

Newsletter

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

Volume 13 Number 4

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

September 1990

From Our President:

Will It Make Any Difference?

The Vatican is beginning to take seriously the organized dissent of Catholic theologians against Church teaching which has materialized in recent years. Since the publication in 1968 of *Humanae Vitae* dissent has been a thorny problem but, for the most part, it came from individual theologians like Hans Kung and Charles Curran. During the past year the stakes were increased dramatically when more than 160 German-speaking theologians from Germany, Holland and Switzerland voiced their opposition to the Pope and the Vatican in the now famous "Cologne Declaration."

Similar declarations from other countries followed: in the United States the Catholic Theological Society of America has drafted its own list of complaints and is expected to publish it later this year.

On June 26 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published a document entitled: "Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian." It was signed by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Prefect of the Congregation, and specifically approved by the Holy Father. The text can be found in *Origins*, July 5, 1990., Vol. 20: No. 8, pp. 117-126. I recommend the careful reading and study of this document to all members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars.

In this Issue

From our President	p. 1
The Universal Catechism: More Reflections, by -	
Rev. Lawrence C. Brennan	p. 3
Rev. Paul M. Quay	p. 7
Rev. Thomas Dubay	p. 10
Dr. Janet E. Smith	p. 11
Rev. George W. Rutler	p. 17
Dr. Paul C. Vitz	p. 19
Items of Interest	p. 20
Books Reviews:	p. 22
Peter Elliott, Paul Hinnebusch, John Miller, Pace 19;	
Bronislaw Dembowski; Alice von Hildebrand;	
Pope John Paul II.	
Reminder: Our Convention September 21 - 23	p. 28

Not surprisingly, the publication of the document was greeted with hostility and severe criticism by many of the very same people it is aimed at and who, by their dissent, in part, are responsible for the Instruction in the first place. In the forefront of the critics are, of course, Hans Kung, Richard P. McBrien, Elizabeth Schussler Fiorenza, Charles Curran, and ex-Jesuit Peter Hebblethwaite.

Their chief objection seems to be that the Holy See would dare to spell out in detail what theologians can and cannot do in order to qualify as Catholic theologians in good standing.

The Instruction reminds theologians that they are members of the People of God just like everyone else and that they are subject to lawful hierarchical authority. In a certain sense, the document is more about the Magisterium or Teaching Authority of the Church than it is about theologians.

The first part treats of God's truth which has been committed to the Church. It is God's truth that makes man free, and that truth must be protected and kept free of all error. The second part deals with the vocation of the theologian who seeks "an ever deeper understanding of the word of God found in the inspired Scriptures and handed on by the living tradition of the Church. He does this in communion with the magisterium which has been charged with the responsibility of preserving the deposit of faith" (#6).

The theologian is free to exercise his charism within the confines of the Church's faith and within the limits set by the Magisterium (#11). He is not a free agent who can set his own opinion over the official declarations of the Magisterium.

The third part gives a theological rationale for the Magisterium, grounding it in divine revelation and the will of Jesus Christ. A theologian is free to be a member of the Church or not, but if he wants to call himself a "Catholic" then he must be subject to the legitimate Magisterium and work in collaboration with it.

The fourth part spells out the various levels of decisions or pronouncements of the Magisterium and the kind of assent that is due to them: the references are to Vatican II and the Code of Canon Law. Finally, there is an analysis of modern dissent; the Instruction summarizes the main arguments in favor of dissent and refutes them, showing that they flow, not from Scripture and Tradition, but from modern secular philosophies which are antithetical to the Catholic faith.

It is truly tragic that a document like this had to be written. Ever since the publication of Humanae Vitae when dissenting theologians came out into the open there has been turmoil, confusion and division in the Church. In former times, in the pontificates of Pius X, Pius XI and Pius XII such dissenters would have been warned immediately and, if they did not obey, silenced or excommunicated. It was clearly understood then that error in matters of faith and morals leads to the loss of souls, and the hierarchy has a serious obligation to protect the integrity of the faith by refuting and condemning errors. The Pastors of the Church realized that the truth of the faith is serious business; they are the proclaimers and custodians of that faith. In this they are helped by theologians, but the ultimate responsibility resides in the bishops, not in the theologians.

Because the Magisterium (after the Council) has been extremely reluctant to invoke sanctions, doing so only in a few notorious cases such as Kung, Curran and Boff, and even then after long dialogues and in a very restrained manner, theologians both individually and in groups have become bolder and bolder. Often protected by powerful bishops, they know that no serious measures will be taken against them.

The terms of the new Instruction are very mild; no threats are made against dissident theologians. They are invited to "collaborate" with the Magisterium and are urged to avoid turning to the "mass media" in order to put pressure on the Magisterium (see #30).

Will this new Instruction from Rome on the "Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian" make any difference? Will dissidents now change their ways and be obedient to legitimate authority in the Church? I doubt it. The document is treated with contempt and ridicule in the July 13 issue of the National Catholic Reporter.

(continued on page 27)

The Draft of the Universal Catechism The Introduction and Part One

Rev. Lawrence C. Brennan

Even the title is a statement. For those who have wondered, in sympathy or negatively, whether a single formulation of the faith is still possible in a fragmenting, multi-cultural Church, Rome has announced an ambitious project. Indeed, one of the most encouraging statements to emerge from the magisterium in the years since the Second Vatican is found in the introduction to "Part One: The Profession of Christian Faith."

Whoever says 'I believe' says 'I stand by what we believe.' Communion in the faith is not possible without a common language of faith, setting the standard for all and uniting all in the same confession of faith.

In this text, Rome, the center of Catholic unity, proclaims that a common language of faith is the necessary condition of communion in the faith. Perhaps it is a comment on the times that such a proclamation is noteworthy.

The Catechism itself is divided into four parts, following a form that has been classic since the Sixteenth Century; the Apostles Creed, the Sacraments, the Commandments, and the Our Father. To this is attached a lengthy Introduction on what it means to say "I believe." I have been asked by the Fellowship to comment on the Introduction and on "Part One: The Profession of Christian Faith."

First an overview.

The Introduction: "I Believe" comprises three chapters. Chapter One treats the topics of religion, the human capacity for God, and the ways of knowing God. Chapter Two treats divine revelation and its transmission. Chapter Three treats the nature of faith. The Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, is cited extensively throughout although, strangely, no reference is made to the material on atheism in *Gaudium et Spes*. Next, the Catechism's "Part One: The Profession of the Christian Faith" comprises an

Introduction on the Symbols of the Faith, and twelve chapters, one on each of the twelve articles of the Creed. In turn, these chapters are grouped into three sections: one section apiece on the credal statements concerning the Persons of the Trinity.

"Section One: I Believe in God the Father" contains Chapter One of the treatment of the Creed. This chapter falls into eight sub-sections treating, among other things: the mystery of the Trinity, including the problem of the Filioque; the Creator and the mystery of creation, with reference to providence and to the problem of evil; heaven and the angels; the hexameron and the earth; the special nature and dignity of the human race; the fall and original sin.

"Section Two: I Believe in God the Son" contains Chapters Two through Seven of the treatment of the Creed. Chapter Two treats each term in the profession, "And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord." Chapter Three treats the Incarnation, the privileges and the role of Mary in the coming of Christ, and the mysteries of the human life of Christ. Chapter Four treats the crucifixion, death, and burial of Jesus, with a lengthy preliminary treatment of Jesus' decision to go up to Jerusalem; this chapter also treats Christ's soteriological offering of himself for our sins. Chapters Five, Six, and Seven are comparatively brief, Chapter Five treating the descent into hell and the resurrection of Christ, Chapter Six treating the Ascension and glorification of Christ, and Chapter Seven treating the second coming and the last judgment.

"Section Three: I Believe in God the Holy Spirit" contains Chapters Eight through Twelve of the treatment of the Creed. Chapter Eight treats the Holy Spirit: our knowing the Holy Spirit, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit and the Word in the time of promise, the Spirit of Christ in the fullness of time, the Spirit and the Church in the last times, and the invocation of the Spirit. Chapter Nine contains a lengthy treatment of ecclesiology and the communion of saints, placing Mary both within the Church and within the communion of saints. Chapter Ten briefly treats the forgiveness of sins and baptism. Chapters Eleven and Twelve treat, respectively, the resurrection of the body and life everlasting, considering the traditional eschatological themes of death, resurrection, the particular judgment, heaven and hell, purgatory, the last judgment, and the new heavens and the new earth.

Overall, the catechism seems to have been written in the manner of a reference book. Its treatment of themes is spare and sober, yet the ensemble of themes provides the comprehensiveness sought by the Extraordinary Synod of 1985. Here and there the treatment can be rich and suggestive, but this is not uniformly the case. At times, the structure of the catechism fragments treatments, such as mariology, that might be better left intact.

