

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

Volume 12 Number 3

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

June 1989

State of the Fellowship

In September my tenure as president of the Fellowship will come to an end, and in the September newsletter I will offer some observations on the theme for our annual convention, namely, "Restoring the Sacred: Catholic Faith, Worship, and Practice." I thus thought it opportune in this newsletter to comment briefly on the "state" of the Fellowship noting, in particular, items of encouragement and serious challenges that need to be realistically confronted.

I am encouraged by the steady growth in membership, particularly among younger scholars. I am also encouraged by the quality of the papers that have been presented at our annual conventions, and I am confident that those preparing material for our Fall convention will do a superb scholarly job. I am also encouraged that regional meetings of the Fellowship are being held in various areas, for instance in the Washington-Baltimore and New York regions, and that regional "chapters" are being planned in other parts of the country.

I believe that the principal challenges facing us are the following. First, and of critical importance, is the need to keep the Fellowship one of "scholars". There is an urgent need, in my opinion, to recruit more colleagues holding full-time positions in colleges and universities. Such recruitment is, I am convinced, of first order priority. I therefore urge every current member holding a full-time academic position to approach his or her associates, encouraging them to join the Fellowship and cooperate with us in our work. If, in the next year, we could increase by one hundred or so the number of members who are teaching full-time in colleges and universities, the influence of the Fellowship could be increased tremendously. In addition, I believe that we ought to stress the "scholarly" character of our work. It would be a good idea, I believe, if members would inform the editor of the Newsletter of their scholarly research. Perhaps an insert ought to be made in each issue of the Newsletter listing the scholarly publications of members in various areas of intellectual inquiry. (In addition, if we are to convey the image of a scholarly society, we must maintain the highest standards of publication in our Annual Proceedings.)

(continued on page 2)

In this Issue

State of the Fellowship	p. 1
Father Wright on Generic Man in the Scripture	p. 3
Doctors Finnis and Hittinger Disagree	p. 6
The Institute on Religious Life on the Pastoral on Women	p. 9
Priestly Morale, James Hitchcock	p. 11
The Convention!	p. 12-13
Books: Kevane and Chervin; St. Vincent de Paul; USCC on Adult Education; Christian Sacraments; and more.	p. 14-21

A second challenge of critical importance is the need for the Fellowship to avoid a "negative" image. Too often, it seems to me, we are perceived as a group constantly complaining about events within the Church. I know that this is a misperception, one undoubtedly fostered by individuals who are not well disposed to our goals. Yet this misperception is also caused by the fact that some developments within the Church have called for intelligent criticism (e.g., the document on AIDS; the first draft of the proposed pastoral on women). While criticism of unscholarly work is sorely needed and will undoubtedly and rightly be done by the Fellowship, and published in the pages of our Newsletter, I believe that we must do a better job in promoting the truly exceptional, positive, scholarly work that Fellowship members are doing. To achieve this goal, I encourage members to submit brief essays for the newsletter summarizing or at least calling attention to significant work of their own or of their colleagues. In addition, and this will perhaps be of help in recruiting members, I think that we ought to be on the lookout for outstanding work by colleagues who are not members of the Fellowship, so that we can personally congratulate them for it, note it in our own publications, and also encourage their authors to become members.

Another challenge to keep in mind is the interdisciplinary character of the Fellowship. Scholars in the theological and philosophical disciplines still predominate our ranks. We all need to make serious efforts to interest our friends in other scholarly areas to join with us.

These, I think are the most serious challenges that face us at present. I believe that we can meet them successfully.

Dr. William May

We regret to inform our members of the death of Monsignor Orville Griese of Green Bay. He was fine scholar and a loyal member of the Fellowship.

He is remembered as one of the first theologians to address the morality of periodic continence more than forty years ago. In this he was a pioneer.

He was also a leading figure in the excellent work of the Pope John Paul XXIII Medical Moral Research Center.

Requiescat in Pace

Generic Man Revisited

About five years ago I wrote an article in which I suggested that both men and women would be losers if generic man was eliminated from the English language. I stated that I was firmly in favor of the movement to remove wherever possible language that was sexually discriminating. Today, January, 1989, I feel this even more strongly and, since the move to abolish the generic sense seems, at least in Catholic circles, just as strong, I am once again taking up my pen to make a few further observations. As a poet with a tendency to drift somewhat whimsically I need to have some goading thought provoking me to the vulnerable, tiresome and hazardous business of articulation. The current goad is: "You can't get rid of Man without at the same time getting rid of God." Clearly this raises the stakes. You can't throw out the generic man bathwater without at the same time discarding God.

Although sometimes we may pretend otherwise, when we are born and learn to speak we "inherit" a language. We do not inherit it as the potter inherits the clay - a highly malleable substance that can be formed in myriad ways. A language is like a genetic code. At the moment of conception we are landed with our physical and even mental make-up and it has taken all the human beings down to our mother and father to produce the precise code that we are. Environment is going to have significant influence on how we turn out but if the genetic code did not provide the potential no environment will be able to substitute for it. The case with language is analogous. We may hope that our language rests freely in the hands of our literary experts, our grammarians or even our liturgists so that they are free to do with it what they will or what society bids them. In fact this freedom is severely limited. Those hands are tied. They are tied by all the literature and all the oral tradition that comprise the genetic inheritance of a language, stretching from the distant past right up to the very moment when we ourselves learned how to speak. And, because our language is living, it is constantly evolving and adapting and growing. New ideas, new discoveries, new inventions - all needing to be named. But there is an important distinction to be made between the creation of new words like "bite" or "biochemistry" and the manipulation of words already in the language which may already have a history of usage stretching back five hundred years or more. Only in a very limited

sense can this growth be controlled by the editor or the grammarian. When the language is English, spoken as it is by so many different peoples on the planet, this process is even more complex.

The limited question that we are asking at this moment is: Can the word "Man" and its plural "Men" be legitimately used today in its generic sense of "human being"? The answer given by those who are in the business of renewing the liturgy in the Catholic Church is a definitive "No". I have been informed by someone who is in the midst of the process that generic man will no more return to common usage than will the words "negro" or "colored". I am told that the National Association of Teachers of English have issued guidelines for the removal of generic man from the language adopted by all textbook publishers. I have heard that the new Lutheran, Episcopal, Christian (Dutch) Reformed, Methodist and Presbyterian hymnals have already or are in the process of eliminating the word. Our own Worship III has done so. The ICEL texts, the revised New Testament of the New American Bible, the New Jerusalem Bible - all have removed it, whether piecemeal or wholesale, or are currently planning to. Am I closing the stable door after the stallion/mare has left? Quite possibly; but I believe this remains to be seen.

"A Feminist Dictionary" by Kramarae and Treichler (Pandora Press, 1985) begins the entry MAN AS FALSE GENERIC with the following sentence: "Convention in English of using the word 'man' to refer 'generically' to people both men and women. Though custom and convention are used to defend this and related usages, sound arguments based on research demonstrate that the claims of generic meaning are false: these words do not include everyone equally" (p. 247). A little later in the same article we learn: "The word man has been making confusion in many respects for more than a thousand years. It was certainly used in the Anglo-Saxon language as early as 825 A.D. to mean specifically the human creature in general; but about the same time it was also used to mean an adult male person; while contemporaneously the word "woman" was in use as meaning an adult female human being. And persons who have occasion to study Anglo-Saxon laws and literature, if they care anything at all about exactness, have to be constantly on guard as to whether man means a human creature in general or an adult male" (p 247).

What I find particularly enlightening about these quotations is that they reveal how far back in the history of the language the roots of generic man go - right to the very beginning. The observation is true that because the language has been landed with one word carrying two distinct meanings - the generic and the male-as-opposed-to-female meanings - this has led to considerable confusion through the centuries particularly in legal documents. No mention is made however of the fact that in literature, which one might dare to call the primary normative region of a language, the context normally clarifies the particular sense intended. In any case it might well be asked whether the long usage of both these senses of the word in a thousand years of literature does not in itself question the legitimacy of labeling such an inheritance a "false" generic.

If the Feminist Dictionary alerts us to the secular scene, Mary Collins in her book "Worship - Renewal to Practice" (Pastoral Press, Washington, DC, 2001, 1987) gives a glimpse of what's going on in the Church and the world: "Presently trade and textbook publishers, journalists, television commentators, and feminist grammarians, are acting as pace-setters for the development of the language. At these levels, the false generic has generally been discredited; lapses into such usage are perceived and treated as lapses."

Once again it is disconcerting to note that the "pace-setters" in our language development no longer include the novelists, dramatists, poets, short-story writers, biographers - those, in fact, who have been the protagonists in the development of language from its beginnings; their place seems to have been taken by "publishers, journalists, television commentators and grammarians". What is even more alarming is the fact that the translators of scripture are now denied the usage of generic man in the name of this new development. This at times seems to be in sharp contrast to the direction in which such translators and editors would themselves wish to go. For example the New Jerusalem Bible includes this sentence in its current Foreword: "Key terms in the originals, especially those theological key concepts on which there is a major theological note, have been rendered throughout (with very few exceptions) by the same English word, instead of by the variety of words used in the first edition." (NJB, p.v.)

