the parallel between the Assumption of Mary, granted by God, and the Ascension of Christ, of his own power. The supreme crown of her privileges, he teaches, was for Mary, "like her Son, when death had been conquered, to be carried up body and soul to the exalted glory of heaven, there to sit in splendor at the right hand of her Son, the immortal King of the ages."²³ Both Adam and Eve had been exiled from Paradise for their sin; Christ the New Adam re-enters the heavenly Paradise at his Ascension and raises Mary the New Eve into the heavenly Paradise at the end of her earthly life. Thus the New Adam and the New Eve lead the way for all the redeemed to enter a greater paradise than the first parents had lost.

The Incarnation stands in reciprocal relationship to Creation in far more than Christ being the new Adam and Mary being the new Eve. God's creation of humanity is already rich in reciprocity, and the Incarnation enriches and renews creation's paradoxes. Adam was created by God first, then Eve was created by God from Adam's side (Gen. 3:21-22).²⁴ Man was created first, and man's substance was the source of woman's. Thus, woman derives from man.²⁵ In his Incarnation, the Creator willed to balance this in its reversal. He chose that he should derive his physical humanity from a woman, Mary. Indeed, the new Eve is historically prior to the new Adam. Mary, the sinless woman, was born first (i.e., before Jesus), and when she

was mature, then with her cooperation Jesus, the sinless man, became Incarnate by the power of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, whereas Adam slept, unaware, when the creation of woman occurred (Gen. 3:21), Mary was awake, informed, and active: she learned the will of God from the angel and chose to accept it. Thus the unique being Jesus derived his human substance from a woman, with her conscious cooperation.

Mary also expresses in her perfect womanhood a metaphor that recurs throughout the Bible: In mystery, inspired Scripture frequently personifies the faithful as a woman. For instance, Rachel represents the entire Jewish people when Jeremiah foresees "Rachel weeping for her children because they are no more" (Jer. 31:5). Jerusalem is personified as a woman.²⁶ So is Zion.²⁷ Israel is personified as God's betrothed, bride, or wife.²⁸ Jeremiah chastises the nation forgetful of God as a negligent wife and even a harlot.²⁹ When Jesus inaugurated his preaching ministry by reading and explaining Isaiah 61 in the synagogue (Luke 4:18), implicitly he endorsed afresh the image of the church as bride (Isa. 61:10). Throughout the New Testament, the Church is the bride of Christ.³⁰ For individual persons, too, the Church asserts "the spousal character of the human vocation in relation to God."³¹ This female modeling of the human relationship to God "is fulfilled perfectly in Mary's virginal motherhood."³² It is meet that we imitate her, for she acted on behalf of all of us: as St. Thomas Aquinas expressed it, "She uttered her yes 'in the name of all human nature.'"³³ Of the two perfect human beings, Mary and Jesus, Jesus has both a human nature and a divine nature. Therefore Mary is the only one of the two who is solely human, and thus she is a congenial example for everyone, male and female, in modeling our relation to God.

The True Humanity of Jesus

Steadfastly the Church has affirmed that Jesus truly has a human nature, with human soul, human knowledge, human body, and human will. The Apostle Paul professes that Jesus is God's son, "made of a woman, made under the

law" (Gal. 4:4), and the Apostle John asserts that Jesus is God's Son "come in the flesh" (1 John 4:2-3, 2 John 7). Progressively through the early centuries of Christianity this is clarified. To counter Gnostic Docetism, which acknowledged Christ's divinity but denied his true humanity, the Council of Antioch (3rd century) affirmed Christ's sonship by nature, not adoption. In 325 the First Ecumenical Council, at Nicea, professed in the Creed that "the Son of God is 'begotten, not made, of the same substance (homoousios) as the Father,' and condemned Arius, who had affirmed that the Son of God 'came to be from things that were not' and that he was 'from another substance' than that of the Father."³⁴ In 431 St. Cyril of Alexandria and the Third Ecumenical Council, at Ephesus, asserted "that the Word, uniting to himself in his person the flesh animated by a rational soul, became man."³⁵ Twenty years later, countering the Monophysite contention that human nature ceased to exist in Christ, the Fourth Ecumenical Council, at Chalcedon, gave a full and explicit statement: "Following the holy Fathers, we unanimously teach and confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ: the same perfect in divinity and perfect in humanity, the same truly God and truly man, composed of rational soul and body; consubstantial with the Father as to his divinity and consubstantial with us as to his humanity; 'like us in all things but sin.' He was begotten from the Father before all ages as to his divinity and in these last days, for us and for our salvation, was born as to his humanity of the virgin Mary, the Mother of God."³⁶ Thus is she the God-bearer, the Theotokos. In 553 at the Fifth Ecumenical Council, at Constantinople, it was further clarified that "everything in Christ's human nature is to be attributed to his divine person," including his miracles, suffering and death.³⁷

DNA and the Maleness of the Second Person of the Trinity

Scientific advances in the last century in the human ability to understand the biology of human reproduction allow a refreshed awe at the mystery of Jesus's Incarnation. For we may

now discern for the first time a paradox that has been present from the start, though till now unguessed. The basic paradox has always been the wondrous conception that Isaiah prophesied: "The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son" (Isa. 7:14). For a virgin to conceive is in itself a wonder. That, however, she should conceive a male child is a further wonder, disclosed by considering that modern science has shown deoxyribonucleic acid to be determinative in human reproduction: No woman's ovum can contribute the genetic material needed to produce a male child.

Here modern science only enhances the wonder as perceived from antiquity. Bronze Age observations of human reproduction, before microscopes and chemical analysis, can be glimpsed in Genesis. The human male contribution to pregnancy, semen, was obvious, even though the potent and microscopic element within it, the many spermatazoa, would not be isolated for ages. As a substance semen is both visible outside the man's body and also strongly experienced physically when introduced into the woman's vagina in ejaculation. The Torah's account of Onan demonstrates that the ancient Jews understood that "seed" was essential in conception (Gen. 38:8-10). But what could be deduced about the woman's role in pregnancy? The cycle of menses gave evidence outside the woman's body in the form of discharged blood, and it became evident that a menstruating woman was infertile during this discharge and that when a woman had become pregnant the cyclic discharge of blood ceased for the duration of the pregnancy. In each case blood, recognized as vital,³⁸ is visible or, during pregnancy, observably absent. Blood, then, was known to be associated with female fertility.

A woman's physical contribution to conception, however, is unknowable through observation by the unaided eye. The ancient Jews appear to have thought that the environment of the mother could influence the nature of her offspring: Jacob placed peeled twigs before pregnant ewes, intending to influence the nature of their

offspring. Providentially the ewes produced the flocks he sought, namely, those of mixed colors that, by agreement with Laban, would be Jacob's (Gen. 31:37-42). But there is no indication that the ancient Jews thought that women contributed substantively to conception. Nor was there any observable evidence available to them to lead to such a conclusion.

For it is only just to recall that the people of Genesis knew nothing of genetics. They lived thousands of years before the invention of the microscope in the seventeenth century, before Baer discovered the unfertilized ovum in 1826,³⁹ Mendel began his experiments in 1856, or Johannsen coined the term "gene" in 1909,⁴⁰ let alone the analysis of DNA in the 1950s. In short, pre-modern science could not deduce that the woman contributed substantively to the physical being of the child in her womb. The ancient Greek reasoning likewise was limited to observable data.⁴¹ It was thought that the woman regularly produced matter which could be formed as human only by the addition of semen with its "vital heat," and that if such formation did not occur, then the matter was sloughed off as menses.⁴² The woman's contribution was necessary, but it was not formative. Given that, it is impressive that the ancient Jews could receive the revelation that men and women are both made in the image of God, the doctrine which is the source of the Christian understanding of the spiritual equality of the sexes.⁴³

Impressive, too, is the Church's tradition of crediting Mary with physically contributing humanity to Jesus. In 431 the Council of Ephesus proclaimed Mary truly the Mother of God: "Mother of God, not that the nature of the Word or his divinity received the beginning of its existence from the holy Virgin, but that, since the holy body, animated by a rational soul, which the Word of God united to himself according to the hypostasis, was born from her, the Word is said to be born according to the flesh."⁴⁴ Recognizing Mary's essential human maternity of Jesus did not depend on knowing the biochemistry of human reproduction.

Now, however, that the double helix of DNA within the cell nucleus has been discovered and its role in human reproduction is understood, fresh details of the mystery of the Incarnation are presented to us for contemplation. Lest it seem flippant or irreverent to consider Christ's humanity as including DNA, let it be noted that the natural human biological means for a new life to be conceived and to grow is through DNA, each person's distinctive⁴⁵ genetic signature encoded in chromosomes from the instant the zygote is formed by the union of the parents' gametes. The doctrine of the true humanity of Christ implies, it would seem, that he has DNA. Otherwise, he would be unlike us in basic human biology, so basic it is common to both sexes from the instant of conception. Further, if Christ became human by some means other than by the adoption of human DNA, it would seem that Mary was not the natural source of his humanity and also that he did not enter human history as the biological descendant of Abraham. On the other hand, if Jesus did become incarnate by means of adopting human nature including DNA, then at the instant of his conception—although this implication could not be known for two thousand years—he began to enlarge the meaning of "seed" as used in the Torah.

Seed of Abraham, Fruit⁴⁶ of Mary

God had made known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that through them and their descendants all nations would be blessed. Specifically, Abraham's seed would be blessed.⁴⁷ Abraham's "seed" manifestly refers to his biological descendants begotten by the only means understood in the Bronze Age, that is, by male generation. When Elizabeth and her infant in the second trimester were moved to acknowledge the blessed fruit of Mary's womb (Luke 1:26, 41-43), Mary's responding canticle of praise, the Magnificat, relates to the original covenant, for she recalls God's mercy, promised to "Abraham and his seed [Gr. *spermati*, Lat. *semeni*] forever" (1:55). But the woman Mary is the one who conveyed Abraham's genetic heritage directly to Christ. No male descendant

of Abraham begot Jesus; the female descendant of Abraham, Mary, conceived him. Centuries before the discovery of women's equal genetic contribution to offspring, the Incarnation thus gave women a new prominence through Mary, a prominence which can only be recognized now.

Thus is Jesus truly descended from Abraham, yet the details of his genealogy are as mysterious as the origin of Melchizedek because Mary's lineage is not recorded in Scripture. The biblical genealogy of Christ (e.g., Matt. 1:1-16) culminates in Joseph, the foster father of Jesus. Luke juxtaposes the declaration by God the Father that Jesus is his Son to the popular assumption that Jesus was "(as it was supposed)" the son of Joseph and then gives the details of Joseph's ancestry (Luke 3:22-38). It is Joseph who is stated to be of the house and family of David (Luke 1:8). Mary's lineage, even her parents, are not mentioned, except that she is related to Elizabeth, who is descended from a daughter of Aaron (Luke 1:5, 36).⁴⁸ Omitting Mary's background is consistent with the limited science of the age. That is, female children were evidently recognized to be the fruit of their paternal lineage, but it was not understood that they, like males, conveyed this biological heritage to their children. Now we may recognize explicitly that Jesus genetically descends from Abraham through Mary.

Jesus fulfills the scope of God's covenantal promise to bless all nations by enlarging the family of Abraham through granting sonship to his disciples, and thus to all the Church⁴⁹ throughout history. Jesus voices this most clearly in directing the apostles to pray addressing God as "Our Father who art in heaven" (Matt. 6:9-13). In the Gospel of John is asserted that faith gives one power to become the son of God (John 1:12), and both Paul and John in their letters reaffirm this belief.⁵⁰ This sonship both includes individuals not biologically among the progeny of Abraham but can also be nullified even by biological descendants of Abraham if they in spirit cut themselves off from God.⁵¹ Through the Holy Spirit Christians

participate in Jesus Christ's relationship of son to the Father.⁵² Typologically, in becoming a son of God, it is faith that is seminal. Or, more precisely—understanding this biological metaphor in light of the "spousal character of the human vocation in relation to God,"⁵³ as exemplified by Mary—it is grace that is seminal and the individual's will that is like the ovum, with the resulting fruit being the faith that makes one God's offspring.

God's wisdom demands metaphors to express mystery and paradox. Fittingly, Jesus Christ, uniquely God and Man, chose to embody this metaphor: his physical body, by nature descended from Abraham through Mary, was the medium for the Incarnation of his divine nature, which had the authority to extend sonship by adoption to his disciples. And his body, being like ours, began as a single cell encoded with DNA in its nucleus.