II

I would like to make a few observations, first on Christology, then on ecclesiology, finally on the stylistic issue of inclusive language.

1) The Catechism's treatment of Christology is generally a "Christology from above" and, in this, the catechism seems to reaffirm the historic Roman affinity for the Alexandrian over the Antiochene approaches to Christ. A quotation will illustrate (page 82, at 1278 ff):

How the Son of God is Man

Because the human nature belongs properly to the Son of God who has assumed it, all that he is and does in that nature does not depend upon a single man, but on one of the Trinity made man:

a) His sufferings are 'freely willed by the Son of God made man,' declares the Fifth Ecumenical Council (DS 423).

b) Concerning the ignorance of Christ (cf Mk 13.32), Pope St. Gregory the Great writes: 'The only Son incarnate, made perfect man for us, knew the day and hour of the Judgement in his human nature, and did not know it by his human nature. What he has therefore known in it, he did not know by it, for it is by the power of his divinity that God-made-man knew the day and the hour of the Judgement' (DS 475).

c) Similarly, concerning the human will of Christ, the Sixth Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople in 681, declares: 'As blessed Athanasius says, the human will had to be moved to submit to the divine will. For as his flesh is called, and is, the flesh of the Word of God, so his will is called, and is, the real will of the Word of God, as he himself says: "I came down from heaven, not to do my will,

but the will of him who sent me" (Jn 67.38)' (DS 556).

Gregory's distinction of what Christ knew in his human knowledge without necessarily knowing it by that human knowledge may be helpful in contemporary theology. Although the catechism has not used technical theological terms here, it has preserved something like what was traditionally called the infused human knowledge of Christ, while allowing the possibility that he could also learn.

Christ's personal human psychology possessed the integrity and dignity that belongs to the human being by God's act of creation. Yet at the same time, in Christ, this psychology unfolded in the closest possible harmony with the divine person of the Word, to whom it was united hypostatically. This harmony is one of the theological reasons for upholding the possibility of an infused knowledge in Christ.

Indeed, the matter is not cross-referenced in either text, but the later treatment of the vicarious atonement presupposes and continues this treatment of the humanity of Christ (page 115, at 1458):

It is 'love to the end' (Jn 13.1) that confers its value on Christ's redemption. He has known us and loved us in the offering of his life: He has 'loved me and sacrificed himself for my sake' (Gal 2.20; cf Eph 5.2.55). 'The love of Christ overwhelms us when we reflect that if one man has died for all, then all men should be dead' (2 Co 5.14). 'No man, even the holy, was in a position to take upon himself the sins of all and to offer himself in sacrifice for all...The existence in Christ of the divine person of the Son, who transcends and at the same time embraces all human persons, makes possible his redemptive death for all' (John Paul II, 28 October 1988).

The idea that Jesus knew me personally in his redemptive death is a crucial, if often unstated, part of the Church's anamnesis of that death. Our memory of Jesus is not of a person who was in his time indifferent or unaware of us in our time, but of a person who reached forward in history to embrace us each. The "Christologies from below" that have so emphasized an ignorance and a need to learn in Christ have risked severing a personal link between the individual sinner and the Redeemer.

The passages that I have just cited from the Catechism text have the advantage of giving the reader of this review a sense of the spareness of the Catechism's exposition. While theologically there may be much more to say on each of these points, the Catechism leaves that to Theologians. Its task is to state doctrine.

2) The ecclesiological themes of the Catechism are propounded with a treatment of the Holy Spirit in Section Three, Chapter Nine. The treatment begins by acknowledging that the Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen Gentium, is "the great catechetical text on the Church" (page 154, at 1613), a text to be preferred for reference. The Catechism's own treatment sets out to help in this reference "by keeping closely (sic) to the teaching of the Council." A first item to note, however, is that the Catechism's treatment follows an outline of its own.

Like Lumen Gentium, the Catechism opens with a consideration of the Church as a mystery, specifically a mystery of communion. In this, the Catechism follows a direction much favored in Rome of late, and adopted by the Extraordinary Synod of 1985. The Church is "a communion of persons, willed by God in his plan of creation, made possible by the sacrifice of Christ and by the gift of the Holy Spirit" (page 157, at 1628). The Catechism continues: "The Church is a communion of persons with God and amongst themselves" (ibidem). While this notion is compatible with the primary-group, communal experience of Avery Dulles' communion model of the Church, the Roman focus is more doctrinal and Trinitarian.

Probably the most controvertible item in this chapter is the treatment of the Kingdom of God and the Church. Here we find the following statement: "The Church (is) the Kingdom of Christ now present in a mystery' (LG 3) (page 157 at 1631." Since much recent ecclesiology has emphasized a certain disjunction of the Church and the Kingdom, a statement like this must be made carefully. The bracketing of the verb "is" left this writer uneasy.

Checking the sources, I found the following in the Flannery translation of the decrees of Vatican I: "The Church -- that is, the kingdom of Christ already present in mystery -- grows visibly through the power of God in the

world" (p. 351). Checking again, I found the original text as follows: "Ecclesia, seu regnum Christi iam praesens in mysterio, ex virtute Dei in mundo visibiliter crescit." In other words, the Catechism's treatment of this issue needs to be tightened. An interpolated verb in an appositive clause quoted out of context raises more questions than it resolves, particularly for those who know the textual history of the "subsistit" in Lumen Gentium 8b.

Like Lumen Gentium itself, the Catechism goes on to speak of the various images that scripture uses to describe the mystery of the Church, including the People of God. Finally, the Catechism organizes its remaining considerations under the headings of the four marks of the Church: grouping ecumenism with unity; church membership and mission with catholicity; and so forth. While at first I wondered at the wisdom of departing from Lumen Gentium's outline, I must confess that the synthesis of conciliar doctrine with the four-marks outline, produced an intriguing result. One thing I would like to see added to the treatment of unity and ecumenism is the fine material on the subject of dialogue available in the encyclical of Paul VI, Ecclesiam Suam, and in the Second Vatican Council's Decree on Ecumenism, Unitatis Redintegratio.

3) I think it worthwhile to say that the English translation's use of the terms "man" and "mankind" is not "oppressively sexist," as has been alleged by critics. For twenty years now, the feminists have had the field to themselves on this issue, because others did not take them seriously. In the process, they have created a widespread cultivated sensibility, a sensibility that presents itself, and is allowed to pass for, a compelling linguistic position. It is not. The feminist argument that the terms are sexist or exclusive is belied by historical fact: the terms are at worst ambiguous. The further feminist argument that the terms' ambiguity harbors a possible offense insists on an over-refinement or on an artificial clarity that can be attained only in technical language. It is no accident that inclusive language has the feel of legalese or that it has destroyed much of the poetry of traditional hymns.

Linguistic arguments aside, the argument that sensitivity and thoughtfulness

should respect the (cultivated) sensibilities of others is the argument that seems to be winning the day. Even here, however, there is a counter-argument to be made, to the effect that those who cultivate sensibility in opposition to standard usage do not thereby have the right to impose that sensibility on others, especially when those others do not share the suppositions on which the cultivation is built. Michael Levin, in Feminism and Freedom, has suggested that the inclusive language issue has as its purpose to serve as an ongoing referendum on the cultural strength of feminism. I find his suggestion persuasive. In my opinion, the Church has no business casting its vote with the feminists until, in society, a form of feminism emerges that is recognizably dissociated from contraception and abortion on demand, and until, in the Church, religious feminism becomes a less polarizing and incendiary movement.

Conclusion: I did my pre-ordination theological studies in the early seventies, at a small free-standing theologate which has since closed. One professor there taught all systematics and moral; he was (and remains) a conscientious and thoroughly competent theologian. When he had occasion in the classroom to distinguish between theological opinion and Church teaching, he was sometimes asked by students where a compilation of

Church teaching could be found. His answer was always the same: look in the index of Denzinger. Now this professor was known for a droll sense of humor, and he would have known, for instance, that even by then few students had a facility in Latin sufficient to enable their working with Denzinger. Was he really referring us to Denzinger?— or was he putting off the question? And even if he were referring us to Denzinger, why was this a matter we had to attend to on our own?

If the question where to look were to be asked today, the Catechism for the Universal Church would be a good starting place for the answer. Having felt the question once myself, I do not ridicule or condescend to those who are asking it now. The Catechism has been proposed in response to a genuinely felt need among Roman Catholics. It is an intervention that is timely and pastoral in spirit and the current consultation can lead only to its improvement and strengthening. Its program deserves to succeed.