Sensitivity to the new dogma that generic man is no longer acceptable means that, as we shall see in a moment, this principle cannot hold good for the translation of "anthropos" and "aner" -

terms that one might be tempted to call "key" since the scriptures exist for "anthropos" not "aner" for the scriptures. It is particularly important here to claim that, in spite of what the feminist dictionaries say, there remains a valid generic sense for the word Man and its plural Men - a sense that we have not created but inherited. It has been preserved in our literature from the infancy of our language and it is irreplaceable particularly in contexts where Man is being compared or contrasted or merely juxtaposed to other entities - God, Angels, Devils, or even personifications of the River, the Mountain, the Sea, the Earth. With minimal research it has been possible to show these words in common currency from the 9th century to June 1989 or, if you like, from Beowulf to Updike. In such contexts the use of philosophical paraphrases or abstract nouns cannot render the meaning or the power of the original and therefore cannot be faithful renderings. This is part of what I mean by saying that if Man is discarded God has to go too.

To examine this matter more carefully it is important to get specific. I will refer to the Greek New Testament. (I have no knowledge of Hebrew but am conversant with Greek.) The Greek language does have two key words for Man: "anthropos" = the generic sense, a human being; "aner" = the male of the human species. The fact that the translation of each word is no marginal matter is indicated by the following list of the frequency of the two terms in the four gospels:

Matt:	has 8 "aner";	109 "anthropos"
Mk:	has 4 "aner";	50 "anthropos"
Lk:	has 31 "aner";	92 "anthropos"
Jn:	has 7 "aner";	57 "anthropos"

From this it may immediately be seen that the word with the generic sense is used by the evangelists many more times than the word that means "male" as opposed to "female". Clearly the translator is faced with enormous problems if the English equivalent to this word is considered no longer valid. The first and perhaps most crucial is how to translate the title of Jesus as "ho huios tou anthropou" or "Son of Man". Here NJB decides to keep the traditional translation thereby suggesting that there does still exist at least one context where the generic term Man may be used. (The Inclusive Language Lectionary translate this title as "The Human One.") But having made this decision he seems to have decided to turn a blind eye to the consistency principle quoted above and to attempt a variety of ways of coping with "anthropos". Herewith a selection to give you a

direct sample. (The revised version of the New American Bible New Testament is also given to show what presumably is about to become the official version for our own American Lectionary.)

"Anthropos" becomes in the RNAB; JB; and NJB in that order:

Mt:4:19	fishers of men fishers of man
Mt:5:16	fishers of people shine before others in the sight of men in people's sight
Mt: 10:32	before others in the presence of men in the presence of human beings
Mt:13:44	a person finds a man has found someone has found
Mt:19:12	by others by men by human agency...

and many other examples in Luke, Mark, John and Paul.

The one Greek word "anthropos" has been translated variously in the contexts above: "people", "man", "someone", "human agency", "human", "human resources", "human beings", "humanity", "person", and "others". This is in itself disquieting because it reveals an added distance of interpretation that has been inserted between the translator and the reader. Add to this the fact that much of the linguistic power of the original has been lost in the various kinds of paraphrase that have been required. None of this would be necessary if it may be shown that general man is still a valid word in our language.

In the Grail Inclusive language version of the psalms a further kind of inaccuracy is adopted as a substitute for the "false generic". This involves the decision to turn into the plural various singular originals or to change the person from third person to the second person - this latter approach being adopted to avoid having to use the masculine pronoun "him" to refer to "the Lord". We are not here concerned with the whole pronominal dimension of the inclusive language scene so we will not linger on this. Suffice to say that "Happy indeed is the man who follows not the counsel of the wicked" (Ps. 1:1) can hardly be translated "Happy indeed are those who follow..."etc. without obvious infidelity to the original. As teachers of Greek or Latin will confirm this kind of change from a singular to a plural would be pointed out to a high school student as an

elementary slip in translation. At College it would be regarded as deplorable. It can scarcely be claimed that the authors of this new version were showing the concern expressed in Section 22 of the Vatican Council's decree on Revelation that the Church "with maternal concern see to it that suitable and correct translations are made into different languages especially from the original texts of the sacred books".

Another concern is poetry. Anyone with an ear for poetry will be familiar with the way in which sound and sense blend in a poem. The whole poem is built of a union between sound, sense, connotation and rhythm in such a way that, as Judy Stix eloquently expressed it, the form and content are inextricably united. It is in this poetic area of psalmody, hymnody and every text for worship where the expression comes closest to poetry that the question of generic man once again becomes crucial. Terms that we have just been looking at in the New Jerusalem Bible version of the gospels - "human beings", "human resources", "humanity" or even "person" are closer to philosophy, sociology or even speculative theology than they are to poetry; and yet the memorable "classic" versions of scripture seemed so close to poetry. In a recent article for the Jesuit periodical *America*, William O'Malley wrote: "Since the advent of English in the liturgy much of the mystique and most of the poetry have been vacuumed out of the Mass. Thirty years ago, even atheists could find themselves unwittingly drawn into the mystery through the cadence of the Latin or even the lusty convinced belting of 'Holy God, We Praise Thy Name'. To them it could be as fascinating as an oriental rite still is to us. Now we have a Mass with such outlandish phrases as 'our spiritual drink' and such tame literalism as 'This is the Lamb of God' instead of the far stronger 'Behold the Lamb of God'. I'm by no means advocating a return to Latin, but let us have a Mass written by a poet rather than one that sounds written by a canon lawyer or a speculative theologian." (*Mass and Teenagers, America*, Oct. 8, 1988, p. 217.)

I would submit that the abolition of generic man is moving us one further step in the direction that the writer of articles above deplors.

The question that needs seriously to be asked is this. What price will be paid in poetry for the proscription of generic man? Down through the ages some of the greatest poems, hymns, carols and meditations depend for their power on generic man as they sing of the Incarnation. The
(continued on page 23)

Doctor John Finnis Responds to Doctor Koterski (last issue of the Newsletter)

May I trespass again on the Newsletter's hospitality to make three points about the March issue?

1. When proofreading my comment on Dr. Hittinger's book, I missed a whole line's omission, which makes me seem to accept one of Hittinger's myths about Grisez. The third paragraph on p. 8 should read (omitted words now underlined):

Dr. Hittinger proceeds: "Finnis, however, who had taken it (argument from self-referential inconsistency) over from Grisez, has made it central to his exposition of the basic goods". Wrong. Grisez never applied it to practical reasoning. And I have never applied it in relations to any basic good other than knowledge.

2. As it happens, the myth that Grisez uses the self-referential method of validating the good of knowledge is one of those accepted by Dr. Koterski in his article on pp. 4-6 of the issue. Much more painful, however, are others of Koterski's quite erroneous allegations about what we say. Especially:

(1)"...even St. Augustine comes in for their (Grisez and Finnis) criticism as a proportionalist when he argues that there is an ordo amorum and a hierarchy among goods that predetermine the ends the will should seek..."

Neither Grisez nor I has ever said or thought that Augustine is a proportionalist, or has denied that there is an ordo amorum. From earliest to my most recent expositions of my theory of ethics, I have expressly stated that there is an ordo amorum, and I have never challenged Augustine's account of it. Grisez's criticisms of Augustine's conception of the last end are in no way denials of an ordo amorum, or of certain natural priorities among a good person's basic interests ("ends the will should seek").

The remark above quoted is not only quite wrong in itself, it also suggests that

Koterski may accept Hittinger's claim (p. 133) that Grisez "reverses the axiology of Augustine (the amor sui in contrast to the amor dei)". That claim is one of the most scandalously false in Hittinger's book. It in turn stems, I think, from Hittinger's pervasive mistake of reading our statements about human good as if they were statements about what is "good for me" — a reading which formally and materially contradicts all our texts, and treats our enterprise as a childish folly whose immediately obvious implications include the shameful heresy attributed to Grisez in the last quotation.

Some other mistaken claims by Dr. Koterski:

(2) "...the reiterated assertions of Professors Grisez and Finnis that the first principles of morality do not presuppose any metaphysical proposition..."

We never assert that. We frequently deny it. Indeed, we undertake the task of articulating and defending truths of metaphysics which are necessary conditions of any moral truth. We do assert that knowledge of the first practical principles is not attained by deduction from any metaphysical proposition, but as Aquinas said is knowledge of principles "per se nota" and "indemonstrabilia".

(3) Koterski accepts Hittinger's claim to have established that we are unfaithful to Aquinas and that we "substitute the moral intuitions of practical reason for a philosophy of nature". He has overlooked Hittinger's decision never to allude, let alone respond, to my central, oft-repeated and amply documented argument that Aquinas's own methodology explicitly demands that the philosophy of human nature be developed, in the relevant respects, precisely by reflection on practical reason's per se nota insights. Until that argument is noticed and refuted, the claim that our natural law theory is "new", let alone "Kantian", remains irresponsible.

3. Fr. Ronald Lawler, in his kind notice of Nuclear Deterrence, Morality and Realism, says that the "main problem" with our book is: "the

argument that nuclear deterrence involves murderous intent is an extremely complex one". I venture to differ. Though we neither feel nor claim any immunity from error, our argument is simple, and for me became ever more straightforward the more I became familiar with the intricacies of nuclear strategy and politics. What makes for complexity is simply the endlessly shifting and mutually incompatible rationalizations produced to avoid the

conclusion that the deterrent involves a murderous intent. These arguments need to be fairly stated, and their fragility exposed. No argument was strong enough to be offered, even in outline, in the final version of the U.S. Bishops' pastoral, or in Fr. Lawler's article.

