

Newsletter

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

Volume 10, Number 1

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

December 1986

A Matter of Common Sense

Immediately following the Second Vatican Council a well-known U.S. bishop got off an unpublished but subsequently oft-told line. It went something like this: "In my position I expect from time to time to have my head bashed in, but I never intend to pay for the bat that does it." He was thinking then of disciplining a young priest for using a Catholic agency to fight the policies of the Diocese. The priest got off with a warning, but the bishop was right that Church institutions were not founded to be turned against Pope or bishops, and it was his responsibility as bishop to see that the abuse did not happen again. In 1965 bishops took that for granted.

Now, twenty years later, Cardinal O'Connor makes national news because, in an obscure Priests' Newsletter, his New York Vicar-General told pastors "great care and prudence must be exercised in extending invitations to individuals to speak at parish sponsored events." Bishop O'Keefe went on to say that it was unacceptable to invite "those individuals to speak at such events whose public position is contrary to and in opposition to the clear, unambiguous teaching of the Church."

Cardinal O'Connor thinks this is a matter of common sense. And he is right.

Can anyone imagine the AFL-CIO, NAM, NAACP, the Democratic or Republican parties turning their meeting halls over to enemies or to disloyalists within their ranks?

Why is it, therefore, that many Americans seem to resent the right of the Catholic Church to conduct its own mission in a common sense way? One dictum of sanity surely is to suffer your indignities when they come, but avoid paying for the bat. In other words, do not allow your own institutions to be used against you.

Strangely, it is not always enemies who do the Church in (they sometimes strengthen Catholic resolve), but in-house disloyalists. In the latest *brouhaha* it was Governor Mario Cuomo of New York, with an enthusiastic assist from the *New York Times*, who wanted to know where Cardinal O'Connor's common sense policy left him and the Governor's Church, the "people of God Church," the Presidential aspirant's Church? The implication was that Cuomo's Church was somehow being sabotaged by Cardinal O'Connor, and this from a political figure who ruthlessly (but correctly) cut Abe Hirschfield off at the knees for daring to contest his gubernatorial decision on the next Lieutenant-Governor. Cuomo unlike the "children of light" knew precisely how to protect his turf. More power to him. St. Augustine would approve. But why not Cardinal O'Connor? Why not John Paul II? (Cont'd on p. 3)

WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS ISSUE?

On Being Catholic

"As long as they are Roman Catholic they are not free to decide that error is truth and sin is virtue..."

p. 3

"The Vatican has demonstrated that it still has a definable identity whose integrity it will defend and whose violation it will resist." (Norman Podhoretz, Editor of Commentary)

On Timely Action

"A man can die but once; we owe God a death—He that dies this year is quit for the next." (Shakespeare, Henry IV)

p. 7

On Sound Teaching

"There are many things that most properly keep me in the bosom of the Church—the very name Catholic Church keeps me in her because it is not without reason that this Church alone has such a name amid so many heresies." (St. Augustine against the Manicheans)

p. 9

Items of Interest

- Readers of Dr. William May's critical review of the book *Bioethics and Belief* by Father John Mahoney, in the March issue of this Newsletter will be interested to know that in a joint statement issued June 30, 1986 by the Archdiocese of Westminster and Father Mahoney the Archdiocese withdrew the *Imprimatur* which it had earlier granted to the book.

- Two years before Vatican II (1960) Joseph Fuchs, S.J. speaking of *Casti Connubii* said: "It is regarded as such a solemn, authentic declaration, reviewing previous decisions and itself afterwards often confirmed, that anyone who did not want to accept it would sin against the virtue of faith."

In 1954, six years before Fuchs' statement, Bernard Haring, CSSR cited Genesis 38 to condemn contraception and described Onan's act as constituting sacrilege, a sin against the creator, and a display of lack of love for his wife. (See John Noonan's *Contraception*, pp. 428, 527.)

- In his acceptance address at the Roosevelt Hotel after receiving the Cardinal Wright Award, Gannon President Joseph Scottino announced that he would devote his 1987-88 sabbatical year to researching the relationship between Church authority and Catholic university administrators. Scottino sees no problem with the new code of Canon Law nor with Cardinal Baum's schema for the world's Catholic universities.

The plaque which he received as part of his Cardinal Wright award for outstanding service to the Church was designed by the award's creators, John and Eileen Farrell of Chicago.

- St. Francis College, Joliet, IL will have an opening in theology/religious studies for the fall of 1987. Qualified candidates may apply.

They are also looking to fill positions in mathematics, finance, and journalism/communications. Write to or telephone: John Hittinger, Ph.D., Chairman, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, O: 815-740-3457 H: 815-722-2366.

- Rev. Robert H. Aucoin was chosen to be the President of Mater Dei College, Ogdensburg, New York, effective July 1, 1986. Fr. Aucoin has been the acting president of Mater Dei since January 6, 1986.

- In 1983, the Diocese of Sorsogon, Philippines, with one of the largest number of seminarians in the Bicol Region, opened its own college seminary. With meager resources, the diocese has undertaken this bold project since the regional seminary in the Archdiocese of Caceres could not accommodate the graduates from the different high school seminaries of the region, and it was impractical to send the seminarians back home just because there was no seminary willing to accept them.

Consequent to the establishment of a college seminary, it needs to provide the students with a rounded academic and pastoral formation that is responsive to the needs of the local church. To have a good library is a priority. Especially with the course offered, i.e., a major in Philosophy and minor in Social Sciences, an adequate collection of books is indispensable. But under the present conditions, the seminary staff feels that much as they would like to give their students more, their efforts are hampered by poor facilities. The students are without the materials and resources they ought to have, which the seminary cannot provide. The following situation can perhaps illustrate their situation better. They need college level books especially in Theology, Social Science, languages, pure science, literature and history. Their address is: Our Lady of Penafrancia Seminary, P.O. Box 43, Sorsogon, Sorsogon H-318, Philippines

- When CUA received Rome's approval the Pope wrote as follows:

"With this present letter we approve by Our authority the laws and statutes of your university and endow it with the rights proper to a *lawfully constituted university*... We desire, furthermore... that competent bishops... vigilantly supervise the preservation of the soundness of studies and discipline among the students in this academic institution... We also request, to safeguard the soundness of doctrine and to insure our consistent and valid approval, that the academic courses of your university, particularly those of philosophy and theology, be submitted to the Holy See for examination... the Catholic University of America, by this letter established in Washington, not only brings increased glory to your country, but also promises great results in *propagating sound doctrine and promoting the practice of the Catholic religion*... May it become a bulwark for the true education of both clergy and laity, and for the instruction in both the divine and human sciences on the basis of the Faith..." Pope LEO XIII, Encyclical *MAGNI NOBIS*, March 7, 1889.

A Matter of Common Sense (cont'd)

Political Dissent

Perhaps we should not be too critical of Mario Cuomo. He is probably the most pious Catholic politician with Presidential ambitions since Al Smith. And unlike "the happy warrior" who anteceded FDR, Cuomo has what Smith did not have: Catholic theologians and a bishop or two who will justify him fighting Church positions on the political implications of Catholic moral doctrine. (Cuomo, for example, has gone beyond "I am opposed to abortion but..." He now defends the political right of women to choose abortion, and he does not intend, as a Catholic, to help overturn what is clearly a grave moral and social evil.)

It is not difficult these days to find "royal theologians" who provide reasons justifying the "new kings" who compromise their religious principles.

Cardinal O'Connor introduced into his explanation of New York policy a word rarely heard anymore in Catholic circles—"scandal"—leading the faithful of the Church astray, into believing that what the Church speaks with its lips can be denied by its behavior. There are many scandals in our history of which we are not proud. In the present case scandal accrues when an invitation is perceived as supporting or tolerating a speaker's position which compromises or undercuts what the Church is trying to do to elevate the moral tone of society or to correct obvious social evils.

Judgments are called for and judgments, like life itself, involve risks. Some Catholic positions are top priority (over-turning legal abortion-on-demand is an example); others are preferences more than priorities (this or that budget cut, for example). Some pastors will be overzealous in reinforcing Catholic interests, others indifferent to the Church's political well-being. Whatever: the principle is sound. Catholic institutions should reinforce Catholic doctrines and policies. Only in this way do outsiders, and insiders too, get the message. It is a matter of common sense.

Ecclesial Dissent

But there is a more important Catholic area where common sense ought to prevail, viz. within the Church itself. Catholic institutional leaders have been bashing *magisterium* for twenty years with the Pope, and the bishops in communion with him paying for the bats. The way the Post-Vatican II system has worked is exemplified best in a policy which permits Jesuit after Jesuit, without penalty, to bash the *magisterium* publicly, and that of the Papacy particularly, but demands that Jesuit superiors discipline Jesuits who publicly criticize or attack confreres who fight the Holy See. This practice does not make sense and the pattern of supporting dissent while punishing fidelity goes far beyond the Jesuits.

It was during the Curran controversy that all the chickens of the past twenty years came home to roost. Instead of those who doubted or denied truths of the Catholic faith being on the carpet, John Paul II, Cardinal Ratzinger and bishops in union with them were forced to defend themselves.

Strangest of all the phenomena of those dog days of August was how clearly the Jewish editor of *Commentary* saw the Holy See's bottom line. Norman Podhoretz wrote this about the Curranites: "So long as they remain Catholic they are not free to decide that error is truth and sin is virtue." And, then, after expressing the unspoken gratitude of Jewish and other liberals for Rome's support of traditional values, he noted: "By forbidding Father Curran to teach Theology in a Catholic university of America, the Vatican has a definable identity whose integrity it will defend and whose violation it will resist."

The time has come to see to it that the integrity of Catholic teaching and discipline be reinforced not only in Catholic schools serving laity but in seminaries, convents, monasteries, formation houses, etc.

If scandal is defined "as unbecoming conduct that gives occasion of sin to others" (Peschke) then a great deal of scandal has been given under Catholic auspices in the past twenty years which has nothing in common with the authentic renewal proclaimed by Vatican II. Some of that scandal has been grave. It is not simply the bad example of those vowed to God's service that has caused so much alienation from Catholic faith or practice; nor that our people are so religiously illiterate or weak that they became unduly upset by the legitimate changes brought on by the Council. The scandal that hurt the Church the most has been the active determination of academics and religious (and to a lesser extent laity liberated from Church ties) to lead the faithful away from the doctrinal and moral demands of the faith as those requirements were defined by the Council, the Holy See, and successive Roman Synods of Bishops.

It is a matter of common sense, therefore, for the removal of scandal and the advancement of Catholic renewal; that academics or religious patently and contumaciously no longer one in mind and heart with the magisterium be excluded from access to legitimate Catholic centers of learning and piety. More important than limiting the access of the Governor Cuomos to parish halls.

—George A. Kelly

The 1986 Fellowship Convention

Two weeks before the convention, William Cardinal Baum, Prefect of the Congregation for Catholic Education, made the observation that it was fortunate at this point in Church history that the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars existed. The occasion for that remark was an earlier announcement that a cursory survey of Fellowship members had turned up 1400 Catholic academics in the U.S. who supported John Paul II's effort to restore authenticity both to Catholic theology and to Catholic higher education. At the opening of the 1986 convention in New York's Roosevelt Hotel John Cardinal Carberry echoed a similar sentiment. In conferring the Cardinal Wright Award on Gannon's President Joseph Scottino, the retired Archbishop of St. Louis assured his audience that "the Fellowship is a source of comfort, a source of joy to the Holy Father, and to all who uphold the teaching authority of the successor of St. Peter—there is no doubt that the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars is truly needed in the Church today."