Lawrence C. Brennan, C.M.
Academic Dean
Assistant Professor of
Systematic Theology
Kenrick-Glennon Seminary
St. Louis, Missouri

Friends of the Fellowship

William Cardinal Baum
Bernard Cardinal Law
Archbishop Anthony J. Bevilacqua
Archbishop William H. Keeler
Archbishop John F. Whealon
Bishop Anthony G. Bosco
Bishop James J. Byrne
Bishop Charles J. Chaput
Bishop William G. Connare
Bishop Thomas V. Daily
Bishop John F. Donoghue
Bishop Paul V. Dudley
Bishop Edward M. Egan
Bishop Bernard J. Flanagan
Bishop Bernard J. Garter
Bishop Norbert F. Gaughan

Bishop Hilary B. Hacker
Bishop Jerome J. Hastrich
Bishop Edward D. Head
Bishop Alfred C. Hughes
Bishop George E. Lynch
Bishop Adam J. Maida
Bishop John B. McDowell
Bishop D. W. Montrose
Bishop Stanley J. Ott
Bishop Fremiot Torres Oliver
Bishop John J. Paschang
Bishop Francis A. Quinn
Bishop Lawrence J. Riley
Bishop James C. Timlin
Bishop Paul E. Waldschmidt
Bishop Thomas J. Welsh

The Draft of the Universal Catechism Part Three: Life In Christ Section One: The Law of Christ

Rev. Paul M. Quay

The draft does well situating its treatment of the specific moral obligations of the Christian within the framework of his over-all life in Christ. Yet, at the beginning of "Life in Christ," a clear statement is needed that our initial faith and baptismal grace constitute a true birth, but only a birth, into a new life. Its powers still need to be actualized. Therefore, whatever our physical and psychic age, we have still to mature in faith and hope and charity, as well as in the natural virtues through which the theological ones are largely exercised.

I suggest a much greater emphasis on the fact that 1) this growth takes time, the entire time of our lives on earth; b) that the Christian life, whatever its successes and failures, must be seen as something that has a history; and c) that life in Christ changes in its modalities and aspects as its history unfolds due to the individual's free choices and God's grace.

To give but one example, "Article 4: Called to Holiness" should indicate how the theological virtues develop differently at different stages of a person's growth. The sort of faith proper for the spiritual child is not suitable for a person further advanced. Mature faith, e.g., enables us to know the Triune God Himself. But a child will advance by learning simple catechism statements about God and the divine Persons. The advanced will profit from meditating upon the Scripture, their revelation of the divine Majesty and the divine Love, and by the exercise of all the virtues which faith shows us as ours in Christ. Later, many enjoy a maturation of faith that is more passive on our part, more active on God's. Though such growth transcends its earlier stages, it does not cancel or annul the moral and doctrinal framework within which this growth has taken place from the beginning.

So, too, our hope is a hope for eternal life in Christ with the Spirit in the glory of the Father. But what is said in 3197-8 seems at best secondary for the Christian since it does not extend even to the level reached in the book of Wisdom. And the way in which our lives are differently colored by hope as we grow in Christ should be indicated. The same defect occurs in the treatment of charity and also the moral virtues (whether these are infused or not): 3067-8 are inadequate. Some of what is missing might be found by looking at the table of contents in Tanquerey or de Guibert.

II

The confusion of thought that frequently appears seems certain to lead to readers accepting false doctrine. E.g., the freedom due to the metaphysical constitution of man, or freedom of the will (cf. 3048a and g) is confounded with civic, political, economic freedoms (c and d) and with the exercise of freedom (b) and with informed consent (c) and with moral freedom (where God leaves one without command to act in a certain way (e, f, and g) and with the freedom of the children of God that comes only from His grace (i). Consider that material in conjunction with 3097: "Freedom enables man to keep the commands of the natural law." This might mean any of these: (1) "It is in the natural power of man's free will to keep any particular command of the natural law," which is true, or (2) "It is psychologically possible for man, without grace, to avoid grievous sin for more than a brief time" which is Semi-Pelagianism. or (3) "God has let man know the basic things he may rightly do in accord with these commands," which is true, or (4) "If and only if man is politically (or economically, or socially) free, is he able to keep these commands," which is false.

So, in 3063, the cardinal virtue of justice (the proper subject of the paragraph) is confounded with the biblical notion of justice or righteousness before God, which goes far beyond the cardinal virtue and the natural order to that of grace. It takes no great theological imagination to see what handle this might give to a renewal of Jansenism or Pelagianism, depending on the reader's bent.

Article 3212, should recognize that an increased companionship and union with Jesus in the fullness of His resurrected glory count for something in sacramental support for one's growth in Christ.

The material on man's freedom and his responsibility seems to ignore the role of psychological repression and of man's unconscious in his decisions. Some advertance to these is called for since the current denial by so many of man's freedom or responsibility is rooted in misunderstandings of the importance of the psychological findings. Thus, in 3057, one might say something like: "Man is responsible for his choices when he has adequate knowledge of what it is he is doing and its objective moral quality and when, though he may be buffeted, he is not governed by irrational drives or mere feeling."

III

The most basic defect of the Draft seems to be making its goal two incompatible purposes: (a) it is to be "a compendium of the whole of Catholic doctrine...to serve as a point of reference for catechisms or compendia which will be composed in different regions" and (b) "the presentation should be biblical and liturgical, offering sound doctrine and being well adapted to the daily lives of Christians." Item (a) seems to be paramount if one may judge it by Cardinal Law's original call for it, the covering letter of Cardinal Ratzinger, and its title: "Catechism for the Universal Church" (henceforth: CUC). But item (b) *presentation* of that doctrine useful for Christians' daily lives (therefore, concretely adapted to a given region or people) seems the business not of the CUC but of those catechisms or compendia that are to use the CUC as their point of reference.

Hence, I suggest: Let the CUC concern itself *solely* with the goal of providing a compendium of Catholic doctrine that will serve

as a doctrinal norm for all other Catholic catechisms or compendia of Church teachings. For this, there is needed the maximum of clarity (compatible with the subject matter, which always remains a part of the mystery of God). The style, in consequence, should be as precise and carefully qualified as possible, with all appropriate distinctions; hence, it will be a little dry. Technical language may often be required; and the resulting document will not be so easily read to those without some theological training.

It should contain, as appendices or notes, brief but adequate indications of the reasons for the Church's positions in the light of biblical thought, its development by the Fathers, local and ecumenical Councils, the Magisterium, and the life of Christians. In addition, it should give full and careful citation and reference to detailed arguments by the great theologians of various schools that are acceptable presentations of the doctrines in question.

Miscellaneous quotations from the Scriptures and the Saints and Councils are distracting and unhelpful. But there should be an adequate outline of the Church's understanding of the scriptural, patristic, liturgical, and other Traditional evidence, so that the regional catechisms will be able easily to choose aspects and evidence that will speak most forcefully to their own people. *The Universal Catechism should be a sort of gold mine of doctrine and its bases in revelation, a mine from which can be quarried the materials needed for more particular needs, interests, and cultures.*

A difficult question that the Draft has not properly dealt with is this: how can such a compendium be composed that is not couched in the characteristic thought-patterns of one or other legitimate school of Catholic theology? The seeming confusion of thought that almost all commentators have noted in the Draft stems in large measure, I think, from an unsuccessful effort to give a coherent voice to a number of different theological approaches. I tentatively suggest that there is no way to avoid the difficulty; and, hence, that one basic vocabulary and doctrinal orientation be overtly adopted -- one with as broad a base of agreement and understanding as possible -- and that a section devoted to the Church's teaching explain the legitimacy, indeed need, for many diverse

schools. (A possible phrasing of this is given in the footnote (1) below.)

The major schools should then be (non-exclusively) praised. Those currents of thought that have proven erroneous and harmful should be set aside (preferably not by name but by indication of their objectionable traits.) Thus, the CUC could serve also as a mine from which to quarry information on acceptable alternative ways of understanding and expressing the common doctrine. Obviously, as a catechism, the fewer the areas of major divergence between the schools that are presented in the main text, the better. But copious references to such legitimate divergences in the notes or appendices would be of great value to the regional compositors.

It seems essential, if these suggestions are to be of help, that much more time be allotted to the composition of the CUC than seems to be envisioned at present. The CUC need not be prepared in haste. While time is important, the Vatican has already made clear Catholic doctrine on most points that are in controversy today.

IV

Since I have had access only to ##3001-3231 of the Draft, the following comments may find their adequate response in other parts of the Draft.

Nothing in the numbers mentioned suggests a connection between maturation in Christ or growth in His grace and the faithful carrying out of the duties of their states in life. There is nothing, here at least, concerning the way in which a layman grows in perfection through the charity with which he labors to transform the world according to Christ. Nor is there any indication here that marriage, as a

sacramental covenant, represents a mutual commitment to *grow* in oneness and familial love. Nor is there here any mention of the religious state and its special contribution to maturation in the love and service of the Lord. Indeed, the whole matter of God's call to each Christian and the latter's personal response to it is omitted, though this is of supreme importance in growth in Christ.

