

## Lines From Father Lawler's Desk

A welcome spring is at hand for the Fellowship. The Convention in St. Louis looks promising. We will be gaining a new president. Books, articles, workshops, enterprises initiated by *FCS* members will be appearing month by month during the next year. And we will enter a new stage of development in St. Louis, when *FCS* gains a second president.

The universal Church also has reason to rejoice in the pastoral guidance of the new Pope. John Paul II has been warming the Catholic community with his astonishing energy, courage, and vision. Even though winter, and the sharing of the cross never entirely passes away, a new spring for the Church is aborning.

As I reflect on the first two years of the *Fellowship*, I realize that, being young, we have done little. But I am also pleased at the blessings we have received in the modest measure of the progress *FCS* has made.

Already we have four hundred members. Many more have shown interest in the *Fellowship*, waiting to evaluate results before joining the *FCS* family. Some others have been tempted to believe the propaganda of dissenters, fearing that the body of Catholic scholars has turned away from a warm Catholic spirit and from faithful acknowledgment of the Magisterium. They are beginning to realize the large number of Catholic scholars in comfortable relationship with Magisterium.

Our *Newsletter* has been doing more good than most members realize. Scholars and pastoral leaders here and throughout the world read it carefully. Over 2000 copies are mailed out quarterly. The letters in response indicate that the *Newsletter* has become a valued source of information and encouragement.

The *Proceedings* of our first convention, recently mailed to members, is a reminder how heartening our experience in Kansas City was. The *Proceedings* also call us to our forthcoming second convention shortly to be held in St. Louis.

Recently, the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* was elected to membership in the *Council of Catholic Learned Societies*, a federation established to serve the Church creatively through Scholarship.

Last spring Cardinal Baum reminded the Convention that the Catholic spirit can never be called merely conservative or liberal. Faith guards the enduring gifts of God with conserving care. But it is also alive, creative, generous, in the liberating spirit of the Gospel. There is room in the *Fellowship*, therefore, for a rich diversity of scholars from a wide range of disciplines. One thing is needed to give us the necessary unity: shared concern to serve Christ in his Catholic Church with energy and faithful love.

## The 1979 Fellowship Convention in St. Louis

With due gratitude to Professor James Hitchcock, who recently became the proud father of a fourth daughter, arrangements have been made to hold the Second Convention at the Ramada Inn, 9636 Natural Bridge Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63134, March 30 – April 1st, 1979. The Ramada Inn is two minutes from the airport. A limousine is available for transportation if the arriving delegates telephone the Inn from a direct line on the lower level at the airport. For those

who come by car, Ramada Inn is at the intersection of the Brown Road South Exit of Interstate 70.

This year the registration fee has been raised to \$25.00 as a help toward balancing the convention budget.

Convention meals are expected to cost approximately \$9.00 for the Saturday dinner and \$5.00 each for the two lunches.

### Program

Chairman and President – Fr. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap.  
Catholic University of America

Friday, March 30th

Arrival Time – At Will

4:00 p.m. – Meeting of the Board of Directors

7:30 p.m. – Brief Meeting of the Membership

8:00 p.m. – Keynote Address

John Cardinal Carberry  
Archbishop of St. Louis

9:30 – Reception

Saturday, March 31st

9:00 a.m. – FIRST PLENARY SESSION

Chairman, Professor James Hitchcock, St. Louis University

Addresses – *Metaphysics and the Problem of Historicism in Contemporary Theology*

Professor David Schindler, Mt. St. Mary's University

*Transcendental Truth and Cultural Relativism; An Historian's View*

Professor Glenn Olsen, University of Utah

11:15 a.m. – Workshops

On the Priesthood (Fr. Frederick Jelly, O.P. and Fr. John Miller, C.S.C.)

On Religious Life (Sr. Mary Christopher and Fr. Thomas Dubay)

On Marriage and the Family (Fr. Henry V. Sattler and Mr. and Mrs. John Kippley)

On Religious Education (Fr. Michael Wrenn and Fr. Robert Levis)

On the Church and Public Life (Professors James Hitchcock and Charles Dechert)

12:30 p.m. – Lunch

1:45 p.m. – SECOND PLENARY SESSION

Chairman, Fr. Earl Weis, S.J., Loyola University, Chicago

Addresses – *Developments in Contemporary Christology*

Fr. Eamon Carroll, O.Carm., The Catholic University of America

*In These Words are Life: Literature and Faith*

Sr. Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J., Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois

4:00 p.m. – Concelebrated Liturgy

Cardinal Carberry and Bishop John McDowell, homilist

6:00 p.m. Convention Dinner – Presidential Address

- 8:00 p.m.      THIRD PLENARY SESSION  
 Chairman, Professor Raymond L. Dennehy, University of San Francisco  
 Address — *Turning Wine into Water: Fashions of the Mind*  
 Professor Andree Emery, Hacker Psychiatric Clinic, Beverly Hills, California
- 9:30 p.m.      — Social Hour

Sunday, April 1st

- 9:00 a.m.      — FOURTH PLENARY SESSION  
 Chairman, Fr. Kenneth Baker, S.J., Editor, Homiletic and Pastoral Review  
 Address — *Historicism and Recent Developments in Scriptural Studies*  
 Fr. Dennis McCarthy, S.J. *Biblicum*, Rome
- 10:45 a.m.      — Workshop Sessions continued
- 12:30 p.m.      — Lunch
- 1:30 p.m.      — Business meeting for Fellowship members.

---

## Political Scholarship?

Mr. Edward B. Hanify, Chairman of *The Human Life Foundation*, raises the following questions in the November 1978 issue of the *Linacre Quarterly*:

“Why did the Ford Foundation, having ample access to our staff and the benefit of its collaboration, publish what purported to be a definitive work on fertility regulation and totally ignore the indisputable scientific credentials of natural family planning?”

Why did the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Community Development (HEW) finance and publish a study by a Princeton group which probed whether Catholic women who receive monthly Communion observe the Church's prohibition of the use of artificial birth control? Why this intrusion, financed by our tax dollars, on the sacred religious practices and private sexual habits of Catholic women? Why did Planned Parenthood's publication, “Family Planning Perspective” then publish this governmental study in an issue with the cover picture of a priest baptizing a Catholic child under the title, “The Secularization of

Catholic Birth Control Practices”?

“Why, in recent hearings before the Select Committee on Population of the House, was so much attention paid to the probable attitude of the Church in Latin America to the A.I.D. population control program?”

“Why the pointed inquiries by certain members of the Committee as to whether priests in South America ignore or teach the principles of *Humanae Vitae*?”

“Why the planned convocation scheduled for August 1979 of 100 parliamentarians from different countries “to investigate institutional and governmental barriers to better and widespread dissemination of family planning”?”

“In these developments, one sees a curious combination of attitudes — an ill-concealed prejudice against natural family planning mingled with a preoccupation with eliminating the possible barriers *Humanae Vitae* creates, to the total adoption of artificial contraception, sterilization and abortion as means of fertility control.”

## Items of Interest

- An important conference on moral theology – titled “Principles of Catholic Morality” – will be held under the sponsorship of Cardinal Baum and the Archdiocese of Washington from June 17-22 at the Catholic University of America. Some of the featured speakers expected to participate are Fr. Donald McCarthy, Dr. Joseph Boyle, Fr. Joseph Mangan, Fr. William Smith, Fr. John Connery. For advance information write Professor William May at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20017.
- Fr. Robert Brungs, S.J. announces the existence and purposes of the Institute for Theological Encounter with Science and Technology (ITEST). ITEST shares many of the purposes of the Fellowship, though on a narrower focus. As an international interdisciplinary, interfaith group, ITEST’s purposes are: 1) to act as an “early-warning system” for Christian churches on work being done in scientific laboratories before it becomes front-page news; 2) to translate this information into an ecclesial vocabulary; 3) to identify, isolate and respond to those scientific developments that challenge our understanding of Christian faith; 4) to explore from the Christian tradition the growth of that understanding; 5) to help build a community of Christian scientists (and other scholars) dedicated both to the advancement of our scientific understanding and to the growth of Christianity. *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* members are invited to membership. Checks (\$15.00 per year; \$10.00 students) should be made payable to ITEST. Further information is available from Robert Brungs, S.J., Director, ITEST, 221 North Grand Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63103.
- Father Paul Marx, O.S.B., Executive Director of the Human Life Center at St. John’s University, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321, announces the Fourth Annual International Symposium on Natural Family Planning to be held there on June 15-20, 1979.
- Other summer programs at The Human Life Center include: June 8-14, *National Seminar on Marriage and Family Life*; June 11-14, Program for Teacher Accreditation/Certification in the Symptom-Thermal Method; June 15-17, Three National Seminars for Beginners in Natural Family Planning (all methods); June 15-17, separate seminars on Chastity, Love, Sexuality, and Fertility Awareness for boys and girls who are at least sophomores in high school (seminars are not co-ed); June 20-22, Special Accredited Natural Family Planning Seminar for Doctors and Midwives, cosponsored by The Human Life Center and the University of Minnesota Medical School, held in Minneapolis; June 22-27, National Seminar on Christian Sexuality, Love, and Parenting (Also for AAI, Birthright, and other emergency pregnancy counselors).
- Rev. John H. Miller, C.S.C., Provincial of the Holy Cross Fathers’ Southern Province and Foundation Member and Director of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, was unanimously elected to the Board of Trustees of Cardinal Newman College, St. Louis, Missouri. Subsequently the Board Chairman, Mr. Donald Traci, appointed him a member of the Board’s Academic Committee.
- The Kairos Foundation will sponsor a program of “Studies in Christian Culture” from July 2 to August 22 at San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Spain. Courses in English for American college credit may be taken in the following: Fundamentals of the Catholic Tradition; the Problem of God in Christian Philosophy; Christianity, Social Thought and Modern Society; Topics in Christian History; Christian Literature; and Spanish Language. Graduate students and non-matriculated students may also enroll. The total cost from New York, including room, board, and excursions to some of the principal historic sites in Spain is \$1650. Further information is available from the Kairos Foundation, 3819 Sassafras Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16508.
- *The Seventh Annual Summer Residence Course in Catholic Teaching* sponsored by Our Lady of Peace Institute in Beaverton, Oregon will be held in two sessions this year July 9-20 and July 23 – August 3 and will include courses on the role of the Holy Spirit in Salvation History, St. Augustine’s philosophy, Catholic Social Teaching, Catechetics, and the New Testament Church. The Beaverton Institute regularly conducts a Pontifical Catechetical Program. For additional information write to Sr. M. Raymond Scheetz, O.S.F., Our Lady of Peace Retreat, 3600 S.W. 170th Avenue, Beaverton, Oregon 07005, (505) 649-7127.
- Bishop Paul Tanner of St. Augustine, Florida, has presented each of his priests with a copy of the Fellowship 1978 Convention Proceedings.
- Fr. Lorenzo Albacete, Secretary for Theological Research to William Cardinal Brown, made a valuable presentation to the St. Louis University Medical Center, entitled, “Theological Dissent From the Encyclical.” *Humanae Vitae*, of course.
- *Wanted:* Family life scholars, social philosophers and others willing to explore the concept of social justice as it pertains to marriage and the family. What are its applications? How does it operate? Why is it emphasized in other areas and completely neglected here? This concept is part of what we call “family conservation” and could be the basis of a collaborative book on the subject. Interested persons should seek me out at the St. Louis convention. Les Kohut, American Family Communiversity, 109 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

## Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

### Book Reviews

Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J., *The Historical Credibility of Hans Kung*, North Quincy, Mass., The Christopher Publishing House, 1979, \$12.95.

*The Historical Credibility of Hans Kung* is an important book. Costanzo examines Hans Kung's well-known work *Infallible? An Inquiry* first published in 1970. His method is to analyze Kung's assault on the infallibility of the Catholic Church, paragraph by paragraph. The net effect is to show that Hans Kung is not credible, in the last analysis, on two counts. He has made a drastic revision in his own position, and he finally rests his case against an infallible church on philosophical premises that are not tenable by a believing Christian. We might, therefore, summarize Costanzo's critique of Hans Kung by saying that he faults Kung for being inconsistent as a person and for being a skeptic as a thinker.

Costanzo explains at great length that anyone who studies Hans Kung must be prepared to deal with two persons. Thus, in 1961, when Hans Kung published his book *The Council, Reform, Reunion*, he urged Protestants to look to the Catholic Church as the citadel of truth and the guardian of the apostolic faith. "The only Church there is, and in which we believe, is simply and always the visibly and hierarchically organized totality of the baptized, united in the eternal profession of faith and in obedience to the Roman Pope." And again, "Of course, it is constantly happening (and often in a strange way) that a non-Catholic comes to see a greater fullness of light shining in the Catholic Church; that he comes to recognize, despite all her numerous deficiencies that she preserves the wholeness of Christianity, with the apostolic and Petrine succession, in a way that other communions, lacking the apostolic or Petrine succession, despite all the good that is in them, do not.

That was a year before the Council opened and almost ten years before *Inquiry* was published. In the meantime, Hans Kung changed his mind. Now he is saying that the Catholic Church is anything but a bastion of truth and a rock of security in the Christian world. It is no longer the Bishop of Rome or the Holy See but the "Roman ghetto . . . Vatican ghetto . . . Curial ghetto . . . Nero Roman theology and ideology . . . Roman mentality . . . Roman reaction." In *Reunion* Kung had called upon the Protestants "to view the history of the popes . . . in a somewhat more cheerful and understanding light" than they had done before. They would discover the fullness of Christian revelation in the Catholic Church. In *Inquiry* Kung concentrates on everything

in papal history that offends him and the papacy becomes the "arbitrary, autocratic, absolutist monarch." On this level, Costanzo concludes, "It is as if the two different minds of *Reunion* and *Inquiry* had never met in one and the same believer."

What happened? The answer, Costanzo believes, was the publication of *Humanae Vitae* in 1968. That this is no mere surmise is clear from the 250 pages of Hans Kung's *Infallible? An Inquiry*. The central issue to which Kung addressed himself in this book was his embarrassment over Pope Paul VI's uncompromising stand on contraception. All hopes of reunion with the Protestants, he felt, were shattered by the Pope's intransigence in refusing to bend to the "signs of the times."

The second level of Costanzo's analysis of Hans Kung focuses on his philosophical premises. The object of his negative *Inquiry* was more than the infallibility of papal definitions. It was even more than papal teaching, confirming the Church's ordinary, universal magisterium. It was nothing less than the Church herself and, in fact, any doctrine which the faithful can trust with infallible certitude. Kung rests his case for re-examining every Catholic dogma on the linguistic philosophy of men like Heidegger, Jaspers, and Wittgenstein, to whom he refers with reverence and gratitude. The result, in Kung's words, is that whatever the Church teaches since it is expressed in propositional form, never really expresses the truth. Why not? "Propositions fall short of reality . . . There always remains a difference between what I want to state and what I do state." Moreover, "Propositions are open to misunderstanding . . . Words have different, often ambiguous and fluid meanings." Also, "Propositions are in motion . . . An unchanging language fades out and becomes a dead language." All of this adds up to a profound, built-in distrust of whatever the Church teaches. There is, in Kung's words, a "fundamental ambiguity" in all Catholic teaching.

It is no comfort, Costanzo observes, to talk about the Church's indefectibility, as Kung does. To say that the Church remains indefectible although she has frequently erred in teaching believers; or that she is indefectible but no believer can ever trust her specific doctrine is to play with words. "Such a faith commitment," says Costanzo, "inserts a wide Kantian wedge between the postulates of speculative reason and practical reason." It gives a Catholic the option of believing what he wants, because it appeals to him, or discarding what the Church proclaims, if it disagrees with his own ideas and especially with his own moral behavior.

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Costanzo plans to publish two more volumes of Hans Kung. The second volume is to be an examination of Kung's ecclesiology and the third of his epistemology. Given the massive influence of Kung's writings, Costanzo's trilogy promises to be a major contribution to Catholic thought in our day.

John A. Hardon S.J.

*Mary in the New Testament*, edited by R.E. Brown, K.P. Donfried, J.A. Fritzmyer, J. Reumann, New York: Paulist Press 1978, 323 pages, \$3.95.

This book is the result of an ecumenical symposium of 12 interconfessional members. It can legitimately be called an abridged and simplified version of Brown's *The Birth of the Messiah*, (Garden City: Doubleday 1977) since all the participating authors subscribe to the former's views. The basic ideas of the book on Mary can be summarized as follows: Mk (taken for the oldest of the gospels) has nothing good to say about Mary; Mk more or less clearly includes her with those relatives of Jesus who were rebuffed by Jesus as unbelievers; in the other gospels Mary's image improves gradually to the point where she ultimately becomes the model of the Christian believers.

Some specific points in this book on Mary should be highlighted.

(1) Brown et al. understand the "macarism" (blessedness) of Mary (Lk 1:45; p. 137) as "The Beatitude of Christian Believers", she is presented as one more believer, nothing more. In support of this view the authors refer to Acts 2:18 (a prophecy which does not seem apropos in this context.) In developing their position the authors disregard the immediate context of Lk which clearly refers to the angelic message concerning Mary's exceptional maternity (Lk 1:31ff), to the "great things that the Mighty One has done to me" (Lk 1:49), to "the fruit of your womb" (1:42), and to "the mother of my Lord", all of which links Mary's faith and macarism to Abraham's (see Lk 1:55) faith and macarism (see Rom 4; Gen 15:6), someone who also "believed" that by God's power he could become a father in spite of everything.

(2) Brown et al. further claim that Mary's self-definition as "handmaid" of the Lord (Lk 1:38) indicates merely Mary's "obedience", that here she "is being presented as the first one to hear the gospel" (p. 125f, 135f), viz. — she is just another believer. This view completely disregards or ignores the functional contents of the notion "servant (*doulos/-e*) of the Lord" in the biblical tradition, as it applies to outstanding persons through whom God implemented his saving plan. The concept which should be emphasized instead is that which is only

incidentally mentioned by the authors in an other context (p. 136): viz. — "that God has employed her in His plan of salvation".