At the concluding mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral on September 28th, New York's John Cardinal O'Connor praised the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars for continuing to teach dynamic orthodoxy. Speaking of John Paul II, he said: "the trouble with this Pope is not that he is behind the times but that he is ahead of the times, trying to pull us into the future by reminding us of the truth which is timeless."

Bishop Edward Egan, New York's Vicar for Education and a scholar in his own right, officially opened a three day discussion of "The Spiritual Life of Catholics" before 250 avid listeners. This was the largest convention audience in the Fellowship's ten year history. Bishop Egan, who reviewed contemporary trends in Catholic spirituality, discerned three developing patterns within the Church: 1. a re-emphasis on a philosophical-theological approach to spirituality in reaction to the current dominance of social science considerations; 2. a desire for accuracy in matters historical as a counterpoint to those who think that spirit and feeling are adequate substitutes for facts; 3. a focus on the Universal Church as against a recent stress on the American experience. The bishop concluded with an advisory that a new trend was in the making—"in the direction of accurate, disciplined prayer about God and the things of God, a trend in the direction of a deepened appreciation of authentically Catholic traditions and in the direction of expanding our religious view so as to encompass as much as possible of the wonder and mystery of Christ's Church."

Toronto's best known Oratorian Jonathan Robinson and Creighton University's leading theologian John Sheets, SJ. reinforced the Bishop's view with their delineation of the factors contributing to a wholesome

spiritual life for all Catholics, including those in religious life. Fr. Robinson emphasized the importance of "those ascetical and moralistic elements of the religious life which are so often ignored in practice, and even openly denied" which he said were "the foundation for a happy and fruitful religious life." Following St. John of the Cross's maxim that "the purpose of walking is to arrive, not to walk," Robinson suggested that meditation, mortification and obedience are avenues for God's movement in the lives of religious. Fr. Sheets considers spiritual direction an important need for those aspiring to holiness, "not one spiritual activity along side other activities" but "the way that the Holy Spirit touches us through the gifts given to another," through which we develop, "a consistent focus on God's will in our lives."

The first workshops were the brainstormings of the Fellowships favorite twins (Carson and Maura Daly) and our five social science musketeers (Chris Wolfe, Brian Benestad, Carl Anderson, Regis Factor, and John Guegan). From quite different perspectives they analyzed the Church's spiritual tradition in the light of the thinking of literary giants like Walter Percy, Caryl Houslander and Cardinal Newman, of present Roman Synods and liberation theology. The role of contemporary theology, of the family, of the Catholic college, of the Vatican II emphasis on social ministry, were not neglected in the presentations of Fr. Thomas Weinandy, John Hass, Ronda Chervin, Jude Dougherty and Fr. Bruce Ritter.

Bishop Sean O'Malley of the Virgin Islands directed morning meditation prior to the mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral, at which sixty-five Fellowship priests concelebrated with Cardinal O'Connor.

Father Miller Named Editor of Social Justice

Father John H. Miller, C.S.C., has been appointed Editor of the *Social Justice Review* and Director of the Catholic Central Bureau in St. Louis, MO., it was announced by the Catholic Central Union of America on August 9th.

The Union was founded in 1855 by German Catholic immigrants to support their Catholic faith

and morality, and works of charity and justice.

Father Miller has published *Fundamentals of the Liturgy* (1959) and *Signs of Transformation in Christ* (1963). He served as editor for *Liturgy and Sacramental Theology* on the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* and edited eight volumes of the *Yearbook of Liturgical Studies*.

Humani Generis and the Teaching of Theology

On August 12, 1950 Pope Pius XII issued his encyclical *Humani Generis*. In it Pius insisted that the teaching of Roman Pontiffs in their encyclical letters called for the assent of the faithful, including theologians. He wrote: "Nor must it be thought that what is contained in encyclical letters does not of itself demand assent, on the pretext that the popes do not exercise in them the supreme power of their teaching authority. Rather, such teachings belong to the ordinary magisterium, of which it is true to say, 'He who hears you, hears me' (Lk 10.16); very often, too, what is proposed and inculcated in encyclical letters already appertains to Catholic doctrine for other reasons. But if the supreme pontiffs in their official acts purposely pass judgment on a matter debated until then, it is obvious to all (*omnibus patet* in the Latin text) that the matter, according to the mind and will of the same pontiffs, cannot be considered any longer a question open for discussion among theologians" (translation my own).

In 1966, in a conversation I had with a prominent leader in the catechetical movement while I was still working for the Bruce Publishing Company, I mentioned this teaching of *Humani Generis*. I was informed that, in his opinion and, according to him, among all knowledgeable theologians of the time, *Humani Generis* was regarded as a "retrograde" document. Indeed, many claim today that the teaching of *Humani Generis* was deliberately ignored at Vatican Council II. To support this claim, some argue that the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*) passes over this teaching in silence; and that it did so despite the desires of some of the Council Fathers to integrate it into *Lumen Gentium* (for this claim see Charles E. Curran, *Moral Theology: A Continuing Journey*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1982, p. 6, where he states: "The Second Vatican Council expressly rejected that same sentence," i.e., the one previously cited from *Humani Generis*).

This claim is spurious. Although *Lumen Gentium* does not explicitly refer to this teaching of *Humani Generis* it in no way "expressly rejected it." Moreover,

in another document of Vatican Council II, *Optatum Totius* (Decree on the Training of Priests), the teaching of Pius XII in *Humani Generis* on this point is explicitly accepted. In n. 16 of *Optatum Totius*, we read: "Theological disciplines should be taught in the light of faith, under the guidance of the magisterium of the Church." At this point in the conciliar text, an official footnote, n. 31, explicitly refers to this teaching, for it reads: "Cf. Pius XII, Litt. *Humani Generis*, 12 August, 1950; AAS 41 (1950), pp. 567-569." p. 568 of the Acta contain the passage from *Humani Generis* cited in the first paragraph of this notice. In view of the fact that *Optatum Totius* thus refers explicitly to the teaching of Pius XII in *Humani Generis*, it seems to me that no one can truthfully claim that Vatican Council II either (a) explicitly rejected the teaching of Pius XII or (b) simply passed it over in silence. The truth is that the Council quite clearly referred to this teaching and made it its own. Those engaged in teaching "disciplinae theologicae" are instructed to accept the teaching of Pius XII set forth in his encyclical.

—William E. May

Optatum Totius and *Humani Generis*

The pertinent line from Vatican II's *Optatum Totius* (Decree on the Training of Priests, October 28, 1965), No. 16 reads:

"Theological subjects should be taught in the light of the faith under the guidance of the church.³¹"

Footnote 31 is printed as follows: CF Pius XII, Encycl. letter *Humani Generis* AAS 42 (1950), pp. 567-569 (This reference corresponds to Nos. 3884-3887 pp. Denziger-Schonmetzer and to paragraphs 18-22 of the NCWC translation.)

The full text of these paragraphs in *Humani Generis* begins:

"Unfortunately these advocates of novelty easily pass from despising scholastic theology to the neglect of and even contempt for the Teaching Authority of the Church itself, which gives such authoritative approval to scholastic theology. This Teaching Authority is represented by them as a hindrance to progress and an obstacle in the way of science. Some non-Catholics consider it as an unjust restraint preventing some more qualified theologians from reforming their subject. And although this sacred Office of Teacher in matters of faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ Our Lord the whole deposit of faith—Sacred Scripture and divine Tradition—to be preserved guarded and interpreted, still the duty that is incumbent on the faithful to flee also those errors which more or less approach heresy, and accordingly 'to keep also the constitutions and decrees by which such evil opinion are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See.'² is sometimes as little known as if it did not exist. (What is expounded in the Encyclical Letters of the Roman Pontiffs concerning the nature and constitution of the Church, is deliberately and habitually neglected by some with the idea of giving force to a certain vague notion which they profess to have found in the ancient Fathers, especially the Greeks. The Popes, they assert, do not wish to pass judgment on what is a matter of dispute among theologians, so recourse must be had to the early sources, and the recent constitutions and decrees of the Teaching Church must be explained from the writings of the ancients.

Optatum Totius and Humani Generis (cont'd)

"Although these things seem well said, still they are not free from error. It is true that Popes generally leave theologians free in those matters which are disputed in various ways by men of very high authority in this field; but history teaches that many matters that formerly were open to discussion, no longer now admit of discussion.

"Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: He who heareth you, heareth me,"³ and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians.

"It is also true that theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation: for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly in the Scriptures and in Tradition.⁴ Besides, each source of divinely revealed doctrine contains so many rich treasures of truth, that they can really never be exhausted. Hence it is that theology through the study of its sacred sources remains ever fresh; on the other hand, speculation which neglects a deeper search into the deposit of faith, proves sterile, as we know from experience. But for this reason even positive theology cannot be on a par with merely historical science. For, together with the sources of positive theology God has given to His Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church. But if the Church does exercise this function of teaching, as she often has through the centuries, either in the ordinary or extraordinary way, it is clear how false is a procedure which would attempt to explain what is clear by means of what is obscure. Indeed the very opposite procedure must be used. Hence Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, and with very good reason: "in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church."

"To return, however, to the new opinions mentioned above, a number of things are proposed or suggested by some even against the divine authorship of Sacred Scripture. For some go so far as to pervert the sense of the Vatican Council's definition that God is the author of Holy Scripture, and they put forward again the opinion, already often condemned, which asserts that immunity from error extends only to those parts of the Bible that treat of God or of moral and religious matters. They even wrongly speak of a human sense of the Scriptures, beneath which a divine sense, which they say is the only infallible meaning, lies hidden. In interpreting Scripture, they will take no account of the analogy of faith and the Tradition of the Church. Thus they judge the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Teaching Church by the norm of Holy Scripture, interpreted by the purely human reason of exegetes, instead of explaining Holy Scripture according to the mind of the Church which Christ Our Lord has appointed guardian and interpreter of the whole deposit of divinely revealed truth."

Although not included in the footnote mentioned above, PIUS XII's concluding remarks in Humani Generis reminds us of many things said by John Paul II:

"For this reason, after mature reflection and consideration before God that We may not be wanting in Our sacred duty, We charge the Bishops and the Superiors General of Religious Orders, binding them most seriously in conscience, to take most diligent care that such opinions be not advanced in schools, in conferences or in writings of any kind, and that they be not taught in any manner whatsoever to the clergy or the faithful.

"Let the teachers in ecclesiastical institutions be aware that they cannot with tranquil conscience exercise the office of teaching entrusted to them, unless in the instruction of their students they religiously accept and exactly observe the norms which We have ordained. That due reverence and submission which in their unceasing labor they must profess towards the Teaching Authority of the Church, let them instill also into the minds and hearts of their students."

2. C.I.C. can. 1324; cfr. Conc. Vat., D.B., 1820, Const. De Fide cath. cap. 4, De Fide et ratione, post canones.

3. Luke X, 16.

4. Pius IX, *Inter gravissimas*, 28 oct., 1870, Acta, vol. I p. 260

Bishop Maida on Institutional Property

Bishop Adam J. Maida, Ordinary of Green Bay Wisconsin, on August 26, 1986 addressed the important question of the civil and canonical status of Catholic institutions in the United States. He was deeply concerned about a thesis put forward by Msgr. John McGrath. We excerpt the heart of Bishop Maida's comments:

"Msgr. McGrath stated: If anyone owns the assets of a charitable or educational institution, it is the general public. Failure to appreciate this fact has led to the mistaken idea that the property of the institution is the property of the sponsoring body..."