All through this Section, there should be a greater sense that growth in Christ means growth as an active member in His Body, the Church. But, also, strong emphasis seems called for on the apostolic aspects of every Christian's life, however various the modes of apostolic life may be. Every Catholic is called to witness before men to the truth of the faith, to Christ and to His Church — first and foremost by good example in deed, but never neglecting the need to witness by word also, in accord with Christian prudence and the exigencies of charity. The interactions, often painful, that result from such witnessing are to be seen as a part of the Christian's life and perhaps the best of all stimuli to personal growth in Christ.

Also missing is an indication of the role of corporal penance in the maturation of a Christian, especially important in the earlier stages of spiritual growth, coupled with an explanation as to how one may never rightly see it as more than a token of an inner attitude at any stage.

There are very many important points of wording to be dealt with, but that is a task for those who have all the text before them.

Paul M. Quay, S.J.
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

(1) No type of theology can represent the entire faith of the Church without distortion. Yet a particular theology is not false if it provides God's truth to one who knows its purpose and particular perspective, how to use it, and what its limitations are. A theology is like a map. No map can, in principle, represent the surface of the earth, without distortion. What kind of distortion is permitted will depend on the precise purpose of a particular type of map. A map is not false if it gives true information to those who understand its use. Those theologies constitute false doctrine which, when used consistently, generate basic areas of disagreement with the teaching of the Church.

Draft of the Universal Catechism: The Spiritual Life

Rev. Thomas Dubay, S.M.

The section of the draft assigned to this writer deals with human dignity and freedom, moral conscience and responsibility, the virtues and sin, the natural and evangelical laws, and the call to holiness. The most appealing trait of the text is that it represents not the private views and agenda of pressure groups, but the mind of the universal Church. That there has been much expressed unhappiness with the draft was to be expected: that is the lot of religious and moral truth. Yet this is not to suggest that the present text is perfect, that all criticisms are ill-founded. Indeed we have been invited to point out deficiencies and omissions.

I may begin with lesser defects and then proceed to more serious ones. There are a few printer's errors: #3006: Mt 5:47 should be 5:48; #3007: Mt 7:13 should read 7:14; #3072: "...cast off disobedience..." is erroneous; the 'dis' should be omitted.

I find a lack of clarity in #3048a: it is not clear to me what the meaning of the sentence may be, namely, freedom "is the source of our moral faith." There are a number of awkward expressions: #3048c: "Freedom can also be on the plane of human relationships." Better would be "freedom also operates on the plane..." Reference #3081: Venial sin "offends the divine order and prefers created things." It is the person who prefers, not the sin. Better: venial sin offends the divine order "and implies a preference for created things." #3083: "Conversion purifies the heart and trust in the mercy of God." Conversion does not trust; we do. Better: "By conversion our heart is purified and we trust in the mercy of God."

Two formulations are incomplete, almost inaccurate. #3048g: "In exercising his freedom man decides for himself and forms himself." Better: "...forms or deforms himself." #3048h: "Sin is the great proof of freedom." Yes, sin proves freedom, but defectively, by no means splendidly. Just as a man gasping for breath after a heart attack proves he is still living, so sin proves freedom but in a highly deficient way. A

much better proof is the choice of good in the face of allurements to evil.

Another statement is misleading: #3057 asserts that when a person "acts with his whole mind and full freedom, he is responsible for his deeds." This should read: "...he is fully responsible for his deeds." There is such a thing as partial responsibility due to acting with less than full freedom.

More serious deficiencies occur in #3215 and #3216. In the former we read:

Spiritual progress leads to an increasingly intimate union with God. This union which may be reached to a high degree, is called the mystical life. God gives this to those he chooses in order to manifest the gratuitousness of his gifts.

This formulation lacks full accord with the teaching of Vatican Council II regarding the universal call to holiness. The council insists that all the faithful are to be perfect (LG #40), that everyone is to experience deep, infused prayer during the liturgy (SC #2), that the faithful of all ranks and status are called to the fullness of Christian life and love (LG #40). Active religious without exception are assumed to be "thoroughly imbued with the treasures of mysticism" (AG #18), and both diocesan and religious priests are to "abound in contemplation." (LG #41). Little of this, one would discern in #3215 in the draft. While Vatican II repeatedly assumes that contemplative prayer is meant for everyone, #3215 suggests that this full union with God may be reached by some, the implication of which seems to be that others may not be called to it. While it is true that God gives advanced prayer to whom He will, it is also true, as Saints John of the Cross and Teresa of Jesus, insist, that he does bestow it unfailingly on those who love him adequately (Teresa) that is, wherever there is room in our souls (John).

(continued on page 26)

Comments on Selected Portions of the Universal Catechism

Dr. Janet Smith

General Comments:

1. Sometimes the "in briefs" make points not made in the body of the text and sometimes they do not include some of the most important points made in the body of the text. It would also be useful to have a reference at the end of the "in brief" to designate which section of the text treats the subject of the summary statement.

2. More cross-referencing would be useful. Sometimes one may think a treatment is inadequate, not realizing a fuller discussion will appear elsewhere. Cross-referencing may enable the authors to abbreviate some discussions for it seems several topics are treated in several sections; for instance, treatment of the divorced and remarried Catholic. Some topics are closely related and ought to be cross-referenced. For instance, the portions on marriage as a sacrament should be cross-referenced with the discussion on the fourth commandment. Indeed, the discussions are somewhat redundant of one another; again, this is not an isolated phenomenon.

3. More introductory sections would be useful. For instance, the discussions on each commandment should be preceded by mention of what topics are covered under each commandment and why.

4. Translate all the Latin quotations (though still cite them in Latin).

5. In the condemnations of immoral actions, sometimes reasons are given and sometimes not, and sometimes the reasons given are not the strongest ones but are a bit idiosyncratic.

6. Undoubtedly there will be criticism of the Catechism for using "sexist language". Perhaps that criticism could be deflected somewhat by having an explanation in the prologue that the Catechism will be using the convention of language that the word "man" refers inclusively to both men and women unless the context makes clear that it is referring exclusively to males.

More Detailed Comments:

0111: I find peculiar the failure to mention Protestantism as a great world religion.

0119: Speaking of Christ as the "only way" of salvation has given rise to all kinds of confusion in the past. It is true that salvation would not have been possible without Christ, but it is also true that some who are not Christians are saved. This "in brief" will certainly be misunderstood as meaning that none other than Christians are saved.

0129: The citations here could be better. Too much emphasis on man's "intellectual nature" (which moderns always misunderstand as representing intellectuals rather than all men). Better supporting statements should be found.

0131: A proof that God exists does not yet tell us much about God. It is revelation that tells us God had a chosen people and a Son, etc. The possibility of a personal relationship is also not known upon "proof" but I think some of the facts of salvation history should be stated here.

0147: I do not have the text of Vatican I before me, but does it say we can know God as Creator and Lord on the basis of natural reason? We can know God, but it is revelation that tells us that He is creator and Lord.

1188: I am a bit uncomfortable with talk of the human being being a "duality of soul and body". 1191 speaks of the soul as the form of the body and that is more precise. Perhaps here one could speak of the human person who is made up of a unity of body and soul. Omit the word "duality"; the whole western tradition of philosophy since Descartes at least has been fighting whether man is essentially a unity of body and soul or a duality of body and soul. Even the first sentence might better read: "Man created in the image of God is a spiritual and corporeal being."

1190: I think the resurrection of the body should be made more explicit.

1191: Omit "duality" here as well.

1192: A little expansion here (or elsewhere) on the meaning of "rational" might be helpful. Moderns tend to think of "rational" as identical with impersonal logic as opposed to being a term which embraces fully man's distinctive capacities as a creature that is able to think, and be creative, and intuitive, and noble. "Rationality" is often thought to be in tension with several of these abilities, rather than to be the root of them.

1197: Reference should be made to some of the passages in *Gaudium et Spes* about "communion of persons." Perhaps something should be said here about the notion that man and woman make a "gift of themselves to each other."

1211: The immediacy of the creation of the soul by God is very important and should be made more of in 1191.

1322: This may be an exceedingly odd suggestion but perhaps something needs to be said to allay the widespread misconception that the "immaculate" conception means that Mary was conceived without sexual intercourse between her parents. Bishops don't make this mistake, surely, but some of their staff will. 1322b should make the freedom from original sin more explicit.

1333: Again, it may not be the purpose of the catechism to waylay all foolish misconceptions but perhaps somewhere in this section it should be noted that Mary was a virgin at conception not because sexual intercourse is sinful but because God is the father of Christ and thus there could be no earthly father. At 1341ff. the fatherhood of God is made clear but perhaps it also would be good to make clear that virginity is not a good because sexuality is inherently sinful.

1483: I think there should be an "in brief" that Christ did not free the damned from Hell when He went there.