(3) At the service of the thesis that Mary is just another believer Lk 11:27-28, ("happy the womb that bore you" (Jesus),) is taken to mean that Mary "has heard, believed, obeyed, kept and pondered the word . . ." (p. 172). Strangely on the same page the authors provide the key for the correct interpretation when they state "that the primary object of the macarism (of Mary by the woman in the crowd) is the son not the mother" This is absolutely correct. The authors should have gone on to draw the right inference, viz. that Jesus' teaching is directed to the woman and to the crowds, and not to Mary, who is not even reported to be there; that true and firm adhesion to what he teaches ("God's word") is much more important than admiration for, and enthusiastic excitement about *him*. Resorting to Lk 1:45 (The meeting of Elizabeth and Mary) to reject the correct inference is of little help, because in this case it is the two "mothers" who are confronted and compared, it is they who act, and do so on behalf of their children; which is not the case at all in Lk 11:27f.

(4) In the light of their basic thesis that Mary is just another believer the two passages of Lk 2:19 and 2:51 are read: Mary "kept/retained all [these] things [pondering them] in her heart". One of the non-stated principles of these authors is that every possibility has to be excluded that Mary is behind the memories preserved in the infancy narratives. So those passages are said to show "her initial attitude. . . to be one that will lead her into the believing post-Easter community" (p. 152); she is so characterized because "of her growth as a believer", since she is the only person of the narratives who will reappear in the ministry of Jesus (p. 151). The authors ground this understanding on Lk 8:11-15, 21 but, oddly enough, they never bother to refer the reader to, or even to mention, a much more pertinent and closer passage, Lk 1:68, where among the "neighbors" of Zechariah "all these things were talked about, and those who heard them put them in their hearts *saying* (asking themselves): what then will this child be?" This reviewer believes it is not a question of believing or obeying God's word; it is a matter of attention to, and reflection upon extraordinary events that clearly suggest God's intervention; it is a question of asking about the meaning of the events. This is the true explanation of the characterization and activity ("pondering") of Mary in the other passages. Zechariah's neighbors do not reappear in Jesus' ministry nor is there any evidence that their reflection led them into the believing post-Easter community. The evangelist's remark serves some other purpose than what Brown et al. suggest; he points to the eyewitnesses of his information.

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

(5) Usually Brown et al operate with gospel units, but they contend that the passage Mk 3:31-35 (Jesus' mother and brothers come to see him) is not a gospel unit in itself; but must be included – they say – in a broader context, namely 3: 20-35. Their conclusion is to the effect that “for Mark the ‘mother and brothers’ of 3:31, who arrive (at the house in Capernaum) asking for Jesus, are the same as the ‘his own’ of 3:21 who set out (from Nazareth [!] to seize him” (p. 56) and who (i.e. his own) thought that Jesus “was beside himself”, with the end result (these authors say) that his family misunderstood him and “the natural family seems to be replaced by an eschatological family” (p. 58). Brown et al. agree that many question marks affect all this reconstruction, and their views are called “more likely”, or “probable”, “may be” (55, 56, 57, 58); which renders the conclusion extremely shaky too. Beyond that, just as in the case of Lk 11: 27f, Jesus' statement “here are my mother and my brothers” addressed to his audience is a message intended, not for his mother and brothers “outside”, but for his audience right there, and denotes Jesus' complete dedication and commitment to his mission and to his adherents. Any attempt to suggest that Jesus is sending a message to his absent mother is to read into the text what is not there. Here Jesus does what any professional man does today when he distinguishes between his official engagements and private family duties, without this implying rejection, dissociation or blame: The authors (p. 54) connect 3: 35 with 10: 29-30, which is partially legitimate: but for other possible implications let us note that 3:35 mentions just brother, sister and mother (but no father and children), and these are “my” relatives, whereas in 10:29 the reference is to *anyone's* relatives.

(6) This leads to the discussion of the episode of the synagogue in Mk 6:3 where Jesus is described as “son of Mary”. The contention by Brown et al. is that such description does not refer to Jesus' virginal conception, even though such identification of Jesus as “son of Mary” is, they admit, anomalous (p. 64). (The other evangelists use “son of Joseph”, the regular Hebrew identity) they admit, “anomalous” (p. 64). The reason for “son of Mary” here, the authors believe, is that Joseph was dead at that time. The authors of this book reject (and rightly so) many interpretations because there is no positive evidence supporting them; but they cannot produce any positive evidence that Joseph was dead. So, how can we know that this *is* the right explanation now? Secondly, in their view Mt (13:55), Lk (4:22) and Jn (6:42) were all written long after Mk; these later evangelists identified Jesus by Joseph, who is in the first position or alone (Lk). Why could not Mk do the same thing? In spite of the (unsuccessful) effort made (p. 102) to prove that the other evangelists do not

represent a tradition older than Mk, the authors have to admit that the tradition in Lk and Jn goes back to a common “pre-Gospel” level; in other words, to a source independent from Mk. Interestingly, when much later than Mk, Jn 6:42 identifies Jesus as “son of Joseph” (which is done again, but not mentioned in the book, Jn 1:45), Brown et al. claims that “we cannot be sure that the Fourth Evangelist knew this”, i.e., that Joseph was dead. The reason for this being that the authors “are not positing that the evangelist himself was an eyewitness of the ministry of Jesus” (1968). What, then, is the explanation, may I ask, of Joseph's mention by Mt and Lk? Were they also ignorant of Joseph's death? Again, why should Mk *alone* know of Joseph's death? Mark was no more witness of Jesus' ministry than Lk and the fourth (and first) evangelist. The conclusions are inescapable (1) that Jn reflects that tradition common to all three synoptists and (2) that, therefore, it was Mk who, independently of Joseph's death or life, changed the identification of Jesus from “son of Joseph” to “son of Mary”. Even though Mk does not speak about the virgin birth explicitly, and precisely for that reason, he (not the “villagers”) found it appropriate to conform to such notion through such change. There is no conflict between Mk's procedure and any alleged “negative attitude of Mary towards Jesus” in Mk 3:21 (Jesus “is beside himself”), as pointed out above.

(7) An idea proposed by Brown in *The Birth of the Messiah* is adopted in this book on Mary, viz. that the evangelist himself wrote only the narrative in Lk 1 and 2 and some time *later*, he interpolated the “canticles” that he found somewhere. Brown et al. contend in this case that the christology of the Lukan narrative is highly developed (as exemplified by 1:35, where the resurrectional theology of Rom 1: 3f is carried back to Christ's birth); so that for Lk, just as for Mt 1:23, “Jesus is God's Son from the very inception of his life” (119) – Son of God, i.e. ontologically (but at the same time they also contend that in 1: 32 “son of the Most High” is just a messianic title deriving from 2 Sam 7:9,13,14; note 256, no high christology involved). However, when dealing with the canticles they maintain: “The ‘christology’ of the canticles is relatively simple: God has fulfilled His promises to Abraham and to David – there is no echo of the conception of God's Son through the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary (1: 34-35). The failure to take account of such differences in the christology of chap. 1 invalidates Miguens' attempt (...) to claim that the virginal conception story comes from Mary and contains ‘a very primitive christology’, consonant with Mary's Jewish background” (note 311). May this reviewer respond to this first by pointing out that Miguens' discussion on the primitive christology of Luke's narratives is found on pages 141-148 of his book (*Virgin Birth*), whereas the

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

discussion of Mary as the *possible* source of Luke's narrative is on pages 128-132. — Miguens does not establish any relationship between both things, nor does he write that the primitive christology of Luke's narratives is "consonant with *Mary's Jewish background*". Miguens' only contention is that "there is almost nothing specifically Christian to these narratives. The various concepts . . . are those of the theology of the Old Testament or of the Jewish extra-biblical literature of the time" (p. 148). A distortion such as this is unscholarly. Furthermore, Miguens never makes a "claim that the virginal conception story comes from Mary." On this point his contention is that "the *ultimate* and *final*" source had to be Mary "regardless of how close to her and how accurate other sources may have been", those namely, to which the evangelist himself could have access. Read Miguens (p. 132): "After all, the narratives originated from some *Jewish-Christian community* in Palestine . . . the *possibility* stands that the memories [and not "memoires", p. 111 etc. in the book reviewed] go back to" Mary. This distortion, too, is unscholarly.

Beyond that, if, as it is maintained in the book being reviewed, the canticles represent a "simple" christology and the narrative a highly developed christology, how explain this kind of christological *schizophrenia* in one and the same literary unit? This kind of thing looks like a logical and dialectical monster. Could Luke be such a poor theologian or so unintelligent, so as not to realize the conflict? Furthermore, the contention that the titles "son of the Most High" and "son of God" (just three verses apart in the same episode) must mean two different things, that one is Old Testament-oriented and the other New Testament-oriented, is just another example of christological *schizophrenia*, this time in the Lukan narrative itself. Making these two titles mean two different things is, in addition, an assumption made with a conclusion in mind; an assumption that is not proven at all, and I wonder if such a distinction in this case can ever be proven. The definition "son of God" (without the article in Luke! with it in Rom 1:3) is as much of a messianic title as the other, as it is evidenced even by Jn 1: 49 or 11:27 where Martha believes "that you are *the Messiah*, the Son of God who was to come to the world." (See 12: 13; 6: 69); and the activity of the Spirit does not represent any kind of higher christology nor is it evidence of the divinity of the child, as Gal 4: 29 serves to prove: Isaac was begotten (not in the sphere of, but) through the causality or power of the Spirit by parents whose genetic vigor had withered away (Rom 4: 18ff). The christology of Lk 1: 35 is as "primitive" as that of 1:32 and of the canticles; the higher christology has to be brought into the narratives from somewhere else, which the authors of

this book call "eisegesis"; the same thing applies to Mt 1: 32 where "God with us" is just the translation of what the Old Testament prophet had said, "Immanu-el" (with us [is] God).