"His thesis was predicated upon three fundamental concepts: 1. The need for change and updating as a result of Vatican II, 2. the conviction that the Church should be a witness to poverty in the world and, 3. an ecclesiology wherein democratic concepts ought to be operative in the government of the Church..."

[After establishing that religious institutions in this country are "juridic persons" in Canon Law, Bishop Maida laid out the procedure that protects property as canonically ecclesiastical prior to the creation of any corporation. Following this procedure they are subject to all the laws of government ownership, administration and control of Church property. After civil incorporation, a religious congregation for purposes of good management and administration moves to protect its college. It gives nothing to anyone. For all intents and purposes, this college is still managed and controlled by the religious congregation: its policies and directives are dictated by the religious congregation, the property remains ecclesiastical property and is subject to all the rules and laws governing the administration of Church property.]

"However, this control by the religious congregation must be exercised within the corporation. Consequently it is incumbent on the religious congregation to exercise its authority by retaining control over the Board of Trustees, the Philosophy of the college, its disposition on dissolution. Where this control is retained, ecclesiastical property is not thereby made secular property or governmental property or public property. It remains essentially what it was in the beginning: ecclesiastical property which now has the shroud or the cloak of incorporation around it.

"What happens in civil law? When a college is incorporated, it receives a distinctive legal personality. It becomes a legal person in the civil law. It acquires rights and obligations to the society in which it was created. Its charter and by-laws dictate its purpose and manner of operation. Because it is an educational and non-profit corporation, the public through the Attorney General protects and promotes the interests of this legal entity. Does this mean that the public then owns and controls this corporation? No! It means that the public has an interest, the public has certain rights, but the college retains its ecclesial character. Incorporation does nothing to change that character...."

"Church authorities act properly when they seek to protect the integrity of their institutions. Our civil society and our civil law understand and respect this mutual concern. It is for this reason that our Church interests should be incorporated and made an integral part of our civil law institutions..."

"On the other hand, there is nothing to preclude an institute of higher learning from identifying itself as Catholic or Church-related. In fact, many institutions, by reason of their history and background, are assumed to be Catholic institutions in the minds of people. It often happens that this reality is not sufficiently expressed in corporate documents or in operational manuals. Lest these institutions be misrepresented in the eyes of the public, corporate articles and by-laws and other documents governing the life of the institution should indicate the church-relatedness and the Catholic identity of the institution. There is no legal reason why this could not be done. In fact, it clarifies the issue. This clarification and identification has been the most helpful, for example, with our hospitals. The Supreme Court has recognized the right of Catholic healthcare institutions to deliver healthcare services pursuant to a Catholic ethic. For this reason, notwithstanding very substantial government aid to healthcare institutions and participation in government sponsored healthcare programs (e.g. medicare), these institutions can function pursuant to their Catholic philosophy and theology...."

The full text of Bishop Maida's address may be secured from his office by writing to him at P.O. Box 66, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54305.

Anatomy of a Translation

The story of how an American publisher was found for the English translation of Father Rene Laurentin's masterpiece, *The Truth of Christmas — Beyond the Myths — The Gospels of the Infancy of Christ* is a tale worth telling. Msgr. Michael Wrenn, the chief translator, tells the story.

The French edition had been "crowned" in 1982 by the French Academy and its second French edition boasted a laudatory preface from Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger. American friends decided that it would be opportune to have this book published in the United States as quickly as possible. Within a matter of five months the work was translated by eight colleagues, but finding a publisher proved to be no easy task. The editor of one publishing house indicated that, although he agreed with a number of Father Laurentin's findings, it would not be politic of him to publish this book. Many theories of people whom he had been publishing for years were seriously questioned by Father Laurentin. It would be a personal offense to these authors were he to publish Laurentin. A second publishing house expressed interest even to the point of having an editor meet Father Laurentin. Subsequently, this editor also reneged, fearing that when he would come to defend his doctoral thesis a couple of years hence, members of his examining board would not look favorably upon him for having published Laurentin.

Another publisher was very interested in Father Laurentin's thesis: "I have for quite a long time seriously questioned the whole relevance of the *Deus-Ex-Machina* device invented by the Germans known as 'Q,' (source)," he stated. But six or seven weeks after he received the manuscript he wrote that two of his readers suggested that the American Catholic exegetical community will never accept this book, and that in their view it would be a financial failure. This gracious gentleman in a telephone conversation later reported that while Laurentin's book was under study by him, an unsolicited and unfavorable pre-publication review of the French original was sent to him, confirming the negative advice he was receiving. (Some years earlier a similar fate almost befell the translation into French of Anglican Bishop John A. T. Robinson's *Redating the New Testament*. To prevent French publication, one publisher sought to obtain rights to the French translation. Robinson cast serious doubts upon the late dating of the New Testament by modern scholars.)

About a year and a half after *The Truth of Christmas, Beyond the Myths* had been translated, St. Bede's Publications, a small publishing house managed by Benedictine Nuns in Massachusetts, ex-

pressed interest in publishing this work.

Father Laurentin's book has been hailed by Jean Guitton of the French Academy as a work of genius. He believes it will be a source of new knowledge for many for three reasons: 1. It does away with those illusory presuppositions which tend to weaken one's faith; 2. It restores the historical reality of the Infancy of Christ; and 3. It manifests the divine reality of the Incarnation which readily vanishes if the historical dimensions of Matthew and Luke are downplayed. Readers of Father Laurentin's American edition will find only seven of the eight translators named. The eighth scholar asked that his name not be listed because he feared professional reprisals from peers in the field in the United States for involvement with Father Laurentin.

Even before its final publication, Father Laurentin had become the object of virulent name-calling and totally unscholarly polemics. Why? Because he challenges the biblical methodology that has been used for many years by German Protestant exegetes and by leading Catholic exegetes who do not yet realize that some of the philosophical presuppositions underlying this methodology are hostile to Christian revelation.

In France the voices of Claude Tresmontant in his *The Hebrew Christ*, Father Jean Carmignac, in his *The Birth of the Synoptic Gospels*; the concerns expressed by Bishop Thomas of Ajaccio in Corsica; and the work of Father Laurentin have resulted in broadsides being levelled against these scholars by Father Pierre Grelot, a leading French biblicist. Recently a vituperative and polemical exchange occurred in a French Catholic weekly between Father Grelot and Mr. Pierre Debray, which led ultimately to an agreement that biblical hypotheses should not be presented to the public as certitudes.

There is more than a suspicion that the pre-publication maneuverings against Father Laurentin's book and the subsequent negative assessments are *not* necessarily purely scientific but are rather an ideological concern that popular theories and hypotheses are now being seriously and scientifically challenged.

Most of those who come in contact with Father Laurentin are immediately won over by his civility, gentleness, good humor, patience, charm, non-polemical scholarly character and priestly style. He is a credit to his Church which he so selflessly serves. Father Laurentin's work has restored the historicity of the *Infancy Gospels* to the faithful and the ageless beauty of that young virgin who said, "Be it done unto me according to thy word."

The Nullity of Marriage

Bishop Edward M. Egan, for twelve years a Judge of the Sacred Rota, has seen two of his articles on the nullity of marriage published in the *Ephemerides Iuris Canonici* (one dated 1983, the second 1984). The first deals with nullity "for reason of insanity or lack of due discretion of judgment," the second nullity "for reason of incapacity to fulfill the essential obligations of marriage." The first grew out of his lectures as a member of the faculty of the Gregorian University; the second developed from an analysis of present tribunal practice in several sections of the western world.

Copies of these two articles are available from Msgr. Eugene V. Clark, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York 11439.

What is submitted here is an excerpt from the 1983 article. The next issue of the Newsletter will contain citations from the 1984 article.

Section VI *One would have to look long and hard through the texts of Ecumenical Councils to find an issue of moral or sacramental theology treated more insistently and forcefully. If before Vatican II there were any room for doubt about the teaching of the Church concerning the indissolubility of marriage, there scarcely can be any now. And this is a reality which officials of ecclesiastical marriage courts may never allow themselves to forget.*

Section VII—*The vast majority of adults are capable of a valid marriage, and the vast majority of marriages are therefore valid.*

There are a number of ways to attack the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage. The best and most worthy is to draw up an argument derived from Scripture, Tradition, and reason, and attempt to show that it demonstrates that the teaching of the *Magisterium* has been wrong about the permanence of the marriage bond. The worst and most unworthy is to concede the doctrine in words but deny it in fact by pretending that a valid marriage is beyond the capacities of most mortals.

Marriage is indeed a "great mystery," a partnership of two human beings ordered to the procreation of other human beings in cooperation with the Creator Himself, a holy state, the magnificent gift of a God Who recognized that "it is not good for man to be alone". All the same, marriage is also a commonplace in the scheme of Nature, the usual way in which most people are to work out their lives and their salvation. Virtually all men and women are attracted to it. Few children can develop properly except in the environment which it creates. In fact, no state, no community of any kind, can long endure without marriage of some sort. It is part and parcel of the ordinary flow of things this side of eternity. Consequently, unless the Creator and the Nature He has brought into being are to be judged outrageously deficient in things essential, marriage must be something that almost every adult who is not obviously gravely defective in mind or body can do.

All of this should be kept ever before the attention of officials in ecclesiastical tribunals which accept cases concerning the nullity of marriage because of insanity or lack of due discretion of judgment. For such cases are inviting fields of battle for the second species of attack on indissolubility. And the reason is plain. A judge in a case of this kind is in the final analysis engaged in a work of evaluation in which he compares that magnificent commonplace which is marriage with that often elusive reality which is psychological capacity for marriage, and more often than not compares them years after their one relevant encounter as far as the nullity of marriage is concerned, that is, when the marriage consent seemed to have been given. In such a situation, it is easy to slide across realities, overstate indications, inflate proofs, and thus manufacture certitudes which are certain not at all.

In so doing, one might resolve the personal problems of one or two or even several individuals; and one might have the feeling that all of this is very "pastoral". However, at the same time, one might also be reducing the religious commitment of the Faithful as a whole to the permanence of the marriage bond and, as a consequence, raising doubts about the solidity of all other elements of the Gospel message as well, an extraordinarily un-pastoral enterprise which, for some melancholy reason, has not of late been accorded the attention and censure it would seem to merit.

Most people today who live in areas of the world where ecclesiastical marriage tribunals are active are sophisticated enough to know that most marriages are valid because most men and women, however pleasant or unpleasant, however educated or uneducated, are able to marry. These people can understand an extraordinary case, something unusual having happened in peculiar circumstances, in a word, an exception; and they can admit that exceptions are at times operative even in the doing of something as ordinary and plain as marrying. However, when the exception

The Nullity of Marriage

becomes the rule, they may remain silent; but they are not without thoughts. The vast majority of marriages are valid, the vast majority of people know it, and they know we know it too.