Each human being has a distinctive DNA with 46 chromosomes, the diploid number. Human chromosomes are diploid or "twofold" because they occur in pairs. Specifically, 23 pairs of chromosomes, including one pair of sex chromosomes, are in every somatic cell, that is, in every cell of the body. Only the reproductive cells have less: Each gamete, the man's spermatozoon and the woman's ovum, has the haploid ("half-fold") number, a linear thread of 23 single chromosomes. This comes about through meiosis, in which the parent's DNA separates into forty-six free-floating chromosomes and then assembles into two strings of twenty-three, each string destined for a separate gamete. Each person's DNA has the potential for numerous possible genetic outcomes in meiosis, thus showing in microscopic miniature the plenitude of creation. When a spermatozoon and an ovum combine, the resulting new life, the single-celled zygote, is created⁵⁴ with a diploid number of chromosomes, an equal half contributed by each parent. The sex of the child is determined from the instant of conception by the child's pair of sex chromosomes. The ovum, the female reproductive cell, always transmits an X chromosome, while the sperm

may transmit either an X or a Y chromosome. Thus the sex of the child is determined by the physical contribution of the father:

mother contributes X + father contributes X =
child with XX = daughter

mother contributes X + father contributes Y =
child with XY = son

This biological fact, namely, that the father's contribution to conception determines the sex of the child, is itself a detail of Creation. Given that God created the universe and all things, visible and invisible, we may expect that the detail of the father's role in conception ought to be meaningful, and therefore it is just to consider how that may be so. The mystery of the Incarnation was accomplished by means unknowable, yet one may reverently contemplate it. God's paternity is by definition supernatural. In the following discussion, it will be assumed that Mary's maternity is entirely natural on her part. Presuming a natural contribution from the Virgin Mary, that is, a normal ovum, she must have contributed to her child an X chromosome. Being female, she could not contribute a Y chromosome.

The maleness of Christ is thus indicated as divinely deliberate. How this was effected remains as much a mystery as ever. Yet, the discoveries of modern science regarding human reproduction show that God's begetting of Jesus was not a divine imposition of form on unformed female matter, but, apparently, a divine creation of a haploid string of DNA to combine with the haploid string of DNA provided by Mary, in an act that beautifully corresponds to the two natures of Christ, divine and human. The point is important: When in antiquity it was thought that a woman could contribute only unformed matter, made into a human individual by the addition of the male reproductive matter, then for a virgin to conceive any child was recognized as a supernatural event. Now it is known that a woman contributes half of the defining reproductive matter, completed by the reciprocal half contributed by the father, with the father's contribution determining the sex of the child. As a result it is more clear than ever that the maleness of Christ is intentional. This

has been the consistent teaching of the Church; reproductive science simply constitutes a newly discerned means of affirming this doctrine.

Put another way: The dramatic theophany occurred at the baptism of Christ, when the heavens opened and the Spirit of God descended like a dove and alighted upon Jesus and the Father proclaimed from heaven, "This is my beloved Son" (Matt. 3:16-17). Even more resplendently it was confirmed at the Transfiguration, when dazzling light shone around them and from the brightness again the Lord affirmed, "This is my beloved Son" (Matt. 17:5-6). Today a quiet confirmation of the essential maleness of Jesus comes from pondering the role in reproduction of the infinitesimal substance, DNA.

DNA and the Maleness of the First Person of the Trinity

At the same time, by the Son's maleness the First Person of the Trinity also demonstrated that truly he wishes to be known as Father, for only a father could have determined that his child would be male. Elsewhere God reveals maternal aspects, shown in, for instance, Isaiah's poignant words, "Can a woman forget her suckling child? Even these may forget, yet I will not forget you" (Isa. 49:15).⁵⁵ God could have emphasized these maternal aspects by choosing to be incarnate as female. The Lord could have doubled the haploid string of DNA in Mary's ovum or created a haploid string of DNA with an X chromosome to complete Mary's ovum, had God wanted to create a female body for Christ and by that act indicate the First Person of the Trinity as preeminently Mother.

Instead, the God who repeatedly affirms his Fatherhood in Scripture demonstrates it physically in the Incarnation. This is, of course, fully consonant with Jesus's frequent reference to "my Father" (e.g., John 8) and, significantly, the exemplary prayer Jesus gave us, invoking "Our Father who art in heaven" (Matt. 6:9, Luke 1:2). Thus, modern discoveries about the role of DNA in human reproduction simply reinforce the revelation of the Trinity's First Person as Father and of the Trinity's Second Person as Son. God used the

manner of the Incarnation to affirm his Fatherhood as well as the maleness of the Son. In the providence of God it is only now, in the 21st century, that science allows such biologically-informed speculations about the Incarnation. For recent decades have seen some seeking to impose androgyny on Christ.⁵⁶ Others, aggrandizing the role of the female imagery used sometimes of God in Scripture and Christian tradition, seek to displace revelation and to denominate God solely as Mother,⁵⁷ or as generic Parent, as evident by the modern blenderizing of the Doxology into such versions as "Glory to the triune God, Divine Parent, Only Begotten and Holy Spirit"⁵⁸ and "Glory be to the One God and to the Christ and to the Holy Spirit."⁵⁹ Such modern revisions ultimately privilege ideology over the Incarnation.⁶⁰

Yet, at the same time that these ideological interpretations have been put forward, reproductive biology has developed, so that now it is possible to call attention to a physical means divinely used to reveal the maleness of God the Father and of God the Son. The sign of which Isaiah spoke was both the outward and amazing mystery of Jesus's birth and also the inner and hidden encoding of his bodily humanity as male in his DNA: "The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son" (Isa. 7:14).

Scientific Analysis of Female Fertility and The Incarnation as the Complete Blessing of Women

Conception requires an ovum. God coordinated his Incarnation with the natural cycle of fertility in Mary, a female process that Thomas Hilgers identifies as "one of the most marvelous, sophisticated events in all of nature."⁶¹ The ovaries are the pair of almond-shaped glands which contain the ova, the individual female reproductive cells.⁶² Mary's pituitary gland had produced the Follicle Stimulating Hormone (FSH) to ripen a follicle within an ovary so that one of her several hundred thousand individual, undeveloped ova would be prepared for ovulation, that periodic ripening and rupture of the mature graafian follicle and discharge of the ovum from the cortex of the ovary. The ripening follicle had been produc-

ing estrogen to stimulate the enriching of the lining of her uterus so that, should conception occur, her womb would be ready to receive and nourish the new life. Mary's pituitary gland also produced Luteinizing Hormone (LH) to stimulate the release of the readied ovum. The ovary's mature follicle (which had become yellow and so called a "Yellow Body") was ripened to release the ovum and impel it to the nearby and receptive fallopian tube. It is now known that an ovum is viable for only twelve hours,⁶³ so that conception occurs immediately after ovulation and usually within the fallopian tube. The journey of the new life through the fallopian tube to the womb lasts 6-9 days.⁶⁴ Meanwhile, the Corpus Luteum (Yellow Body) would produce the hormone progesterone to give the uterine lining hormonal support so that the lining cells now produced "a highly nutritious fluid"; if no implantation were to occur, the progesterone would drop and menstrual sloughing of the uterine lining would follow.

The timing of the angel's visit was consonant with the natural female process of ovulation. This would mean that one of Mary's ova had ripened in readiness for the moment of the Annunciation. As a result, her act of assent, her "Fiat," coincided with ovulation, so that her deliberate and holy will was matched by the physical process. The Church teaches that in procreation a married couple cooperates with God's creation, in that, by engaging in fertile coitus with openness to conception, they effect the conditions in which another human person is created by God. In Mary this spousal cooperation in creation is demonstrated profoundly, for her very word of assent, her fiat, echoes the creating word of God: in Genesis 1:3, 6, 14-15, fiat is the first word in each clause.⁶⁵ Perhaps at the very instant Mary spoke, God the Father effected conception of the Son, actualizing her fiat in the Incarnation. Certainly this is the traditional view, the one expressed eloquently in artworks such as Robert Campion's Annunciation. If so, then God let the word uttered by Mary, the new Eve, mark the historical instant when Christ, the new Adam, became incarnate. God, whose will and word of fiat effected Creation, granted to a sinless human being, the woman Mary, to utter the word of fiat that

ARTICLES

effected the Incarnation. Significantly, Mary's utterance is not, however, identical to God's creative command in Genesis, for Mary first identifies herself as the Lord's handmaiden (*ancilla*) and then says, not "Let it be," as in "Let there be light," but "Let it be to me [*fiat mihi*] according to thy word." Her *fiat* conveys the sense of "Amen." Thus is it demonstrated through Mary that the human act of assent to the will of God is creative and sacramental.

God incarnate now dwelt within Mary. While this life, biologically speaking, was merely a single cell at inception, the complete divinity of God almighty was present within it, and we do well to consider the behavior of Jesus in occurrences which for no other person in human history could be considered behavior. But this single human cell, uniquely, was no creature, but the Creator of all, God Incarnate. His actions may therefore be regarded as intentional, as willed, on the part of the person of Jesus Christ. While it would have been impossible for Jesus, humanly speaking, to be conscious at that point, it is abiding Christian doctrine that God willed the Incarnation and that Christ's actions, including his ministry, healing, sacrifice upon the Cross, Resurrection, and Ascension, were intended from the start. Specifically, they were intended by Christ, as was professed in 553 at Constantinople.⁶⁶ Moreover, because the Trinity is united in volition, Christ's actions are, by participation, willed also by the entire Trinity. For this reason, the Eastern rite affirms in the Divine Liturgy, "The Trinity has saved us."⁶⁷ Omniscient and omnipotent, God knew from the beginning of time what the details would be of Jesus's preborn life, from conception to birth, and consequently it is clear he intended them. We do well, therefore, to consider the events in the pre-born life of Jesus as divinely willed behavior. What do these actions imply?

God so often expresses his relationship with us physically, as in the account of his molding Adam from the earth (Gen. 3:21-22) and in Jesus's physical, healing touch bestowed throughout his ministry, and in his taking children up into his arms (Mk. 10:16) and laying his hands on their heads to bless them (Matt. 19:13-16). Consider, then, the blessing touch of Jesus within his

mother. Perfectly sinless and bodily whole, she needed no healing of soul or body. The first contact that God incarnate made with a human being was with a woman, his mother, and that touch imparted ineffable blessing. As intimately as Jesus dwelt within his own male body, imparting to all men the resanctification of their bodies, so with corresponding intimacy did he in his pre-born life dwell within his mother's body, imparting to all women the resanctification of theirs.

Upon Mary's *fiat*, God touched an ovum and at once it was his body. By mystery, her ovum with its haploid number of chromosomes was completed divinely and became a zygote with the full complement of 46 chromosomes in Jesus's distinctive encoding of the elegant double helix that dances in every human somatic cell. Perhaps this occurred in the instant when the ovum was emerging from the ovary and was still in contact with it. If so, God incarnate touched her ovary as well. At once, as new research from Oxford microbiologist Richard Gardner indicates, the axis of human morphology was present in the new human life, perhaps even before the first cell division.⁶⁸ While Mary journeyed to attend her cousin Elizabeth in her pregnancy, Our Lord was carried by the natural processes of his mother's fertile body through the fallopian tube into her womb. The innermost places of female fertility, the ovaries and fallopian tubes, have thus been blessed as the places where God became incarnate and sojourned for a week.

Next, the few-celled body of Christ touched and was implanted within the enriched lining of his mother's uterus. How replete with blessing is this act. No amniotic sac enclosed him yet, not even that thin transparent membrane separated him from her uterine wall, itself richly interwoven with the uterine arteries and capillaries. At the moment of implantation, God directly and in person physically touched the living blood of a woman. Further, this act was necessary, given that God had chosen to become incarnate, for the contact of implantation was the natural means for his human body to grow, gestate, and develop to the point of birth. Blood is life in Scripture, from Genesis through Revelation. God declared to Cain that Abel's blood called to him (Gen. 4:10),

and blood-crimes require blood-payment.⁶⁹ The life-protecting blood of the original paschal lamb preserved all the faithful (Exod. 12:7, 13, 23). This accords a special status to the paschal lamb, for afterwards blood was to be drained from animals offered in expiation of sin (Lev. 1:15, 4:4-7, 5:9). The life-giving, sanctifying blood of Christ God is announced by Jesus in his astounding "Bread of Life" proclamation (John 6:53-56). After the Ascension John's vision extends the imagery, as the saints wash their robes in the blood of the lamb (Rev. 22:14).⁷⁰ Within the constant tradition of blood as life, the Lord God almighty, whose life-giving blood would be sacrificed on the Cross and cleanly given in the Eucharist to his Church, at the start of his Incarnation did Himself touch the life-giving blood of his mother. Christianity is a religion of mysterious paradoxes, and here is one of great humility and unspeakable tenderness.