2802: Perhaps some introductory section is needed here to sort out the different teachings on marriage; in the created order; after the fall; under the new law; as a paradigm for God's relation to his people; for Christ's relationship to his Church (2806 3). Maybe this subtitle should be "Marriage after the Fall."

a) The third sentence here is perhaps misleading. It says that "from the beginning" the union of man and woman has been menaced and soiled by disorder..." But it was not so from the beginning but only after the fall. Something should be said in the prior section on the created order about how the union was harmonious and without sin before the fall.

2809: Although it is implicit, perhaps it should be made explicit that marriage has two different "forms" under the law, for there are two laws - the old and the new. Perhaps the subtitle at 2809, 4 should be "Marriage Under the Pedagogy of the Old Law."

2811: This section should have an introductory sentence stating that throughout the old testament, marriage is portrayed in a positive light as a deep interpersonal relationship that also contributes to salvation history.

2820: Virginity should perhaps be treated after the treatment on marriage is complete. I think it needs fuller treatment.

Perhaps mention should be made of spiritual parenthood and the special contribution that celibates make to the Church. And perhaps there could be a call for the need that attention be given to the needs of the single (much as mention is made below of the need for particular attention to the divorced). Discussions on virginity and celibacy do not seem to have a natural place in this catechism.

2833: Why a Latin subtitle?

2829: I am waiting for a definition of marriage. (Is it to be found in 2846; isn't this the cart after the horse?) Is it sufficient to say that it is the "consent of the couple" that constitutes a marriage? How technical is the word "constitutes"? Something needs to be said soon about consummation.

2856: Canon Law seems to say that the consummation of marriage does not take place until there is an uncontracepted act of sexual intercourse. If this is so, it should be stated, I think. Perhaps here? Still no mention of consummation!

2859: Shouldn't something be said here about how contraception violates the good of fruitfulness (much as adultery and divorce violates the good of fidelity)? Much is said below

about how the divorced should be given particular attention. Shouldn't particular attention be given to contraceptors; to try to teach them the truth of the Church's teaching and to help them discern how they are relating to a Church from which they dissent? A balance would be good here.

2864: Shouldn't mention be made of those who have been abandoned by their spouses and who never remarry? About how they offer a particularly worthy witness to the indissolubility of marriage and deserve particular support? Many do not consider this living of a celibate life possible.

I think the section on the essential properties of marriage should precede the sections on the celebration and preparation, etc. of marriage. No mention is made of impediments to marriage. Some survey of these should be given or at least reference should be made to canon law. This section shows little sign of the influence of *Gaudium et Spes* and its references to mutual self-giving, etc.

2872: The pronouns in this section aren't clear. Is the referent always the sacrament of marriage or marriage? For instance, the sentence (fragment) that reads "Hence the difficulties, but also the graces of the sacrament." Is it the graces of the sacrament that have "difficulties" or marriage that has difficulties? Should the next sentence read "If it (marriage) bears the imprint, it (marriage?, the sacrament?) is nonetheless the sin..."

2878, 2879: Shouldn't something be said about consummation?

2822: The distinction should be made between those who divorce and remarry and those who divorce and do not remarry.

3031: Shouldn't "received" in baptism be "receives?"

3044: Much more needs to be said about formation of the conscience in light of the Church's teaching. Illustrations based on references here to teachings on social justice and contraception would be most useful since it is here that many Catholics have difficulty with the Church's teaching and the formation of their consciences.

3048a: This paragraph is fraught with problems. Freedom is the power to initiate

actions reflecting truth and goodness - when it is used properly. It is also the power to initiate actions that are evil. And why speak of reflecting the truth and goodness within us rather than simply truth and goodness? Nor is freedom the source of our moral faith. Faith is a gift and comes from God. Freedom allows us to respond to that gift. Nor is it, properly speaking, freedom that makes man aware of the possibility of failure and sin; the intellect does this.

3050: Saying that conformity with the "objective norms" of morality is not wrong, but may not be sufficient. Where does one get these norms? Later in 3058, mention is made of the "natural order willed by God." That seems more accurate to me and should be mentioned in the body of the text as well as in the "in brief". This section needs more development. Mention might be made of right reason and what that entails and of the natural law. Or at least it needs to point forward to sections 3091ff.

3051: Perhaps the last sentence should read: "they cannot make an act which is intrinsically bad into one which is good."

3052: The last sentence: a bad intention diminishes and sometimes negates the moral worth of an action in itself good.

3056: I don't know that our age is more aware than any other group. I suspect it's equally true that our age is as fiercely individualistic and atomistic as any age.

3063: The emphasis on the nonviolent nature of justice is peculiar. Generally the first definition is the "rendering unto each what is his due."

3066: It wouldn't hurt to mention that prudence is often called practical wisdom.

3067: It is curious to speak of virtues "achieving mastery". They help man achieve mastery and help man develop an aptitude to good.

3085: There is an effort here to distinguish between individual sin and collective sin but it is not done clearly.

3090: It seems there should be mention of collective sin in the "in brief".

3092: This section seems to place the natural law too firmly within the conscience and

not enough in the nature of the world as well. That is, it seems to me that the primary precept of natural law is written into man's conscience (as a kind of innate idea) but that there are many prohibitions derived from the natural law that man can only know through experience. It doesn't seem right to speak of these as "engraved" in his heart. Maybe it is wrong to think of what is "engraved" on the heart as "innate ideas" but so it sounds. I do not think the precepts of natural law are innate ideas; I think the mind naturally assents to them since they conform to the order of nature.

3093: It is strange to think that the decalogue is the same as the natural law - this suggests that we have the Ten Commandments written on our hearts. Do we? Or are these commandments easily derivable by any man who reflects upon his experience.

3094: Thomas made a lot of statements about what the natural law is (see the Treatise on Law) that don't perfectly conform with this statement. I suspect the "natural law" is a many-faceted ability of our mind to discern what is right and wrong. Reference should be made to St 1-II, 94.2 where he talks about the "order of the precepts of natural law" following the order of natural inclinations.

This section needs to say something about natural law and the laws of nature. Is there any connection? How do we come to know the precepts of natural law? Are they "engraved in our hearts" and "written on our conscience?"

3100: The line of thought in this paragraph is not clear. One expects a justification for the claim that the magisterium has a mission to interpret the natural law but what one gets is a further distinguishing of natural law from other laws.

3103: There should be an "in brief" about the Church's competency to teach and interpret natural law.

3104: Somewhere in this section should be the portrayal of law as a gift from God - a gift of guidance that will lead man to happiness. Moderns tend to view law as the imposition of a tyrant or as the arbitrary impositions of man. Something needs to be said about how splendid law is as a teaching tool and how it fosters, not inhibits, human well being.

3112: Is this a standard interpretation of the sabbath rest - as for servants and slaves? It may have a particular benefit for them, but is this its primary purpose?

3115: I think there should be mention of the liberating power of law in the "in briefs".

3119: Doesn't he make it a bit tougher - lust as well as adultery is wrong, hatred as well as murder? It is less burdensome not in itself but because we have the grace of Christ to assist us.

3140: Nothing is said about the fruits of the Holy Spirit.

3147: Again, I think this section is vague about what the natural law is.

3454: The remarks about marriage being a covenant relationship do not seem to belong to this section which should be about the obligations that one has to parents and perhaps by extension to all those in authority.

3463: The sections that suggest that society must support the family are interesting and true, but is this properly speaking "Church teaching" and church teaching that falls under the Fourth Commandment? This seems a bit inventive to me but plausible. Sections 3486 deal with this point much more clearly and legitimately it seems.

The following paragraphs about duties to the weak and vulnerable seem to be quite stretching the bounds of the Commandment. We have those obligations but under the Fourth Commandment?

3503: This discussion of celibacy seems out of place here.

3519: Rather than conscience, perhaps one wants to say "natural law" or "fundamental human rights".

3539: This call for censorship is peculiar and seems jarring.

3540: The command, if stated sufficiently precisely, need never be "set aside". It should be "Thou shalt not Murder", that is, "though shalt not deliberately and directly kill the innocent." This formulation admits no exception.

The first sentence more precisely stated might be "There are two situations when the command not to kill does not apply."

3541: I don't think it is good to speak of the "instincts" of scripture.

3545-49: Something might be said in this section, perhaps at 3549, of the attempts of many philosophers to change the definition of when life ends (neocortical brain death criteria) in order to facilitate various actions, such as euthanasia and organ transplants.

3548: I am happy enough to call the embryo at the earliest stages of its development a person, but the Church has been reluctant to do so to date. It says that it must be treated as a person, but does not say that it must be "recognized" as a personal being.

3555: The meaning of "Collective Sins" is not clear. Does it refer to sins against collectivities or sins by collectivities?