Section VIII—*The insights of criminal jurisprudence can be of assistance in developing principles "In iure" for cases concerning the nullity of marriage because of insanity or lack of due discretion of judgement. However, we must be careful to distinguish the imputability of a delict, which results from sufficient knowledge and liberty and admits of greater or less, from the valid positing of an act of marriage consent, which likewise results from sufficient knowledge and liberty but does not admit of greater or less.*

In criminal trials, both ecclesiastical and secular, oftentimes the central issue to be decided is whether or not the defendant enjoyed sufficient knowledge and liberty at the time of the crime of which he is accused so that it can be justly imputed to him. Over the centuries in criminal jurisprudence, and especially in secular criminal jurisprudence, many valuable principles have been evolved to help the judge in resolving this question. Hence, it should be no surprise that in ecclesiastical tribunals treating the nullity of marriage for reason of insanity or lack of due discretion of judgement, tracts concerning criminal capacity are frequently consulted and insights drawn from them cited and applied.

None of this need cause concern as long as those handling the marriage nullity cases recognize the fundamental difference which exists between psychological capacity for a crime and psychological capacity to posit a valid act of marriage consent.

Very often it is suggested that this difference has something to do with the duration of the results of the two acts in question. Thus we frequently read that more discretion of judgment is required to consent to a marriage than to perpetrate a delict because marriage entails commitments stretching into the future while the delict is ordinarily just a single act performed here and now.

Perhaps this explanation has some merit. However, when one commits a crime which is truly a crime, what he is doing is usually something that carries with it at least the possibility of a penalty in the future. Accordingly, the difference in the discretion of judgment the two acts require does not seem to be reducible simply to time and its implications.

Rather, it seems to concern the fact that a delict can be more or less imputable or, if you prefer, the offender can be more or less responsible for it, depending on the amount of knowledge and liberty he had at the time it was perpetrated, whereas an act of marriage consent is either validly posited or not, depending on whether the knowledge and liberty of the one who was endeavoring to marry were sufficient or not. *I can be slightly, moderately, or very guilty of a fraud. I cannot be slightly, moderately, or very married. I am either married or I am not. The condition does not admit of greater or less.*

If all of this be kept in mind, criminal jurisprudence regarding knowledge and liberty can be studied without fear of misapplying what has been learned. For example, in a case concerning the nullity of marriage because of insanity or lack of due discretion of judgment, a judge who understands the difference (and the reason for the difference) between capacity to commit a crime and capacity to posit a valid act of marriage consent will not dismiss debilitation of the mind or will which was intentionally induced or insufficiently guarded against as irrelevant, will take ignorance into account even if it be altogether culpable, and will refuse to allow himself even to consider the availability of the party in question to mend his ways if his ways are, in fact, in need of mending. *All that will concern him will be: "Is it provided that sufficient use of reason or discretion of judgment were not had at the time of the marriage?". And whatever the dispositions of mind and heart of the interested party are now, the answer will be "Yes" or "No" exclusively in the light of demonstrated realities then.*

A judge in a trial about the valid or invalid positing of an act of marriage consent is, indeed, fundamentally different from a judge in a criminal trial. *For his function is not to penalize or even to reward. His function is simply to affirm or deny that something has been shown to be so with moral certitude gleaned from convincing proofs.*

Final Note

In the opening section of this study it was stated that psychic disorders can lead to the nullity of marriage either because of an incapacity to posit an act of consent such as would be required by a commitment as serious as marriage or because of an incapacity to carry out that to which the consent was given, that is, to fulfill the essential obligations of marriage. Our assignment was to explore the first of these two incapacities, and this we have done. Now, however, we

The Nullity of Marriage

presume to attach a brief note about the second as well. For it is closely bound up with the first and has, moreover, recently replaced the first as the "caput nullitatis matrimonii" in the ecclesiastical tribunals of many nations.

Marriage, according to the natural and the divine positive law, is a relationship (society, communion, partnership) between a male and female, which is exclusive (all third parties are ruled out), perpetual (it continues in existence as long as both parties are alive), and ordered by nature to the procreation of children. If one grants this definition, all else that we have to say here follows, "as night the day". If one calls into question any of its essential elements or seeks to add others, all else that we have to say here will probably founder.

But let us push on. The marriage we have just defined is a relationship, an "esse ad", if you will, which is brought into being when Titius and Titia consent to it by giving and accepting the exclusive and perpetual right to perform acts which are intrinsically directed toward the begetting of offspring. *It has never been brought into being in any other way and, indeed, cannot be brought into being in any other way.* Consequently, if one or both of the partners to a marriage were unable to participate in marital acts or were unable to commit himself or herself to participate in marital acts or were unable to commit himself or herself to participate in those acts only with the other partner as long as both were among the living, their marriage, their conjugal "esse ad", or more explicitly, that relationship which should have resulted from the exchange of the above-described right, would be invalid for incapacity to follow through on marriage, which is to say, for incapacity to fulfill the essential obligations of marriage.

Perhaps we may seem to be pointlessly laboring the obvious. Unfortunately we are not. For, while the vast majority of canonists today would accede in theory to what we have just written in the paragraph above, not a few deny it in fact by attaching to the key word, "relationship", a new meaning which, though never spelled out, emerges quite clearly, all the same.

The approach goes something like this: "Of late the Church has discovered that marriage does not have just a corporal but also a personal meaning, nay more, an interpersonal meaning. Hence, if Titius and Titia are unable to constitute an interpersonal relationship, their marriage is manifestly null and can be declared such on the grounds of incapacity to fulfill the essential obligations of marriage".

Up to this point, no urgent complaint need be lodged. It is, of course, not true that the Church has

only recently learned that marriage is an interpersonal relationship, as is evident from the fact that Canon 1082 of the 1918 Code of Canon Law stated that anyone who did not know that marriage was a "permanent association of a man and a woman" could not marry validly and that such ignorance was not to be presumed after puberty. Likewise, it is not true that the Church only recently learned that marriage is something more than a merely corporal matter, as is evident from the fact that Canon 1081 of the same 1918 Code of Canon Law stated that marriage results from an exchange of rights, something that can be done only by persons exercising their highest spiritual faculties. However, setting these two reservations aside as issues of secondary importance, we repeat that no grave damage has been done thus far. Marriage is a relationship (interpersonal, of course) and if Titius and Titia are unable to constitute the relationship, they do not marry validly. So far, so good. *But the explanation continues: "The interpersonal relationship which Titius and Titia must constitute is clearly not had if they cannot grow in it, if they cannot be enriched by it, if they cannot be mutually fulfilled as a result of it. Therefore, when either or both parties to a marriage are afflicted by a psychic disorder (usually an abnormality of the personality) whereby they are unable to grow in their marriage, be enriched by it, and mutually fulfilled as a result of it, again, they do not marry validly".*

Here we have the most serious of complaints. For "relationship" has moved from meaning an "esse ad" to meaning a successful "esse ad". And worse yet, *the criteria for the success (which is, of course, quite beside the point when the validity of a marriage is at issue) is so vague ("growth", "enrichment", "fulfillment") that it is unlikely that any marriage could survive the test* if those judging a case based on such grounds were disposed to sanction a new effort by Titius and/or Titia to achieve a more satisfactory growth, enrichment, and fulfillment in a new, conjugal, interpersonal relationship.

Are we therefore suggesting that the second kind of incapacity for marriage is without meaning? Certainly not. For there are psychic disorders which can render persons incapable of fulfilling the essential obligations of marriage, namely, those psychic disorders which make it impossible for persons to give and accept the exclusive and perpetual right to conjugal acts whence arises that interpersonal relationship which is marriage. As a matter of fact, three are well-known to have such an effect. They are 1. satyriasis, whereby a male cannot commit himself to an exclusive, interpersonal, conjugal relationship; 2. nymphomania, whereby a female cannot commit herself

(Cont'd on P. 20)

Fr. Donald Keefe, S.J. on the "Exception Clause"

The Gospel of Matthew has two different statements on the indissolubility of marriage.

Mt 5:32 (American Bible) reads: "Everyone who divorces his wife—lewd conduct is a separate case—forces her to commit adultery. The man who marries a divorced woman likewise commits adultery."

Mt 19:9 reads: "Whoever divorces his wife (lewd conduct is a separate case) and marries another commits adultery, and the man who marries a divorced woman commits adultery."

An article which appeared 1972-1973 in *New Testament Studies* (XIX, 98-119) on "The Patristic text of Mt 5:32 and Mt 19:9" and was republished in a collection of articles by the same author (Henri Crouzel, *Mariage et divorce, célibat et caractère sacerdotaux dans l'Eglise Ancienne*. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1982, pp. 92-113) tried to shed some light on the much-discussed question of the synoptic logion concerning repudiation from the viewpoint of the patristic citations. Mk 10:11-12 and Lk 16:18 present no ambiguity: the person who has repudiated his or her spouse and remarries commits adultery as does the person who marries the one divorced. Mt 5:32, in spite of the presence of the famous parenthetical clause "except for the case of adultery" (the Fathers unanimously interpreted *porneia* as adultery), is likewise clear: the one who repudiates his or her innocent spouse will be responsible for the adultery that would result were the innocent spouse to remarry. The difficulty, however, remains in Mt 19:9 because the same verse contains both the parenthetical clause and the mention of remarriage: by reversing the sentence one could in effect interpret it in such a way that the one who has repudiated his or her adulterous spouse and remarries does not commit adultery.

The study of the patristic citations shows that the present version of Mt 19:19 is extremely questionable. The present form is known only by Hilary of Poitiers, Pelagius and Augustine.

Indeed, all the ante-Nicene Fathers, all the Greek Fathers up to the first decades of the fifth century, and most of the Latin Fathers of the same period, as well as the oldest of all our manuscripts, the Greek Vaticanus 1209, cite Mt 19:9 in the same form as Mt 5:32, that is, *without the mention of remarriage*. The fact that the citations refer to Mt 19:9 and not to Mt 5:32 is evident from the context of the citation which is the discussion of Jesus with the Pharisees in Mt 19. Even if the majority of the manuscripts presently preserved present the text as we have it today, an important minority still cite Mt 19:9 in the same form as Mt 5:32. *There is every possibility that Mt 5:32 is the primitive form of the text*. The present reading might have come from a projection of Mk 10:11 onto Mt 19:9 which would be the work of Tatian in his *Diatessaron*, a Gospel formed by the fusion of the four Gospels, as H. Crouzel hypothesizes in a

second article, "Quelques remarques concernant le texte patristique de Mt 19:9" (*Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 82, 1981, 83-92, also republished in the collection mentioned earlier, pp. 234-242.) The text of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, written in the second century, has been lost, but we can conjecture from the *Commentary on the Diatessaron* of Saint Ephrem as well as from a study of different later *Diatessaron* inspired by that of Tatian. Moreover, the history of these various *Diatessaron* shows that the texts inspired by Tatian progressively infiltrated the texts of the various Gospels published separately.

H. Crouzel has not been the first to show this. He is preceded by a study by A. Vincenzi, *Lectiones variae commatis IX capituli XIX Mattaei*, published with separate pagination in volume V of *In Sancti Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio* (Roma, 1869) and by J. Mac Rory, "Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries and St. Matthew XIX, 9" *Irish Theological Quarterly* 6, 1911, 172-185.

On this subject one can point out a curious phenomenon. Exegetes have kept an almost absolute silence concerning these three interventions. The works occasioned by Mt 19:9, books as well as articles, are innumerable, this verse being one of the most important *cruces interpretum* of the Gospel: but *no one finds any hint of inauthenticity in the present text in spite of what the three authors mentioned have written*.