God chose to grow full term within his mother's womb, nourished and cleansed through her blood and laved in the amniotic fluid. The disc-shaped placenta developed where the new life was implanted; and as the fetus grew so did the umbilical cord, connecting mother and child. The child's chondrion reached villi into his mother, and these were continually bathed in the mother's blood and lymph. Through the close contact of maternal blood (in the placenta and then also in the cord) and fetal blood (in the villi), Mary gave her child food substances, oxygen, and antibodies, and cleansed her child's blood of metabolic waste products.⁷¹ A transparent membrane, the amnion or amniotic sac, grew to enclose the child; in the amnion he was borne and protected and awash in the amniotic fluid or liquor amnii.⁷² The amnion is named from the diminutive of the Greek word for "lamb."⁷³ Presumably this etymology grew from the visibility of the caul in sheep, for lambs are yet encased in it at lambing. At the same time, this nomenclature provides a tender paradox, for the Lamb of God, *ho Amnos tou Theou* (John 1:29), grew within the amnion in his mother's womb; the Lamb of God whom John would baptize in the Jordan was immersed first in the liquor amnii.⁷⁴ Furthermore, a Greek homophone, amnion, provides a foreshadowing of Christ's sacrifice, for in Classical Greek to am-

nion is a bowl in which the blood of sacrificial victims was caught in religious rituals.⁷⁵ Surely the Word knew of this punning, which is as serendipitous linguistically as "son" and "sun."

God chose to be born. He chose to traverse the birth canal.⁷⁶ When Mary's waters broke, Jesus moved out of the amnion—the Lamb, Amnos, ready to be visible, left the amnion, the "lamb" sac. Again, as he had during the first week of his Incarnation and at implantation, Christ directly touched his mother. He passed through her cervix.⁷⁷ Its strength had kept him securely in the uterus throughout gestation and now it widened to deliver him to wider life. He passed through the vagina, the organ with which every wife knows her husband. Jesus emerged⁷⁸ through the labia, the vulva. Sinlessly (of course), with more than the innocence of a baby and with the unbounded bestowal of blessing that is divine, God touched these female sexual organs. And when born, surely Jesus was suckled by his mother at her breasts. Through the manner Jesus chose for his Incarnation, he blessed women anew and entirely, blessing with his sanctifying touch the entire female reproductive system and the womanly capacities to lactate and to nurse.

Contemplating the paradox of the full divinity of God, the entire being of the Creator of the Universe, being present within a single cell, points like a laser to one of the meanings of Jesus's assertion that what is done to "one of the least of these" is done to him. Our Lord's admonition has long been associated with the right to life of the unborn. The present analysis directs our attention to the likeness of the just-conceived new human being to Jesus when just-conceived, even before implanted in the uterine lining, even before detectable by hormonal changes sequent from conception. Jesus, too, has been embodied in a single cell, manifesting in his flesh when it consisted only of a single cell that the unborn are equally are made in the miniature image of God. Modern reproductive science is thus in accord with what was evident from the Gospel of Luke: Jesus, only a few days after conception, was hailed by Elizabeth as the Lord. Elizabeth's unborn son, in the sixth month of life, was inspired by God to leap in the womb, in response to the

Lord. This consideration affirms the Church's teaching on the sanctity of life and on the sin of destroying preborn persons. It is a human person that is destroyed by an abortion; or by RU-486 when it directly causes expulsion of a fetus; or by the "morning after" pill when it abruptly disrupts and vitiates a woman's hormonal and bodily state to prevent implantation; or by the daily "contraceptive" pill's steady disabling of her hormonal system, when it fails to suppress ovulation and instead prevents implantation.⁷⁹ Likewise *in vitro* fertilization produces several new lives from a couple's gametes, but if only one life is transferred to the mother's body, it is that child's siblings that are discarded.

Considering the modern advances in the scientific understanding of human reproduction lets us ponder anew the Sonship of Christ, the Fatherhood of God, the true and complete maternity of Mary the God-bearer, and the fresh blessing bestowed on both sexes through the Incarnation. Yet the mystery of Jesus's Incarnation remains ineluctable and eternal. Isaiah's prophecy still staggers the imagination: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son."

Dr. Tkacz is an independent scholar in Spokane, Washington, whose essays have appeared in such journals as Revue d'etudes augustiniennes, Vigiliae Christianae, Studia Patristica, and Traditio.

Footnotes

¹ This essay is dedicated to my husband, Michael W. Tkacz.

² The following discussion draws on the publications of Thomas W. Hilgers, M.D., especially *The Medical Applications of Natural Family Planning: A Contemporary Approach to Women's Health Care: A Physician's Guide to NaPro Technology (NPT)* (Omaha: Pope Paul VI Institute Press, 1991), esp. chapter 6, "The Scientific Foundations," pp. 57-71; *The Ovulation Method of Natural Family Planning with an Introduction to NaPro Technology, the Contemporary Approach to Women's Health Care: An Introductory Booklet for the New User* (Omaha: Pope Paul VI Institute Press, 1992); and *The Scientific Foundations of the Ovulation Method* (Omaha: Pope Paul VI Institute Press, 1995), esp. at pp. 5-9. See also T.W. Hilgers and J.B. Stanford, "Crieghton Model NaProEducation Technology for Avoiding Pregnancy: Use Effectiveness," *The Journal of*

Reproductive Medicine 43.6 (June 1998), which documents that the Creighton Model System has a method effectiveness of 99.5 % and a use effectiveness of 96.8 %, that is, as good or better than the effectiveness of any contraceptive drug or device on the market.

³ A recurring statement in Dr. Hilgers' writings is that women's self reports are to be taken seriously, because their personal observations of, for instance, the quantity and quality of cervical mucus provides reliable evidence.

⁴ NaProTRACKING of the menstrual cycle can allow diagnosis of such problems as infertility, repetitive miscarriage, recurrent ovarian cysts, premenstrual syndrome, a variety of different hormonal abnormalities, the effects of stress, and abnormal bleeding.

⁵ Those wishing practical information and professional references may contact the Pope Paul VI Institute of Human Reproduction, 6901 Mercy Road, Omaha, NE 68106-2604 (<http://www.popepaulvi.com>), or The Couple to Couple League International, Inc., P.O. Box 11084, Cincinnati, OH 45211 (<http://www.ccl.org>).

⁶ Robert J. Spitzer, S.J., "The Definition of Real Time and Ultimate Reality," *Journal of Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 23.3 (2000): 260-76; idem, "Indications of Creation in Contemporary Astrophysics," *JURM* 24.3 (2001): 209-54; idem, "Proofs for the Existence of God, Part I: A Metaphysical Argument," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 41.2 (2001): 161-81, and "Proofs for the Existence of God, Part II," *IPQ* 41.3 (2001): 305-31.

⁷ Although Arthur Peacocke treats the incarnation in *God and the New Biology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), he misses the issues addressed in the present essay. Moreover, he uses a reductionist, post-Enlightenment concept of the incarnation, as shown by microbiologist and theologian Alister McGrath, "Old Theology and New Biology," *Science and Christian Belief* 1 (1989) 167-71. J. Puddefoot's concern is the consciousness of Christ in "Information Theory, Biology, and Christology," pp. 301-19 in *Religion and Science: History, Method, Dialogue* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

⁸ On the patristic interpretation of three-part human nature as an image of the Trinity, see Kenneth Paul Wesche, "Man and Woman in Orthodox Tradition: The Mystery of Gender," *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37.2-3 (1993), 213-51, at 233.

⁹ Affirmed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council, i.e., Constantinople III in 681; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed. (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), §475.

¹⁰ *Catechism*, §491.

¹¹ Num. 28:3, 29:17 treat the spotless lamb required for sacrifice; Heb. 9:14 and 1 Pet. 1:19 identify the blood of Christ as that of the spotless lamb. The Church is spotless

(Eph. 5:27) and the individual is to seek to remain without spot (2 Pet. 3:14). It was a natural step to recognize Mary as spotless also.

¹² Catherine Brown Tkacz, "Christian Formulas in Old English Literature: *Naes hyre wlite gewemmed* and Its Implications," *Traditio* 48 (1993) 31-61, at 45-48.

¹³ Pius IX, *Ineffabilis Deus*, 1854: DS 2803, quoted in *ibid.*

¹⁴ *Catechism*, §493.

¹⁵ For other biblical women as models for everyone, see C. B. Tkacz, "Singing Women's Words as Sacramental Mimesis," *Traditio* (forthcoming), *passim*

¹⁶ 2 Pet. 1:4, quoted in *ibid.*, §460.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, quoting St. Athenasius, *De incarnatione* 54.3 (PG 25:192B), and St. Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula* 57:1-4.

¹⁸ Anna D. Kartsonis, *Anastasis: The Making of An Image* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 211, citing Theodore Studites' Easter homily, *In Sanctum Pascha* (PG 99:716 etc.)

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, §494.

²⁰ "Ure ealde moder Eua us beleac heofenan rices geat, and seo halige Maria hit eft us geopenede"; *Catholic Homilies*, vol. 1, pp. 295-98, last paragraph.

²¹ *Christ is Born! Glorify Him!* Adapted from Traditional Byzantine Slavonic Chants for Congregational Use. Comp. Rev. Wm. Levkolic. (S.I., 1969).

²² It is easy to forget that angel does not name Mary, for her name was, in the West, added by the seventh century to the prayer based on the angel's greeting; Jean Laurenceau, O.P., "Les débuts de la récitation privée de l'antienne 'Ave Maria' en occident avant la fin du XI^e siècle," *De Cultu Mariano saeculis VI-XI: Acta Congressus Mariologici-Marianni Internationalis in Croatia anno 1971 celebrati*, ed. Gérard Philips (Rome, 1972), vol. 2: *Considerationes generales*, 231-46, at 237.

²³ Quoted in *The Liturgy of the Hours according to the Roman Rite* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1975), vol. 4, pp. 1320-22, the second reading for August 15.

²⁴ Donald M. Joy argues that human fetal morphology also balances the order of Adam and Eve's creation. Following Mary Jane Sherfey's "inductor" theory, Joy asserts that every fetus in the first trimester is female but that, if the Y chromosome is present, in the second trimester the female sexual organs are transformed into the male; "Toward a Symbolic Revival: Creation Revisited," *Religious Education* 80 (1985) 399-412, at 403-05, drawing on Sherfey, *The Nature and Evolution of Female Sexuality* (New York: Ran-

dom House, 1972), a volume known more for its promotion of multiple female orgasms via multiple partners and vibrators, so that women might return to the richness of experience of female apes; on the inductor theory, see pp. 37-40, and on female primates see esp. pp. 103-04, 112-13, 143. The usual interpretation of human fetal development is that the early fetus is, in morphology, undifferentiated sexually and in the later weeks the sexual organs are developed as female or male. The genetic code determining sex is present in the person from the instant of conception; see below.

²⁵ In Hebrew, "adam" is the generic word for man, and "eve" means "life" or "living."

²⁶ E.g., Isa. 9:1, 52:1; Jer. 4:14; Lam. 1:1-2, Rev. 21:9-14.

²⁷ E.g., Isa. 9:1, 49:14, 52:1-2, 66:8-9; Jer. 4.14, Lam. 1.1-2. For additional passages, see Aloysius Fitzgerald, F.S.C., "BTWLT [Virgin] and BT [Daughter] as Titles for Capital Cities," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1974) 167-83 on 168. His view on a pagan origin for such naming has been refuted; see Peggy L. Day, "The Personification of Cities as Female in the Hebrew Bible: The Thesis of Aloysius Fitzgerald, F.S.C.," in *Reading from This Place*, vol. 2: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective*, ed. F. Segovia and M. A. Tolbert (Minneapolis, 1995), 283-302.

²⁸ Hos. 2:19-20, Jer. 3:14, Ezek. 16:8-14.

²⁹ Negligent wife: Jer. 2:32, 3:20; harlot: Jer. 3:1, Ezek. 16:15-29.

³⁰ John 3:29, Eph. 5:25, Rev. 21:9-14.

³¹ *Catechism*, §505, citing 2 Cor. 11:2.

³² *Catechism*, §505, citing 2 Cor. 11:2.

³³ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, 30, 1, quoted in *Catechism*, §511.

³⁴ *Catechism*, §465.

³⁵ *Catechism*, §466.

³⁶ Council of Chalcedon (451): DS 301, see also Heb. 4:15; *Catechism*, §467, italics added. The scripture quoted is Heb. 2:16-18.

³⁷ *Catechism*, §468.

³⁸ Blood as life is affirmed in the Torah repeatedly, for instance, in the prohibition against eating blood (Gen. 9:4, Lev. 17:10-12, 14) and in blood paying for blood in the case of capital crime (1 Reg. 2:32, 37).

³⁹ *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, 1:386. From his discovery of a dog's ovum, Baer theorized the role of the ovum

ARTICLES

in all mammalian reproduction, including human.

40. Dictionary of Scientific Biography, 7:114a.

41. Aristotle's understanding of human reproduction and embryology was "by necessity hypothetical and liable to fallacy. Its conclusions were based on knowledge derived from inadequate sense perception"; Luke Demaitre and Anthony A. Travill, "Human Embryology and Development in the Works of Albertus Magnus," in Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays, 1980, ed. James A. Weisheipl, O.P. (Toronto: PIMS, 1980), 405-440, at p. 409, see also 415.