Moreover, if the canticles in the infancy narratives were included at a later time by Luke into his own previous narrative, how is it that in the rest of Lk or Acts he does not include any canticles, other than the one that belongs to the traditional material and is found, therefore, in all forms of the gospel (19: 38)? Were there no more hymns or canticles in the Christian community? The epistles, Apc, and even Jn (prologue) show that there were. In addition, these other hymns are not so profoundly semitic as those in Lk 1 and 2. Was Lk so unlucky that he came across semitic and christology-poor hymns only? Why not include some christologically more progressive hymns like those in Phil. 2:6ff or Col. 1:15ff or 1 Tim 3:16 that would support Luke's alleged developed Christology in his narrative? Or was Luke so pro-semitic and so anti-Greek? The question that arises here is: Do Luke's infancy narratives have a semitic pre-history. Brown et al. disregard this question completely. They get around the difficulty by stating that Luke merely imitates the semitizing Greek of the LXX. This reviewer finds such a proposition to be in sharp contrast with the language of the rest of the gospel and, particularly with the section in Acts where Luke is free of semitic influences. It must be added that an analysis of Luke in the material common to the other synoptists proves that Luke does *not* make any effort to imitate the LXX or to write semitizing Greek. Most of the time his retouches are made in idiomatic Greek.

Manuel Miguens, O.F.M.

---

*Principles for a Catholic Morality* by Timothy E. O'Connell. New York: Seabury Press, 1978. \$11.95. With a Foreword by Charles E. Curran.

In this work O'Connell, professor of moral theology at St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois, presents a synthesis of the moral theology emerging from the positions developed by such authors as Josef Fuchs, Bruno Schuller, Louis Janssens, Richard McCormick, Charles E. Curran, et al. The work is intended as a text for use by seminarians, by priests, and by anyone wishing to learn about contemporary Roman Catholic moral theology.

The work contains four parts. Parts I and IV are somewhat loosely related to the whole, with Part I containing "introductory essays" on the nature of moral theology, its relationship to biblical morality and to Christology and with Part IV embracing



### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

"concluding essays" devoted to the subject of the distinctiveness of a "Christian" morality and the present and future of Catholic morality. Parts II and III, which are concerned with the moral subject or agent and the objectivity of moral norms, are more intimately related. Here I shall center attention chiefly on the positions taken in Parts II and III.

Part II deals with the human person and human action as expressive of the person's basic, transcendental freedom. O'Connell sharply distinguishes between "categorical freedom" or the freedom to choose among alternatives and "transcendental freedom" or the freedom to be. Since a human act is "fully human" only when it is an expression of transcendental freedom, it follows for O'Connell that fully human acts are exceedingly rare, and it follows too that mortal sins, which require the full expression of transcendental freedom, are also quite rare in human life (cf. p. 72).

The notion of conscience is also addressed in Part II. O'Connell distinguishes conscience/1, conscience/2, and conscience/3. Conscience/1 is a "general sense of value, "whereas conscience/2 is concerned with "the specific perception of values," and conscience/3" is consummately concrete" (pp. 90-91). Conscience/1 and conscience/3 are uniquely personal and inviolable and conscience/3 is, indeed, "infallible" because it is "the final norm by which a person's action must be guided." Church teaching on moral questions can influence only conscience/2. Such teaching can never bind the conscience because the Church, in proposing specific moral values, is just as fallible as the individual person in their discernment (p. 96). O'Connell, in other words, claims that personal conscience/3, in making specific, concrete moral judgments, is utterly infallible while denying that conscience can discover universally true moral norms according to which such judgments can be known to be true or false. His analysis of conscience seems, to this reader at least, to be utterly irreconcilable with the analysis offered by Vatican II in *Dignitatis Humanae*, pars. 3 and 14.

It is in Part III, devoted to the objectivity of moral norms, that O'Connell lucidly draws together the moral thought developed by Fuchs, Schuller, Janssens, McCormick et al. In the chapters of this Part O'Connell provides what he calls a "history" of the natural law. He sees the natural law of previous theologians, including Aquinas, as identifying "the demands of the natural law with physical and biological processes" (pp. 138-139). In providing this interpretation of Aquinas, O'Connell simply follows the positions set forth by Curran in some of his articles on the natural law in Aquinas. A study of the Thomistic texts in question (principally *Summa Theologiae*, 1-2, 94, 2) is sufficient to show the superficiality of O'Connell's "history" of the natural

law. What Aquinas is doing is arguing that there are many *first* principles or precepts of the natural law. He sees the principle (not, by the way, "maxim," as O'Connell terms it) that *good is to be done and pursued and evil is to be avoided* as first in an epistemological sense. However, *precisely because the good that is to be done and pursued embraces every truly human good* (and not what O'Connell and those theologians upon whom he relies refer to as the "moral" good alone), *Aquinas goes on to state that every basic human good toward which we are naturally inclined serves, when intelligently apprehended, as a principle or starting point for moral deliberation, for practical reason.* Aquinas in no way equates such principles with "physical or biological processes" as Curran and O'Connell claim.

In place of this misnamed "physicalistic" natural law O'Connell proposes a notion of the natural law that is above all consequentialistic and proportional. He argues that ultimately "specific actions are to be evaluated from a moral point of view by considering their actual effects or consequences" (p. 147). He opposes what he calls a "micro-consequentialism," by which he seems to have in mind the sort of act-utilitarianism one finds in Joseph Fletcher, and argues for a "macroconsequentialism," where "one attempts to take into account the results of particular acts in *both* the near and long term" (p. 148).

In developing this view O'Connell claims that we discover the right thing to do "by balancing the various 'goods' and 'bads' that are part of the situation and by trying to achieve the greatest proportion of goods to bads" (p. 153). He continues by explicitly rejecting the view that it is wrong directly and deliberately to intend evil (in the premoral sense) and by claiming that the maxim, "the end does not justify the means" must be repudiated if by "end" we mean consequences, for it is these consequences alone that justify the means (p. 172). His natural law, in short, is simply a form of consequentialistic thinking.

O'Connell not only presents an atrocious version of the "history" of the natural law and offers an end-justifying-the-means consequentialism as *the* way to make good moral choices, he also takes care to omit consideration of significant studies questioning this trend in contemporary Catholic thought. His work, moreover, is one that is sure to contribute to the division of the Catholic people, for it argues that in forming their consciences the Catholic people can choose between, on the one hand, the teachings of the hierarchical magisterium and, on the other, the corps of theologians who have developed this consequentialistic methodology. Since a consequentialistic methodology can justify contraception, sterilization, abortion, etc., it is obvious that one who accepts it has in principle judged that the specific

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

teachings of the Church on moral questions not only can but indeed must be rejected.

O'Connell's work, which will undoubtedly be used in some seminaries, has received warm, glowing praise from Charles E. Curran, John F. Dedek, Josef Fuchs, and Sister Agnes Cunningham. It is useful to have a book as frankly, indeed brutally, consequentialistic in its approach available. It ought to help open up the eyes of many to what is going on and encourage them to do something to rectify the matter.

William May

Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kinschenbaum, *Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*, Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe and Howard Kinschenbaum, New York Hart Publishing Co., 1972.

Even though this book was published some years ago, it invites comment at this time for at least two reasons: 1. Moral education and values clarification programs are being presented in, and proposed for, many *more* secular as well as non-secular secondary and elementary schools. 2. One of the authors, Sidney Simon, has made presentations before Catholic organizations, e.g., the Ohio Catholic Education Association Convention in 1971, and the moral strategy that he and the other authors propose in the book is incompatible with Catholic doctrine and theoretically unacceptable.

They claim (p. 167) that, "young people brought up by moralizing adults are not prepared to make their own responsible choices. They have not *learned a process* [emphasis added] for selecting the best and rejecting the worst elements contained in the various value systems which others have been urging them to follow."

They further claim that the "new" approach that they present in the book, (p. 19), "is more systematic and more widely applicable" than the "old" approaches that have been advanced by parents, teachers and other educators. The authors say that the system is (p. 19), "based on the approach formulated by Louis Rath, who in turn built upon the thinking of John Dewey."

Valuing, according to Rath, is composed of seven sub-processes:

PRIZING one's beliefs and behaviors

1. prizing and cherishing
2. publicly affirming, when appropriate

CHOOSING one's beliefs and behaviors

3. choosing from alternatives

4. choosing after consideration of consequences
5. choosing freely

ACTING on one's beliefs

6. acting
7. acting with a pattern, consistency and repetition

The fourth feature of the process is the one that is central to the system. In addition, it is the one that most obviously places the values clarification process, as they present it, in opposition to Catholic doctrine and sound moral theory. They claim that through the process, (p. 20) "students learn to weigh the pros and cons and the consequences of the various alternatives." They further state that teachers, (p. 20) "give students options, in and out of class; for only when students begin to make their own choices and *evaluate the actual consequences* [emphasis added] do they develop their own values."