3573: Very Important: The Church condemns all "contraceptive" methods. It allows some methods of birth control or regulation of birth. It would seem most appropriate to cite Humanae Vitae 1.1, here to the effect that "each and every marital act must remain in itself ordained to the transmission of new human life." It would be wise to point out that this has been the constant teaching of the Church and has been repeatedly reiterated by synods of bishops and official documents of the Church. Gaudium et Spes 51 should also be cited to the effect that:

When it is a question of harmonizing married love with the responsible transmission of life, it is not enough to take only the good intention and the evaluation of motives into account; the objective criteria must be used; criteria drawn from the nature of the human person and human acts; criteria which respect the total meaning of mutual self-giving and human procreation in the context of true love; all this is possible only if the virtue of married chastity is seriously practiced.

I find this section very disappointing for here I think Vatican II has led to great progress in our understanding of why contraception is wrong. Pope John Paul II has made a major contribution. Reference should be made to his

discussions on "language of the body." Familiaris Consortio was cited extensively in the sections on the Fourth Commandment; it should be cited here to the effect that "contraceptive sex is a lie" (cf. FC 11, 32). (John Paul II uses these very words, I believe, in some speech.)

But since this section is about sins against life, I think it should be explained in more detail how contraception is a sin against life. Let me suggest two ways. 1) Certainly it should be mentioned that some of the most popular forms of contraception such as the IUD and most forms of the pill are abortifacients, that is they work by causing early term abortions (the IUD always, the pill occasionally). 2) Furthermore, as it was mentioned in an earlier section, God is the immediate creator of each and every human life. Couples who use contraception are refusing to cooperate with God in the transmission of human life; they are excluding God from an arena where he might act to bring forth new life. The Pope makes this argument and it is an important one, and highly suitable to a discussion on the fifth commandment. (Perhaps 3608 belongs here along with further comment.)

3580ff.: There is nothing in the "in briefs" about contraception.

3605: It is unfortunate to split up the discussion on contraception into two parts. It can be done - for as I suggested above, under the Fifth Commandment it can be described as an offense against life, and here it can be described as an offense against marriage, but it should be made very clear in each section that there is a discussion elsewhere (a simple "cf." will not do) or an effort should be made to bring these discussions together.

It should be pointed out that John Paul II teaches that contraception violates the unitive as well as the procreative meaning of sexual intercourse, which seems all the more to make it an offense against the Sixth Commandment which is the commandment that protects the good of sexuality.

Most everything that I said about 3573 above applies here. This discussion about contraception is extremely minimal and does not take into account the advances in our understanding since Vatican II.

I am really surprised to read no mention of methods of Natural Family Planning and their acceptability. John Paul II makes a great deal of

how the use of NFP develops the virtue of self-mastery, how it makes for better marriages and stronger families, and more virtuous and generous Christians. All this should be mentioned.

Mention should be made of the need for the Church to give support to couples trying to live by the Church's teaching and of the Church's need to do all it can to make these methods more widely known; of the horror of some states (like China) using coercive methods to force couples to use contraceptive measures.

Although sterilization was mentioned very briefly in the section on the Fifth Commandment as a form of self-mutilation, since it is one of the most popular forms of contraception, it should be mentioned and condemned here.

The Catechism has not been shy about rebuking modern society for materialism and hedonism; it should not be shy about chastising many modern couples for limiting their family size largely for selfish reasons.

3612: This subtitle doesn't seem to work. Perhaps it should be "The Problem of Infertility".

3614: In vitro fertilization should be mentioned along with artificial insemination and surrogate motherhood.

3629: "Free love" seems unnecessarily colloquial to me especially since usually there is very little "love" involved. "Premarital sexual intercourse" or "promiscuity" would be more appropriate. Dangers of unwanted pregnancies, abortion and the considerable psychological trauma experienced by those involved in such relationships should perhaps be mentioned.

3630: There is a third category between promiscuity and "trial marriage" and that is the sexual relationships of the engaged or about to be engaged. They do not live together but they do on occasion have sexual intercourse. Since even many priests countenance this, it should be mentioned and warned against.

3632: I think at least one sentence should be given for the reason of the immorality of homosexual behavior. Perhaps some mention of AIDS should be made in this section

on the need for preaching against behavior that leads to its spread, and on the need for compassionate care of sufferers of AIDS.

3633: The distinction is not made clearly enough between homosexual tendencies and homosexual behavior.

3634: Rape may not be the best example since most in the sociological professions now think of rape not as a sexual crime but as a violent one.

3635: Again, some reason should be given for the immorality of masturbation. For instance, it makes solitary what should be a mutual act.

3639: In many other sections advice is given to those in the public sector. Perhaps those in the entertainment industry could use a warning in this section for promoting immodesty and giving relentless occasion for lust.

3658: Something specific should be said about the condemnation of contraception here.

3660: Something specific should be said about in vitro fertilization, artificial insemination and surrogacy.

Something specific should be said about the wrong of homosexual acts, masturbation, incest, etc.

3665: "The seizure of his person" is too vague. It is said below that this is an absolute right. What about arrest for crimes committed. Is this "seizure of person"? I suspect this is a technical term which I also suspect is not widely understood. It seems in the rest of the section that what is being protected is the "dignity" of the person which should never be violated. That seems to me to be true but it needs to be made much clearer. Some rights flow from this dignity, such as rights to food, shelter, etc. These we must always respect. We need to hear that there are some things that can never be done to another because it violates man's fundamental dignity, such as torture or mandatory sterilization. These rights can never be forfeited no matter how bad one's behavior.

3669: The exact referent of "this right" is not clear.

(continued on page 27)

Catechism: Part Three - "Life in Christ"

Rev. George W. Rutler

The entire Catechism, in one sense, succeeds or fails according to the section on spiritual life, for it is to the economy of interiority that doctrine is directed. The text of Part Three recognized this at the start by quoting Gal 5.6: "What matters is faith that expresses itself in love." Right here there should be a dogmatic definition of perfection and its distinction from "goodness" in the account of our Lord (cf. Luke 18.19; Matt. 5.48). The proper delineation of justification by faith, later treated in the text (3006) has its primary definition in these dominical texts.

The ontological reality of man created in the image of God is not identical with conformity to "the image of the Son" (Rm. 8.29), for the latter is a condition of baptismal regeneration. While this is explained in Chapter One (3018 - 3019) some indication should be given here (3005) to prevent confusion in the reference to mirroring the image which has been renewed. The citation should read Mt 5.48 not Mt 5.47 (3006).

The assertion of the Draft about modern difficulty in moral judgments is debatable. While there are more complicated problems particularly in scientific and moral decisions, this smacks of the novus ordo seclorum rhetoric in, for example, some of Gaudium et Spes and Paul VI's address on the eve of the closing of Vatican II, which has been misused by not a few commentators to set "modern man" up as an almost distinct ontological reality. And a tendency to "chronological arrogance," confusing secular optimism with Christian hope, crops up again in the unqualified assertion (3056): "Our age, more than any other, is aware of the group, of the links which bind people together." Such generalizations limp in the face of reality and are best omitted.

The greatest strength of Chapter III may be the treatment of the life of the virtues. So long neglected in recent catechesis, this section is admirably concise, and would not be hurt by slight expansion. Among the natural virtues, prudence should logically come first as the "mother" of the moral virtues (cf. J Pieper: The Cardinal Virtues, p. 39; St. John Chrysostom: Hom. in S. Matt., 33; S.Th. II-II, q. 49, a.6). If Proverbs is cited, so also should Luke 2.47. There is no reason why Scriptural evidences for the natural virtues should be reserved to the Old

Testament. And if Wisdom 8 provides a proof text (3062), acknowledgement of St. Augustine's synthesis of the same would be helpful, especially as it provides an alternative to the more mechanical listings of the Manualists (cf. eg. St. Augustine: De Moribus Ecclesiae I, 25, 46). The summary speaks of "greek (sic) tradition" when it would be more accurate to speak of "Greek traditions" in tribute to the diverse Socratic, Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic notions (3070).

To prevent confusion, some reference should be made here to the existence of the infused virtues which are treated considerably later (3190 ff). To aid in memorization, a list of the cardinal and infused virtues could be given at least in the cross reference to the natural virtues in 3190.

Surely this would be the place for mentioning the seven deadly sins, as well. In fact it is quite astonishing not to find them here.

There could well be added here specific explanation of why "fundamental option" theory is a wrong account of the economy of consent mentioned here in 3075, along with mention of material and formal qualities of sinful actions, lest the only distinction be that between mortal and venial acts (3076). Retention of the mortal/venial terminology is thank-worthy, and could not be over-emphasized, given its neglect these past years.

Given the above, the section on the sacrament of penance (3084) is lame without mention of the ascetical benefits derived from confession of venial sins, and the tradition of frequent devotional confession in cultivating the life of the virtues. This theme has been revived in "Reconciliatio et Penitentio" and numerous documents of Pope John Paul II.