42. Aristotle, On the Generation of Animals I, cc. 19-20, and II, c. 4; see also Demaitre and Travill, op. cit., p. 415.

43. See C. B. Tkacz, "Jesus and the Spiritual Equality of Women," Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly 24.4 (Fall 2001) 24-29.

44. Catechism, §446, citing Council of Ephesus: DS 251. See also §496.

45. Except in cases of monozygotic multiple births and cloning, each individual person has a unique DNA.

46. See also prophetic passages in the psalms, e.g., Ps. 131:11.

47. Gen. 17:7-9, 12:3, 28:13-14; also Gal. 3:16. See also Catechism §§59-60.

48. Non-canonical texts indicate that her father was Joachim, of the house of David, and that her mother was Anna, sister of Elizabeth, indicates that the royal and priestly lines meet in Mary. While venerable, the legend is not doctrine.

49. On the inclusiveness of the Church, see, e.g., Lumen Gentium (21 Nov. 1964), in Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P. (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1975), pp. 364-66.

50. Rom 8:14-15; Philippians 2:15; 1 John 3:1-2.

51. See, for instance, J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Exercitationes on John 8," Estudios Biblicos 52.4 (1994): 433-51, at pp. 440-46.

52. Catechism, §2780.

53. See note 31 above.

54. As St. Thomas Aquinas explained, God's unique and comprehensive act of creation included the historical moments of creation of individual persons at their conception.

55. Similarly, Jesus likens himself to a mother hen when he apostrophizes Jerusalem (Matt. 23:37, Luke 13:34).

56. For instance, Thomas F. Mathews, The Clash of Gods: The Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), "Chapter Five: Christ Chameleon."

57. For analysis of tradition's affirmation of God's self-revelation as Father and Son, on the one hand, and of feminist theologian's dismissal of this, see, e.g., Benedict Ashley, O.P., Justice in the Church: Gender and Participation (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996). See also Wesche, "Man and Woman in Orthodox Tradition," pp. 216-19.

58. Evidently from the Book of Common Prayer as used in New Zealand.

59. Captured through google.com as the version used by the Metropolitan Community Church, which has a particular service to homosexuals.

60. Wesche, "Man and Woman in Orthodox Tradition," pp. 216-18.

61. Hilgers, Ovulation Method of NFP, p. 5.

62. Ovaries lie in the fossa ovarica on either side of the pelvic cavity, attached to the uterus by the utero-ovarian ligament and close to the fimbria ovarica of the fallopian tube.

63. The length of time during which coitus can result in pregnancy is longer, because sperm can live for some days within the vagina and uterus, so that intercourse during the days preceding ovulation can produce a child. For the conception of Jesus, only the duration of the ovum's viability matters.

64. Hilgers, Ovulation Method of NFP, p. 12.

65. Mary's full response: "Ecce ancilla Domini. Fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum" (Lk. 1:38). In Greek, Mary's response and the word opening each clause of the Genesis account are from the verb gennaō (cognate with Genesis), although the inflected forms are not identical, as they are in Latin. Mary's reply would have been in Aramaic, and therefore its cognate would have been with the Hebrew of the Torah. Surely the Evangelist Luke saw the connection, and one may see in his narrative the beginning of the Church's teaching that procreative married intercourse participates in God's creation.

66. Catechism, §468.

67. In the post-communion hymn of thanksgiving, "We have seen the true light"; The Divine Liturgy: A Book of Prayer for the Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great, comp. Rev. William Levkulic (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1978), p. 26.

68. Helen Pearson, "Your Destiny, from Day One," Nature 14 (July 4, 2002), 14-15.

⁶⁹ See above, note 31. The need to pay for blood with blood grievously culminates in Judas, who rejects the blood money he has received for betraying Christ, but despairs and kills himself, exiling himself from the blood of Christ (Matt. 27:3-8).

⁷⁰ For further discussion, see my "Literary Studies of the Vulgate: Formula Systems," Proceedings of the International Conference on Patristic, Mediaeval, and Renaissance Studies 15 (1990) 205-19, at 209-12; and "The Topos of the Tormentor Tormented in Selected Works of Old English Hagiography," (Ph.D. diss.: University of Notre Dame, 1983) 108-12.

⁷¹ Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary, ed. 14 (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1984), s.v. "placenta," etc. For the etymology, see the Oxford Latin Dictionary.

⁷² A pregnant woman's body continually renews the amniotic fluid, replacing about a third of its water every hour, suggesting a constant gentle laving of the child; Taber's, s.v. "amniotic fluid" and "amnion."

⁷³ See Taber and esp. the OED, s.v. "amnion." Likewise, "amniotic" is clearly from the Greek adjective "amneios"; Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon⁷.

⁷⁴ See Taber and esp. the OED, which clarifies that "amnios" is a "variant of amnion, based upon an erroneous form of the Greek," with the "liquor amnii," the fluid contained in the amnion, contrasted to the "liquor sanguinis," i.e., blood plasma; s.v. "amnios" and "liquor," meaning 6.

⁷⁵ Derivation uncertain; Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon⁷.

⁷⁶ Pace Stanley Jaki, who is certain that Jesus was not born normally but emerged by a "miraculous exit out of the womb"; "The Virgin Birth and the Birth of Science," Downside Review (Oct. 1989), pp. 255-73, at 267. Although Jaki ascribes this view to the Fathers (p. 266), he cites no texts. The view seems to me essentially modern, based on a pietistic thought that to honor Jesus one must dissociate him from human birth, as if birth were indecent. But to construe birth as indecent is surely to reject the blessedness of God's creation of mankind as male and female, which Judaeo-Christian tradition has proclaimed from the start as declared by God to be good (Gen. 1:26-28, 31). Would the Lord who healed by touching, making mud from his own spittle for the healing of the blind man's eyes, have hesitated to enter life outside his mother's body by her natural passage, created for this purpose? Would he have neglected to share this human experience with us? Would he have avoided this opportunity to bless the female human body in its generative detail?

⁷⁷ For ordinary human reproduction, the cervix has a focal role in healthy conception also: Cyclic changes in cervical mucus make it an elegant "biological valve," because it "at certain times during the reproductive cycle allows entry of sperm into the uterus and at other times bars their admission"; Hilgers, Scientific Foundations, 7. The "valve" functions to "assure the presence of fresh sperm and ova at the time of conception," which is greatly to the health of the child and the mother; Hilgers, Medical Applications of NFP, 60.

⁷⁸ Legend attributes an intact hymen to the Theotokos; certainly in some women a "fold of mucous membrane which partially covers the entrance of the vagina" occurs. However: "Contrary to folklore, presence or absence of the hymen cannot be used to prove or disprove virginity or history of sexual intercourse. Its rupture or absence is not evidence of loss of virginity"; Taber's, s.v. "hymen."

⁷⁹ The "contraceptive" pill works only partially by suppressing the hormonal cycle that produces ovulation, and works otherwise, when a woman has ovulated and conceived, by making her uterine lining insufficient to implant the zygote; John and Sheila Kippley, The Art of Natural Family Planning, 2nd ed. (Cincinnati: The Couple to Couple League, 1979), e.g., 46, 57.

A CATHOLIC PHYSICS?

Peter E. Hodgson,
Corpus Christi College,
Oxford

Can there be a Catholic physics? Of course not! The idea is absurd. Newton's equations of dynamics, Einstein's relativity and Maxwell's equations of the electromagnetic field are objective descriptions of the behaviour of the natural world and are just the same for atheists as for Catholics.

Yet there may be more to be said than that. The following remarks are stimulated by Professor Gerald Bradley's article on Catholic Education¹. He is able to show how holding the Catholic faith affects the teaching of the humanities, but admits that he is unable to do the same for physics, not because it is not possible, but because he is unfamiliar with physics. This is a challenge to Catholic physicists.

One can begin by observing that it is a remarkable historical fact that many of the great civilizations of the past achieved a high level of excellence in the humanities, in philosophy, law history, drama and music, but none of them developed science in the modern sense, that is the detailed knowledge of the behaviour of the natural world, expressed by differential equations. Modern science was born in the high Middle Ages, when for the first time in human history there was a civilization permeated by Catholic theology. Included in that theology are the beliefs about the natural world, that it is good, rational, contingent and open to the human mind, that form the essential basis of science. These beliefs are lacking in all ancient civilisations². Furthermore, the beginning of physics and hence of all science, may be identified with the work of the Parisian philosopher John Buridan. He studied the key problem of local motion, and his belief in the creation of the world in time (contrary to the eternal world

of Aristotle) led him to formulate the law of inertial motion, later to be expressed quantitatively as Newton's first law. Thus physics, unlike the humanities, is essentially and radically Catholic, as it is based on Catholic beliefs³.

The development of science through the following centuries was largely due to the work of Catholics, other Christians and Jews. The greatest physicist, Newton, was a somewhat heterodox Christian, the second greatest, Einstein, had a strongly Jewish upbringing. Most physicists would choose the gentle Maxwell as the third greatest, another devout Christian. The founder of experimental science, Robert Grosseteste, was one of the first Chancellors of the university of Oxford and bishop of Lincoln⁴. Buridan's pupil Nicholas Oresme, who carried on his work, was a bishop. Copernicus was a canon, Galileo a devout Catholic, and Kepler a Christian. Many Catholics were pioneers of astronomy, among them the Theatine priest Piazzi the discoverer of Ceres, and the Jesuits Schiener who studied sunspots and Secchi, a pioneer of meteorology who also made spectral analyses of the sun and of thousands of stars. Another Jesuit, Roger Boscovich, made important contributions to mathematics and astronomy and developed ideas on fields of force holding atoms together that were far in advance of this time. Niels Stensen made important discoveries in medicine, was one of the founders the sciences of crystallography, geology and paleontology and also worked on embryology and mineralogy. He became a bishop and was canonized. Laplace, one of the greatest developers of Newtonian mechanics and often described as an atheist, died a Catholic. Fresnel and Fraunhofer, pioneers of optics were Christians, and Galvani, Ampere and Volta, pioneers of electricity, were all Catholics. Pierre Dunem, the French physicist who founded the discipline of the history of science, was a devout Catholic, as was Alistair Crombie, another historian of science. The Austrian monk Gregor Mendel founded the science of genetics. The theory of the Big Bang was due to the Belgian Abbe Lemaitre. The list is endless⁵.

All this refers to the past, but what is the situation today? I can only answer through my own experience. This is not entirely negligible, as I have been engaged on research in nuclear physics, and lecturing and tutoring mathematics and physics, continuously for the past fifty-four years, mainly at Oxford.

Oxford today, despite the presence of Christian symbols, is entirely secular, apart from the theological Colleges. Religion is almost never mentioned in the science laboratories and I would never raise the subject either to colleagues or students. And yet, looking back, there are several experiences that indicate that this is not the whole story.

Over the years I have become aware that a substantial number of the physics students I tutored at College are Christians' two of them are now Catholic priests and one a Venerable Archdeacon (it is rather easier for an Anglican than for a Catholic to become Venerable). One year when the College had five physics undergraduates in the first year, one of them came to me and said that four of them were active Christians, and they were working on the fifth. I never mentioned Christianity in my lectures on nuclear physics but somehow, as I was told just a few weeks ago, they all knew that I am a Catholic

The graduate students, like the undergraduates, are selected solely on evidence of ability and over the years I have found that many of them are Christians. One of the very best of my own students applied for entrance to an Anglican theological College, and I was asked to provide a reference. The letter told me that they required candidates to have a second-class degree. I could not resist replying that I regretted that he did not have the required qualification; he had a first class degree and an excellent D. Phil. Another graduate student in the Department obtained a D. Phil in elementary particle physics and is now studying for the priesthood at the Venerable English College in Rome. Another student there who has recently been ordained has a Cambridge doctorate in astrophysics.

A very substantial proportion of the science lecturers and professors at Oxford are Christians or Jews, and so are the scientists all over the world with whom I have worked on joint research projects. Those from France, Italy, Spain, Poland and Slovakia are mostly Catholics, and they included Prof. Madurga, the first professor of atomic and nuclear physics at the University of Seville, who was a Jesuit priest. The son of another colleague, Professor van Heerden, sometime professor of nuclear physics at the university of the Western Cape, is the Rector of the new seminary in Cape Town, where I had the privilege of giving a few lectures.

One of my colleagues in Oxford once commiserated with me that I was unable, as a physicist, to use my position as a tutor to inculcate students with my religious beliefs. He taught history, and presumably used his tutorials to advance his political opinions. I replied that I simply tried to teach my students how to find the truths of mathematics and physics. He was rather surprised at this, and remarked that physics must be a very constricted subject. I replied that there is an objective truth that can be found by rigorous arguments, and that if I succeeded in training them to seek the truth, whatever the cost, this habit would eventually extend beyond physics, and would lead them to even greater truths.