A recent book makes a great effort to explain the parenthetical clause "except for the case of adultery" of Mt 5:32 and 19:9—a clause, let us repeat, upon which the present discussion does not bear, for this discussion concerns only the presence of a mention of the second marriage found in the present text of Mt 19:9 and not in that of Mt 5:32 although this latter text also contains the parenthetical clause—and while this book cites the article of H. Crouzel in its bibliography, it treats in a single line the question, raised in that article, of the two forms of Mt 19:9, without taking any account of it, even to refute it; without proving anything at all, the author of the book sees in that form of Mt 19:9 which reproduces Mt 5:32 only the relatively late product of a will to harmonize.

We may wonder about the reason for this silence. Perhaps the exegetes think that the scriptural text reflected in the citations of the Fathers is not trustworthy. It is true that the Fathers cited Scripture

Fr. Keefe (Cont'd from p. 12)

from memory, particularly in their homilies, and that they did not all have a preoccupation for a critically exact reading of the manuscripts. However the first author who cites this text in its entirety, repeated three times in his *Commentary on Matthew* when he explicates 19:9, is Origen. He cites it in the form of Mt 5:32 and this citation predates all the manuscripts preserved today. Moreover, we know that Origen was a great critical exegete and that he exercised his critical powers not only on the Old Testament in the *Hexapla*, but also frequently in the New Testament. Often, even in his homilies, he notes other forms of the text that he had found in other manuscripts than those which he habitually used, and he also explicates these forms. *It is scarcely sensible to suppose that Origen knew the present reading at all, for his regular exegetical practice, even in his homilies, was to note and comment upon such variant forms of the text under consideration as were known to him. Since*

in the Commentary on Matthew he has not mentioned the present form of 19:9, we may confidently conclude that he did not know it, although he had travelled widely throughout the eastern part of the Roman Empire, ranging as far as Rome, Arabia, and the borders of the Caucasus.

Many exegetes who have studied Mt 19:9 have been preoccupied to show that the Church, in opposing the practice of a second marriage after divorce, does not take into account the text which would authorize this second marriage. The demonstration of the inauthenticity of this text takes away their principal scriptural argument. If they had been able to refute the studies of Vincenzi, Mac Rory and Crouzel, they certainly would have done so. *However, the patristic evidence on this point is so extensive as to be scarcely contestable. The best tactic is then to pass over these three works in silence. Never mind scientific honesty!*

Books Received

- Clyde F. Crews *Ultimate Questions: A Theological Primer* (Paulist Press, pp. 169, \$6.95.)

This book is what it says it is—a book of questions with only a hint of answers. Its early chapters open with citations from Thomas Edison (“We don’t know one millionth of one percent about anything”) and H.L. Mencken (“There is a solution for every problem—simple, neat—and wrong.”) And closes with the suggestion that “all our secrets are the same”—about the Universe, Humanity and its flaws, with Christ as the remedy. The proposals are guidelines, not answers.

- Eugene J. Fisher et al, *Twenty Years of Jewish Catholic Relations* (Paulist Press, 236 pp., \$11.95.)

This volume of 13 chapters and 14 authors encapsulates the essence of what has gone on in Jewish Catholic dialogue since Vatican II. The Catholic participants include Msgr. George Higgins, Fr. Edward H. Flannery and Msgr. Royale Vadakin. Strong feelings sometimes cloud objectivity but the subject is not easy to separate from passion.

- Paul Flaman *Family Unity: A Christian Perspective* (St. Peter’s Press, Muenster, Saskatchewan, 251 pp., No price.)

This is a relatively unknown but rather valuable book on the theological and sociological sources of family unity and disunity. Its second part deals with reconstruction and is solidly Catholic.

- Jim Forest *Love Is The Measure: A Biography Of Dorothy Day* (Paulist Press, 224 pp., \$14.95.)

This volume is written by a fan and a convert about a lovely lady who also was a convert and, like Jim Forest, a pacifist. There cannot be enough books about Dorothy Day, although this one differs in style and some content from William Miller’s 1982 biography of the Holy lady who made the Catholic Worker famous.

- George W. Rutler, *The Four Last Things* (Credo House, 199 pp., \$8.95.)

Four solid and literate sermons on death, purgatory, hell and heaven. First given during Advent but presentable at any time of the year.

Book Reviews

Peter O'Connor, *Understanding Jung, Understanding Self*, Paulist Press, 1985, \$6.95.

Peter O'Connor who authored *Understanding Jung, Understanding Self* is an Australian psychotherapist. His book originated in lectures given to lay groups in Australia in order to make Jung's teachings more widely known. The author has succeeded in translating Jungian doctrine into terms understandable to a nonprofessional audience without diminishing or diluting Jung in the process. The format of lectures for a general audience has been carried over into the book in that no footnotes were included. However, a list of suggested readings has been appended for those whose interest has been whetted, as O'Connor hoped for in his lectures and his book.

O'Connor draws upon Jung's biography to illuminate Jung's theoretical structures and explain Jung's more abstract theories in contrast to Freud's accentuation of interpersonal dynamics. Theoretical positions of even the greatest minds bear the fingerprints of their family background and experience.

Very quickly, for those who do not know him, Carl Gustav Jung was born in 1875 in Switzerland and attended school from the first grade through his medical degree in Basel, Switzerland. His father and his father's brothers were ministers and his mother had been hospitalized for a while for mental illness. His first psychiatric work was in Zurich in a famous clinic with schizophrenics. When he read Freud's article on dream interpretation, he wrote to Freud to commend him. They corresponded frequently for the next decade and 359 of their letters have been published. He was president of the International Psychoanalytic Association, nominated by Freud, but resigned in 1914 as president and member. His disagreement with Freud was many-sided; it involved both personal and intellectual incompatibilities, part of which was Freud's pansexualism. He was almost 20 years younger than Freud and outlived him by about 20 years, dying in 1961. Jung spoke English, visited United States often, lectured here and, unlike Freud, enjoyed the United States.

Jung's "psychological types," introvert and extrovert, are well known; these types and Jung's terms: anima and animus, archetypes, and collective unconscious, O'Connor describes clearly. O'Connor's goal, however, was a book not merely about Jung's theories but also a "book that facilitates the process of understanding... [by] bringing into consciousness, ... what was at another level of mind already." [p. ix]. The examples O'Connor chooses from Jung's writings and from his own professional experience illustrate tellingly the topics discussed and still are within reach of a lay audience.

Jung "bravely" endeavored to uncover and accept unconscious layers of his own personality, the "shadow" side, and to integrate them into his conscious self. Jung believed that if you sought to uncover the shadow side of your personality you had to be brave because you had to face life problems without blaming them on others and recognize that whatever is wrong in the world is wrong in oneself. "Persona" in the Jungian framework is the mask, the role in social settings that one exhibits publicly. As the face that psyche shows to the world, the persona simplifies interpersonal contacts and reduces the anxiety of daily living but lurking within the persona is the danger of identifying oneself with the role, the mask, the facade.

His "psychological types" embody Jung's major and lasting contribution to the psychology of consciousness. Jung, who originated the introversion-extroversion dimension, judged that Freud was extroverted and Alfred Adler and he were introverts. The complexity of human personality demanded more and Jung proposed that people, both introverts and extroverts, tend to orientate themselves around four functions: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. Everyone possesses both mechanisms, introversion and extroversion, and only the relative predominance of one over the other determines the psychological type. People come in various combinations of types, for example introverted sensation type, extroverted intuitive types, etc. Our predominant function and the situations in which we feel most comfortable, or most anxious, or experience most conflict, reveal our identity. Extroversion-introversion typology was a classification of the normal but either type could become neurotic or even psychotic.

Jung's notion of "Self" is the center that embraces both consciousness and unconsciousness "ego" is the center of the conscious mind. O'Connor thinks it is plausible to relate Jung's concept of Self to the Christian idea of soul. Christ's redeeming crucifixion might be viewed as the archetypal expression of the redemption of Self from the darkness of the unconscious. Self-realization may entail suffering, struggling with the shadow side of our nature in order to attain self-knowledge. Christ on the cross may be considered a classic Christian "mandata" inasmuch as it is a symbol of unity, of wholeness, a symbol of the goal of "individuation."

Jung's terms "anima" and "animus" enabled him to reconcile the sometimes competing tendencies of masculine and feminine in each person. They are archetypal forces at the most powerful level. The anima helps men to appreciate the nature of women and the animus helps women appreciate men. Jung discussed the anima, that is the feminine aspect of men,

Book Reviews

in more detail than he discussed the animus, the masculine aspects of women. O'Connor believes that the women's movement and social change has enabled women to choose more freely the aspect, animus or anima, that they develop first. Men, however, still are limited by stereotypical limitations.

At the end of his book O'Connor applies Jung's theories to the decision-making and problems of marriage, although Jung wrote only 12 pages on marriage. O'Connor expressed concern with the proliferation of marriage books, especially in the United States, in that they represent an external, conscious, rational level of marriage and perpetuate the mistake of assuming that the outside marriage is the real marriage. The outside marriage is only the first step toward a true marriage which requires greater knowledge of self and renunciation of blaming one's partner for one's faults.

O'Connor has succeeded in his goal to explain Jung's concepts. Jung's preoccupation with reconciliation of opposites, a thread that he picked out of Jung's childhood experience with his parents who were so different, helps to guide us through the complexities of Jung's theories. Some may miss discussion of the Myers-Briggs test, based on Jung's theory, results of which have been popular and helpful in religious communities but O'Connor's psychotherapeutic experience and cultural background suggest stress on other aspects of Jung's voluminous writings.

Jung's time may have come. For so long his theories were overshadowed by Freud's but Western society's interest in Eastern mysticism, the occult, meditation, spirituality, self-fulfillment, expansion of consciousness, individuation, especially among the young, may account for the current popularity of Jung's writings. Jung discussed self-realization before Rogers and Maslow, and anticipated Eysenck's concentration on introversion-extraversion. Jung's ideas have outlived him and they continue to provoke interest. O'Connor's book will help Jung's ideas, help people to understand themselves and others and to live lives less encumbered by unnecessary burdens.

—John B. Murray, C.M.

Michael Schwartz, *The Persistent Prejudice*, (Our Sunday Visitor, 277 pp. \$6.95)

Mr. Schwartz, a pioneer with Fr. Virgil Blum S.J. in establishing *The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights*, has a good little book here. It deals with the deep-rooted anti-Catholic prejudice which still pervades the under-culture of the country's elites. One notices how it rears its ugly head every time questions like aid-to-religious schools, or abortion and similar "hot" subjects, surface to public consciousness. The activist groups fighting for aid or the

right to life may be originally Protestant, dominantly Protestant, or led by Protestants, but the issue always ends up labeled Catholic, if only to make it more controversial.

Dr. Schwartz has twenty-two chapters all readable, all reasonably short, which trace the history of anti-Catholic bigotry from its origins in nativism to its sophisticated life in more modern times. He has some salutary advice for those who develop hostilities against the secular establishment.

"The recognition that U.S. culture has strong biases against the Catholic Faith is no cause for despair, but is a first step in understanding which must be done to reform, revitalize, indeed to convert America into the kind of temporal community that nourishes the life of the spirit rather than stifling it. This is the challenge facing the current generation of Catholics. That challenge cannot be met by minimizing our Faith or by adjusting our beliefs and behavior to conform more closely to the standards set by our culture, but only by becoming as perfectly Catholic as we can be and by living our Faith confidently in public as well as in private. Amen.