Furthermore, the theory of consequentialism<sup>1</sup> that they either knowingly or unknowingly espouse is presented in conjunction with a theory of moral subjectivism that is incompatible with a morally acceptable subjectivism.

John H. Walsh

*MARY THE SERVANT OF  
THE LORD*

M. Miguens, O.F.M.  
St. Paul Editions  
(Boston: 1978)

Because of space limitations it is perhaps wiser to refrain from attempting the full scale book review that Father Miguens' book deserves but instead give a descriptive notice of what one may hope to find in this valuable book.

One is hard put to think of anything in the Catholic roster of beliefs and practices that has suffered more from the slings and arrows of minimalist theologians and exegetes than Mary. Father Miguens' book moves to restore some balance.

The author makes much — perhaps too much — of the mistrust of Marian doctrine that prevails in ecumenical circles. Today one has more and more the experience of meeting with anti-Marian sentiment within the Catholic camp than among Protestants.

The forte of this book, I believe, are its nuanced judgements which time after time put Mary in a new and refreshing perspective. An instance of this would be Father Miguens' study of Luke 1:37. The author shows with force and clarity that the usual interpretation of this verse as an expression of humility or submission is wide of the mark. Rather,

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

he argues, one has here an expression of courage and determination in a resolute person who has made up her mind to assume a responsibility and to take up a task. Furthermore, Father Miguens calls attention to the fact that in this place in Luke, as well as in Isaiah 6:8 — a text which seems to be in the background of the Lucan text — one is confronted with a calling rather than an annunciation. This is to say there is here a true calling of Mary by God, comparable to the call of Isaiah.

All of this lines up neatly with a point that Father Miguens insists upon at the outset and again at the conclusion. It is the analogy that he sees between the servants of God written about in the Old Testament and Mary. In those Old Testament figures, God's saving activity is praised and celebrated, one must be ready to acknowledge and commend the same in the story of Mary.

All in all, this book should prove a useful tool, a joy and an enrichment for the serious Christian.

James C. Turro

---

The Ann Landers Encyclopedia  
Garden City, N.Y.  
Doubleday & Company, Inc.,  
1978  
1202 pages.  
Index. \$17.50

Don Juan would have loved this book. Fans of Ann Landers might consider than an undeserved put-down, and they could make out a case for their viewpoint.

After all, it is a good compendium of general knowledge on many things and on problems that trouble many people. It treats, and often treats well, such diverse topics as acne, anorexia nervosa, alcoholism, cancer, cleft lip, drugs, hypnosis, head injuries, self-confidence, posture, procrastination, ulcers, sun lamps, and warts. It has good articles on hyperactivity, hearts and diseases of the heart, widowhood, breast feeding (Edwina Froehlich of La Leche League), and budgets for married couples. The essays on interfaith marriages by Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen are lucid and quite objective. Catholics will be surprised to learn that most Jewish and many Protestant congregations are far more restrictive on interfaith marriages than we are. The treatment of child abuse is timely, and the case for gun control is well documented. The general approach of the book is to have authorities in each field give factual information coupled with common-sense advice.

It is generally known too that Ann has, in previous books and articles, as well as in her daily columns, deplored heavy petting, making out, and easy morals. One of her books is entitled *Teen Age Passion — How to Cool It*. Why, then, line her up on the side of a callous seducer and why concentrate this review primarily on the parts of the book that concern sex, marriage, and the male-female relationship? Answering the second question first, this critique deals mostly with the boy-girl theme because, in the view of her public, that is Ann's forte, and the area in which she is usually consulted. Most people looking for answers on the plethora of other topics treated here would find ready replies from doctors, counselors, ministers, and others close to them. Also, the factual information is, in numerous instances, subject to constant updating, so that much of it will soon be old hat.

Where, then, do we find her lacking in her chosen field? To begin with, her position on many moral matters is either no firm position at all, or else it is contradictory. We will assume that if only one position is given on a particular topic, Ann accepts that position, whoever the writer is. In only two instances are contrasting views given — abortion and homosexuality. It may be significant that the proabortion and prohomosexuality articles are given first. (The antibortion article by Father Burtchaell of Notre Dame is very well done.)

The line taken by pro contributors on these two topics and such others as masturbation, oral sex, virginity, and sexual fantasies are not only contrary to Catholic and much other Judeo-Christian religious teaching, they are often directly opposed to the explicit words of Christ in the Gospels. The article by Father Greeley is perverse and curiously naive. Has he never heard of psychological infidelity or the occasion of sin? Even our modern truncated *Confiteor* scores sins of thought as well as those of deed.

But what of Don Juan's approving of this book? He would not only approve of it, he would learn a new line from it. In her article on virginity, Ann has this to say: "Through the years some of my ideas have changed. Virginity is one of the subjects about which I have done some rethinking. Twenty-five years ago I held the firm conviction that a girl should hang onto her virginity until marriage or death — whichever came first." (The college audiences must love this one-liner.) She goes on: "I no longer believe this. I am still opposed to high school sex since I believe very few girls under eighteen years of age are emotionally equipped to handle a sexual relationship. If, however, the girl who goes to college (or to work) is mature and has her head together, meets someone with whom she becomes emotionally involved, and if

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

there is a genuine sense of mutual caring, respect, and commitment, it seems to me a physical relationship would not be inappropriate. In fact, for a young, in-love couple nearing twenty years of age, not to express their feelings in this way would be unnatural." That's Ann's considered judgment. The key words are "very few," "mature," and "head together."

The flaws in her thesis are obvious. For one thing, in this ecumenical age, it violates the standards of many religions, including the Catholic — the "fundamental option" and "internal forum" cadres notwithstanding. Perhaps an even stronger objection is that it provides the rationale for doing the very things Ann professes to be against. Healthy girls or boys of 16 or 17, or less, feeling a yen for sex, would readily convince themselves that they are "mature and have their heads together." Also, in many states, a girl can go to work at 16, if this is to be taken as a sign of maturity. Ann's own article on maturity in this volume could be cited even by a bright 12-year-old as proof that he or she possesses it.

There are numerous other deficiencies. One of the articles gives the lie to Ann's own thesis on the possible beneficial effects and maturity of college sex when, in discussing one form of venereal disease, the author says, "When school is in session, in some college towns, the sale of medication for this kind of VD is almost equivalent to that of mouthwash."

In many pieces, there is smugness and an attitude that "this and this only" is the answer to a problem. This is annoying, unscientific, and even anti-intellectual. The bland toleration of oral sex and masturbation are cases in point, as is the position on sex education. With regard to the likely salutary effects of oral sex, doesn't Ann know that some medical circles are really alarmed at the spread of VD related to it? Doesn't she know also that this is a phenomenon now not of the ghetto but of the upper and middle classes?

With respect to sex education, there are the usual fulminations against "Victorian" ignorance and the pushing of sex education classes as the cure-all for VD, abortion, unwanted pregnancy, marriage break-ups, and sex-related crime. As a matter of fact, as sex education has become more prevalent and more explicit in our schools each year, these ills have not decreased but have escalated.

Furthermore, there is in this encyclopedia far too heavy a reliance on psychology and psychiatry. It isn't that these disciplines aren't good and helpful, but that, as used here, they shut out the spiritual as a motivating factor for right conduct. The professional counselor in one field or another seems to be Ann's all but infallible authority on most everything. Few

of these people even make reference herein to the spiritual — so one cannot but get the impression that it has little practical value. True, there are many articles by religious leaders, including an inspirational one by Cardinal Cody. However, these cover areas where there is no real conflict with secular values. Nowhere is religion asked or permitted to suggest that spiritual motivation might be applied to help young people master illicit sex urges. In fact, there seems to be no such thing as an illicit sex urge — only an inappropriate age or situation or locale. One is permitted to indulge in sex — almost of any kind — provided it is neat and discreet, and does not result in emotional hangups or unwanted issue. The mild warnings against it are almost on a par with cautions against eating too many chocolate eclairs or Napoleon slices.

This contrasts oddly with Ann's strident condemnation of smoking. Here there is no question but that youth can be convinced that to continue to smoke is wrong, wrong, wrong. Not so with "sexually active" youth, the current jargon for youthful license. Ann echoes the thesis that once a youngster has become thus "active," all you can do is see that he/she takes precautions against VD or becoming pregnant. Again, on the subject of smoking, she has a curious ambivalence when it comes to marijuana. Of course she writes against it, but since the article on it says, "It probably carries the same lung risks as would occur with the use of an equivalent number of cigarettes," and since it also cites the often addictive effects, why isn't it, too, wrong, wrong, wrong?

And there are other oracular pronouncements in the book that are ill-timed and harmful. In point of numbers, a leading contributor is Eugene Kennedy, the psychologist. His eight articles are adequate, and more than that, but in the one on adultery there is this sentence: "It is possible that one can discover through adulterous behavior the first truly generous concern for another that the individual has ever experienced." Often true enough. One can think of many famous instances: William Parnell and Kitty O'Shea; Lord Nelson and Lady Hamilton, among others. The point, though, is that this is an insight to be used by a professional counselor or confessor. Trotting it out here for general perusal is foolish and counter-productive. To cite another example in which the Judeo-Christian ethic is undermined, there is Phil Donohue's piece on "When a Father Gets Custody." He says, "If you are involved with a woman and expressing yourself intimately, you are now coming face to face with single parenthood's most distracting problem, whether or not to share the same bedroom. . . . If it (the relationship) ends, how soon can the kids expect you back with another woman? With how many women can you share a bedroom in front of your kids without affecting their moral perception?"