If it is indeed the case that physics is based on Catholic beliefs about the natural world, then it might well be asked what will happen if these beliefs are removed. Ever since the Middle Ages, science has developed into a self-sustaining enterprise that seems able to exist apart from its origins and to spread over the whole earth. Closed examination reveals a somewhat different picture. In Germany, where physics formerly flourished, it was almost completely destroyed by the Nazis. Hitler declared that Germany did not need physics. Many of the best German scientists, particularly the Jews, were expelled from their posts and went overseas, and Party hacks put in their places. Only a very few, such as Max Von Laue, firmly opposed the Nazis⁶.

Even more revealing is the situation in Soviet Russia, where it was declared that henceforth science was to be built on the iron rock of dialectical materialism, Engels in his "dialectics of nature" laid down a series of rules, invariably erroneous, that physics is supposed to obey. He castigated a whole galaxy of physicists, even including Newton. For Engels, science is not the source of objective knowledge but the slave of dialectical materialism. The results were not long in appearing. Those who resisted were purged from the Academy. Landau was imprisoned and Einstein's theory of relativity condemned. Genetics was destroyed by the charlatan Lysenko, and Vavilov, the greatest of the Russian geneticists, exiled to his death in Siberia⁶.

To a lesser extent, we can see the same process insidiously at work in our own society, as it becomes progressively more secularized and divorced from its Catholic roots. The numbers of aspiring physicists in most countries is steadily falling, and with it the number of those who seek only the truth about the natural world, with no thought of their reputation or personal gain.

So modern physics is Catholic through and through. It is rooted in Catholic theology, is sustained by those roots, and if those roots are weakened or destroyed it withers and dies⁷.

References

- ¹ Gerard V. Bradley, *Looking Ahead at Catholic Higher Ed.*, Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly, Vol 25 #2, Spring 2002. p. 16.
- ² Stanley L. Jaki. *Science and Creation*. Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press, 1974.
- ³ Peter e. Hodgson. *The Christian Origin of Science*. Logos. 4:2. p. 138 Spring 2001. And references therein.
- ⁴ A. C. Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of Experimental Science 1100-1700*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1953.
- ⁵ Karl A. Kneller. *Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science*. Real-View-Books. 1995.

⁶ Peter E. Hodgson. *Science in non-Christian Cultures*. Lecture 7 of course on Science and Belief, 1999.

⁷ Peter E. Hodgson. *The Roots of Science and its Fruits: The Christian Origin of Science and its Impact on Human Society*. St. Austin Press, London, 2002.

Membership Matters

by Christopher M. Janosik

At its fall meeting, Officers and Directors accepted the resignation of Fr. Thomas Dailey, who asked to be excused from office to allow him to give proper attention to expanding apostolic and ministerial commitments at De Sales University.

Fr. Dailey had served the Fellowship from 1997 until 2001 as its first Executive Secretary, and as its tenth president, this past year. Under his leadership, a membership data base was created, and membership directories, summer mailings, director elections, and Membership Matters in the *FCS Quarterly* all became second nature to the Fellowship.

The Board expressed its appreciation to Fr. Dailey for these years of service and wishes him continued success in his future endeavors. Pursuant to Fellowship By-Laws, Dean Bernard Dobranski, Vice President of the Fellowship assumed the presidency.

Officers and Directors approved:

- Expansion of the Fellowship web site to high light the extensive contributions of our members to scholarly organizations, publications and lay apostolates beyond the Fellowship.
- Funding for the Membership Media Guide project proposed by Fr. Matthew Gamber. Watch for details about how you can participate in the coming months.
- Ratified 56 membership applications, bringing the total for the year to 70.

The group also finalized the theme, location, and date for the 2003 Annual Convention.

Catholic Citizen: Debating Issues of Justice
Arlington, Virginia
September 26-28, 2003

Welcome New Members

During the 2002 calendar year, 70 new members joined the Fellowship. Their names are arranged below by area of academic specialty, with current place of employment. It's a pleasure to welcome this exceptional group to the Fellowship, please join me in doing likewise.

Economics & Management

Claveau, Victor
Catholic Footsteps
Davies, Antony
Duquesne University
DeMars, William
Wofford College
Harris, Malcolm
U.S. Postal Service
Ricciardi, Anthony
Returning Home Apostolate

History

Garneau, James
The Pontifical College
Haynes, John
Library of Congress
Melton, James
Emory University
Melton, Barbara
Georgia Perimeter College
Kelker, Signe
Shippensburg University
Rahe, Paul
University of Tulsa

MEMBERSHIP MATTERS

History—*continued*

Roach, Michael
Mount Saint Mary's Seminary

Humanities

Beall, Stephen
Marquette University

Beierschmitt, Mary Paula
Academy of Sacred Arts

Bequette, John
St. Joseph's College

Bonario, Bernard
University of St. Thomas

DiVietri, Patrick
Family Life Institute

Nordlund, David
Spain Study Center

Stephen Utick
Australian Nation University

Woods, Thomas
Ave Maria College

Wilde, Denis
Villanova University

Law

Bhala, Raj
George Washington University

Hanna, Frank
HBR Capital

Kelly, Jim
Center for Law & Justice

Laurento, Wendy
Immaculata University

Russell, Henry
Ave Maria College

Russello, Gerald
Covington & Burling

Medicine and Health Sciences

Hubert, John
Retired Medical Doctor

Husgen, Daniel
Abbott Northwestern Hospital

Messario, Andrew
West Virginia University

Zappe, Dion
Novartis Pharmaceuticals

Philosophy

Anadale, Christopher
Georgia State University

Argosino, Arvin
Independent Researcher

Berg, Thomas
Legionaries of Christ

Farnan, Theresa
Mount Saint Mary's College

Hock, Bart
Immaculate Conception Parish

Political Science

Bayer, Thomas
Bulletin News Network

McFadden, Peter
CatholicCulture.com

Ollivant, Douglas
U.S. Military Academy

Reilly, Robert
Voice of America

Physical Sciences & Engineering

Bratton, John
U.S. Geology Survey

Casey, Francis
North Dakota State University

Physical Sciences & Engineering—continued

Gleeson, James
Kent State University
Keck, John
American University
Wojcik, John
Villanova University
Zmuda, Henry
University of Florida

Social Sciences & Education

Hendershott, Anne
University of San Diego
McDarby, Dario
McDarby Home Schooling
Swindell, Linda
Anderson University
Tondra, Rose
Nevada Community Schools

Theology

Brugger, Christian
Loyola University (LA)
Carlin, Michael
Catholic University of America
DeCelles, John
from Mount Saint Mary's College
Donaldson, George
National Seminary - Scotland
Holland, Kim
Vianney College
Kane, Neil
Salesianum School
Leies, John
St. Mary's University
Liberto, David
Marquette University

MacDonald, Thomas
Church of Saint Michael
Meenan, John
Our Lady of Wisdom Academy
Nicholson, Scott
Our Lady of Wisdom Academy
Nutt, Roger
Aquinas College
Pandiappallil, Joseph
Katholisches Pfarrament
Pilion, Mark
Mount Saint Mary's Seminary
Prudlo, Donald
University of Virginia
Rocha, Biff
University of Dayton
Rodarte y Vigil, Jason
Archdiocese of Santa Fe
Schloeder, Steven
Theological Union
Sell, Jeremy
Diocese of Peoria
Tartaglia, Philip
St. Mary's Parish

Members of the Fellowship continue to contribute scholarly expertise to National Associations and publish on a wide variety of topics. Among the most recent are:

CHRISTOPHER ANNANDALE (Georgia State University), PHILIP BLOSSER (Lenoir-Rhyne College), JULIAN DAVIES (Siena College), and MARY CATHERINE SOMMERS (University of St. Thomas, TX) who contributed to the program of the recent annual meeting of the Catholic Philosophical Association in Cincinnati.

REV. JOSPEH LINCK, SJ who published *Fully Instructed and Vehemently Influenced: Catholic Preaching in Anglo-Colonial America*. Saint Joseph's Press. (2002).

MEMBERSHIP MATTERS

ALICE RAMOS, Ph.D. & MARIE GEORGE, Ph.D., who have recently edited *Faith, Scholarship, and Culture in the 21st Century*, Catholic University of America Press with contributions from Ralph McInerny and James V. Schall, S.J. (2002).

KEVIN SCHMIESING, Ph.D., who has recently published *Doing Justice to Justice: Competing Frameworks of Interpretation in Christian Social Ethics* with S. Grabill and G. Zuniga. Acton Institute, (2002).

NICHOLAS BAGILEO, M.T.S, who has reviewed Fr. James Schall's book *On the Unseriousness of Human Affairs* in the October issue of *Inside the Vatican*, (2002).

RAJ BHALA, J.D., who published Theological Categories from Special and Differential Treatment, in the *Kansas Law Review*. (2002) and Poverty, Islam and Doha, in *International Lawyer* (2002).

REV. JOHN GARKOWSKI, Ph.D., who recently published A Pastor's Stroll Through Immigration Law, in *The Priest*, (August, 2002).

MSGR. GEORGE KELLY who published Enjoying the Priesthood in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, (October, 2002).

REV. JAMES V. SCHALL, SJ, Ph.D., who recently published Belloc's Mrs. Markham on the American," in *St. Austin Review*, (July, 2002).

JOSEPH VARACALLI, Ph.D., who published Catholic Social Thought and American Civilization in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, (October, 2002).

PAUL VOSS, Ph.D., who published Assurances of Faith: How Catholic Was Shakespeare? How Catholic Are His Plays? in *Crisis Magazine* (July, 2002).

REV. THOMAS WEINANDY, Ph.D., who has published Zizioulas: The Trinity and Ecumenism in *New Blackfriars Review*, (September, 2002).

RALPH MCINERNY, Ph.D., recently received three awards: *Crisis Magazine, 20th Anniversary Award*, Washington, DC. in September; *American Maritain Association—Humanities Award*, at the Annual Meeting at Princeton University in October and *21st Annual Christ the King Award*, Board of Directors, Christian Law Institute, Lincoln, NE in November. The citation from Lincoln, NE reads: "In recognition of his outstanding contributions to the cause of Christianization of civil society in America, in his distinguished efforts of many years in higher education, in his study and teaching of and writings on Thomistic philosophy, in his fictional writings (among them, "The Father Dowling" Mysteries), in co-founding and contributing to *Crisis* magazine, all the while remaining faithful to Jesus Christ the God-Man, His Church and His Revelation."

MARY SHIVANANDAN, MA, STD, who presented a lecture on *Original Unity of Man and Woman, The Redemption of the Body, and Marriage, Celibacy and the Language of the Body* at 2002 Institute, Diocese of Cheyenne and *Our Bodies, Our Gift of Selves* at the Moss Program for Christian Social Thought and Management, Center for Catholic Studies, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN. Spring Author's Forum, Diocese of Scranton Pastoral Formation Institute, Dalton, PA.

All members of the Fellowship are encouraged to submit news of appointments, awards, and publications directly to the executive secretary for this column. Preference will be given to events that have already taken place, and publications that are available in print, subject to limitations of space in each issue of the *Quarterly*.

**Presentation of Cardinal O'Boyle Award
To Senator Rick Santorum
Written by Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM Cap
Presented by Dean Bernard Dobranski**

The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars is honored by the presence of Senator Rick Santorum, and is happy to confer on him this award.

As a senator he has been intensely aware of many of the battles that must be fought in public life to guard the dignity and security of our citizens. In a special way he has been a warrior in defense of the life of the most imperiled of our people, children before their birth.

Senator Santorum was born in Winchester, Virginia, in 1958, but his childhood was lived in Butler, PA. He received his undergraduate degree in Political Science at Penn State University (whose football team is having a grand resurgence this year) and he obtain an M. B. A. degree and later a J. D. (Law) degree from the University of Pittsburgh.

He first worked in a Pittsburgh law firm, and then was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1990, at the age of 32. He was first elected a United States Senator in 1994, and was reelected comfortably in 2000. He has been a hard-working Senator, and is a member of many of the most important committees. He is the youngest member of the Senate Republican Leadership. When congress is in session he keeps busy with Senate and Senate Committee work. During out of session times, he goes all over the state—seeing to it that he takes part each year in at least one event in each of Pennsylvania's 65 counties. This may remind us of the days when we priests visited the homes of their parishes with great regularity, keeping an eye on the state of our flock.

He married a member of one of the great Catholic families in western Pennsylvania, Karen

Garver. Her father, Dr. Kenneth Garver, at the request of Cardinal Wright, had made a career change in mid-stream, becoming a very distinguished geneticist, and a voice for the Catholic vision of medical ethics in the midst of troubled years. With Karen, Senator Santorum has seven lovely children.

In a special way, I think, the Fellowship is pleased to honor the earnest work that Senator Santorum has faithfully shown in pro-life work. He has shown a Catholic concern also for maintaining a healthy welfare system for the poor; he has been a leader in efforts to serve impoverished rural and urban communities. As a member of the Congressional Empowerment Alliance he has sought to promote responsible fatherhood and marriage. He has been an earnest voice for the public concerns most likely to move us members of the fellowship.

With his wife Karen, he has not only battled for the lives of unborn children, but with her he showed the courage when faithfulness to principle brings great danger into one's own home. The earnest faith of their home made them able to respond with grace to distressing problems made bitterly persona.