Grace on Crutches, *Homilies for Fellow Travelers*, by Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., 208 pages, footnotes, Paulist Press, New York/Mahwah, paperback, \$10.95.

Unlike most other books of homilies, this is a collection of "occasional" homilies, given at intervals rather than following the liturgical year Sunday after Sunday. They are also "specialized," largely prepared for and delivered to college students, mainly at Georgetown.

Father Burghardt has been indefatigable over the years in sharing his carefully worked-out homilies with a wider audience. There is a great richness here of intelligence and culture, but also a deep and uncompromising spirituality based on the love of God and the neighbor. There is also an earnest and gracious effort to relate this spirituality to the mentality of his young hearers by constant colloquial references to the things of their world, such as rock and roll and beer—which this reviewer found forced at times (a reaction which well might be ascribed to the generation gap). What cannot be so ascribed is the seeming overuse of learned and/or literary allusions and quotations that sometimes mar a gospel simplicity of approach and clarity. Regrettably lacking is confrontation with temptation to the personal sins which face youth in an immoral, pagan and unbelieving age.

Priests looking for fresh ideas or old ideas freshly told will surely find them here, and excellent spiritual reading as well.

—Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

Book Reviews

Marsha Sinetar, *Ordinary People as Monks and Mystics*, 1986.

Bernard J. Tyrell *Christotherapy*, 1985, Paulist Press.

Both these books build upon Abraham Maslow's concept of self-actualization and are therefore optimistic in their expectation that human personality can be changed and uplifted by inspirational reading and by clues that may be garnered from others. These other people are unknown persons in Sinetar's book; in Tyrell's "Christotherapy" they are recognized, self-actualized people like Jesus Christ whose teachings can heal both souls and psyches.

Self-actualization was Abraham Maslow's contribution to modern psychology. Maslow tells us he turned away from laboratory experiments with mice when he first looked at his newborn child and was awestruck at the wonder of life. Marsha Sinetar proposes that the mystery of life within us and in others can be best received when we step aside from the activity of living and look at life freshly, as if for the first time. Similarly, in her book *Ordinary People as Monks and Mystics*, Marsha Sinetar interviewed approximately 40 people who were striving to live full, whole, self-fulfilling, and self-giving lives. In 175 pages she describes the lifestyles of many "monks," not religious but socially detached people who sacrifice security and society's opinion to pursue and express truth, love, beauty, compassion; and mystics, whose daily life and every thought are linked intimately to spiritual issues, whose spiritual eyes have been opened, who have awakened to being and to a deepening relationship with God, and whose dominant life-emotion is love. Her book is one to read and reflect on. On almost every page she has caught a spark from someone's quest for self-discovery which might light a path for others.

Tyrell focuses on the healing that comes through Christ and living by His values. Tyrell leads his readers through a "dialogue" of therapeutic approaches, Viktor Frankl's logotherapy, some existential psychotherapy, and ends with his own approach, distinctive in its emphasis on Christ's role in healing, enlightening, and leading us away from error and wrong assumptions about our self and others, towards His truth and freeing love.

The passages chosen from the Gospels and Paul's letters are familiar, as are their interpretations. What can be burdensome for the reader is Tyrell's special terminology. The emphasis on basic attitudes needed for effective Christotherapy, namely, humbleness of heart, listening, and "letting be," are well de-

veloped and helpful. Chapters on the Church's continuation of Christ's healing through the sacraments and Christ's death and resurrection as a dynamic means to confront tensions and suffering and achieve new and higher levels of existence, may bring the healing of heart and soul that Tyrell expects for those who adopt his Christotherapy.

—John B. Murray, C.M.

Gerald P. Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Wilmington, Michael Glazier, Inc. 438 pp. \$16.95.

Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience* (Garden City, Double Day & Co. 504 pp. \$19.95.

The Church of the United States is remarkable for the interest it elicits from historians. When it was a young Church the internecine fights between bishops took up a great deal of their footnoted pages, but the more solid historical fact was how those same warring bishops fashioned such pious and practicing Catholics that they became for Pius XII and John XXIII the wonder of the universal Church. Then, when we seemed to have reached the summit of religious piety and fidelity to the Catholic world view, the centrifugal forces unleashed by Vatican II divided the U.S. Church as it was never divided, emptied Sunday mass of millions of Church-goers, almost wiped out convents and seminaries, certainly the sacrament of penance, and institutionalized "pick and choose Catholicism" along with an anti-Roman spirit, even in Chancery offices. These changes were passed off as "Vatican II renewal." The emerging American Church may have been something of a myth when Leo XIII condemned Americanism on January 22, 1899, but it surely came out of the closet three score years later.

Fr. Fogarty has here a book worth having in any good Catholic library. His sixteen chapters, covering the period from Vatican I through Vatican II, is based on a great deal of original research in the U.S. and Rome. Much of the subject matter is "old hat" in the sense that Baltimore Councils, the School Controversy, the Mc Glynn case, Americanism, John A. Ryan are offered for another look. Fogarty makes them interesting studies once more, even as he incorporates new materials on the U.S. Church from 1940 onward. His style and approach are what one finds in John Tracy Ellis, Thomas Mc Avoy, or James Hennessy, somewhat more ideological than the writings of Peter Guilday or Marvin O'Connell.

Ex-priest Jay P. Dolan begins his account earlier (1500) and continues further (to 1984), and is inter-

Book Reviews

ested more in what he calls "the experience" than with the datum of history. His fifteen chapters explore what it means to be a Catholic—in colonial America, in immigrant slums and as a member of the "New Catholicism" to grow out of the Catholic reformation he says was initiated by Vatican II.

Fr. Fogarty's book is the far more valuable because he stays close to documents, even while admitting that the absence of critical documents makes his study of the hierarchical Church less than complete. Dolan, who only a few years ago was predicting with no regret that the Church in the United States by 2000 would be more Anglican than Roman, writes a social history which is vintage Dolan, as much as it is the reality of the American Church. Both books contain a lot of facts, theories and memories and, if the history of the Church fascinates the reader as it does this reviewer, he will find much to think about, much to be proud of, much to regret.

Although Fogarty, like Dolan, falls into the trap of dividing the Church into liberals and conservatives (when fully believing and half-believing; principled or opportunist; idealistic or pragmatic; or whatever, are more suitable divisions), the Jesuit is far more restrained in the use of that older terminology. Nonetheless, once an author thinks in these terms he is likely, discussing the Church, to give his scholarly compliments to those who put America first, who prize ecumenical opinion and academic freedom, who are tolerant of disorder in the Church and who worry a good deal about our acceptance by non-Catholics. The converse of that is the tendency of such an author to depict the stiffness, if not the narrow-mindedness of prelates who put the Church and its teaching at the top of their priorities, who are concerned most about the faith and practice of their people and who are prepared to join a counter-culture when the good of the Church demands.

Catholic historians in the tradition followed by Fogarty or Dolan tend to be anti-institutional, somewhat anti-Roman, and not very sympathetic to the niceties of doctrine Rome and its Episcopal loyalists regularly reinforce. Since such academics are not usually and rarely ever have been in charge of a parish or a diocese, they find it easier to treat with sympathy an excommunicated priest like Edward Mc Glynn than an Archbishop (Corrigan) who had to put up with his likes. Mc Glynn got himself into trouble less for his political views than for his manifest contempt for Church authority and Church institutions, for his woolly-headed doctrinal statements, and his trouble-making personality. Fogarty resurrects the old saw that Mc Glynn never had a trial. True. But he never asked for one and did not want one, because

there were more serious charges waiting to be brought, which to this day are not mentioned. Florence Cohalan's *Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York* does more justice to some of these issues than either Fogarty or Dolan, but then Cohalan who knows the sources also knows what it means to be a pastor.

In summary, if you like Church history you will learn from Fogarty and even from Dolan, if you understand the Notre Dame professor does not like a Church which is clerical or Roman.

—George A. Kelly

Jesus According to a Woman by Rachel Conrad Wahlberg (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1986 reprint from 1975) 100 pp. \$4.95.

Jesus According to a Woman is a book written by a feminist to turn simple Bible-reading Christians into feminists. Its nine chapters interpret encounters of Jesus with women as Ms. Wahlberg views them. Fr. Thomas Dubay, S.M. speaks of "the more or less tacit influence on exegesis of a hidden agenda derived from the secular world." In *Jesus According to a Woman* the agenda is not at all hidden: it is blatantly feminist.

If you are not a feminist, you will find the book at first amusing, then annoying, then infuriating. It is amusing because much of Ms. Wahlberg's "exegesis" is midrash. For example, in her treatment of Martha and Mary, she psychoanalyzes both women. After writing on possible sibling rivalry for three paragraphs, she states:

"Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus," comments John 11:5. What sort of love? Could there indeed have been sexual jealousy between the sisters for the attention of Jesus? Or was it platonic, a friendly relationship? As lively, physical human beings, we cannot discount the possibility that there was more than friendly interaction among the three, a factor which could have entered into the resentment Martha expresses. Attracted to Jesus, she wanted to be in his presence too. Yet at the same time she wanted to please him by preparing food. (p. 76)

The book becomes annoying when Ms. Wahlberg deliberately misquotes Jesus, as in her "Jesus and the Adulterous Men" chapter. She states that Jesus said, "Neither do I condemn you," but then adds: "No guilt for sexual sin?... Is there such a thing as condemnationless sin? Yes, Jesus has called it sin but not condemned it." What a difference a pronoun makes.

Book Reviews

The book is also annoying in Ms. Wahlberg's repeated assertions that "Christianity has not known what to do with..." (p. 24). "There are three implications of the story that Christianity has missed" (p. 52). "In this story of the ministering woman, then, Christendom has missed several things: the initiative of the woman, the passive as well as the verbal response of Jesus to her initiative, and the implication that neither sex identity nor sexual purity is a prerequisite to performing a service for Jesus" (p. 59). Most of the things she says we missed, we've known since grade school.

Ms. Wahlberg seems not to know what faith is. Examples are numerous. In the story of the woman with the flow of blood (entitled "Jesus and the Audacious Woman"), Ms. Wahlberg says:

She was a person who had courage, wisdom and decisiveness. Having heard about Jesus as one who had healing power, she reasons that if she merely touches this man or his garment she may be made well. It sounds naive to twentieth-century ears—as does the unclean syndrome—but that is what she believed. She acted on her supposition, touched the man—and lo, she felt herself healed. p. 40)

In "Jesus and the Uppity Woman," Ms. Wahlberg says: "In the first century, possession by a demon was an accepted label for conditions now known as epilepsy or mental sickness" (p. 13) as if demonic possession were impossible.

Ultimately, the book is infuriating. It is infuriating when feminists use Jesus and God's revealed Word to push an un-Christian hedonistic philosophy.

In the best analysis I have yet seen of feminism, Teresa Martino says, "Feminism is an ideology... (its) core beliefs divide roughly into three categories: philosophical, practical and sexual." As its philosophical components Miss Martino discusses: 1. materialism, 2. egocentrism, 3. hedonism, 4. utilitarianism, 5. humanism, and 6. body and mind dualism. For greater insight into the errors of *Jesus According to a Woman*, I highly recommend Miss Martino's article and Father Thomas Dubay's "The Taming of Catholicism."

—Sister Bernadette Counihan, OSF

Stanley B. Marrow, *Paul, His Letters and His Theology*, Paulist Press, New York/Mahway, 1986.