John Finnis
University College, Oxford

A Response to the Exchange of Opinion: Doctor Hitinger's Response to Doctor Finnis' Comments in Our Last Issue

It is gratifying that the FCS Newsletter published the exchange of opinions on my book. No one will be surprised if I say that I agree with Professor Koterski rather than Professor Finnis. It is, however, disappointing that Professor Finnis does not engage any of the major philosophical areas of disagreement. He charges that I misquote, completely misunderstand his work, and that none of the problems I raise are really in his work. He does not reproduce any strands of my arguments.

Professor Finnis admonishes me for having said that his use of a retorsive, or dialectical argument, in dealing with the good of knowledge is in "the chapter devoted to the basic goods". His objection is that he uses this argument in Ch. III of his book Natural Law and Natural Rights (whereas it is in Ch. IV, that he says, he treats the basic goods). But Ch. III is entitled "A Basic Form of Good: Knowledge". I make it very clear that the dialectical argument is used only in connection with the basic good of knowledge. Professor Finnis neglects to mention that I agree with his argument for the good of knowledge. However, I point out repeatedly in my book that Professor Finnis (and Professor Grisez) does not try philosophically to defend any of the other basic goods. One of my principal criticisms of his system is that the basic goods (with the exception of knowledge) are pulled out of thin air.

He also criticizes my statement that the dialectical argument is "central to his exposition of the basic goods". This is probably a fair criticism. When I wrote "central to his exposition"

I had two things in mind. First, he devotes an entire chapter to the basic good of knowledge. The notion of a basic good is introduced in that chapter. Second, it is the only instance where Finnis defends and philosophically examines one of the basic goods. Hence, my use of the term "central". However, my use of the plural ("goods") is misleading. For this I apologize. I do not see how it affects the substantive points I raise about the lack of evidence for the basic goods.

In any case, I would like to summarize, in part, the substance of my questions. By all means, I would urge the reader to go on and read the many articles and books of Grisez and Finnis (in particular, their response to critics in the AJJ piece (2), and then judge whether my questions are fair and cogent.

I. Does it make sense to treat the first principle of practical reason (the good is to be done and pursued, and evil avoided) as "pre-moral"? The first principle governs an actus humanus, and a human act always has as its necessary conditions both sight and intention. Can an actus humanus ever be pre-moral? If so, how does it ever become "moral"? Can morality begin at choice? If the first principle is pre-moral, would this not raise the problem of morality commanding goods on terms other than the first principle, and hence dividing the house of practical reason against itself?

II. Granted that "basic goods" are irreducible (viz. apples are not oranges), it does not follow, and indeed seems wrong to say, that

this means they are incommensurable. Heterogeneity does not imply incommensurability. If we cannot compare basic goods according to an end, human choice would be reduced to arbitrary orderings of the goods. I claim that Grisez and Finnis are so intent upon avoiding consequentialism, that they radically impoverish the national ground for ordering the goods. If human goods are both irreducible and incommensurable, how could we retain an analogical notion of the good?

III. Granted that by analysis one can tease out certain basic goods, does it make sense to believe that these goods are ever given to human intentionality as so many piecemeal goods? Or, do these goods come in clusters – for example, a distinctive marital good that embraces a number of goods as constituent parts? Consider what would be the implication for the case made in Humanae Vitae if the bona matrimonalia are incommensurable. Isn't this what the dissidents have been claiming all the way along? If the goods proper to marriage are intentionally distinct and incommensurable, why should I be obligated in the act of marital intercourse to intend all of them? Incommensurability implies that they do not share a common, inherent property. One could choose one in exclusion to the others without violating the whole. To say that basic goods are commensurated in choice is not enough. Is the choice secundam naturam – in accord with a principle that is not an artifact of our practical reasoning? I claim that Grisez and Finnis do not provide a natural law argument for the principle of commensuration, and therefore the objective principles of morality run dry right at the point of interest. In my book I discuss in considerable detail the implications of their assertion that the goods are incommensurable.

IV. Do any of these goods have proper referents? What, for instance, is the proper referent of the good of religion? Unless we can find proper referents, it would seem that practical reason is left unable to distinguish between more or less adequate realizations of the good in question.

V. Is there a good for man that is something more than the sum of the parts of these basic goods? If basic goods, or a bona honesta, are "ultimate rational grounds", (3) and are "reasons with no further reasons" (4) then what good is a human being seeking (intending) when he pursues his perfection? Is the problem of a unified end for man to be reserved for

theology? If so, what might God add to the situation that isn't already found in one of the basic goods?

VI. Since Grisez and Finnis repeatedly insist that the grasp of basic goods is thoroughly practical, and does not involve an inference from what is grasped speculatively, isn't the good thereby reduced to the operable? Practical reason pertains to what we can do (the agibile) or make (the factible). Is the grasp of the good locked into what the scholastics called operability? Presumably, when Professor Finnis grades his students' papers, and goes on to judge that this paper is "good", the judgment is not immediately an issue of his own making or doing. The truly practical issue is what ought to be the proper response to the student's work (the just grade). Isn't the practical judgment, then, dependent upon a value judgment made in the speculative mode? Does dependence upon the speculative imply reducibility to the speculative? I don't see why it should. Grisez and Finnis say that theoretical reflection "deepens understanding of the basic goods, and knowledge about facts bearing on their instantiation is necessary to pursue them effectively". (5) But so put, the speculative grasp remains extrinsic to the grasp of values. I believe this reduces the speculative to a merely instrumental role. If they were to say that the practical grasp of value emerges out of the speculative, but that the practical ordination to making or doing is not reducible to the speculative, then we would not have a problem. As I read them, however, they are saying something far more radical. To repeat my question: Can we see something as "good" independent of what we intend to make or do?

VII. The judgment that the basic goods are basic human goods would seem to require (a) an analogical conception of the goods, and (b) a speculative rather than a merely practical judgment. Even if we grant that an individual can grasp one or another of these goods practically, the question remains as to how we universalize them. In my book I ask whether these goods can be anything other than mere bona mihi without a universalizing principle.

VIII. Finnis, Grisez, and Boyle contend that the first principle of morality is as follows: "In voluntarily acting for human goods and avoiding what is opposed to them, one ought to choose and otherwise will those and only those possibilities whose willing is compatible with a will
(continued on page 23)

A Comment on the Bishops Pastoral on Women, "Partners in the Mystery of Redemption"

May we first of all pay tribute to Bishop Joseph Imesh and his brother bishops on the committee for the patience with which they have performed the immense labor that has already gone into the Pastoral Letter. Their sincerity and openness are to be commended. However, due to the gravity of the subject, it seems necessary to call attention to certain deficiencies in the Pastoral without in any way questioning their good intentions.

Several analyses of the bishops' pastoral on women, "Partners in the Mystery of Redemption" have been made and they have found it wanting on several scores: the selections from women telling their experiences are heavily weighted in favor of radical feminist perceptions of reality; the whole process of the preparation of the Pastoral, hearings, listening sessions, etc. generally was guided by and controlled by discontented lay women and Sisters working in some capacity in Church offices; it rests on incomplete data and therefore amounts to a distortion of the truth; input by women who find their spiritual life enriched and their difficulties comforted by the Church as it is and has always been was discounted or ignored; there is almost a total absence of the image of Christian womanhood conveyed in the Church throughout the ages by holy women, beginning with the blessed Mother of Christ; not least is the observation that despite its pretentious title, the "redemption" proposed in the letter is not the redemption from sin wrought by the Sacrifice of Christ, but some sort of secular redemption accomplished by changing the structures of society and the Church.

Then there is the criticism of the feminists that the Pastoral does not go far enough in projecting the secularized image of womanhood culminating in admission to the priesthood.

Methodology Key to Pastoral

It is fundamental to any study to follow a method appropriate to the subject being studied. The method for the study of the empirical sciences, for instance, is not a proper method for the study

of theology. The question, then, is: was a proper method used in the study of women for the production of the Pastoral?

Methodology of Structuralism

A theory of reality called "structuralism" became popular in the 1960's and 1970's in the academic world. This theory is based on the assumption that events are determined not by the human will, as has been traditionally supposed, but by the hidden structures of society. Man, then, is imprisoned in structures. To free man the Structuralists would use the social sciences, especially psychology and sociology, to bring these hidden structures to the surface and in the process change them to suit the Structuralists' own plan for society.

It would seem that the methodology used in the study of women for the Pastoral, whether consciously or not, was that of Structuralism. It might be of interest to quote the description of Structuralism given by Paul Johnson in his book, Modern Times:

But all accepted Marx's starting point that events were determined not by human will, as had been traditionally supposed, but by the hidden structures of society. As Marx put it: 'the final pattern of economic relations as seen on the surface...is very much different from, and indeed quite the reverse of, their inner but concealed essential pattern and the conception corresponding to it.' Man was imprisoned in structures: twentieth-century man in bourgeois structures. In Structural Anthropology, first widely read and translated in 1963, Claude Levi-Strauss insisted that, though social structures were not visible to the eye or even detectable by empirical observations, they were present, just as molecular structures existed though undiscoverable by all but the electron microscope. These structures determined the cast of mind, so what appeared to be acts of human will were merely concordance with the

structure. For Levi-Strauss, as for Marx, history was not a succession of events but a discernible pattern working according to discoverable laws...