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

The ethical answer is, of course, none — unless you are married — and the kids know that even if Phil doesn't.

Another indictment against the book is the easy use of code words to cover some very unlovely actions: "terminate a pregnancy" for abortion; "sexually active" for promiscuous; "sexual preference" for all manner of aberrations; and "physical relationship" for the earthier but more accurate "shacking up."

A minor disturbing note is that Ann allows, uncharacteristically, one rather cheap shot at Catholics. In the article on divorce, the author says, "Interesting that in 1946, James Curley, the mayor of Boston, was re-elected while in jail. Had he been divorced he wouldn't have had a chance." This is just the kind of put-down we now associate only with our Catholic left. To begin with, it isn't true that Curley enjoyed total Catholic support. The clergy in authority in Boston, notably Cardinal O'Connell, were not in his camp, to say the least. Further, he was not re-elected because of or even despite his conviction for corruption. Neither, in more recent times, were Adam Clayton Powell or Representative Diggs. All three men were re-elected because, in the eyes of their co-religionists or fellow blacks, they were, whatever their failings, the champions of their peoples' rights against an alien establishment. Agreed that their constituents took too narrow a view, but that's how they sincerely saw it.

It is perhaps significant that the word "sin" does not appear in the index, nor, as far as I can recall, in any of the articles. Indeed, if it is in any piece, it must have been given so little credence, or been dismissed so blithely that one would take no note of it.

Truly, Don Juan would treasure this book. So would Casanova. I don't believe either of them smoke.

John and Eileen Farrell

---

## Periodical Reviews

Martin Hopkins, O.P., "Jesus in Contemporary Thought" and "Preaching the Christ-Event Today." In *Bible Today* (December 1978, pp. 1806-1815).

These two articles represent an attempt to work out a new synthesis in Christology. Specifically, they explore the relationship between the divine and human natures in Christ primarily from a creational (rather than simply redemptive) viewpoint, all in a

spirit of fidelity to Scripture, Chalcedon and the Fathers of the Church. Central to this approach is the biblical definition of man as "image of God" (rather than "rational animal"), and the text from Col. 1:15ff.: "He (Christ) is the image of the invisible God . . . all were created through him and for him."

Although in no way denying that Christ became man "propter nos et propter nostram salutem", this viewpoint sees a broader purpose in the Incarnation: God freely choosing to express Himself, through His Word, in a new medium — tangible, visible, audible: the medium of flesh. Thus, human nature is viewed as the unique channel permitting the Father to *transpose* all of His divine attributes and His eternal relationship to the Word via the Incarnation. It may be compared to a tapestry: the front side with the clear design, represents the divine mode of being (with the "glory"), whereas the backside of the tapestry represents the human mode (without the glory). All of the divinity is there (on the backside), but is inverted, and often looks ugly. In this transposed state, the Holy Spirit plays a vital role in the life of Christ, rendering Him the perfect pray-er.

Where is the biblical evidence of this "transposition"? In Matthew 5 — the Beatitudes. These dispositions are not human achievements, but divine attributes in a human, graced mode of existence. Since human beings share the same nature as Christ in His humanity, they are privileged to be "divinity containers" also by allowing the divine attributes represented by the Beatitudes to form an integral part of their lives . . . thereby transcending the bonds of finite humanity through the graced activity of the Spirit. Four of these transpositions are worked out in detail in the second article.

## Publications of Interest

- A group has recently launched *Ignatius Press*, which is a separate entity from the University of San Francisco and the St. Ignatius Institute, but in which many Institute faculty and staff are taking part. Ignatius Press has received from Libreria Editrice Vaticana the English translation rights for all the theological and philosophical articles of Pope John Paul II written prior to his elevation to the Papacy as well as his book on the phenomenology of Max Scheler. IP may also be the editors for the American edition of *Love and Responsibility*, hoping to provide the very best of theological and spiritual works with an emphasis, at least at the beginning, on words by European authors not yet available in English. It is always looking for translators from French and German — and now Polish — particularly high qualified and zealous ones who are willing to do this work as a labor of love.

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

The following translations have been completed and are in final stage of review: 1) *The Heart of the World (Das Herz der Welt)*. Hans Urs von Balthasar. 163PP; trans. Dr. Erasmo Leiva. 2) *Woman and the Church (Mystere et Ministerie de la Femme dans l'Eglise)*. Louis Bouyer. 108 pp.; trans. Marilyn Teichert. 3) *Towards a Theology of the Secular Institute (Zur Theologie des Sekular Instituts)*. Hans Urs von Balthasar; 50 PP; trans. Dr. Erasmo Leiva.

- Julian Burt, O.S.B. of St. Vincent ArchAbbey in Latrobe, Pennsylvania has a worthwhile article in the December 1978 issue of *The Priest* (pp. 39-43) entitled "Truth and the Theologian". His concluding line reads: "The crisis in the Church today is caused by the abandonment of the Thomistic concept of truth and reality for the sake of the dynamic concept of truth and reality. Until the theologian abandons the latter and returns to the former I see no hope for the preservation of the truth of faith or of theology."
- Fellowship member Mary Joyce in the Fall 1978 *International Review of Natural Family Planning* reviews a book entitled *Marriage among Christians: A Curious Tradition*. The book in question is edited by Notre Dame's James Burtchaell and published by that University's press. Taking note of the fact that Burtchaell bases morality on marriage as a whole, rather than on individual acts, Mary Joyce makes the pregnant observation: "Morality is not based on any way of life taken as a whole. It is were a single act of murder could be justified by life as a whole that respected the rights of others."
- Fr. W. J. Hayes in Australia wants American readers to know of his booklet *The Second Wave: Return of Modernism*. Fr. Hayes writes that he does "not expect this little book to take the place of St. Thomas' *Summa* "but he offers a 'grey headed country parish priests' analysis" of the present controversies in the Church. Copies are available from John XXIII Fellowship Cooperative Ltd., P.O. Box 22, Ormond, Victoria, 3204 Australia.
- *The Human Life Center* in Collegeville, Minnesota has reprinted Dr. Thomas W. Hilgers article "Human Reproduction: Three Issues for the Moral Theologian". The three issues are: whether the rhythm method contributes to spontaneous abortion, whether it causes a considerable waste of zygotes, whether final irreversible individuality occurs so much later than conception that early abortion can be justified. The original article was intended as a refutation of Fr. Bernard Haring's errors first published in *Theological Studies* (37-1976, pp. 120-132).

- *Doing Evil to Achieve Good*, edited by Paul Ramsey and Richard McCormick, S.J., has been published by the Loyola University Press. (\$11.95) This work reprints Fr. McCormick's "Ambiguity in Moral Choice" and criticism thereof by other theologians, including Ramsey. An essay by Bruno Schuller rejects the principle of double effect and the reasoning behind it. Ramsey is particularly strong in the criticism of the "proportionate good" school of moral theology.

- Fr. Henry V. Sattler's new book *Sex Is Alive and Well and Flourishes Among Christians* will be published by Our Sunday Visitor Press in the Fall of 1979. This book attempts to highlight the mystery of reference and meaning due sexuality inspired by the Christian ethos, both of which have been exorcised by the "sexperts" of our time.

- In the July-August 1978 issue of *The Ecumenist* (pp. 70-73) there is a reprint of Gregory Baum's introduction to Peter Kelly's book *Searching for Truth: A Personal View of Roman Catholicism* (World Publishing, Cleveland, 1978) Baum concludes his introduction as follows:

"There is no way of getting around the uncomfortable fact that Jesus did not "institute" the Catholic Church in the ordinary meaning of that word. Even if one acknowledges that the historical development that took place was guided by the Holy Spirit, there is no good reason to regard the Catholic Church in the history of Christianity as the only authentic bearer of the Christian Gospel. Added to this is another difficulty. Contemporary biblical scholarship has shown that there is no good reason to affirm the historicity of certain events recorded in the Bible — for instance, the narratives of Jesus' infancy — thereby removing the foundation of certain doctrines defined by the Church. The enormous claims which the Catholic Church made for itself (and for the Bible) do not stand up under the impact of critical scholarship. This discovery creates a problem not only for Peter Kelly; it ushers the entire Catholic community into a spiritual turmoil comparable with the disturbance produced by critical biblical scholarship in Protestant Christianity.

"Peter Kelly tells us that since he no longer agrees with the Church's official self-definition, leaving the priesthood was the honest and honorable thing to do. The majority of critical Catholic theologians regard the present crisis as part of the spiritual drama by which the Church becomes reconciled with modern critical thought and learns to formulate the Christian Gospel as the good news for contemporary society. These theologians trust that by abandoning the excessive claims, the Catholic community, in continuity with its past and accompanied by the order Christian churches, will eventually perceive itself in a new way as the place where Jesus Christ is

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

proclaimed, celebrated and extended in history. The more modest self-understanding which critical research forces on the Catholic hierarchy will not harm the reality of Catholicism. It will modify the princely style of Church government, and it will generate a more ecumenical perception of the Church, but the essential continuity with the past will remain visible. Some readers may interpret the present book as an argument against the Catholic Church. Peter Kelly may not be the marginal figure he thinks he is; he may turn out to have been a believing, sensitive Christian at the center of the Church where God's Spirit generates the creative thrust into the future.