If not here, then certainly in the section on the sacraments, a consistent name for Confession should be explained. Here (3084) "sacrament of penance" is used, which is preferable to "sacrament of reconciliation." However, the text is inconsistent in speaking of the "sacrament of reconciliation" below (3213). The former describes reconciliation with the Church, and the latter with God. But both are incorrect renderings of Katallasso. One is reconciled to the Church and God. It is not a

suburbanized agreement not to disagree, but a contrite response to judgment. Culpability rests in the penitent and in the Church (cf Rom 5.10,e).

Without weakening the admirable conciseness of Article 2 on natural law, the confusion about whether or not certain matters pertaining to natural law (e.g., contraception) need to be dogmatically defined to be authentic could be addressed here (3099 - 3100). The economy of divine revelation in relation to natural law which needs to be "confirmed and completed" does not require that natural law itself be dogmatically defined; the essence of natural law is that it defines itself through the appeal of natural evidence to conscience. This is a good opportunity for teaching which should not be missed. It has even more specific application in the subsection on "The Church and the natural law" under Article 5: "The Prophetic Function of the Church."

Article 4 on The New Law could be supported by reference to the Transfiguration.

We need a style guide to capitalization especially touching upon those words where the small case alters meaning: e.g., "gospel (sic) and catholic (sic) tradition" (3156). Cf. also "christian (sic)" (3158 and 3159).

Stronger citations on the subject of lay witness are to be found in, e.g., St. Francis de Sales, Introduction to the Devout Life, I, 3, 19-20; St. John Chrysostom: Homily 4 (On the Prophetess Hannah); St. Bernard: Sermon 17; St. Basil the Great: On the Holy Spirit, 9; and the contemporary teaching of John Paul II: Homily, 26 Oct. 1980.

There is need in Chapter Three, as in the entire treatment of Christology as well, to treat more radically and specifically the significance of the Fatherhood of God and the nature of the divine Sonship as it bears on the charisms of human sexuality cf. esp. (3169). What is the particular connotation of the address "Abba" for the Father?

The gifts of the Holy Spirit should be listed here (3185) or cross-referenced elsewhere in the text.

Why is "charity" used as the translation here for "love" (3199-3201, 3204)?

The summary section on the way of perfection is thin, and could be supported by

noble citations (cf. eg. St Gregory of Nyssa: Homily on Virginity; and S.Th., 3, q.45, a.1c.) It is rash to move from a brief allusion to asceticism, to a commendation of martyrdom without a lengthier treatment of the science of corporal and interior mortification (3216-3217). The distinction in the text is unclear. Helpful references would include: Pope Leo XIII: The Practice of Humility, 34; St. John Vianney: Sermon on Penitence; St. Augustine, Sermon 13, Clement of Alexandria: Stromata 5; and, by way of summary, Benedict XIV's On the Beatification of Saints, III. On the whole subject of sanctification, the Roman Catechism III, 78; and S.Th. II-II, q. 180, a.4c. certainly are classical references in support of modern Conciliar texts (eg. AA,4; LG, 11).

The gratuitous reference to businessmen (3225) is a glib job of stereotyping; tends to a sentimentalism about childlike love which is inconsistent with the integrity of perfection, and certainly appears at variance with the parables on the costs of discipleship (Luke 14:28-33). Extrapolation of St. Basil slights the meaning of divine justice and spiritual rewards, offends what has been said of the virtues by identifying prudence with calculation, and implies an acrobatic "leap of faith" which vaults over reason (cf. 2 Ch. 15.7; Jer.31.16; Matt. 6.4; Matt. 16,27; Phil. 3.14).

On the whole matter of citations, there should be some canon or explanation for the choice of texts. The references to Vatican II would be greatly enriched, and the development of doctrine more vividly shown, by citing more generously the ample riches of earlier Councils; Vatican I on Revelation, for example. The use of Trent and Vatican I by the constitutions of Vatican II needs to inform the apparatus of Part Three, particularly in the treatment of the saints: cf., eg. LG 50.

As for style, occasional passages sound like ICEL prayers.

Translation of the whole catechism will lend itself to criticism if it is not revised by persons with a better command of the English language and a distaste for the poeise which afflicts the text in moments of unguarded exuberance.

Rev. George W. Rutler
Church of St. Agnes
New York

The Draft of the Universal Catechism: Vague, Wordy, and Wimpy

Paul C. Vitz

The word "catechism" originally meant oral instruction in the faith, the instruction being based on a simple summary of doctrine. Such instruction was often in a question and answer form. But if something like that is what you expected from the draft of the new Universal Catechism, you are in for a disappointment. Instead the Vatican has given us a compendium - an abstract comprehensive theological summary of the essential topics of Catholic faith and morals. There is nothing simple or memorable about it. The summary found in the part that I have read is written for those with education, who like to read, and with the patience to stick with it. As an example of abstract, wordy and ambiguous language, take the third paragraph of the first chapter:

More profoundly still, man recognizes that he depends upon a first source of life that has brought him into being, maintains him in existence and takes care of him beyond death. Man expresses his dependence, this fundamental condition of his life, spontaneously in primordial religious rites dealing with fecundity and birth, food and subsistence, the life of the community, death and survival. He expresses them in myths. Reflection on God and on human life is born from the womb of religions.

The implications of this paragraph are hardly Catholic. Permeated with a non-biblical optimism about primitive and other religions, it sounds like the description for a college course on "Comparative Religions." Moreover, countless modern skeptics would reject the first sentence: unlike the "man" cited, they do not recognize dependence on any first source of life, or on any divine entity whatsoever. The next to the last sentence refers to common beliefs in an afterlife, whose reality many Jews and other non-Christians deny. The last sentence is also most unconvincing: what of Buddhism and other non-theistic religions, which have no true notion of God? The paragraph's bland support for "natural religion" ignores the religion of Satan-worship and fails to acknowledge those who are "spontaneously" engaged in human sacrifice. The concept of God's revelation -- from the

beginning of human history -- and of that revelation's persistent degradation as a result of our fallen nature is totally absent in this paragraph. The whole thing reeks of latitudinarianism and sows the seeds of religious relativism.

This catechism is not written for the average adult catechumen, much less for children. Rather, it is aimed at trusty theologians, especially those who have the responsibility to put together or approve national or diocesan catechisms. Apparently each country -- possibly each diocese -- will be composing its own more concrete and "culturally contextualized" catechism in the near future. This is where I get even more nervous. For example, the prologue explicitly asks the question: "What is the purpose of this catechism?" and answers: "it is intended to serve as a point of reference for the catechisms or compendia that are drawn up in different regions." Good grief! What does "a point of reference" mean? Does it, for example, mean that those who might prefer two or four members to the Trinity, rather than three, can justifiably feel they have some leeway? (You think this sounds crazy? Jews and Muslims would be quite comfortable with two; Carl Jung, connoisseur of myths and world religions, using the Trinity as a "point of reference," voted for four -- though he waffled between the Devil and the Virgin for the open slot...) And what about those who might wish to shift the definition of the Trinity to "Mother, Daughter and Holy Spiritess?" In a word, such guidelines for those who will make up new "local" catechisms are so vague as to hardly act as guiding lines at all! This is my deepest concern: why are such open-ended instructions all that is given?

If the Vatican believes that, in fact, a relatively short basic universal catechism is not possible, then it -- they -- should say so and defend such a view. It is my understanding that the production of exactly such a catechism was the charge of the committee in question. And, for example, is it really more difficult to provide a short universal liturgy -- the Mass?

(continued on page 27)

Items of Interest

A Startling Contrast: Hans Kung and Cardinal De Lubac - Who will be the Theologian of the Third Millennium?

Since the publication of To Be a Christian, Hans Kung has been focusing more and more on questions of fundamental theology.

In the second section of a new work, entitled Perspectives d'avenir, he summons theology to the task of establishing its foundation upon the results of historical-critical exegesis along the lines set forth by Edward Schillebeeckx. He uses a good number of ideas borrowed from the philosophy of science. A student of revolutions (scientific and others), such as Thomas Kuhn, thinks that during every age there exists a dominant method of thinking. Kung applies this to theology. Thus, we have passed from a method inspired by an (anti Protestant) Counter-Reformation model to another model which is linked to the confrontation between the Bible and current life. He proposes a theology of world religions which is to wrestle with the question: Does one true religion exist? For the informed reader this present work of more than 350 pages will serve as a presentation of current difficulties that exist for Catholic theology as it engages in debate with Protestantism. The professional theologian cannot fail to take note of the approaches presented in Kung's previous works. Everything hinges, at this point, upon historico-critical exegesis in which the question being asked is: Does tradition still have any value? On this work, Kung is a reformed Protestant in his thinking!

Contrast the position of Hans Kung, no longer considered by the Church to be a Catholic theologian, with what we find on the last page of Henri Cardinal De Lubac's Memoires sur l'occasion de mes ecrits, published September 1989.