What all the Structuralists had in common was the Marxist assumption that human attributes and activities were governed by laws in a way analogous to the way scientific laws governed inanimate nature. Hence it was the function of the social sciences to discover such laws, and then for society to act upon their discoveries. The emergence of this new form of intellectual Utopianism, with its strong suggestion of compulsory social engineering at the end of the road, coincided exactly with the rapid expansion of higher education, especially of the social science disciplines, in the late Fifties and throughout the Sixties...

By an historical accident, which had nothing to do with structures, deep or otherwise, the Structuralists thus had an influence quite disproportionate to the intrinsic plausibility of their theories, and they attained their maximum impact on society during the Seventies, when millions of new graduates poured out of the universities (pp. 695 and 696).

Methodology of the Pastoral is that of Structuralism

From the explanation of Structuralism, given above, it would seem that this was the methodology used in the study of women made for the Pastoral. The lengthy hearings, the extensive listening sessions all were and are, since they are still going on, an effort to bring to the surface the hidden structures in which, it was presupposed, women were imprisoned.

Indeed the hearings and listening sessions themselves were designed to institute changes in the structures they were supposedly uncovering. Instances of this were the manipulative questions proposed to those who came to the listening sessions, e.g., the presumption that women were oppressed in the Church – an instance of discounting facts in favor of "explanations" – the cry of "sexism", and the demand for full participation of women in the life of the Church: all clear instances of the conviction that it is "the function of the

social sciences to discover...and then for society to act upon their discoveries".

But Structuralism Has Been Discredited

Structuralism as a theory of reality and as a method of changing or manipulating reality largely has been tried and found wanting:

The heyday of Structuralism coincided with the demoralization of America and with the steady expansion of Soviet power and influence. It reinforced both tendencies, for Structuralism, like the Marxism from which it sprang, was anti-empirical, denying the real world in favour of the theoretical world, discounting facts in favour of 'explanations' (Modern Times, p. 696).

Might not the Pastoral in its present form and the method by which it was produced – and, further, the way in which it would be taught -- result in the demoralization of faithful Catholic women and the steady expansion of the power of radical feminists?

Looked at from the point of view of its methodology, it should be clear that the Pastoral, since its production was based on a fundamentally flawed notion of reality, cannot contribute in its present form to a better understanding of women or womanhood.

Perhaps even more disconcerting, the methodology of Structuralism is no longer considered up to date by the young generation of academics. It is still being used, but by those whose minds were formed in the Sixties:

Structuralism, like Marxism, was a form of gnosticism, that is an arcane system of knowledge, revealed to the elite. Both expanded rapidly in the Sixties and, in conjunction, were intellectually predominant in the Seventies. But reality cannot for long be banished from history. Facts have a way of making their presence felt (Modern Times, p. 696).

It is an embarrassment to the bishops then that they are saddled with a document that is not only seriously deficient in Christian anthropology, but was produced by and framed in a methodology that no longer has the respect of "modern man", indeed, does not even use his terminology.

(continued on page 23)

An Observation on the Morale of Priests

A recent report submitted to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops diagnoses American priests as suffering from low morale. That there is such a problem can hardly be doubted. That the report in question adequately diagnoses it can be.

Obviously the large numbers of men leaving the priesthood in the past quarter century suggests some kind of morale problem, especially given Catholic teaching that a commitment to the priesthood is life-long. The priesthood, as everyone knows, is also not attracting enough new men to compensate for death and retirement.

I wonder whether anyone has ever compared these statistics with those in somewhat comparable professions - elementary and secondary teachers, for example, or social workers. My impression is that there, too, the "dropout" rate is rather high.

The reason might well be the same. These are professions which initially attract people with a high level of idealism; people willing to sacrifice certain material rewards for the sake of doing good. Such idealism, however, is hard to sustain for an entire lifetime. In this sense I don't think the present problems of the priesthood are new or unique. What is new is the fact that many priests no longer regard their commitment as permanent.

The report cites overwork as one cause of discouragement. But it is doubtful if most priests work longer hours than corporate executives, physicians, or successful lawyers. In these professions a 60-hour work week is often taken for granted. What makes the difference, of course, is the high monetary compensation. Once again, the problem turns on the nature of the priest's commitment.

The report also makes much of the fact that priests feel "caught in the middle" in church conflicts; between those who think the pace of change is too slow versus those who think it is too fast. (The committee issuing the report makes it rather clear that it regards the second group as more troublesome than the first.)

But, once again, there are certain professions whose practitioners (politicians, family counsellors, judges) are by definition "caught in the middle" of conflicts. That in itself is an insufficient reason for low morale.

Like most such discussions, the report does not talk much about those places where there is not a serious morale problem. There are, for example, certain religious orders which are now attracting more new members than ever before in their history, and there are a few small dioceses which now ordain annually more priests than do the larger archdioceses. These same communities and dioceses have a very low rate of priestly "dropout".

I think the modern priest is in a difficult situation not because he has conflicting demands made on him but because often he seems to receive little support or encouragement simply to do the right thing.

Instead, in countless books and articles, speeches, and workshops over the past quarter century the very nature of the priesthood itself has been called into question, in ways both subtle and blatant. Over and over again priests have been warned not to appear authoritarian, not to emphasize their clerical identity, not to promote a "magical" idea of the sacraments, etc. Often it becomes impossible to say even what a priest is.

Once again, I don't know if anyone has made a comparative study, but it appears that among liberal Protestant clergy also the level of discontent and the rate of "dropout" are rather high, even though issues like celibacy and Vatican authority do not apply.

Historically, the identity of the Catholic priest has been intimately linked with teaching authority and sacramental ministry. Where there is a strong sense of both, priests have joyfully endured all kinds of privations, including death itself. Where those have been weak, other kinds of satisfaction are not likely to compensate.

Dr. James Hitchcock

**James Cardinal Hickey, Archbishop of Washington,
will deliver the Keynote Address at the 1989 Convention.**

**Twelfth Convention
Fellowship of Catholic Scholars
September 22, 23, 24, 1989
Atlanta, Georgia**

**THEME:
RECOVERING THE SACRED:
CATHOLIC FAITH, WORSHIP AND PRACTICE**

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1989

12:00 Noon - 1:00

- Hotel Registration

12:00 Noon - 6:00

- Convention Registration

2:00 - 3:30 pm Concurrent Sessions

A. Canon Law and the Sacred
Edward Peters, J.D., J.C.L., FCS Coetus on
Canon Law
Speaker:
Rev. Vincent Rigdon, J.C.L.
Tribunal of the Archdiocese of
Washington, D.C.

B. Social Sciences: Sacredness and Liberty
Dr. John Gueguen, Illinois State
University, Chairman
Speakers:
Dr. John Gueguen
American Efforts to Deny the
Sacredness of Liberty

Dr. Peter Augustine Lawler, Berry College
American Efforts to Restore the
Sacredness of Liberty

Respondent: Dr. Charles R. Dechert
Catholic University of America

4:00 - 5:30 pm Concurrent Sessions

A. Human Life and the Recovery of the
Sacred
Dr. Janet Smith, University of Notre
Dame, Chairwoman
Speaker:
Dr. Alice Ramos, St. John's University

B. The Recovery of the Sacred and Our
Spiritual Life
Dr. Maria Rosario del Adriaioia, Pope
John Paul II Institute, Chairwoman
Speaker:
Rev. C. John McCloskey, III, S.T.D.
Princeton University

6:00 pm - Board Meeting

8:00 pm - Plenary Session

Keynote Address "Recovering the Sacred"
His Eminence, James Cardinal Hickey

9:30 pm - Reception

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1989

9:00-10:30 am Concurrent Sessions

A. Scripture and Recovering the Sacred
Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap.
Holy Apostles College and Seminary,
Chairman
Speakers:
Dr. Michael Waldstein
University of Notre Dame

Rev. Paul Mankowski, Ph.D., Harvard
University

B. Recovering the Sacred: Catholic Worship
Msgr. Michael Wrenn, Ph. D. Chairman

Speaker:
Rev. Anthony Sorgie, S.T.D., St. Joseph's
Seminary, Dunwoodie

11:00 am - 12:30 pm Concurrent Sessions**A. Catholic Doctrine and Its Effect on Catholic Practice**

Rev. Thomas Weinandy, Ph.D.,
Gaithersburg, Maryland, Chairman
Speaker:

Rev. Francis Martin, O.F.M., S.T.L.,
Dominican House of Studies

B. A Sense of the Sacred in Creation and Natural Sciences

Dr. Stephen Barr, University of Delaware,
Chairman

Speaker:

Rev. Lazarus Walter Macior, O.F.M.
University of Akron

2:00 - 3:30 pm Plenary Session**Church Governance and Its Effect on the Sacred in Catholic Life**

Msgr. Eugene V. Clark, Ph.D. St. John's
University, Chairman

Speaker:

Rev. Marvin O'Connell, Ph.D.,
University of Notre Dame

4:00 - 5:30 pm Concurrent Sessions**A. The Behavioral Sciences and the Sacred**

Dr. Paul Vitz, New York University, Chairman

Speaker:

Dr. Joseph Varacalli, Nassau Community
College, "A Catholic Sociological Critique of
Gustavo Gutierrez' Theology of Liberation"

B. Literary Form and the Sacred

Rev. Joseph W. Koterski, S.J., Ph.D.

Western Chair of Theology, Chairman

Speakers:

Dr. Glenn Arbery, Thomas More Institute
"Deconstructive Criticism: The Disrecovery
of Form"

Dr. Sue Abromaitis, Loyola College,

"The Sacramental Vision of Gerard
Manley Hopkins, S.J."