His wife Karen records these struggles in her beautiful little book, Letters to Gabriel. At the very time when Senator Santorum was fighting in the Senate against the horror of partial-birth abortions, they learned that their own unborn child, Gabriel, was in great danger, as Karen was with him. Advice was given to them by their physician to consider a partial-birth abortion – after all, the mother of young children had to be saved.

Karen's little book of letters to this son, Gabriel, shows that in face of personal pressures they did not for a moment consider turning from their deepest convictions that no one should for any reason deliberately kill another human person. Little Gabriel was born, and lived only two hours, all in the arms of his parents, and in each moment received great love. He was baptized; and he died, and he entered into the great life and great love of God.

Senator Santorum is a man of deep and right convictions, a political leader with concern for the most pressing issues of our day. Like Cardinal O'Boyle, after whom this award is named, he knows how to face without flinching the duty to guard principle, even if one must suffer for that. We are happy to present to Senator Rick Santorum the Cardinal O'Boyle Award.

Acceptance of the John Cardinal Wright Award 2002 Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

J. Augustine DiNoia, O. P.

Twenty-five years ago, a group of Catholic scholars in philosophy, theology, the humanities, and other fields joined together to form the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Looking back over the past twenty-five years, the members of that founding group may well be amazed by the great success the Fellowship has enjoyed and the significant contribution it has made to Catholic intellectual life in the United States. Happy to share the joy of the founders and members, the rest of us cannot fail to see as well the hand of divine providence at work in the foundation and activities of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Almost exactly contemporary with the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars has embraced his teaching and fostered its reception in the US.

During these years, Pope John Paul II articulated a far-reaching challenge to all Catholic intellectuals and the institutions that sustain them, most notably in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, *Veritatis Splendor*, and *Fides et Ratio*. The members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars have taken up this challenge, through their teaching, research, and publications, and in this way embodied the kind of collaboration upon which the See of Peter depends for spreading the culture-transforming Gospel of truth and freedom which is Christ's gift to the Church. It is a great privilege for me to share in this happy moment by being honored with the John Cardinal Wright Award in their twenty-fifth anniversary year of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. *Ad multos annos!*

AVE MARIA COLLEGE CHAPLAINCY POSITIONS

Ave Maria College is accepting applications for the following full-time openings.

Chaplain: Candidate must be an ordained Catholic priest and should possess a strong desire to serve the Church and enjoy working with young adults in a college setting. He will be responsible for daily Mass, weekly confessions, and the various spiritual needs of the College community; will also direct the campus retreat program. As Ave Maria's principal pastoral minister, he should seek to foster an atmosphere of faith, joy, fellowship, witness, service and scholarship on campus.

Director of the Pre-Theologate: Candidate must be an ordained Catholic priest with knowledge and experience in priestly formation, with a particular emphasis on fostering vocations to the ministerial priesthood in the Catholic Church. Must have the ability to fully implement the Program of Priestly Formation of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. The Director will primarily see to the spiritual needs of the young men in the program, including giving direction to their common study and sacramental life and daily interaction. Will also assist with wider campus ministry, recruitment and with the development of funding for scholarships.

Evaluation of applicants will continue until the positions are filled. Applicants must have earned appropriate degrees in their respective fields, and be familiar with philosophy and Catholic theology. The successful applicants will be committed to the educational mission of Ave Maria College, which dedicates itself to the education of the whole person in the Catholic liberal arts tradition. The College's mission philosophy is articulated in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, *Veritatis Splendor* and *Fides et Ratio*.

Qualified applicants should send a letter of interest that addresses the aforementioned criteria, along with their CV to:

Daniel Dentino, Dean of Students
Ave Maria College
300 W. Forest Avenue
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197.

www.avemaria.edu

Ave Maria College is an Equal Opportunity Employer

BOOK REVIEWS

Weigel, George, **The Courage to Be Catholic: Crisis, Reform, and the Future of the Church**, Basic Books, 2002.

Reviewed by Kenneth D. Whitehead

This excellent book is one of the first book-length studies to appear on the clerical sex scandals of 2002. It is quite likely to remain one of the best studies on the subject, since the author understands both the remote and proximate causes of the scandals themselves; and he also understands that no solutions based merely on new administrative policies or processes can possibly avail; only a return to the authentic teaching and practice of the faith at all levels in the Church--which the author expects!--can lead us out of our present difficulties.

Catholics who are loyal to the Church, but who have been shaken, not only by the scandal of priests vowed to celibacy and chastity engaged in sexual activity, including sexual abuse, but perhaps even more by the evidence of widespread misfeasance and even malfeasance in office by many of America's bishops engaged in covering up or otherwise abetting and protecting priests guilty of such immoral conduct, will find in this book not only cogent explanations of how it all was allowed to come about, but also where Catholics and the

Church need to go from here. Although the book shows signs of rather hasty composition, including a number of typos, this generally does not detract from its value in placing in coherent perspective the often jumbled, confused, and disparate serial revelations of the clerical and episcopal misdeeds that came tumbling out in the first months of 2002.

The book covers the crisis only up to the threshold of the bishops' June meeting in Dallas. In Dallas, of course, under intense public and media pressure, the bishops adopted a Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People, along with a virtual zero tolerance policy calling for the removal from active ministry of any priest involved in even one incident of sexual abuse. The bishops thus limited their actions in Dallas pretty much to trying to deal with the problem as it had been defined for them by the media, namely, as the abuse of children. They specifically voted down, for example, a proposal to examine the role of homosexuality in the priesthood in helping to bring about the scandals. Generally, they did not touch upon questions of the faith at all, but were concerned mainly with damage control, remedies, "therapy," and the like. Most of this was thus hardly along the lines George Weigel envisages in this book. It was not too surprising that Rome proved unwilling to accord the required

recognitio to the bishops' action, in large part, no doubt, because it diverged so markedly from existing norms of canon law. As things stand, a mixed commission composed of U.S. Bishops and representatives of the relevant Roman congregations will now work out what will be the Church's ultimate policy in dealing with clerical sex abuse.

However, as George Weigel well understands and makes clear, cases of sex abuse involving children and young people, although heart-breakingly serious, are only a small part of the multi-faceted and long-term crisis that now confronts the Church in the wake of the revelations of 2002. What is involved is a necessary reform of the Church in America, "root and branch," almost as in Reformation times. Weigel recalls the failed Fifth Lateran Council convened 1512, which did not succeed in launching the reforms necessary at that time; and the unhappy result, of course, was the Protestant Reformation, which only succeeded in dividing the Church permanently. The author correctly sees one aspect of our present crisis today as a failure, so far, to implement Vatican Council II properly. And at the root of this particular failure he sees the major problem as what he calls a "culture of dissent," which was allowed to gain a foothold in the Church in the early post-conciliar years, and which has helped to establish within the

Church a widespread new revisionist version of the faith which the author styles "Catholic lite"--a version of the faith which conveniently passes over or lays aside those elements of Catholic teaching today seen as "hard sayings," while accommodating itself to the dominant secular culture that surrounds the Church in America. George Weigel is quite clear in asserting that the whole crisis basically boils down to widespread *infidelity* to the Church's own teaching and practice.

In line with this understanding of the roots of the crisis, all of the author's very sensible "solutions," whether concerning the priesthood, the seminaries, the laity, the episcopate--or even the Holy See--his solutions in all these areas go back to a need for reconversion and true renewal, and for the restoration of fidelity at all levels and in all aspects of Catholic life and practice. While he is justly very severe in judging the post-conciliar performance of the American bishops as, among other things, the tolerators and enablers of the culture of dissent, he understands that the crisis extends far beyond the bishops; it extends to the profession and practice of the faith generally in the post-conciliar era.

It is surely indicative of the present post-crisis climate, though, that George Weigel, like so many other observers of the current scene, quite

naturally, and surely inevitably, now treats of bishops and their affairs in a critical mode that not even the writers in the *National Catholic Reporter* would have dared to adopt prior to the revelations of 2002. That even loyal Catholics, especially, can no longer just "pay, pray, and obey" is a new fact of life in the Church in America that one hopes the American bishops too are beginning to understand: no more automatic deference to them simply because they are bishops and successors of the apostles; they have to start proving it. Meanwhile, loyal Catholics have to start affirming the authentic teachings of the magisterium and expecting that their bishops will honestly uphold these teachings.

All this should find particular resonance among the members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Most Fellowship members have understood for a good while now what George Weigel now finds himself obliged to say; many Fellowship members have long been saying it themselves; and some, such as, for example, Msgr. George A. Kelly in his *The Battle for the American Church* (Doubleday, 1979), have said it quite effectively, and quite a long time ago. However, fresh from the success of his superb 1999 biography of Pope John Paul II, *Witness to Hope*, George Weigel is perhaps now able to say it with a new seriousness and convic-

tion--at the same time as he may be able to reach a wider audience than has generally been available to the defenders of Catholic orthodoxy associated with the Fellowship. We should be grateful that he is now able, in effect, to "proclaim upon the housetops" (Mt 10:27; Lk 12:3) what most of the members of the Fellowship have believed and held all along. Until the dismaying revelations of 2002 came spilling out, most American Catholics simply did not understand that allowing a dissenting, revisionist version of the faith to grow up within the Church in this country inevitably meant the unraveling of Catholic faith and practice which we now unhappily see.

Weigel is both acute and unsparing in his analysis of what has gone wrong, just as he is definite in his conclusion that what now has to be restored to the life and practice of the Church in America is nothing else but the authentic vision of Vatican Council II--a vision that has too often been deformed or distorted by the influence of separate agendas alien to the Church though often claimed to be inspired by "the spirit of Vatican II."

In his account of how the American Catholic bishops came to tolerate for so long an alien culture of dissent within the Church under their authority, George Weigel correctly points to the outbreak of open, public dissent by theologians

BOOK REVIEWS

from the Pope Paul VI's 1968 encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. In a section entitled the "Truce of 1968," he writes that Cardinal Patrick O'Boyle of Washington was obliged by Rome "urgently" to reinstate the priests he had suspended for dissenting from the encyclical without requiring either repudiation of their dissent or explicit affirmation by them of the truths taught by *Humanae Vitae*. This came about, according to him, in the course of negotiations between Cardinal O'Boyle and the Congregation for the Clergy in Rome. Concerning these negotiations, he states:

According to the recollections of some who were present, everyone involved understood that Pope Paul VI wanted the "Washington Case" settled without a public retraction from the dissidents, because the Pope feared that insisting on such a retraction would lead to schism--a formal split in the Church in Washington and perhaps beyond. The Pope, evidently, was willing for a time to tolerate dissent on an issue on which he had made a solemn, authoritative statement, hoping that the day would come when, in a calmer cultural and ecclesiastical atmosphere, the truth of that teaching could be appreciated. The mechanism agreed upon to buy time for that to happen was the "Truce of 1968."

The author then goes on to

draw the lesson of what he thinks the Church in the United States learned from the Washington Case and this Truce of 1968:

Theologians, priests, and nuns who publicly dissented from *Humanae Vitae*--who said that the Church's teaching about the morally appropriate way to regulate births was *false*--were encouraged by the Truce of 1968 to continue, even amplify, their dissent. There were going to be no serious penalties on fundamental breakdowns in ecclesiastical discipline. Theologians, priests, and religious men and women under vows of obedience could, in effect, throw a papal encyclical, a solemn act of the Church's teaching authority, back in the Pope's face--and do so with impunity. The culture of dissent, professional division, was born.

George Weigel's description here of the ultimate result of tolerating dissent from the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* is, of course, entirely correct; this did indeed turn out to be a crucial factor in the development and spread of the culture of dissent generally within the Church--which eventually issued in our current scandals. There have in fact been virtually "no serious penalties" for dissent from authentic Church teachings from that day to this (except for penalties insisted upon by Rome itself, as in the case of the dismissal of Father Charles Curran from the theo-

logical faculty of the Catholic University of America). However, Weigel's account of the so-called "Truce of 1968" is surely a simplification of how the regime of tolerated dissent came about and perhaps it is also not even completely accurate. In his brief and concise narrative of the whole affair, he both simplifies the ultimate causes of the culture of dissent and, I believe, exaggerates the degree to which Pope Paul VI's attitude may have contributed to it.

First of all, contrary to his account, the Washington dissenters whom the Congregation for the Clergy "urgently" wished to have reinstated *were* required as a condition of their reinstatement to accept the "findings" of the Congregation of the Clergy, and these findings included affirmations both of the truth of *Humanae Vitae*'s teaching and of the obligation of those holding canonical faculties in a diocese to "intend to communicate this teaching according to the traditional norms of the Church." These "traditional norms of the Church" included, of course, the requirement that the Church's teachings be taught as *true*. Perhaps as a practical matter nobody paid much attention to these express requirements for reinstatement at the time, and perhaps the priests being reinstated never intended to abide by them; nevertheless, the requirements were there, plainly stated, in the document from the Congregation for the Clergy.