There are indeed many books on Paul. No doubt many others are forthcoming. This is neither surprising nor unhappy. Paul's importance demands it. In all this flood of Pauline literature, Marrow's book finds its

place between works of piety and edification on the one hand, and works of heavy scholarship on the other. It should serve very well as a book to introduce interested Christians to Paul—his life in general, his conversion in particular and his letters.

The special charm and worth of the book is its approach—that it studies Paul's life in conjunction with his theology, expertly allowing the one to interpret the other. There is a commendable order in the way the study unfolds. It begins with a consideration of the religious and cultural backdrop against which Paul lived and worked. Then it attends to Paul's life, and especially and minutely to his conversion. Then it offers an overall view of Paul's letters, their dates, authenticity, etc. The final segment of the book discusses the individual letters in chronological order. The author does not trace individual themes through the entire Pauline corpus but instead identifies individual themes within each letter, noting their recurrence, if any, in other letters. This methodology tends to create for the reader a discrete and unified sense of the respective letters.

There is much to praise in Marrow's work. He is masterful in his treatment of the character and role of the Cynic School and its use of diatribe, which he views in terms of its influence on the writing of Paul (pp. 12-13). It is also to Marrow's credit that he maintains an unbiased attitude toward the Acts of the Apostles as an acceptable source—with due cautions observed—for Pauline study. There is a wonderful clarity to Marrow's thought and expression.

There is, however, small cause to commend Marrow's occasional digressions. In discussing the outcome of the Apostolic Council, for example, he feels compelled to go down a bypath and reflect on the setback (as he judges it) that Paul suffered at that meeting (pp. 90-91). His application of this to the Church in subsequent ages is, at the least, highly subjective. One suspects a personal bias here. Another instance is Marrow's consideration of the question of authorship in relation to dogma (p. 51). Here, too, Marrow seems to be engaging one of his *betes noires*. To be sure the point he makes is valid, but the drift from the matter under consideration is annoying. And the animus with which he expresses himself at times is unpleasant. At one point, for instance, he brings himself to bracket religious institutions with totalitarian regimes because of their "compulsion to rewrite history" (p. 50). This sort of editorializing imparts a polemical tone that is unwelcome in a serious work, which this intends to be. However, despite these secondary flaws, Marrow's book is eminently worthwhile.

—James C. Turro

Book Reviews

Fleeing the Whore of Babylon: A Modern Conversion Story by James J. Thompson, Jr., Post Office Box 30, Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, Inc., 1986, 159 pp., \$9.95 paperback.

The New Religious Image of Urban America: The Shopping Mall as Ceremonial Center by Ira G. Zepp, Jr. (with an Introduction by David Carrasco), Post Office Box 30, Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, Inc., 1986, xi + 159 pp., \$12.95 paperback.

What threads these disparate essays together is the insight that the merely natural and human cannot satisfactorily replace the supernatural and religious. It is especially so in terms of providing meaning for the individual and an overall sense of direction for society. This theme is explicit in Thompson's extraordinary volume but has to be teased out of Zepp's useful, but flawed, analysis. Both books are well-written and should have a wide appeal to a well-educated public concerned with the interaction of religion and culture in the United States. Thompson's volume, however, is directed to those concerned with American Catholic affairs.

Zepp's analysis is an application of the general theoretical work of the historian of religions, Mircea Eliade, and of the human geographer, Paul Wheatley. Both Zepp and Eliade, according to David Carrasco in his introduction, "emphasize the human tendency to organize all modes of human life around ceremonial centers which derive their authority from celestial archetypes relicated in cultural conceptions of space and time" (p. 6). Zepp's thesis, in a nutshell, is that shopping malls represent "for many contemporary people, a substitute for... ancient sacred centers. If churches, schools, and families (our three major institutions) fail us, we will seek other places to fulfill basic human needs. It is not accidental, therefore, that malls contain the same structures, objects, and symbols which gave ancient centers their rich human meaning" (p. 52).

Zepp's analysis is useful but overstated. It is true that human beings, in the absence of some transcendental reference, have an inherent tendency to construct order out of chaos. The question is: how *successful and true* are such attempts? The Smith Haven Mall of Long Island is not equivalent to St. Patrick's Cathedral of New York City. In general, Zepp is guilty of the same liberal "Christian Tower of Babel" and "immanentistic" theological approaches of figures like Peter Berger and Harvey Cox. Zepp's failure is partly tied into his conscious methodological decision not to probe the depths of the subjective "intentions and motivations of the average mall developer,

architect, clerk or customer" (p. 15). If he had bothered to make such a systematic inquiry, he would have discovered the quantitative difference, noted by most, between approaching a shopping mall and approaching the Lord.

James J. Thompson, Jr. cannot be faulted with the same methodology *legerdemain*. His autobiographical essay is a brilliantly written and deeply moving personal account of his progressive but tortured movement away from the religion of his birth, i.e., the Seventh-Day Adventism, and to the Roman Catholic Church. Of particular importance is Thompson's discovery that his secular allegiance to his beloved Southern-American traditions and to American political conservatism neither can nor should replace an ultimate allegiance to the "Bride of Christ." As he put it, "I had tried to ignore the transcendent (or at least to restrict it to a niche where it would not be a bother) and to imbue the mundane with a meaning that it could not support. That which man has devised—whether political ideology or historical tradition—cannot displace what God and the Church freely offered" (pp. 131-2).

Thompson, author of *Christian Classics Revisited* (Ignatius, 1983) and writer for the *New Oxford Review*, gives as his primary reasons for staying in the Catholic Church the pontificate of John Paul II and the activities of such distinguished lay Catholics as Dale Vree. Also telling is the reason for his initial attraction to Mother Church: "as the stack of carefully read books—Chesterton Belloc, Pieper, Maritain, Guardini,—mounted, so too did the conviction that the Catholic Church was the greatest repository of Christian truth; other churches had bits and pieces of the truth (even *important* bits and pieces), but nowhere outside the Roman Church could one find such richness and plenitude... I had come to realize that the ultimate value of Catholicism... is... in the simple fact that it is true" (p. 75-6). Amen.

—Joseph A. Varacalli, Ph.D.

Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics: Volume III Studies in Theological Style: lay styles*. Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1986 (original German, 1962).

Confronting a work by Hans Urs von Balthasar is like staring up a side of the Grand Canyon. His powerful erudition and the range of his theological philosophical, historical and (here) esthetic interests make his works exceedingly rich if not monumental. His profundity requires that any Christian with a serious interest in his own subjects (in this volume:

Book Reviews

Dante, St. John of the Cross, Pascal, Hamann, Soloviev, Hopkins and Peguy) read his observations or be guilty of missing a singularly important review of the subject.

All is forgiven the translators. The author's prose is weighed down with philosophic observations, scholarly references and meaningful use of original languages. Translation must have been a fearful challenge. This is a packed German tome and glorious in its category. The English text is clear, careful and rewarding for the attentive reader.

Few writers dissect as von Balthasar does. His studies are microscopic, ruthless, denuding and exhaustively cross-referenced to other studies. but with all that, he carries his readers into poetry and mysticism. An example—his analysis of Gerard Manly Hopkins entitled "Sacramental Poetry." He might have paid his own work the compliment he paid Hopkins:

"For what has to be interpreted is not concepts (of universal, abstract truths) but images (of the unique, personal, divine-human truth) and here poetry is the absolutely appropriate theological language... His constant efforts at schooling in reading the forms of nature is therefore not aesthetic in the usual sense nor mystical nor one sidedly "exact and scientific" but rather it subsumes them all under the higher law... The idealists and the romantics were right when they understood that in-scapes would only open themselves to the poet in some creative consummation between him and the spirit of nature; but for a Christian the final creative unity lies higher and he must raise himself to this in his faith."

The whole book requires slow reading but it is well worth it.

Lawler, R., Boyle, J., May, W. *Catholic Sexual Ethics* (OSV Press, 377 pp. \$7.95)

Once in a while there appears a book truly useful to students and instructors. They are well served, remedially and positively, by *Catholic Sexual Ethics* written by Ronald Lawler, Joseph Boyle and William May (Our Sunday Visitor Huntington, Indiana, 46750. \$7.95 in paperback.)

Pioneer books like Messenger's and classics von Hildebrand's head a short list of excellent books on sex and marriage but they require a sense of Christian thinking. This book is written for college students of our time and explains simply and briefly the assumptions behind Catholic sexual ethics.

Reassuringly the authors guide the student through evolving attitudes toward sex in Christian writers and do not pretend that everyone from Apostolic times had a total, balanced view; on the other hand they delineate the perduring principles of Catholic Tradition.

They do not sermonize. But they make the important and intellectual point that no Christian sexual ethic, with the discipline it requires, will ever bind anyone who is not already a convert to Christianity.

The authors concentrate on questions that confront Catholic Students in our time: the information of conscience and its relationship to the teaching Church; chastity inside and outside marriage; the moral imperatives regarding homosexual practice. They explain the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* openly and cogently. In their care not to allow an avuncular note to invade a text on ethics, the authors appended a "Pastoral Conclusion" in which they review subjects like subjective innocence and guilt, diluting chastity dangerously, and aids in teaching the meaning of chastity.

The authors have written formally of Catholic principles and of the basic situations in which people seek to be moral; they have left lively examples to the instructors and students who will no doubt provide them enthusiastically.

And, God bless them, an index.

—E. V. Clark

Bishop Egan

(Cont'd from p. 11)

to an exclusive, interpersonal, conjugal relationship; and 3. that homosexual condition whereby a male is permanently impeded from engaging in sexual activity with a female or a female is permanently impeded from engaging in sexual activity with a male.

If there by any others, they have not as yet been identified at least for those for whom the word, "relationship", means "relationship" and not necessarily "happy relationship". Thus there seems to be little more to be remarked about the second incapacity beyond the simple fact that the jurisprudence of the Sacred Roman Rota concerning satyriasis, nymphomania, and homosexuality is quite well-developed and easily available in the published decisions of the past twentyfive years.

—Edward M. Egan

[All emphases ours—The Editor]

Evangelizing the Poor: A Convention Excerpt

The *anewim* of the gospel are not only "the chronically homeless, chronically hungry, chronically disadvantaged," but all the poor and lowly of the Lord, many of whom are adequately fed, clothed and sheltered, but are nonetheless not among the great and favored ones of the earth. While it is true that the Church fails if she does not bring the gospel and its message of hope to them, she cannot confine herself to bringing it only to them or simply divorce herself from the aspirations of human culture.

The gospel is radical in its demands, and men like St. Francis of Assisi have generously responded to those demands. But the radical tradition in Christianity has its limitations. Professor Clarke E. Cochran of Texas Tech University has well remarked:

The same Father who sent Jesus to show a new way also created the world and human beings with a need for order, culture, and stability. Those who would transform the world forget that Jesus recommended no specific plan of political change, no form of a regime, and no social-economic theory. The radical gospel sits side by side with the prudent advice of Romas 13, Jesus' evasive answer to the tribute question, and the compromise over the application of the law to gentile Christians (Acts 15:1-29). ["The Radical Gospel and Christian Prudence," in Francis Canavan, ed., *The Ethical Dimension of Political Life* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1983), pp. 191-192]

The preferential option for the poor which the Church is now stressing is meant to correct our all too human tendency to leave the poor out of the benefits of society, but we should be wary also of the opposite tendency to regard the poor as the only legitimate claimants on those benefits.