Dr. Mary Mumbach, Thomas More Institute,
"Renunciation and Sacred Form in Faulkner's
Go Down Moses"

6:00 pm Reception**6:30 pm**

Banquet - Presentation of Cardinal Wright Award
Review of Past Year, Msgr. William Smith,
St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie

Presentation of Award: Archbishop Eugene Marino,
Archbishop of Atlanta

8:00 pm

Social Hour

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1989**8:30 - 9:30 am Concurrent Sessions****A. Recovering the Sacred and Catholic Practice**

Msgr. George A. Kelly, St. John's University,
Chairman

Speaker:

Dr. John Haas, Josephinum Pontifical
College

B. The Socio-Economic World and the Sacred

Rev. Matthew Habiger, O.S.B., St.

Benedict's Abbey, Chairman/Speaker

Respondent:

Dr. James Schall, Georgetown University

10:00 am - Boarding of Buses to Cathedral**10:30 am - Mass - Cathedral of Christ the King**

Archbishop Eugene Marino

Principal Concelebrant

Msgr. William Smith, St. Joseph's
Seminary, Dunwoodie, Homilist

Books Reviewed

Love of Wisdom: An Introduction to Christian Philosophy by Eugene Kevane, Ph.D. and Ronda Chervin, Ph.D., Ignatius Press, 550 pp., \$24.95

Unashamed statements of conviction are as rare today as displays of virtue. The obligatory tributes to pluralism that oblige the modern mind only serve to dilute and attenuate the truths it should be vigorously seeking. The baneful result to the academy and society at large is a jargon that becomes trendy and imprecise as it dutifully strives to neither offend nor disturb. Euphemism has replaced honesty and dissimulation stands in place of candor. With unsettling frequency authentic truths avoid being mentioned out of respect for a situation's "complexity". In all of this, basic verities are considered less and less. No wonder a certain alarm is sounded when the same authors dare to speak of "permanent things" today. They provoke ire and sneers. A spokesman of those basic verities is unwelcome today because he causes us to pause and hear the awful truths that are our nature's long desired end. Many voices of these sane verities come to mind: Justice Bork striving to bring law back to its natural and reasoned foundations; Professor Bloom alerting us to the timeless constants in the education of the young; or Cardinal Ratzinger's solitary voice pleading with the practitioners of the Sacred Science to be faithful to their first principles. People become great because they boldly articulate basic verities, simple truths. Truths which were once embraced with unreflected ardor are now often met only with obloquies.

To this list of brave exponents of simple verities we may add the names of Dr. Ronda Chervin and Msgr. Eugene Kevane. Their newly released **Love of Wisdom: Introduction to Christian Philosophy** leaves the reader warmly applauding their eminent efforts at setting down the invariant principles of a Christian philosophy. They proceed with a profound grasp and engaging presentation of the elements that have always characterized genius, yet never diffident or apologetic in identifying Christian philosophy as a superior synthesis begun in Aristotle, developed with the Fathers, especially Augustine, and reaching its full flowering in the creative thought of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The authors clearly state in their Introduction that the book is "designed for courses of study in seminaries, universities, catechetical institutes and adult education and also for the general reader concerned with understanding the relationship between philosophy and Christian truth. (p. 9) They ably fulfill this end. The bane of most college philosophy courses is the failure to set the goal of philosophy as wisdom - an integral vision (system) which assists the knower to appreciate the meaning of existence, man's place in the world of existence, and the ways in which man can achieve happiness. Often students are exposed at best to a history of philosophy - leaving the student with the impression that truth is so relative that an ultimate resolution is futile. Or else, the course becomes a dreary excursion into 'systems' of philosophy that are alien to Catholic tradition. Both methods are certain guarantees that the student will depart believing philosophy to be totally mad or adventitious to their ordinary lives.

Love of Wisdom deftly steers clear of these two extremes. It proffers Thomism as the philosophical system apposite to the contemporary student. For two reasons: (a) it is the philosophy which first confirms the data of common sense, moving forward only to deepen and refine its foundational observations, and (b) it moves harmoniously within the revealed truths of Christianity - demonstrating no conflict between faith and reason. Thomism is the instrument that can restore the ideals of education and the aspirations of culture, as well as furnishing a unity of life that understands the true nature of natural goods in their trajectory toward God.

After establishing the unique value of Greek philosophy in the systems of Plato and Aristotle, the authors pursue the importance of stressing that philosophy does not operate within an intellectual vacuum. Ideas are not key in philosophy - but reality - 'ens'. Ideas are valuable insofar as they enrich our understanding of that 'ens'. In *De Veritate* St. Thomas explains (qu.1, a.1) that that which the intellect first conceives and into which it resolves all its other conceptions is being(ens). Aristotle's gaze is fixed on things existing, and his reflections spill off the beauty of existing things. Hence, the primary value and trustworthiness of all philosophy begins in the truths received by natural reason: common sense. Enough

emphasis cannot be placed on this insight. Philosophy begins to wheeze and speak unseemly words when it withdraws from the pure air of the 'real' (ens). Philosophy is the instrument for uncovering the deep and lovely truths of being; not the brush which paints the surreal pictures of ideas no longer fastened to the truth of being. Philosophy will be only as attractive as its fidelity to its principles - the facts of being. Only then will students crave its insights and fight for its truths. The development of philosophy through the ages is simply a greater penetration into the truths of being. Its vocabulary and analyses, though sometimes difficult, are the strong tools necessary to its task. The authors write:

The answer of Christian philosophy, fulfilling the aspirations of classical pagan philosophy, is that these first conceptions of the human intelligence begin with the dawn of natural reason in the life of each person, and they continue in the daily natural life of each person, whether educated or not, and especially whether one has taken formal courses in philosophy or not. (p. 109)

The central part of the book is devoted to a careful analysis of Aquinas *De Ente et Essentia* - the exquisite bud that eventually flowered into his mature thinking. In a chapter by chapter exposition the authors unfold the key principles of Christian philosophy for which Aquinas' work is architectonic. At each principle the authors pause to remind the reader that a key term or technical concept is merely a reflection of the rich texture of being. These reminders are salutary in a work of this kind lest the student think that a philosophical journey, sometimes startling in its complexity, is a useless esoteric exercise. It must be said, however, that whether the authors are delineating Porphyry's tree or tackling the real distinction between existence and essence, the student senses that these are gravely important issues whose mastery is worth the labor. Metaphysics is given its prominent place on every page of this fine work. No opportunity is missed to insist on metaphysics as the indispensable antidote to man's ennui, society's decay and the Church's lethargy. The authors make repeated and pointed applications, "The philosophy of truth, ontological and logical, is constantly at work in the teaching of revealed religion. Why is this true? Because truths are related to substantial realities, which reflect ideas in the Creator's mind (p. 190) They continue:

Applied in revealed religion, this means that the propositions of human discourse that teach the word of God, the prophetic word, on the human scene, are abidingly the same in meaning. Since this is a truth that derives directly from the transcendent Supreme Being, its abiding character is even more present and pronounced than the substantial realities of creatures (p. 190).

The book goes on to a substantial treatment of modern philosophy in the representative philosophies of Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Comte and Hegel. Through a skilled selection of the major ideas of each of these philosophers the reader develops a true taste for their thinking while at the same time seeing their inadequacies, especially *vis-a-vis* revealed religion. In the authors words, these philosophies signal "the metaphysics of apostasy from God".

Of particular interest is Part Four with its penultimate Chapter IV, Internal Resistance to the Renewal of Christian Philosophy. Kevane and Chervin forthrightly consider the status of authentic Christian philosophy within the Catholic Church itself. They go directly to the root of the problem, a "new Hermeneutic", which they analyze with illumination:

What, exactly, is this new hermeneutic? The Church herself in Mysterium Ecclesiae (June 24, 1973) defines it as dogmatic relativism. This expresses the nature of 'Modernism' as the philosophical heresy par excellence, the ultimate and total heresy, because it sets aside the entire Creed at one stroke. It does this by changing the original meaning of all the Articles of Faith and Morals and all the dogmas that have explained, developed and defended this meaning across the centuries. It is perhaps Father Alfred Loisy who best exemplifies and expresses this relativism when he writes in his Autour d'un petit livre (1903, p. 192): "Truth insofar as it is a human good, is no more changeless than man himself. Truth evolves with him, in him and by him. This does not prevent it from being the truth for man, for it can be such only on this condition". Giordano Bruno's motto, "Truth is the daughter of time", and Hegel's dialectic provide the philosophical background

for Loisy's relativism. He is applying the metaphysics of Modern Philosophy to revealed religion and its deposit of divine faith. The implication of Loisy's doctrine is atheistic...(p. 374).

But the authors conclude this thorough study by sounding a certain trumpet:

The heart of this ministry of Christian Philosophy to the Divine Deposit is a corollary of both the metaphysics of openness to the personal Supreme Being and the philosophical anthropology that provides ears to hear his word. It does so by means of its philosophy of truth...In these judgments the intellect knows truths, many beyond its natural power, such as those handed on in catechesis...(p. 378).

Both teachers and students using this work will find its appendix of selected primary sources a welcome relief from having to comb through libraries in search of them. One small recommendation might suggest the inclusion of diagram guides - especially in trying to explain complex relationships in metaphysics.