(This document, entitled "the Washington Case," can be found in Dominican Father Austin Flannery's readily accessible *Vatican Council II: More Post-Conciliar Documents*, pp.417-422).

Secondly, the Washington Case, in unfortunately typical Roman fashion, was not settled until April, 1971, nearly three years after the outbreak of the *Humanae Vitae* affair. The case itself arose out of a canon law suit by the suspended Washington priests, and it was a disgrace that it took Rome so long to determine that Cardinal O'Boyle had acted entirely in accordance with existing canon law in the matter. By the time the case was settled, however, the culture of dissent was already firmly in place in America without regard to any fear by Pope Paul VI that maintaining the suspension of a few dissenting priests might cause a schism. Long before 1971, when the Washington Case was finally settled, the bishops of the United States of the United States had already plainly signaled to the world that they did not intend to discipline any dissenters. As many of us who lived through those days in Washington well remember, Cardinal O'Boyle was, along with Bishop McNulty of Buffalo, the only American prelate who even attempted to discipline priests or theologians for openly dissenting from *Humanae Vitae*. A Washington priest who worked in the

office of Cardinal O'Boyle at the time told me that His Eminence spent night after night in the fall of 1968 telephoning his brother bishops all over the country trying to find one of them who would publicly stand up with him. The cardinal failed to find one. From the start, then, the American bishops were determined to treat the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* as the "non-essential" teaching the dissenters too claimed it was.

Moreover, already in November, 1968, in their Pastoral Letter "Human Life in Our Day," the American bishops actually included a section entitled "Norms of Licit Dissent." Yes: "licit dissent." They laid out a series of hypothetical conditions in which, according to them, dissent could be licit. The conditions they described bore little or no resemblance to the open rebellion against Church authority which they actually faced in 1968; but simply by creating the new category of licit dissent, they effectively took the actual dissenters off the hook, since the latter could always claim that their particular dissent was licit. Who was going to gainsay or contradict them in an atmosphere in which it had already been decided that no disciplinary action was going to be imposed? It suited everybody's purposes to believe that there was indeed something called "licit dissent," and that those who dissented from *Humanae Vitae* could thus remain "in

good standing" in the Church. The same situation still generally obtains in the Church in America today, as a matter of fact.

Only the issuance in 1990 of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's Instruction *Donum Veritatis* on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian in the Church officially eliminated the category of "licit dissent" which the American bishops had created out of whole cloth in 1968. Actually, of course, the very idea of licit dissent was contrary to the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* #25, which, by requiring strict assent to the authentic teachings of the magisterium, logically eliminated the possibility of the kind of dissent labeled licit by the American bishops. But then what bishop was going to stand up even for the teachings of Vatican II if it meant publicly rebuking or disciplining anybody? The beating the Church customarily took in the media at the mere suggestion of any kind of an "authoritarian" crack-down was evidently enough to dissuade the bishops. They appeared to consider unfavorable publicity about the Church to be much more harmful than allowing dissent to fester within the Church. The same attitude persisted in other ways, of course: in 2002 we all learned, sadly, that many of the bishops evidently preferred cover-ups and quiet monetary settlements rather than exposing wrong-doing or

BOOK REVIEWS

seeing wrong-doers punished.

Long before any "Truce of 1968" desired by Pope Paul VI and reported by George Weigel in this book, then, the American bishops had already made their near unanimous tacit collective decision that open dissent from the teachings of the magisterium was no longer going to be subject to episcopal correction. The pope's attitude as reported by George Weigel could well have been based on his perception that the American bishops were obviously not prepared to do anything as much as upon any fear of his of schism arising out of the disciplining of a handful of Washington priests.

Pope Paul VI, of course, *was* at fault in not requiring any more of his bishops, just as Pope John Paul II is today, as a matter of fact--and just as the American bishops too have now been shown to be seriously remiss in not maintaining discipline among their few (after all) dissenting and erring priests. If anything, the fault for institutionalized post-conciliar episcopal indulgence can perhaps be traced farther back still--to Blessed John XXIII, and to his famous distinction in his Opening Address to the Council to the effect that today the Church prefers "the medicine of mercy" to the "medicine of severity" that she used to administer back in the days before the Council. This distinction of John XXIII's was premised,

though, upon the jovial pontiff's belief that doctrine no longer had to be defended because it was no longer being seriously contested at the time he made his speech; it was, rather, in his view, firmly and unalterably "established," and so he thought we needed to emphasize other things. However, once Catholic doctrine did begin to be contested again, as with the *Humanae Vitae* dissent, surely some modification in the policy of preferring "the medicine of mercy" was called for?

However that may be, the fact of the matter, as irrefutably brought out by George Weigel in this book, is that the "medicine of severity" never has, in fact, gotten revived, although it surely needs to be, and quite urgently. The scandals of 2002 have now made it plain that dissent and error *cannot* be allowed the same freedom of the Church which they have unfortunately been allowed throughout most of the post-conciliar period. The only possible result of allowing this--as has now been abundantly verified--is the degree of the *corruption* of the Church which is now unhappily there for all to see.

No better and more readable short account of how all this came about, and what now needs to be done about it, exists than in George Weigel's *The Courage to Be Catholic*. Mainly for the record, I have offered a few paragraphs here to correct one minor point

about how the culture of dissent got established in the United States. That it did get established, though, and what now needs to be done about it, is nowhere better laid out than in this timely and important book. We can only hope that many bishops will read it. Members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, though, will be especially heartened by this bracing account.

Kenneth D. Whitehead is a former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education; he is the author, most recently, of *One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic: The Early Church Was the Catholic Church* (Ignatius Press, 2000).

* * *

Angrosino, Michael V.
Talking about Cultural Diversity in Your Church: Gifts and Challenges
AltaMira Press, 2001

Reviewed by Reverend Brian Van Hove, SJ
The St. Joseph and St. Peter Seminary
Mission, Texas

By each generation since the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, science has been "seen at once, because of the novelty and power of its methods and results, to be useful against anything rooted in tradition," as Paul Quay pointed out to the Tenth Convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars in 1988. [*Proceedings*, 109]. -

This slim workbook by Michael V. Angrosino, a social scientist with a doctorate in cultural anthropology, seems to be an example of what Quay had in mind. While this modest text is aimed at religious professionals in the United States who wish to minister better in situations of increasing diversity, the author seems blissfully unaware of the history of the ideas which guide him and, in matters of religion, of the existence or importance of the Catholic magisterium.

In other words, while purporting to offer an aid to Christian evangelization, the author is merely surrendering to the relativism and secularism of establishment social science. He thus eliminates any trace of the transcendent message of orthodox Catholicism or, for that matter, of orthodox Protestantism.

For example, on page 16 he says that "confusing sexuality with reproductive sex has led to the negative stigmatization of all expressions of sexuality that do not lead to procreation." Consequently, we may doubt Dr. Angrosino would agree with the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* that marriage is a true sacrament of the New Law. On the same page he says, "Confusing gender with sexuality leads to injustices directed against gay men and lesbians and, indeed, leads to the stereotyping of everyone (in the sense that there is presumed to be only

one 'masculine' and 'feminine' way to behave)."

While we may deplore injustices of any kind, and while there may be secondary considerations about behavior from group to group (in Portugal men hug men and shake hands with women, while in the English-speaking parts of the United States men hug women but shake hands with other men), it does not seem that Dr. Angrosino is interested in a sacramental worldview which holds that marriage and the family are normative and proceed from a divinely ordered vocation.

On pages 98-99 Angrosino proposes for discussion the case of a single dad joining the Mom's Club of the United Community Church. While ministering to everybody is surely a key value when running a church, this particular example seems to be midway between the curious and the repugnant.

Unless you accept the philosophical foundation of the secular social-science background of Dr. Angrosino, *Talking about Cultural Diversity in Your Church* is not the book for you. Though swaddled in the jargon of inclusiveness and sharing, it promotes a specific ideology incompatible with Catholic doctrine. Members of the Fellowship and orthodox Catholics everywhere would find this project at cross-purposes with what they believe in. We may

say that here the process is methodologically more important than truth, whereas in historic Christianity knowing and living by transcendent truth is what counts. As the author says in a case study of dealing with the aging, "In effect, the content of the seniors' program might in the long run be less important than the value of including them in the decision-making process to begin with" (p. 86). Conceivably, could the decision-making process conclude that the content of the seniors' program be to euthanize them?

This "how to" book might be best suited to liberal Protestants or Unitarians who already assimilate the Christian faith to the secular agenda, which, while it may have many benevolent aspects, should be identified for what it is and especially for where it came from

* * *

Fisher, James T., **Communion of Immigrants: A History of Catholics in America**. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Reviewed by Kevin E. Schmiesing
Acton Institute
Grand Rapids, Michigan

This is a brief, accessible summary of the history of Catholics in the United States. Fisher, holder of the Danforth Chair in Humanities at St.

BOOK REVIEWS

Louis University, is a skilled writer and a knowledgeable historian. *Communion of Immigrants* is a fair and balanced treatment of its subject, refreshingly free of the axe-grinding that has characterized much of post-Vatican II American Catholic historiography.

Communion of Immigrants appears to be a paperback edition of Fisher's 2000 book, titled *Catholics in America*, which listed its audience as "young adults." The book, therefore, serves as an introduction for audiences unfamiliar not only with American Catholic history, but with Catholicism itself. Fisher pauses to explain terms such as "sacraments." These explanations will be a useful feature when the book is employed as a text for a high school or introductory college course, but they will probably be unnecessary and perhaps even tedious for the educated Catholic. At the same time and with few exceptions, Fisher's explanations are clear and sound (in the case of "sacraments," for instance, drawn directly from the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*), and might provide remedial catechesis of a sort to misinformed Catholics.

There are some weaknesses in the book. While the anti-Catholic strain in American history is not ignored, Turner pays insufficient attention to it at times, particularly after the eighteenth century. The so-

phisticated anti-Catholicism of the intellectual elite in the early twentieth century (documented by Notre Dame historian John McGreevey, for example), was epitomized in the mid-century writings of Paul Blanshard, and continues to be present as the "last legitimate prejudice" (Stanley Hauerwas) of the American elite. Turner, instead, emphasizes the assimilation of Catholics in American society with the implication that the tensions of the anti-popey revolutionary era have all but disintegrated. Assimilation is a crucial part of the American Catholic story, to be sure, but inadequate attention to the continuation of conflict renders that story incomplete. The second general weakness in the book—following, in a way, from the first weakness—is its emphasis on American Catholic distinctiveness, at the cost of a full sense of the ways in which the American church was tied to the universal Catholic Church. Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*, John XXIII's calling of the Second Vatican Council, and Paul VI's *Humanae Vitae* are given due attention, but the three Piuses are barely mentioned. More serious is the complete absence of John Paul II from Turner's story. It is true that the pope is still alive and it is difficult to gain historical perspective, but in light of the fact that Turner's treatment ostensibly covers the period to the end of the twentieth century, it is hard to see how a history of Catholics

in the last two decades of that century could fail to take into account the writings, travels, and administrative actions of John Paul. Turner broaches the subject of liberation theology, for instance; it would seem obligatory to mention the opinion of the pope on the matter.

In addition (and perhaps inevitably in a review of a survey such as this, which cannot hope to cover its subject exhaustively), this reviewer would in some cases choose different items on which to focus. Turner has a tendency to highlight relatively minor movements within the American church, such as the Catholic Worker and Grail. These are interesting and in some respects important movements, but the attention paid to them detracts from the effort to depict the overall state and character of the Catholic Church in the United States. There are no statistics offered, for instance, on the numbers of Catholics, priests, nuns, or schools, or the growth in these numbers, from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. There is no description of liturgical change following Vatican II. There is no mention of the GI Bill or the impact of the dramatic increase in college-educated Catholics that it enabled. An awareness of all of these phenomena would seem to be indispensable for understanding the development of American Catholicism during the twentieth century.

These disagreements aside, Fisher's presentation skillfully weaves together and covers evenly developments in the various spheres of Catholic life—economic, cultural, religious, and political. Most of the major characters are here: Bishop John Carroll, Matthew Carey, Bishop John England, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, Cardinal James Gibbons, Al Smith, Bishop Fulton Sheen, and John Kennedy (John Courtney Murray and Cardinal Francis Spellman might deserve more space). *Communion of Immigrants* is a reliable and readable introduction to the history of Catholics in America.

* * *

Stravinskias, Reverend Peter,
Advent Meditations: Helps to 'Wait in Joyful Hope'
 Newman House Press, 2001.

Review by Sister Mary
 Jeremiah, OP
 Monastery of the Infant Jesus,
 Lufkin, TX

Each year as the season of Advent approaches I scour the library shelves for a book to accompany me in my spiritual journey with the Word of God. If you have had a similar experience, why not try this little book? Each word in the subtitle, like the entire book, is loaded with meaning. Stravinskias does not say this, but I was struck by these words which echo the prayer after the *Our Father* at Mass.