As Bishop Egan said last night and Fr. Ritter has repeated today, the Church on the eve of the Reformation was overintellectualized and over-institutionalized. That is, in fact, a perennial danger St. Jerome, a millenium before, had worried lest God call him a Ciceronian rather than a Christian. There has always been a strain of feeling in Catholicism that denounces overintellectualism and emphasizes the very Catholic truth that faith without works is dead and understanding that does not lead to practice is sterile: *non in dialectica statuit Deus salvare hominem*, as St. Anselm said. But this reaction, healthy though it is, carries its own danger with it, which is that of running off into anti-intellectualism and mere activism. The Church in fact needs both a head and a heart.

The heart has its reasons that reason does not know, as Pascal said, and we must never forget that because without the reasons of the heart there is no

faith. But the heart that cuts itself off from reason ceases to be Catholic and lapses into that sentimentalism which is probably the most prevalent heresy of our time. I am inclined, therefore, to think that we may exaggerate when we say that contemporary Catholicism "runs the grave risk of being more and more defined by ideology and dogma and orthodoxy than by the universal preaching of the gospel of Jesus." On this proposition several comments are necessary.

First, it is a mistake to identify—or even to seem to identify—dogma and orthodoxy with ideology. Ideology is a program of political action disguised as an explanation of the nature of the world and society. Its purpose is to draw people into the service of a political cause so that the ideologues may win political power and so be able to remake society. Dogma, on the other hand, is a definition of revealed truth, whether it has any relevance to political action or not, and orthodoxy is the correct teaching of that truth.

Now, I do not see how anyone can preach the gospel of Jesus Christ without being prepared to answer questions about him. The first and most obvious of these questions is, "Who is this Jesus?" It renders the preaching of the gospel ineffective if we duck this question and take refuge in a vagueness that leaves the hearers uncertain whether Jesus was anything more than a man, how he came into the world, whether he really died for our sins, rose again, and will come again at the end of time to judge the living and the dead. The only effective way of preaching the gospel, I should think, is to start with a clear and certain answer to the question, "Who is Jesus?" and *this means dogma*:

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father, through whom all things were made. For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven; by the power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary, and became man. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered, died, and was buried. On the third day he rose again in fulfillment of the Scriptures; he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end.

Dogma, in turn, requires an institutional Church strong enough to define right doctrine against those who, pretending to explain who Jesus was, really explain him away. Faith without works indeed is dead, but a faith without an intellectually definable content becomes mere emotion. Theory is no substitute for practice, but practice has to be guided by theory in

Evangelizing the Poor: A Convention Excerpt (*Cont'd*)

order to be sound practice. As Fr. Ritter says, we must not "let the institution so permeate and control the vision that the vision itself simply begins to wither." Neither, on the other hand, must we let the vision run wild.

We live, after all, at the end of a century which has been devastated by visions run wild. Adolf Hitler is this century's most famous mass murderer but, if we judge by numbers alone, he was not its worst one. We may never know just how many people Stalin, Mao, and Pol Pot starved, shot, and beat to death, but the number runs at minimum into scores of millions. This was done in the name of a vision of universal brotherhood and a classless society in which all exploitation of man by man would disappear. Without vision the people perish, as the prophet said, but let us not overlook how many people have perished in this century because someone had a vision.

I am afraid I must simply disagree with anyone who tells us that Jesus "said very clearly that it was mercy—not doctrine; pity—not dogma; love—not credal statements that got you in his company." I do not find in the New Testament that Our Lord talked about these subjects at all. The object of his criticism was not doctrine but legalism, the preference for the letter of the law above its spirit. The doctrine, the dogma, and the credal statements came after his death and were about him, and they are still the necessary means of keeping knowledge of who and what

he was alive in the minds and hearts of men.

Finally, I am not so worried about "a growing preoccupation with revealed truth as dogma, with credal formulations, and a growing tendency on the part of some to believe that dogmas and doctrines and creeds can be shoehorned and crowbarred into docile minds by discipline and fear of the consequences of dissent." I mean no disparagement of those who have become famous as dissenting theologians. They are worthy and, I am told, charming men. But I see no reason to believe that they are any more concerned about the poor than the rest of us. On the contrary, the thrust of their dissent seems to identify them as spokesmen for the felt needs of that comfortable middle class which some feel with some justification to be reluctant to hear the full gospel of Christ.

Let us admit it, we are all reluctant and slow to hear the gospel. At very best, we make some progress in the course of a lifetime in interiorizing its demands. Even then, we do it in a somewhat lopsided way. St. Francis of Assisi and St. Thomas Aquinas were among the greatest lights of Christian history, but they were very different men and we need them both, mind and heart, intellect and will, contemplation and action. Both, incidentally, were devoted sons of the Church and neither was noted for dissent.

—Francis Canavan, S.J.

Academic Freedom and the AAUP

The American Association of University Presidents set up a special committee earlier this year to study the basis on which four Catholic institutions refused to permit Marquette University's Daniel Maguire to dispense his abortion views on their campus. The final evaluation by the AAUP groups signed among others by Notre Dame's Theology professor Harold W. Attridge, gave its estimate of the four institutions:

"Whatever the motives of the four presidents in withholding, cancelling, or otherwise terminating contracts for Professor Maguire, the message which those actions sent to the academic community was difficult to mistake. One who speaks out publicly on abortion in opposition to the officially held church position is not likely to be welcome on a Catholic campus. No doubt such a message does a disservice to a good many, perhaps most, Catholic institutions. But in the heated climate generated by the abortion controversy, it is understandable that members of the academic community would look upon Professor Maguire's four incidents not as isolated experiences, but as representative of a more widespread determination to

suppress dissent on the abortion issue. The special committee has expressed its own dissent from AAUP, encouraged by certain Catholic college presidents, has begun to interfere with the religious commitment of self-declared Catholic institutions. The time may have come, therefore, to demand that the AAUP, which today is often a labor union as much as a professional association, respect the freedom of those who define their university as Catholic to choose their own competent teachers or speakers and, when necessary, exclude those who will subvert the college's reason for existence. The AAUP is not an organ of the Catholic Church and may not be its judge. When AAUP or its offshoots, Middle States evaluating teams, for example, move on to the campus of a committed Catholic university to criticize that institution's leadership for not accepting (as in N.Y. State) Bundy money, or like Daniel Maguire, calls the decisions taken by the four institutions. Each of them seems to the committee to have been contrary, perhaps to the spirit or letter of the institution's policies, and certainly to statements on academic freedom promulgated by the Catholic higher education community and the American As-

Academic Freedom and the AAUP (Cont'd)

sociation of University Professors.”

While Federal and State bodies do not discriminate against religious colleges and universities in making grants and loans to students and faculty, upon college administrators to forswear their Catholic identity and intellectual convictions on important moral matters, they overstep their authority.

Those who define freedom, academic or otherwise, in AAUP terms, as Land O'Lakes did in 1967, tend to undermine the rightful liberties of faithful Catholic institutions to conduct their affairs according

to Catholic rules, which presume religious faith, and not AAUP rules which are unrelated to religious faith and do not recognize the existence of religious truth.

The least that believing Catholics can do is to take the AAUP's disapproval in stride, as evidence of their priorities. Such avowed Catholic institutions may once more regain the respect of the faithful and of fair-minded Americans of other and perhaps no religious persuasion.

—Charles W. Fitzgerald

From the Mail Bag

[Editor's Note: Since these two communications were not intended for publication, and each says something important, the message is published without signature.]

The Pastor and Correct Teaching

“The cries of horror coming from dissenting priests and prelates over John Paul II's concern for correct teaching of the Catholic faith and his efforts to reinforce correct teaching at every level prompt this pastor to ask: Do their clerks believe any longer in the truths of our faith? Do they accept the pastoral direction of the Pope and the Church's canons aimed at safeguarding these truths?

“At one of the largest funerals in my parish in twenty years the following parishioners walked up our middle aisle to receive Holy Communion *from me*: two living in concubinage, two who were married outside the Church, four or five who live contraceptive married lives and speak of this quite openly, a number who never attend Sunday mass, a young lady who recently married a divorced Catholic in a local Protestant Church with her large circle of good Catholic friends frolicking as if a non-marriage was something to celebrate. I could go on.

“All of this scandalous conduct was observed by 400 mourners at a funeral liturgy for a saintly mother of nine children.

“A few questions are in order: Since respect for the Eucharist was commonplace twenty years ago and as far back as St. Paul himself (1 COR. 11:27) even by the excommunicated, who is to be held accountable for these sacrileges? Or are they—in the

minds of the complaining clerks—no longer sacrileges? Are they not the result of false teaching now fairly widespread? Who is to protect the faithful if not the Pope? Would Christ himself do otherwise? Did He?

“It seems to this journeyman parish priest that any pastor who thinks that false teaching is legitimate should be corrected by superiors and removed from office if he is committed to such error. There cannot be two contradictory Churches under one Pope than two Christs under our Father.”

“Conservative Ecclesiastical Views”

“Have you noticed how during all the recent controversies involving Pope John Paul II and Rome, the Fellowship or its spokesmen are always put down as “conservative” or as mouthpieces for “conservative ecclesiastical views?” One cannot blame the secular media for not knowing the Fellowship members involved in ecumenical dialogue, social action or in innumerable new ministries; but NC News, too? What is so liberating (or “Liberal”) about adultery, abortion, Marxist revolution, or even Statism. The only thing Fellowship members have in common is their devotion to the *Nicene* Creed and the Church's understanding of its meaning. Has the word “conservative” become a substitute for “faith” or “morals?” Why do many prominent Catholics, including religious, feel compelled to bend over backward to demonstrate how “unconservative” they are?

1987 CONVENTION

Los Angeles—September 25-27, 1987

Theme: The Catholic Church's Message For World's Citizens Of The Twenty First Century

Especially For: Government and Institutional Leaders
The U.S. Family

Archbishop Roger Mahoney, presiding

Artists and Scientists
Pastors and Faithful Catholics

If any member of the Fellowship would like to present a paper on any of the above subjects at this Convention please contact Msgr. Kelly *immediately*

Fellowship's Bishops' Advisory Committee

An Episcopal Advisory Board has been established to review the work of the Fellowship's Study Commission on the Catholic Laity, formed to contribute to the 1987 Roman Synod. The five study groups are in the process of drawing up presentations on the state of Catholic life, on the laity's relations with hierarchy, on marriage and his family life, catechetics and the lay apostolate. Prior to submitting them to Rome the papers will be reviewed by competent scholars and by designated bishops. The Bishops Advisory Committee include:

John Cardinal O'Connor
Archbishop Thomas A. Donnellan
Archbishop Roger Mahony
Bishop Anthony Babilacqua

Bishop Thomas Daily
Bishop John Donoghue
Bishop Adam Maida
Bishop Norman McFarland

Friend of the Fellowship — Bishop Adam Maida

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter
Published by St. John's University
Jamaica, New York 11439

Non-Profit
U.S. Postage
P A I D
Jamaica, NY
Permit No. 451

Fellowship Scholarly Works

The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars came into existence ten years ago. We would like to publish at some point a *bibliography of the book-length publications* by Fellowship members for the years 1976 to 1986.

If you wish to be included in this list kindly send the list *as soon as possible*, with each book's name, publisher, year and number of pages. Paperback books are acceptable, but not articles.

Address to: Msgr. Kelly, St. John's University, Jamaica, NY 11439.