A friend of mine insists that all he desires of Churchmen is a preaching of the true Faith - a request that should be 'normal' to any teacher of the Faith. But in our times, how rare to be 'normal'. This work of Chervin and Kevane is a 'normal' presentation of the verities of Christian Philosophy. But, for today, how rare a treasure.

Rev. John Perricone
St. John's University, New York

The American Vincentians: A Popular History of the Congregation of the Mission in the United States, 1815-1987 by John E. Rybolt, C.M., Editor, 449 pages plus Introduction, illustrations, maps appendices, sources, index, New City Press, Brooklyn, paperback, \$35.

This is a formidable achievement, undertaken by the editorial staff of the Vincentian Studies Institute, and written by Vincentian Fathers John Rybolt, Stafford Poole, Douglas Slawson, and Edward Udovic, "with the generous assistance" of John Carven, Frederick Easterly, John Sledzione and Arthur Trapp. This frank, "warts and all" history covers the successes and failures

of the 172 years of Vincentian apostolate in America. It begins with an overview of these years and ends with a reflection on them. In between, the chief Vincentian apostolates -- education of the clergy, parish missions, parishes, education, foreign missions, and other works are treated in that order and as extensively and profoundly as the chosen scope allows. This very succinctness necessarily bewilders the reader with the seeming endless tabulation of foundations considered and rejected, opened and closed, lasting and extant, as well as the bristling array of names and personalities. There are bound to be, also, and indeed are differences of opinion concerning reasons presented and conclusions drawn by the authors, emphasis on certain houses, works, events and individuals rather than others, omissions, and even challenges to things presented as facts. An example of the latter is the statement on p. 86 that Father William Slattery resigned the post of superior general at the general assembly of 1968-69 "following the wishes of the majority of delegates". Not so (I was there). He resigned on his own initiative, but first humbly asked the delegates' opinion as to whether he could resign since he had been elected for life and did not wish to appear before God having shirked his responsibility; the delegates then by a large majority assured him that he could.

This is a book to dip into, a ready reference and, we hope, a lure and a quarry for future history and biography.

The authors, in their closing reflection, state that the long Vincentian ministry in America has been accomplished "without self-glorification or publicizing. The concept of corporate, as opposed to personal humility, so strongly inculcated by St. Vincent, has been a tenacious characteristic of the Congregation of the Mission since its beginning. In a real sense, the Vincentians have been the 'silent service' in the American Church." They concede, however, that "when one considers the numbers of bishops, priests, lawyers, judges, legislators, workers and immigrants touched by Vincentian ministries, the impact must be seen as substantial." Indeed, the impact of the nine Vincentian bishops of American Sees, three of them the founding bishops of St. Louis, Texas and parts of contiguous present-day states in one vast See, and Buffalo, and the others, early bishops of New Orleans, Monterey-Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, Toronto, and Salt Lake City, had great influence on the growth and

direction of the Church in America. For these reasons, this worthwhile volume should be of interest to American historians, bishops, priests, religious and laity because a goodly number of religious communities were introduced to America by the aforementioned Vincentian bishops.

The authors and assistants are to be thanked for their exhaustive research which has added to American Catholic historical knowledge. While the volume is entitled, properly enough a "popular history", there are ample, pertinent end notes to each chapter and a fine bibliographical essay dealing with sources.

Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

The World of Monsieur Vincent by Mary Purcell, Loyola University Press, Chicago, 234 pages, plus preface, notes, bibliography and index, paperback, no price listed.

This is a re-issue of the biography of St. Vincent de Paul published simultaneously in London by Harvill Press and in New York by Charles Scribner in 1963. The great Irish lady of history and biography, Mary Purcell, is at her best in this volume. It is learned, authentic, as forthright and unsentimental as the saint himself, yet also as warm, devoted and affectionate as he. It is no small achievement, to capture the spirit and life of such a giant in so small a space, but Ms. Purcell does it in a spare, flowing style against an astonishingly thorough background of major contemporary figures such as Louis XIII, Louis XIV, Richelieu, Mazarin, Berulle, Olier and so many others, and vivid environmental and historical passages. This short but complete, readable biography fills a great need in present day hagiography. There are a couple of factual errors in Miss Purcell's new preface: she states that only 3,000 "letters and documents" the saint wrote are extant; there are some 3,000 letters extant as well as practically all his conferences to the Priests of the Mission and the Daughters of Charity, the whole available in a critical edition of 15 volumes. And Vincent was appointed to the Council of Conscience during the minority of Louis XIV, not Louis XIII.

Highly recommended.

Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

Agenda for the 90's: Forging the Future of Adult Education, Neil A. Parent, General Editor, Department of Education, United States Catholic Conference.

There is an interesting disclaimer in the introduction to this 71 page "agenda". We read: "Although each of the primary authors wrote his or her article from guidelines that were developed by the National Advisory Committee on Adult Religious Education (NACARE), these authors basically present their own views on the issues and not those of NACARE or the USCC Department of Education.

"One essay, 'The Mature Christian Adult' by Loretta Girzaitis, coordinator of Adult Education for the Archdiocese of St. Paul/Minneapolis in its opening section refers to Alfie's cry in the song 'What's it all about?' That cry is the cry of parents, business executive, sports heroes etc. and is described at some length also as the cry of Jesus. 'His (Jesus) was an ordinary but exceptional life as he matured and developed, consciously aware of its meaning...If we are to grow in Christian maturity, then we need to be as ordinary and exceptional as Jesus was."

In "Reclaiming Meaning: A Response to the Mature Christian Adult", Fred Eyeran, coordinator for Adult Education of the Archdiocese of Denver, makes brief comments on the necessary role of doubt (sic) in the process of Christian maturation. Thus we read: "Doubt is a necessary stage in the journey to wholeness. How open are we, as Church, as educators, to allow persons to doubt?"

M. Scott Peck, M.D. in his book "The Different Drum", in quite strong words, believes that "one of the two greatest sins of our sinful Christian Church has been its discouragement of doubt through the ages". Eyeran agrees: "We need to enable people to ask questions, to doubt, to struggle with life issues, to not only bring our tradition into dialog with day-to-day reality, but also to question our tradition."

David M. Thomas, Ph.D., director of the graduate program in Adult Christian Community Development, Regis College, Denver, Colorado, in his article "Leadership in Adult Religious Education" lamenting the replacement of content in adult religious education by process, makes the astute observation that at times the

process was more concerned with making people feel good about themselves. Thus, he observes, "Evaluation of programming should include hard questions on what people learned and not just on whether they liked the program." But towards the conclusion of this article a statement is made which expresses, in a clever and non-specific fashion, the on-going problem with the Roman Catholic Church's ability to teach clearly in matters of faith and morals. It might be helpful for the reader to underline the ambiguous parts of this statement:

In adult religious education, I would hope that a leader would have a broad, up-to-date understanding of the basic tenets of the faith...Finally, as one who educates in a particular Church tradition, one should be aware of those issues currently debated and discussed in the Church and be able to provide people with wise guidance as to the way people can become more knowledgeable about these issues.

What does Thomas mean by "a broad, up-to-date understanding of the basic tenets of the faith"? Obviously, he refers to a faith that is time bound and culturally conditioned. What issues are currently debated and discussed? Why doesn't he name them? Obviously, this is a euphemism for what he would probably consider to be the opinion of those who describe themselves as the Church's "loyal opposition" on questions of birth control, abortion, human sexuality, the nature of the Church, the role of Bishops and theologians in handing on the faith, etc.

In Theological Perspectives on Adult Religious Education, John L. Elias of Fordham University, sets down in striking fashion a number of guidelines for dissent. "The sense of the faithful contributes to the tradition being a living and learning process...A corollary of the first two points is that equal emphasis should be placed on the learning Church and the teaching Church...only a Church of faith that constantly engages in learning can teach with authority...A Community may teach, but the effectiveness of its teaching is conditioned by how well the members accept and learn from it (emphasis added).

He further observes, "If we believe survey polls, there have been some teachings in recent years that have not received widespread

acceptance...While there is a certain presumption given to authority and tradition, the freedom and responsibility of individuals to learn, discuss, and come to judgements are of high value in the community of faith (emphasis added). How high Mr. Elias? Most assuredly at the expense of the authentic teaching of the Church.

Elias states that while in England, he followed carefully the annual Synods of the Anglican Church in which deliberation took place on the ordination of women, and the doctrinal positions of Anglicanism on issues like the divinity of Jesus, the Virgin birth and the Resurrection of Jesus. He then makes bold to mention how the Anglican (sic) Church in New Jersey has grappled for the past few years with issues in sexual morality. The positions and publications on sexuality of the Episcopal Church in New Jersey mainly championed by Bishop Spong represent a total departure from Christian morality, bordering on deviance!

A fundamental reason for continued adult learning in Elias' view, is that Jesus "Whom we worship, through whose power we learn, was himself a learner."

We are given a glimpse into Elias' brand of Christology when he, quoting John Hull, What Prevents Christian Adults From Learning, writes: "Concepts of an omniscient and unlearning Jesus and an infallible and unlearning Church may sadly influence adults to be unlearning Christians."

This article of John Elias which claims to present theological perspectives is by far the most threatening in the book to an adult Catholic's faith and practice.

Incidentally, Elias is the director of Programs in Adult Religious Education and Development, Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education of Fordham University.