Deliver us, Lord, from every evil, and grant us peace in our day. In your mercy keep us from sin and protect us from all anxiety as we wait in joyful hope for the coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ.

This is a prayer said everyday of the year just before the Lord comes to us in Holy Communion. It is a prayer that could be in our hearts each moment of our lives as we stand ready for His continual coming to our lives through grace.

Helps – This is “user friendly” book! In physical make-up, it is a perfect Advent companion, concise, trim, light, small enough for a purse or suit pocket. Stravinskias has intentionally left empty spaces for the reader-pilgrim’s own personal insights. The author also provides the Scripture references for each day’s liturgical celebration. As always, Fr. Stravinskias is clear, logical, positive, and contemporary.

Wait – As we mature “...we seem to learn the truth of the adage that ‘all good things come to those who wait.’ Nothing and no one could be more worth the wait than Jesus Christ.” (Preface)

Joyful – “Christian joy is able to respond to the crises of life with confident assurance because it operates on the assumption that the real battle is over and done: Christ has con-

quered, and so have we.” (3rd Sunday B)

Hope – “The essential ingredient of Christianity is hope... The Source of this hope is not wishful thinking but the coming of God to dwell among us.” (2nd Tuesday)

This book is a jewel. Don’t be fooled by its diminutive size; it is a storehouse of wisdom revealing Stravinskias as his poetic best. Here is a powerful statement on a current cultural crisis in our country (cf., Dec. 21 – Gospel of the Visitation): “The Author of Life will not be mocked, as ‘the former fetus,’ Jesus Christ, sits at the right hand of the Father to judge us for our complicity in the crime of abortion – either for our direct involvement, for our silence, or for our inaction.”!

Fr. Stravinskias has fulfilled his goal of providing succinct yet thought provoking reflections of the Scripture reading for each day of Advent. This is a book meant not so much to be read, as to be pondered. It exudes the spirit of Advent: Quite, simple, gentle, dropping down the dew of wisdom. Let us surrender ourselves to a perpetual spirit of Advent and longing for the fulfillment of infinite desire for the coming of God’s Kingdom in our hearts and in the world. I recommend this book for your next Advent preparation

BOOK REVIEWS

* * *

Stanley L. Jaki. **A Mind's Matter: An Intellectual Autobiography.** William E. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2002

Reviewed by Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.
Toronto, Canada

Fr. Jaki, a Benedictine who was born in Hungary in 1925 and came to the United States in 1950, is a Distinguished University Professor at Seton Hall University, New Jersey. He has doctorates in theology and physics and has specialized in the history and philosophy of science, with over forty books and nearly a hundred articles to his credit. Indeed, a list of his publications takes up 50 of the 311 pages of this book. He has been a guest lecturer in several countries, has given the Gifford Lectures in Edinburgh (1974-76), has been awarded the LeComte de Nouy Prize (1970) and the Templeton Prize (1987), and is an honorary member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.

This latest book is strictly an **intellectual** autobiography, reviewing chronologically Fr. Jaki's writings and commenting on his discoveries, his disputes with scientists and dissenters, and his opinions on many matters. These are the matters he has had on his mind and are referred to in the book's title.

One soon sees that Jaki is a

hard worker and that he believes in getting to original sources. A major contention of the book is that many physicists have failed to realize that science, though valuable, does not give a complete account of its object of study but must be accompanied by a philosophical and theological view of reality. Science deals with quantifiable things but cannot account for qualities or moral matters. As a result, Fr. Jaki has frequently opposed well-known scientists who have unwittingly transgressed the boundaries of their discipline.

A second contention of his is that, though the sciences had a beginning in the major pagan civilizations, they soon petered out, and, in fact, progressed only in the Christian world, the reason for this being that pagan theology pictured a cyclical universe in which history continued in an endless repetition of itself, so that progress was not really possible; and that pagan theologies were pantheistic, with God being identical with, or part of, the physical universe, so that laws were not constant.

A touching account is given of the life of Pierre Duhem (1861-16), an outstanding scientist and Catholic, about whom Jaki has published more than one book. Duhem showed that modern science began in the late Middle Ages, and this was possible because Christian theology

teaches that the universe was created in time and proceeds linearly, not cyclically; and that God transcends it completely. Duhem didn't try to hide his religion in the anti-Catholic world in which he lived and worked. This showed Jaki how religion is important in every intellectual enterprise: "If one were to ask what is the basic claim which underlies my Gifford lectures, I would say that one's idea of the ultimate in being and intelligibility has an inevitable bearing on anything one says provided one tries to be consistent." Credit is freely given to others who favorably influenced Jaki, such as Newman, Chesterton, and Etienne Gilson.

Jaki frequently returns to one of his basic principles: realism rather than idealism, that is, the teaching that science is a grasp of reality, of a physical world outside our mind; though science is in our mind, it gives us first a knowledge not of our mind but of the world outside.

There are many other "matters" that have been in Jaki's mind, for example, his own interpretation of the first chapter of *Genesis*, his interpretation of the miracle of *Fatima* as a natural event supernaturally predicted, and his opinion about the consciousness of computers.

The book reveals that Jaki is a fighter because truth must be defended. He doesn't hide the

fact: "I have been fighting, and consciously so, ever since in the early 1940s I read a series of public lectures on 'God in History.' . . . For a long time, I hoped for a quick success, provided one fought well, . . . although it usually earns one more resentment than favors, at times even from those for whom one keeps fighting."

* * *

The following books are available for review:

Caterine, Darryl V. **Conservative Catholicism and the Carmelites Identity, Ethnicity, and Tradition in the Modern Church** (Indiana University Press, 2001)
122 pp. ISBN 0-253-34011-X

Cavins, Jeff and Pinto, Matthew. **Amazing Grace, For Those who Suffer** (Ascension Press, L.L.C., 2002)
271 pp. ISBN 0-9659228-4-7

Claudel, Paul. **I Believe In God, A Meditation on the Apostles' Creed** (Ignatius Press, 2002)
317 pp. ISBN 0-08987-08567-6

Dennehy, Raymond. **Anti-Abortionist at Large** (Trafford Publishing, 2002)
212 pp. ISBN 1-55369-380-9

Edited by Dovre, Paul J. **The Future of Religious Colleges** (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002)
362 pp. ISBN 0-8028-4955-5

Dubay, Thomas. **Happy Are You Poor, The Simple Life and Spiritual Freedom** (Ignatius Press, 2003)
170 pp. ISBN 0-08987-09210-0

Durand, Dave. **Time Management for CATHOLICS** (Sophia Institute Press, 2002)
174 pp. ISBN 1-928832-57-1

Epie, Chantal. **The Scriptural Roots of Catholic Teaching** (Sophia Institute Press, 2002)
278 pp. ISBN 1-928832-53-9

Etzioni, Amitai. **The New Golden Rule, Community and Morality in a Democratic Society** (Basic Books)
257 pp. ISBN 0-465-04999-0

Edited By Ford, David F. & Higton, Mike. **Jesus** (Oxford University Press, 2002)
525 pp. ISBN 0-19-289316-5

Goodier, S.J., Archbishop Alban. **The Meaning of Life, The Catholic Answer** (Sophia Institute Press, 2002)
185 pp. ISBN 1-928832-61-X

Edited by Hancock, Curtis L., and Sweetman, Brendan. **Faith & The Life of The Intellect** (The Catholic University of America Press, 2003)
259 pp. ISBN 0-8132-1311-8

Compiled by Hickey, O.C.D.S., Penny. **Drink of the Stream, Prayers of Carmelites** (Ignatius Press, 2002)
352 pp. ISBN 0-08987-08524-9

Knox, Ronald A., **The Hidden Stream, Mysteries of the Christian Faith** (Ignatius Press, 2003)
215 pp. ISBN 0-08987-08630-7

Hayamim, Behoref. **In the Winter of Life, A Values-Based Jewish Guide for Decision Making at the End of Life** (Reconstructionist Rabbinical College Press, 2002)
186 pp. ISBN 0-938945-06-8

Montgomery, Marion. **Romancing Reality, Homo Viator and the Scandal Called Beauty** (St. Augustine's Press, 2002)
138 pp. ISBN 1-58731-725-7

BOOKS RECEIVED

O'Donnell, Timothy T., **Swords Around The Cross, The Nine Years War, Ireland's Defense of Faith and Fatherland 1594-1603** (Christendom Press, 2001)
276 pp. ISBN 0-931888-78-6

Edited by Ramos, Alice and George, Marie I. **Faith, Scholarship, and Culture in the 21st Century** (American Maritain Association, 2002)
321 pp. ISBN 0-9669226-5-4

Ray, Stephen K., **St. John's Gospel, A Bible Study Guide and Commentary for Individuals and Groups** (Ignatius Press, 2002)
402 pp. ISBN 0-08987-08214-9

Roche, Marianne E., **On-The-Job Spirituality: Finding God in Work.** (St. Anthony Messenger Press, 2002)
152 pp. ISBN 0-86715-456-5

Edited By Stravinskias, Rev. Peter M.J., and Reilly, Patrick, J. **Newman's Idea of a University: The American Response** (Newman House Press, 2001)
102 pp. ISBN 0-9704022-3-6

Shaw, Russell, **Ministry or Apostolate? What Should the Catholic Laity Be Doing?** (Our Sunday Visitor, Inc, 2002)
122 pp. ISBN 0-87973-957-6

Sister Miriam Joseph, C.S.C., Ph.D, Edited By McGlenn, Marguerite. **The Trivium, The Liberal Arts of Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric, Understanding the Nature and Function of Language** (Paul Dry Books, 2002)
285 pp. ISBN 0-9679675-0-3

Suarez, S.J., Translation and introduction by Freddoso, A.J. **On Creation, Conservation, & Concurrence, Metaphysical Disputation 20-22** (St. Augustine's Press, 2002)
249 pp. ISBN 1-890318-76-0

Tietge, David J. **Flash Effect, Science and the Rhetorical Origins of Cold War America** (Ohio University Press, 2002)
178 pp. ISBN 0-8214-1433-x

Tkacz, Catherine Brown. **I, Rachel, A Biblical Love Story.** (Forest of Peace Publishing, Inc, 2002)
197 pp. ISBN 0-939516-63-2

Tkacz, Catherine Brown. **The Key to the Brescia Casket: Typology and the Early Christian Imagination** (University of Notre Dame Press, 2002)
189 pp. ISBN 0-268-01231-8

van Zeller, Dom Hubert. **Suffering: the Catholic Answer, The Cross of Christ and its Meaning for You** (Sophia Institute Press, 2002)
122 pp. ISBN 1-928832-52-0

West, Christopher, **Good News About Sex & Marriage, Answers to Your Honest Questions about Catholic Teaching** (Charis Books, 2000)
167 pp. ISBN 1-56955-214-2

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

Dr. Larry Chapp, Editor in Chief
Fellowship of Catholic Scholars
DeSales University
2755 Station Ave.
Center Valley, PA 18034

610-282-1100 ext. 1264
Larry.Chapp@desales.edu

BOARD OF DIRECTORS – 2002

OFFICERS

President

Vice-President

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

Executive Secretary

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

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

Rev. Thomas F. Dailey, O.S.F.S.
DeSales University
2755 Station Avenue
Center Valley, PA 18034
Thomas.Dailey@desales.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
fax: 412-456-3113

Dr. William May
John Paul II Institute
415 Michigan Avenue,
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
fax: 914-376-2019

Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.
Loyola University
6525 N. Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60626-5385
fax: 773-508-2098

ELECTED DIRECTORS

(2000-2003)

Dr. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese
(Emory University)
1487 Sheridan Walk
Atlanta, GA 30324
efoxgen@bellsouth.net

Dr. Patrick Metress
(Catholic Research Center)
9118 Steeplebush Court
Annandale, VA 22003-4051
pmetress@wans.net

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
smbarr@bartol.udel.edu

Dr. Stephen Miletic
Franciscan University of
Steubenville
1235 University Boulevard
Steubenville, OH 43952-1763
smiletic@franuniv.edu

Rev. Peter Ryan, S.J.
Mount St. Mary's Seminary
Emmitsburg, MD 21727-7700
pryan@msmary.edu

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

(2002-2005)

Dr. J. Brian Benestad
University of Scranton
Scranton, PA 18510
benestadj1@uofs.edu

Rev. Joseph Koterski, SJ
Fordham University –
Philosophy
Bronx, NY 10458
koterski@fordham.edu

Prof. Glenn Olsen
University of Utah
300 S. 1400 E. Room 211
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0311
Glenn.Olsen@m.cc.utah.edu

Dr. Joseph Varacalli
(Society of Catholic Social
Scientists)
225 Lewis Avenue
Westbury, NY 11590
varacaj@ncc.edu

Send Address Changes to:

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly

Box 495

Notre Dame, IN 46556

E-mail to: Alice.F.Osberger.1@nd.edu

**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**