● Fr. John R. Sheets, S.J. of (*Communio*, Winter 1978, pp. 382-388) Creighton University evaluates the CTSA report on the ordination of women which considered invalid traditional reasons against and favoring the new reasons proposed for their ordination. The pertinent passages in his critique are as follows:

"Those who have tried to express the reasons against the ordination of women stress that it is not an isolated doctrine, but one that is intimately connected — as is true with all elements of the faith — with the other truths. In arguing against that position, the advocates of ordination of women have proved the very point in a negative way. They have had to reform the view of anthropology, Church, sacrament, even the view of reality itself."

"Perhaps unconsciously, but nevertheless clearly, many of them support a view of reality and of society which substitutes functionality for being. Everything is interchangeable, if it can perform the same function. There is only one norm, functionality. Reality in this sense is not organically related, and hierarchically multi-leveled, but constructed very much like a machine with interchangeable and replaceable parts."

"Parenthetically this report raises different but related questions. How does the CTSA expect professional respect when it loads a task force with people who have the same opinions on the subject, and who call in consultants who share these opinions? Much the same thing happened in the study on human sexuality. Has the CTSA ceased to be a body of professional scholars interested in the series investigation of the truth, or has it become a politicized advocacy group? Every serious body of scholars realizes that truth is not served by simply turning up the volume, hoping to drown out other points of view. Again, has what is supposed to be a body of theologians begun to assume a more direct and extensive pastoral role not only in competition with the bishops, but sometimes in contradiction of them? These are serious questions"

"Such studies as those done on human sexuality and the status of women could be genuinely theologically creative if they were truly representative of the best theological opinion, not in its uniformity but in its diversity."

● *The Bulletin of the Council on the Study of Religion* (December 1978 p. 137) reports on the 1978 meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association in San Francisco. The news note of one of CBA's panel discussions read as follows:

"A panel discussion on 'The CTSA Report, *Human Sexuality: Biblical Perspectives*' was moderated by Eugene H. Maly, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Norwood. The panel of four was composed of three CBA members, Carroll Stuhlmueller, Catholic Theological Union, Chicago; Joseph Jensen, Catholic University; and John Meier, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie; and of Francis X. Meehan, a moral theologian from St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia. The discussion took note of the fact that the authors of the CTSA Report had invited evaluation and criticism on the part of scholars. The panelists were sympathetic to the Report's attempt to deal anew with problems in the area of human sexuality but expressed basic disagreement with the results; the Report's use of scriptural data was often inaccurate and tended to neglect the broader context (e.g., failing to read Israel's legislation in the light of narrative and wisdom traditions) and put too much emphasis on the effect of New Testament eschatological expectation on its moral teaching."

---

### Fr. William Smith on the alleged 'moral right to dissent'

The physical and at times moral duty to *Withhold internal assent* has been converted and escalated into an alleged positive *moral right to dissent*. I take it that *withholding internal assent* is different from *positive expression of dissent*, but I see them everywhere lumped together and some authors use the concepts interchangeably. Curiously, the advocates of the alleged right to dissent would have it that we, as faithful Catholics, not only have the moral right and moral duty to assent to Church Teaching (Vat. II, *Lumen Gentium*, n. 25; *Dei Verbum*, n. 10), but that we also have the "moral right" to dissent from same.

Fr. Charles E. Curran, of the Catholic University in Wash., D.C., is, perhaps, the leading advocate of theological dissent in this country as a recent article of his verifies. As with several authors, Fr. Curran, passes rather easily from a possibility of dissent (i.e., *withholding internal assent*), to an alleged and explicit right of Catholics to dissent from Catholic teaching.

### Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

We know from logic that the pass from the possible to the actual is a transfer more easily stated than verified. Now, it is Fr. Curran's particular claim that the Canadian Catholic Bishops – while they themselves did not dissent from *Humanae Vitae* – did in their post-*Humanae Vitae* statement (9/27/68) about that encyclical, “acknowledge the explicit right of Catholics to dissent” according to Fr. Curran.

Upon reading and rereading that statement of the Canadian Hierarchy of Sept. 27, 1968, I can find no acknowledgement by them of any “explicit right to dissent.” I do find in n. 17 and n. 25 of that statement:

“ . . . In particular, the argumentation and rational foundation of the encyclical, which are only briefly indicated, have failed in some cases to win the *assent* of men of science, or indeed of some men of culture and education who share in the contemporary empirical and scientific mode of thought. . . . ” (n. 17)

“ . . . But they should remember that their good faith will be dependent upon a sincere self-examination to determine the true motives and grounds for such *suspension of assent* and on continued effort to understand and deepen their knowledge of the teaching of the Church.” (n. 17)

“In the situation we described earlier in this statement (paragraph 17) the confessor or counsellor must show sympathetic understanding and reverence for the sincere good faith of those who *fail* in their effort to *accept* some point of the encyclical.” (n.25)

“Counsellors may meet others who, accepting the teaching of the Holy Father, find that because of particular circumstances, they are involved in what *seems* to them a clear conflict of duties . . . ” (n.26)

(emphasis added)

Now certainly, Fr. Curran is not among the latter, those who accept the teaching, because he has written elsewhere:

“For the sake of the truth and the best interests of the Church and all mankind, I have concluded that it is necessary to take the more radical solution which maintains that the papal teaching on this point is in error.”

Similarly, he is just as empathic on what he considers his own refutation of Church teaching on direct sterilization – a teaching also affirmed in *Humanae Vitae*. Nonetheless, granting the Canadian mention of actual and possible *lack of assent*, I find no explicit mention of any “explicit right to dissent” as Fr. Curran claims to find.

It is true that the Statement of the Canadian Hierarchy of September 1968 received much attention and generated some amount of confusion. But it is also true that that statement was not that Hierarchy's last word on conscience formation. It approaches the disingenuous, for someone who reads widely in the field, not to mention the Canadian Hierarchy's more recent and relevant *Statement On the Formation of Conscience* of Dec. 1, 1973. Surely this fuller and later statement of the same Episcopal Conference must be considered an important part of their complete discussion of this matter.

A careful review of the statements of so many episcopal conferences reveals that the word “dissent” rarely if ever appears. Several do mention the possibility of persons coming to different conclusions, or, accepting only parts of the teaching, or, withhold internal assent, but any alleged “right to dissent” cannot easily be grounded on these statements. Interestingly, the Belgian and Austrian Hierarchies are often cited for this purpose. Yet, the Belgian statement (August 30, 1968) reads in part:

“ . . . This disapproval by the supreme authority of the Church constitutes a rule of conduct for the Catholic conscience; and no one is authorized to dispute that its character is in itself obligatory. (n.1)

and again:

“Someone, however, who is competent in the matter under consideration and capable of forming a personal and well-founded judgment – which necessarily presupposes a sufficient amount of knowledge – may, after a serious examination before God, come to other conclusions on certain points. In such a case he has the right to follow his conviction provided that he remains sincerely disposed to continue his enquiry. (A similar doctrine, which we find also in St. Thomas Aquinas (I-II, q.19,a.5), inspires the conciliar Declaration on Religious Freedom, nn. 2,1.)” (n.2,40).

It may be of interest that the question referred to in the *Summa Theologiae* is “*utrum ratio errans obliget?*” – Is a mistaken conscience binding? (*ST*, I-II, q; 19,a.5).

By way of conclusion to this section, I would ask the reader not to equate uncritically a lack of internal assent with some alleged positive right to dissent. I would further suggest that those who insist that the alleged right to dissent is found in the statements of episcopal conferences after *Humanae Vitae* to please document such explicitness: – incantation will not supply where documentation is lacking.

(Excerpt from 1978 Fellowship Proceedings where documentation is found.)



## Editorial

What kind of response would Jesus of Nazareth have gotten in Mexico January last had he, not the Pope, been the preacher of the occasion?

Probably not much different than the one given to John Paul II.

Crowds would have followed, to be sure, looking for wonderful things to happen, but the customary critics would have hung around the fringes waiting to put him down — precisely because of his power with people. Who did he think he was? What could a man from Nazareth know about the big issues? Especially the son of a carpenter? Depending on their own special interests, the critics would make Christ out to be either the greatest public agitator of all times, the toppler of established oppressions, or an addleheaded dreamer piously rambling on about turning the other cheek but quite harmless.

John Paul II turned out to be a popular success in the mould of his master. Crowds adored him, even the young anti-clerical college students who were expected to give the Pope a hard time. But the opinion moulders, both reactionaries and radicals? Well, they found a little something in everything he said to express their disappointment or disagreement. They explained John Paul's shortcomings as due to his newness in the job, his long but limited Polish experience, his unfamiliarity with Latin America, his capitulation to the Vatican bureaucracy.

In all the analyses and interpretations of the Popes various sermons to the Church of South America, a major point of the papal visit seems to have been overlooked.