John L. Zauns, Ph.D., chairman of the Religious Studies Department of Marywood College in Scranton, Pa., in his response to "Theological Perspectives" pulls out all the stops in a cliché ridden article, to agree with Elias. Thus, we read:

For the Catholic Church to remain both faithful and willing to learn from differing voices and sometimes clashing perspectives requires a theology of Church solidly grounded in the

documents of Vatican II. The Pilgrim Church proclaimed by Vatican II does not profess to have a monopoly on all possible truth, and the truth that it possesses remains incomplete. Because the Church is a pilgrim, it has to be constantly on the move...The truth which the Church today proclaims must always stand under scrutiny, remain open to new perspectives and be subject to debate so that a richer truth can emerge...Thus, divergent positions discussed in honest and open dialogue should incite and challenge the Church not only to rethink and reword but to purify and further develop the truth which it partially comprehends and humbly proclaims.

Quoting James Fowler who has elaborated a hypothesis regarding various stages of faith through which people pass or in which they become bogged down during their lives, Zaums speaks of "conjunctive faith" in which "truth is seen as rich, multiform, ambiguous, and complex. Conjunctive faith combines a deep commitment to one's own tradition with, first, a genuine and humble openness to often contradictory perspectives held by differing traditions." The implications that this statement has for ecumenical dialogue is all too clear.

In "Unity and Diversity Within Adult Religious Education" by C. Michael Lebrato, Executive Secretary of the National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education - CCD Washington, D.C., we are told:

As we attempt to apply the light of the Gospel to today's world, we see that we can no longer look exclusively to the Church's teaching office. Complexity has forced us to see truth as emanating from many persons and situations...There now exists within the Church not simply one theology but many theologies..We now have not just one ritual, the Latin Mass, but a host of ways of celebrating the Lord's meal in language and cultural adaptation. (Emphasis added.)

In "The Social and Cultural Context of Adult Religious Education", Maurice L. Monette, OMI, a consultant and researcher in adult religious

education and lay ministry, tells us in a section captioned Democracy:

The several polls taken before the recent visit to the U.S. by Pope John Paul II indicates that U.S. Catholics strongly desire a say in the ecclesial decisions that affect their lives. They want their experience to matter in Church decisions about the morality of birth control, abortion, and sexual orientation...This democratic sense of participation is deep in the psyche of a Catholicism that survived a priestless frontier, elected a bishop, and administered parishes through lay trustees. (Emphasis added.)

Agenda for the 90's, Forging the Future of Adult Religious Education could well and properly have served as part of the March meeting of the Thirty-Four Metropolitans from the United States with the Holy Father on the role of the Bishop as Teacher of the Faith. This document, in most of its articles, exceeds the boundaries of legitimate theological pluralism. Most unfortunately it proves, by the authors it features and the positions which these authors hold in graduate schools of religious education and in religious education professional organizations, that the voices of those possessing the sure charism of truth are being muted and the teaching of the Church distorted. These articles demonstrate clearly and convincingly some of the "American" impediments to episcopal teaching.

Sad to say this document bears out the claim that Hans Kueng made a couple of years ago that a "new" Church is aborning because promoters of this "new" Church Catholicism are at the switching points of the ecclesiastical apparatus. The disclaimer in the introduction to this document that these authors are basically presenting their own views on the issues and not those of NACARE or of the USCC Department of Education absolves no one from responsibility for the damage that this Agenda will do not only in the United States but throughout the English speaking world.

Msgr. Michael J. Wrenn, Pastor
St. John the Evangelist Parish and
Special Consultant for Religious
Education to John Cardinal O'Connor
New York

The Miracles of Jesus and the Theology of Miracles by Rene Latourelle, Paulist Press, New York, 333 pp. plus bibliography and notes.

The heart of this fine work by Fr. Latourelle is a form/critical study of all the Gospel miracles of the Lord. To achieve this study, Latourelle uses what have become commonly accepted criteria for the investigation of the historical reliability of Gospel events: 1) the criterion of multiple attention, 2) the criterion of discontinuity, 3) the criterion of continuity, 4) the criterion of substantial agreement among divergent interpretations, 5) the criterion of the necessary explanation, 6) the criterion of internal intelligibility of the accounts, and 7) the criterion of the "style" of Jesus. Apart from the legitimate questions which have been and should be raised about the presuppositions involved in approaching the sources this way, and about the actual value of the results of such an approach, it can be said that the author approaches the matter in a carefully nuanced fashion which evidences none of the superficial applications sometimes made of the various criteria.

The general conclusion reached by Fr. Latourelle is that each of the accounts is, in all essentials, an historically accurate presentation of what Jesus actually did, although the evangelists have each used the historical material in the framework of their own perspectives and theological interest. Like many today, however, Latourelle is unwilling to attribute historical reliability to the notoriously difficult account of the drowning of the swine in Mt. 8:38-34 and parallels. This is viewed as "a literary device to show that henceforth demons no longer have any power over human beings, unless Jesus allows it" (p. 117). His reasons for this conclusion are *a priori*: Jesus came to save and not to destroy, and such an action would have been incompatible with the salvation He was bringing to pagan lands" (p. 117). One may properly wonder whether the permitted destruction of pigs is counter-indicative of a mission aimed at the salvation of humans.

The treatment of the miracles of Jesus is followed by a developed theology of miracles in general, and it is very well done both from a theological and apologetic point of view. Some of the abundant riches of this book may be gathered from the following citation, rich in its implications. "Miracles draw us toward the earth and at the same time detach us from it; they call the senses into play, but in order to provide new direction for the spirit. — The transformation of

the universe by miracles and the transformation of human beings by holiness are the signs of the new world that is being brought into being before our eyes. A miracle is a 'sign' occasionally sent to us from the promised land, like an interstellar light that gives us a glimpse of undreamt wonders" (p. 331).

Rev. James T. O'Connor

The Christian Sacraments of Initiation: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist by Kenan B. Osborne, O.F.M., Paulist Press, New York, 1987, 249 pp., \$10.95.

Kenan Osborne, professor of systematic theology at the Franciscan School of Theology (Berkeley) and former President of the Catholic Theological Society of America, presents an introduction to the sacraments of initiation. His fundamental premise is that these three sacraments, as recognized by the early Church and as advanced by Vatican II, form the complete and unifying process of initiation into the life of the Church.

Each of the three sections of the book is devoted to one of these sacraments, laying out the Church's tradition teaching, relevant New Testament data, a brief history of its sacramental practice and theological development, and a summary of contemporary theological understanding related to it. Father Osborne's personal commentary and insights are woven throughout the text.

Much of this book is excellent, especially in two areas. The first is the author's understanding and presentation of Jesus as the primordial sacrament. For Osborne this insight is foundational for understanding all three sacraments — that all who are baptized partake of the one baptism of Jesus, and that all who are confirmed are confirmed in the one Spirit of Jesus. For a clear, contemporary explanation of this central sacramental truth, one could probably not find a better and more articulate expression. The second area is his treatment of the sacrament of baptism. Here he demonstrates creatively how each person's baptism is a participation in Jesus' own baptism.

Nonetheless, while reading this book, I was drawn to Jesus' words that a wise man is one who is able to take from his storehouse the new as well as the old. Osborne is superb when he treats contemporary insights into the sacraments

of initiation, aptly placing these insights within their historical context and the Church's traditional teaching. This is very wise. However, there are a couple of "old things" in the theological storehouse which he seems unable to handle – original sin and transubstantiation.

He does not deny the truth these teachings seek to express; he shows clearly that they form part of the Church's traditional teaching. But he seems embarrassed by the doctrine of original sin, almost as though it were something best forgotten. In addition he seems unable to articulate the concept of transubstantiation in a manner that would benefit contemporary understanding. Here Osborne's wisdom seems to falter. Space does not permit me to treat both concerns here, but I would like to address the first briefly.

Father Osborne stresses that in baptism one dies and rises with Christ (Romans 6), but he fails to appreciate the degree to which we must die and rise. The doctrine of original sin indicates that our humanity has been so corrupted by sin that we are in need of an entirely new human nature. Our sinful nature must die. Jesus' death on the cross defined the extent to which we

need to be recreated because of sin (both original and personal).

On the cross, Jesus – who in the Incarnation assumed the fallen humanity of Adam (sinful flesh) – put to death that fallen, sinful humanity, a humanity defiled by original sin. In rising from the dead, Jesus assumed a new and glorious humanity now free from the effects of sin and death. This radical and marvelous transformation is now available for those who are baptized into Christ. Christians die to the old sinful nature of Adam and come to share in the entirely new nature of the New Adam. This dying to sin and rising to new life in Christ is the heart of a Christian's daily spiritual life. Each day a Christian must appropriate the power of Jesus' cross by which sin is put to death and new life in the Spirit is nourished.

I would recommend Father Osborne's book to teachers and those well grounded in their faith, but would be reluctant to suggest it for the theologically uninitiated.

Fr. Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M. Cap.
Mother of God Community
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Books in Brief

Ad Limina Addresses...of Pope John Paul II to the Bishops of the United States, March 5th-December 9th, 1988, USCC, Washington, D.C.

This useful record of the words of Pope John Paul II addressed to the Bishops of the United States is worth having for the Pope's mind on several subjects including the important subjects of the Sacrament of Penance and the high role of theologians when they remain faithful to the Church.

Religious Liberty and Contraception by Brian W. Harrison, John XXIII Fellowship, P.O. Box 22, Ormond, 3204, Australia, 193 pp., \$12.