Pope John Paul II was not in Mexico to represent his Polish experience or the Curia or the particular demands of Latin American activists or intellectuals. From the moment Karl Wojtyla took the keys of Peter into his hands he was already 2000 years in the job. When he undertook to speak on this difficult and obviously precarious occasion, the voice was Peter's, not his own. And since the social doctrine of the Church would never have crystallized into anything much except in and around the Chair of many Peters, it is ironic that any Pope secure in that tradition from

his first day would be second guessed by lesser figures in and out of the Church (even the *New York Times*), who have neither the Holy See's vision of universal needs of man nor the Papacy's competence to proclaim the essentials of God's law or Christ's gospel. A key sentence in John Paul's January 28 address to the bishops assembled in Puebla goes to the heart of the Church contemporary difficulties in all areas. The Pope solemnly warns all of us:

"Everyone in the ecclesial community has the duty of avoiding magisteria other than the Church's Magisterium for they (the other magisteria) are ecclesially unacceptable and pastorally sterile."

No one who is deeply committed to the Church's social doctrine, or even knowledgeable about its contents, can deny the Catholic commitment to social justice for the poor and the oppressed, not only as a matter of teaching but of direct action. That same social doctrine makes priests the moulders of conscience and opinion, not "social directors, political leaders or functionaries of a temporal power" (the Pope's description). Social reform is the special vocation of formed Christian laymen and laywomen, the Church knowing better than most how clericalism of right or left variety has been a curse for emerging peoples and a source of division within the Body of Christ. The reminder, too, that the Church in Christ's name forbids violence and conspiracy with Marxism as steps toward desired reform was especially apropos because the Holy See has cabinet files of documents on priests who are both active Marxists and violent revolutionaries.

John Paul II repeatedly used the word *fidelity* in his Mexican homilies, that one time prized virtue commonly dismissed in our time because it suggests conformity. Yet the Catholic faith at some point demands fidelity — not only to Christ of the New Testament sermons — but to his authentic voice in our time — the Pope.

Perhaps the greatest disrespect of all may come from those who seem to be saying: "The Pope came to Mexico, but nothing has changed. All previously held opinions are legitimate. Let us proceed as if he never spoke at all."

George A. Kelly

## "The McCready Flap"

Although USCC leadership has given the impression that Catholic opposition to the appointment of Dr. William C. McCready to a Bishop's Commission on Marriage and Family Life is minor in scope, the issues raised by the objectors (who in fact were numerous and nationally situated) are major. An editorial in the *Long Island Catholic* (January 25, 1979) briefly summarized the case:

"Dr. McCready is a Catholic, a well-known sociologist and senior research assistant at the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center. So why the flap? Dr. McCready has also publicly rejected and vigorously combatted the authentic teaching of the Church on artificial contraception. Some Catholics feel, therefore, that he ought to be sacked.

"Turning the heat on Dr. McCready, though, may subtly distract us from focusing on the main question, which, we believe, is this: Should Church authorities appoint to official Church commissions persons who have publicly rejected some element of the Church's authentic teaching on faith or morals? We think the answer is clearly No.

"We would be surprised and chagrined, for example, if USCC were to appoint the Rev. Charles E. Curran or Msgr. Stephen J. Kelleher to a Commission on Marriage and Family Life. Both men are Catholics, priests and recognized scholars in either theology or canon law. Their Church membership, professional credentials or personal integrity are not the issue. The issue is their publicly declared judgments that some element of authentic Church teaching — be it contraception, sterilization or general remarriage after divorce — constantly affirmed against their opinion, is erroneous and therefore to be abolished.

"Church authority indeed respects the sincere convictions of Catholics who repudiate one or other of its authentic teachings. This respect does not and should not include, however, any action by Church authority that can easily be perceived as conferring legitimacy and acceptability upon the repudiation of its teaching. Appointment to a USCC commission can easily be so perceived."

"As the verbal scuffle continues, Dr. McCready unfortunately becomes a kind of victim. He didn't ask to be appointed to the USCC Commission. Should he now be sacked or collapse under pressure? We don't believe so. He should be true to his informed and upright conscience. Church authorities, should also be true to theirs, live with their honest mistake, but not make it again. If that lesson is learned, the flap and the flack will have been worth it."

In the February 22, 1979 issue of the LIC, Dr. McCready objected to the editorial. His letter read in part: "Your statement that I have 'publicly rejected and vigorously combatted the authentic teaching of the Church on artificial contraception' is both erroneous and undocumented, and is not worthy of your reputation for accuracy and decent reporting. In my role as a sociologist, I have documented the negative impact which *Humanae Vitae* had on the devotions and attitudes of American Catholics, data which ought not be ignored by any responsible Catholic planning group. However, this certainly does not mean that I have publicly rejected any authentic teachings of the Church. I have never publically (sic) taken any stand on the morality of birth control. I will continue to participate, as a sociologist, in the planning activities of the Church to the extent that I am invited to do so, and hope that this sets the record straight. Thank you for the opportunity to clarify this unwarranted and unwanted 'flap'."

To which the Editor of LIC replied as follows: "We are grateful for Dr. McCready's statement that he has not 'publicly rejected any authentic teachings of the Church and that he has 'never publicly taken any stand on the morality of birth control.'

"Because he has described our conclusion as 'erroneous and undocumented,' we feel obligated to call attention to the documentation on which it is based: 1) the 1976 study *Catholic Schools in a Declining Church* co-authored by A.M. Greeley, W.C. McCready, and K.M. McCourt, which relentlessly criticizes the teaching on artificial contraception affirmed in *Humanae Vitae*; 2) public statements by Dr. McCready reported in NC-4/9/76; RNS 4/8/76; 3) Dr. McCready's 4/2/76 NCEA address (cf. *Origins*, Vol. 5, No. 46, pp. 732ff.) where, after calling upon Church authority to put off any more statements on sexual morality, he continues: 'Most of us mature when we admit that we have made a mistake and have taken steps to correct it. Why can we not assume that the church too would grow and mature if it could admit that the rigid prohibition against artificial contraception was an honest mistake?'

Dr. McCready implies that in documenting, as a sociologist, the 'negative impact' of *Humanae Vitae*, he prescind from the truth value of the encyclical's central teaching. We do not find this dualistic approach convincing by reason of Dr. McCready's (in the references cited above) several times repeated, strongly critical approach to *Humanae Vitae* and his several times repeated assertion or implication that this teaching should not have been reaffirmed and should now be revised in the light of the NORC study's findings."

## Employment Opportunities

● Christendom College, a recently opened (1977) Catholic college is expanding in its third year with a new campus and needs to fill the following positions for the academic year 1979-80 with Catholic laymen or women committed to the Catholic Faith:

*Professor of Political Science* – Will establish and build the Christendom College Political Science Department. Ph.D in political science required; teaching experience preferred but not required.

*Instructor in Spanish and French* – M.A. required; teaching experience preferred but not required. Must be able to teach introductory and advanced Spanish and at least introductory French.

*Librarian* – M.A. in library science required.

*Business Manager* – Knowledge of accounting required. Experience in small college administration preferred but not required.

To apply, write Dr. Warren H. Carroll, president of Christendom College, at 18825 Fuller Heights Road, Triangle, Virginia 22172 or telephone the College at (703) 221-3266 or Dr. Carroll at (703) 754-9793.

● Two positions in philosophical and/or theological ethics. Responsible for development and teaching of team-taught courses on the Analysis of Values. Each course will include introduction to ethical reasoning, treatment of contemporary moral issues, and self-analysis of the student's ethics.

1. Ethicists with teaching experience in the field of bio-ethics and/or related areas of the natural resources.

2. Ethicist with teaching experience in the integration of ethics and the humanities and/or ethics and the social sciences.

Both positions are for one to three year appointments with renewal possible. Rank: Assistant Professor. Doctorate required: support degrees in other disciplines desirable. Salary negotiable. An Equal Opportunity Employer.

Apply to: The Office of Academic Affairs, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321.

● The Board of Education for the Diocese of Galveston-Houston is in the process of conducting a search for a permanent Director of Religious Education to be presented to our Ordinary Bishop John Morkovsky.

"We are looking for someone with experience in Administration and who would maintain a doctrinal approach to religious education at all levels.

We are asking for your assistance in obtaining names of possible candidates for this position at the earliest date possible."

Please refer all correspondence to: Board of Education, 2401 East Holcomb, Houston, Texas 77201.

● St. Joseph's College, an accredited four year residential coeducation Catholic Liberal Arts institution, about twenty minutes west of Portland, Maine, is seeking a president. Nominations and applications should be sent by early March to Sister Mary Philomene, R.S.M., St. Joseph's Convent, 605 Stevens Avenue, Portland, Maine 04103.

### Chicago Declaration of Christian Concern on Social Activism

"During the last decade especially, many priests have acted as if the primary responsibility in the Church for uprooting injustices, ending wars and defending human rights rested with them as ordained ministers. As a result they bypassed the laity to pursue social causes on their own rather than enabling lay Christians to shoulder their own responsibility. These priests and religious have fought to impose their own agendas for the world upon the laity. Indeed, as in the past the Church has suffered from a tendency to clericalism on the right, it may now face the threat of a revised clericalism – on the left."

The entire statement issued in December 1977 is available from The National Center for the Laity, 6363 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois 60660.