It is a commentary on the state of the Church in our time. Few scholars review the Church's teaching on contraception as true. The few who do seem to be members of our Fellowship - one way or another. This volume of eleven chapters and three appendices covers a ground of subject matter far beyond contraception, e.g.,

religious liberty, freedom of conscience, the role of the State, question of coercion, and Humanae Vitae, including the infallibility issue.

The Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church, Christifideles Laici, Post Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, December 30, 1988, USCC Publication #274-8, Washington, D.C.

Anyone who reflects on and considers important the contemporary vocation of the laity in serving the community of the faithful and in developing a rich interior life, should read and reread this essay by the Holy Father.

Of special focus and interest: his precise analysis of the "priestly mission" of Christ as the laity shares in it; of the "criteria of ecclesiality" for lay groups; charity as the soul and substance of solidarity; evangelizing culture; older people and the gift of wisdom; women and men as they serve the church, and other good subjects.

The Reshaping of Catholicism: Current Challenges in the Theology of Church by Avery Dulles, Harper & Row, 276 pp., \$19.95.

Father Dulles has begun to mute or nuance some of his earlier dogmatic demands - for a second magisterium or for co-authorship rights with bishops when magisterial pronouncements are made. In this book of twelve chapters, which is a collection of essays written between 1984 and 1988, he opts to play the role of bridge-builder. Mindful of the heavy emphasis given in recent years to good works, especially of justice, Father Dulles comes down on the side of faith and salvation as the basic work of the Church and demonstrates a certain theological anxiety about the advocacy role of bishops in matters heavily political. He discusses dissent and treats its gingerly but without assaying what it has done to Catholic laity in the U.S., or without making much of the fact that the first obligation of those who profess faith is assent. The Reshaping of Catholicism is a catchy title but it is never quite clear what the finis operis of the reshaping is to be, or what the reshaped Church might look like. John Paul II is not so imprecise.

Fellowship member David Q. Liptak has published two small but important paperbacks (Liturgical Publications) - Back to Confession and The Gift of Life. Father Liptak is a faculty member at Holy Apostles Seminary in Cromwell, Connecticut.

From Ignatius Press

Women in the Priesthood? A Systematic Analysis in the Light of the Order of Creation and Redemption by Manfred Hauke, 497 pp., \$19.95.

Father Hauke, a German theologian from Augsburg, writes what Hans Urs Von Balthasar called "the definitive work" on women's ordination. In eighteen large chapters there is hardly an aspect of this subject - from the "emancipation of women" as a question to the theological certainty of the Church's position - which is not fully examined. A first-rate piece of scholarly rebuttal to much American propaganda.

What Will Happen to God: Feminism and the Reconstruction of Christian Belief by William Oddie, 159 pp., \$9.95.

Father Oddie is an Oxford Fellow who argues that the feminist target is not simply "God the Father", but the nature of Christianity itself. In nineteen chapters he takes up in detail what he calls "femspeak".

Test Everything: Hold Fast to What is Good by Hans Urs Von Balthasar, 93 pp., \$6.95.

Shortly before his death this great theologian "free associated" with a friend about the contemporary Church on such profound topics as Faith, biblical exegesis, liberation theology, and on popular subjects as the clericalization of laity. A jewel of a book.

Letters to Jesus (Answered) by Peter Kreeft, 284 pp., \$10.95.

A creative piece of writing with questions directed to Jesus, answered on the same page, from and to people simply identified as "Libertarian", "skeptic", "population estimator", etc. Quite clever.

Where God Weeps by Werenfried Van Straate, O. Praem, 250 pp., \$9.95.

This book by a Dutch Norbertine - a begging priest in post-WWII Germany - who began with an old hat collecting nickels and ended up giving away \$600 million over forty years.

Heaven: The Heart's Deepest Longing by Peter Kreeft, 281 pp., \$9.95.

St. Augustine would have treasured this book on a subject more rarely discussed than it used to be.

Chance or the Dance: A Critique of Modern Secularism by Thomas Howard, 151 pp., no price.

Since the search for meaning is a hot modern struggle, readers will find here the two basic choices of our time: A radically unfocused universe or a reality of purpose. Many readers in growing numbers enjoy Thomas Howard's insights into contemporary society as its backs away, more and more, from reality.

Generic Man (continued from page 5)

melody, the refrain, of God becoming man cannot be played if the generic chords are removed from the instrument. The terms "human beings" and "humanity" or even the bloodless "someone" or RNAB's "others" unfortunately just will not do. Our own Catholic generations are about to be deprived of the resonances of a thousand years of reflection poetry and meditation even while our secular culture is claiming that the generic sense is still very much alive and kicking.

Ralph Wright, O.S.B.

Finnis/Hittinger (continued from page 8)

toward integral human fulfillment". (6) But, they insist, integral human fulfillment is "not a reason for acting", but rather an "ideal whose attractiveness depends on all the reasons for acting which can appeal to morally good people". (7) It is an "unrealizable ideal" that functions like a "hypothetical approximation". (8) To speak of the objects of choice as "possibilities" (in contrast to potentialities), and then to posit, as a moral principle, the notion of integral fulfillment which is not even a possibility, is more Kantian than Kant. What is in actu in this system other than choice? What's guiding choice?

IX. In the same AJJ piece, they contend that: "In coming to know theoretically, one comes into accord with prior reality. But in coming to know practically, one becomes able to bring something into reality. It follows that practical knowledge cannot have its truth by conformity to what is known". (9) Aquinas distinguishes between speculative adequation ad rem and practical adequation ad appetitum (9.t. I-II, q. 57, a. 5, ad 3). This is a different distinction from the one offered by Grisez and Finnis. In any case, Aquinas insists that both speculative and practical uses of the intellect must conform to reality (9.t. I-II, q. 64, a. 3). This seems like common sense to me. But Grisez and Finnis hold that "practical knowledge cannot have its truth by conformity to what is known". Once again, what is guiding choice? What is there to prevent the judgment that practical reason, on Grisez and Finnis' account, is solipsistic, and its imperatives dogmatic? This is not an unfair question, and to complain that critics have not adequately quoted their texts is evasive.

These are a few of the questions that can be raised, just for starters. Philosophical answers are required.

Russell Hittinger
Fordham University

Notes:

- (1) Critique of the New Natural Law Theory, p. 46.
- (2) Grisez, Finnis, Boyle, "Practical Principles, Moral Truth, and Ultimate Ends", in American Journal of Jurisprudence, vol. 32 (1987).
- (3) Ibid., p. 106.
- (4) Ibid., p. 110.
- (5) Ibid., p. 111.
- (6) Ibid., p. 128.
- (7) Ibid., p. 132.
- (8) Ibid., p. 133.
- (9) Ibid., p. 117.

Woman's Pastoral (continued from page 10)**Pope's Supposed "Praise"**

It should be noted that the reports in the newspapers that the Holy Father praised the Pastoral were not at all accurate. An examination of what he actually said shows that on September 2, 1988, he merely referred to the pastoral in his address to some American bishops on their ad limina visit, among whom was Archbishop Levada, who is on the committee for writing it. The Pope mentioned some parts of it, namely, presenting women as partners in the mystery of redemption; eliminating discrimination based on sex; presenting Mary as a model of discipleship. However, since the first is not presented clearly as a participation in the redemption wrought by Christ and the third is barely brought in, perhaps the Holy Father's words should be taken as a gentle hint that these matters should be developed correctly and more fully.

We humbly submit these modest observations for the consideration of the Committee and of the bishops as they prepare to revise the first draft of "Partners in the Mystery of Redemption". May Mary the Mother of God and the Model of Discipleship guide their work by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, her divine Spouse, so that it will help clarify the rights and duties of women while defending their feminine dignity and vocation.

Prepared by the Institute on Religious Life

Items of Interest

Back to Fundamentals

The Jacques Maritain Center at Notre Dame will again sponsor a summer conference/retreat for lay men and women on the FUNDAMENTALS OF CATHOLICISM. Father Joseph Fessio and Marvin O'Connell, Monsignors William Smith and Eugene Clark, and Notre Dame Professor Ralph McInerny and Janet Smith will conduct intensive courses June 2-11. Stipends are available to help with housing, meals, and travel. For more details, call Alice Osberger at 219-239-5825.

NFP

In late March, Bob and Lynn Littleton of Hollywood, Florida, presented the fourth - and

final - class in their latest series, the 10,000th class series offered by the Couple-to-Couple League.

In 1971, John and Sheila Kippley offered the first of what they hoped would be a regularly recurring series of meetings to teach natural family planning. Since that first class in 1971, the Couple-to-Couple League has grown to be the largest NFP organization in North America. It has trained over 850 volunteer teaching couples in 48 states and 13 foreign countries. These teachers have taught NFP to more than 75,000 couples.

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

Non-Profit Org
U S Postage
PAID
Jamaica, NY 11439
Permit No. 451

Position: Provost and Chief Operating Officer for Cleveland State University. The Provost is the University's chief academic and operating officer, reporting directly to the President and serving as his deputy in the absence of the President.

Contact:

Professor Lizabeth Moody, Chair
Cleveland-Marshall College of Law
Cleveland State University
Euclid Avenue at East 24th Street
Cleveland, OH 44115
Tel. 216-687-2348

Position: Vice President for Student Affairs for San Francisco State University. The Vice Presidency is a new cabinet-level position reporting directly to the President.

Contact:

President Robert A. Corrigan
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132