"No authority of the Society (General, Assistant General, Rector, Visitor, assigned theologian, or anyone else has ever ex officio questioned me publicly or secretly on my teaching (oral or written, published or unpublished) on doctrinal matters.

"No authority of the Church (did so) (whether Pope, Holy Office, Congregation of Catholic Education, or any other.)

"Never once in my life.

"On the other hand, there have been numerous accusations of every type. No legitimate authority has ever accepted these.

"With one apparent earlier exception: the address read by His Paternity, General Janssens, S.J. back in 1950 at the General Meeting of Procurators in Rome. This address was not his own; it is full of evident contradictions. Immediately after it the General gave me numerous spoken and written signs of quite the opposite."

His Eminence was seriously ill and almost succumbed last Christmas. He is 94 years of age and will continue to be considered one of France's greatest theological voices well beyond the Third Millennium.

Monsignor Michael J. Wrenn, D.H.L.
Church of St. John the Evangelist
New York

* * *

From John F. Kippley of The Couple to Couple League:

"Doctor Hannah Klaus (13:3, p. 27) rightly draws attention to the sorry state of the Natural Family Planning movement in the United States. While NFP programs have proliferated, NFP usage appears to have dropped by one-third from 3.2% to 2.1% in the short period from 1982-1988, according to the National Survey of Family Growth, 1988. Furthermore, no one can disagree with her conviction that to reduce the incidence of pre-marital and even teenage sex, 'we need to start with youngsters before they become sexually involved'.

However, it has not been demonstrated that "exhortatory approaches have not been effective" as Dr. Klaus claims. I am not aware of any program that has teenagers coming each month to hear sound biblical-moral-psychological

reasons for chastity and reporting on their sexual behavior. I am not aware of any program that reaches teenagers with any sort of an exhortatory message on a month to month basis. We know that any sort of meaningful exhortatory approach is forbidden in the public schools; and who would dare say that any sort of systematic exhortatory approach is common in Catholic schools? To paraphrase Chesterton, the exhortatory approach has not been tried and found wanting in the last 20 years; it has increasingly not even been tried.

While agreeing with Dr. Klaus that understanding human fertility should be a normal part of adolescent education today, I would add that such education must be coupled with explicit education in chastity (the exhortatory approach) to result in chaste behavior. It is well known that some married couples who are fully aware of their mutual fertility choose to engage in sexual immorality during the fertile time, and there is no reason to think that, other things being equal, adolescents will exhibit any greater degree of chastity. In short, knowledge is not virtue.

* * *

Pope John Paul II has reappointed Msgr. George A. Kelly as Consultor to the Congregation for the Clergy for a second five-year term. The Congregation, headed by Antonio Cardinal Innocenti, has charge of the work and discipline of diocesan clergy and the universal apostolate of catechetics.

* * *

Ambassador Melady Receives Two Honorary Doctorates.

Dr. Thomas Patrick Melady, U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See, gave the commencement address and received an honorary doctorate at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, Saturday, May 19.

The University of Connecticut conferred an honorary doctorate on him on Sunday, May 20.

Ambassador Melady is President Emeritus of Sacred Heart University (Fairfield, CT) and the former President of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council (Hartford, CT). A

former Professor of International Relations, he has served as Assistant U.S. Secretary for Post Secondary Education and is a former Ambassador to Burundi and Uganda.

He is a member of the Fellowship.

* * *

From a foreword by Billy Graham for The Spark That Ignites by Robert Coleman.

"The greatest need among Christians and churches today is for genuine spiritual revival - revival which comes not from man but from God himself. Whenever God has touched His people in special times of revival, lives have been changed and Christians have experienced new power to do God's work. True revival - as the title of this book says - is the spark that ignites.

"Drawing upon his thorough understanding of both the Bible and church history, Robert Coleman points the way to true revival. A revived condition, he rightly states, should be the normal situation of God's people, but all too often sin makes us complacent, dulling our spiritual sensitivity and blocking the channel of God's blessing. Only when we face our need of repentance, and seek God's forgiveness and power, will we experience the full measure of new life He has for us.

Revival also means we begin seeing the world the way God sees it... ,

So I am thankful that Dr. Coleman has written this volume. It is one of those rare books which speaks both simply and profoundly, challenging each of us to a deeper commitment and a greater openness to what God wants to do in us and through us. It could be one of the most important books you will ever read.

We note with pride that Reverend Robert W. Libera has become a Foundation Member of the Fellowship.

Book Reviews

What God Has Joined: The Sacramentality of Marriage by Peter J. Elliott, Alba House, 287 pp., \$15.95.

"At last a book about the sacrament of marriage." These were words chosen by Edouard Cardinal Gagnon, president of the Pontifical Council of the Family, to define this book which, he hopes, will become a standard text for priests and seminarians and for those engaged in Christian family apostolates. Father Peter Elliott, who works for Gagnon, insists that the sacramentality of marriage has been neglected by specialists in the fields of both Canon Law and pastoral theology. Its ultimate purpose is the salvation of married Christians.

Chapter 3, entitled "The Quest for the Sign" is worth the price of the book. It deals thoroughly with a contemporary error, viz., that the Church's doctrine of marriage is a relatively recent, a teaching imposed on the Church by scholastic sacramental theology. Elliott does not deny that there was a developing understanding of the sacrament beginning with Paul's description of it as a great mysterion. Our Lord instituted no visible new sign for the marriage of Christians, but Paul did see what later became known as "sacramentality" in the persons of the baptized spouses.

The historical search for better ways of articulating the sense of this mystery goes on to this day. The Letter to Polycarp by St. Ignatius of Antioch (100 A.D.) is early evidence of how the Church took control of the celebration of marriage, on the principle that Christian marriage is different from pagan marriage. Father Elliott traces additional developments through Tertullian, Origen, Augustine, the early rise of canonists, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, the Council of Trent and thereafter.

Father Elliott's scholarly treatise explores also the consent by which matrimony is established, the bond that is rendered indissoluble by sexual union, and the grace conferred by Christ and ministered by couples to each other in daily life. "Consent", with its gender and fertility significance, is called the efficient cause of the sacrament and creates a

binding public contractual relationship of the couple with Christ and the Church. That "bond" (not grace) is the immediate effect of marriage and it is permanent. Opposed to this reality is the contemporary sexual revolution which separates procreation from self-giving. Possibly, the more subtle attacks on marriage today include the attempt to undermine our Lord's teaching by the rash use of biblical criticism and/or by the proposal, sometimes made, that the Eastern Orthodox policy in favor of remarriage by innocent parties to a divorce be adopted by Rome. The more radical view, of course, is the one which suggests that Christ's own opposition to divorce was culture-bound. The replacement of the word "contract" by "foedus" is not intended to advance a less binding understanding of marriage; the juridical significance is merely reinforced by a new accent on its personal aspects.

Chapter 7 deals with specific sacramental problems -- (1) the degree of faith required, (2) the marriages of baptized vs. unbaptized, (3) the attitude of other ecclesial communions, (4) the effect of contraception on the sacrament. The practice of other churches will have special interest to readers, especially the practice of Orthodox churches which grant divorce and permit remarriage not only for adultery, but for attempted murder, abortion, impotence, abandonment, leprosy, and prolonged abuse. The final chapter deals with the family as a social sacrament.

All in all Father Elliott's book is worth owning.

George A. Kelly

Come and You Will See!: St. John's Course in Contemplation, by Paul Hinnebusch, O.P., Alba House, New York, 1990, 92 pp., \$5.95.

Elijah by Adrienne von Speyr, translated by Brian McNeil, C.R.V., Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 123 pp., 1990.

from a series of college lectures. It takes the form of a genial exegesis, tracing prominent themes of the text with an eye to spiritual import and with a minimum of scholarly encumbrance. It is a strikingly gentle book. The author presumes no in-depth knowledge of the New Testament on the part of his audience, and does not make it his purpose to dazzle the reader with his erudition or to startle him with novelty. As the subtitle suggests, the book reads the Gospel of John as a kind of primer in analogical interpretation, modestly continuing a tradition at least as old as Origen.

Hinnebusch is particularly deft at disentangling various exegetical rams from the thickets of Old Testament philology, without losing sight of the requirements of the non-specialist reader. Notable in this regard is his exposition of the seven "I AM" statements in John: "I am the bread of life", "I am the true vine" and so forth. While one might quibble that he has sometimes over-interpreted the evidence to his own advantage, as in his suggestion that the divine YHWH "really means, 'I am with you to save'," Hinnebusch's overall effort is sober and competent. It could be used with equal profit as spiritual reading and as an undergraduate textbook.

The Ignatius Press edition of Adrienne von Speyr's Elijah is another welcome contribution to the project of exegese dans l'Eglise, although it is in the form of a spiritual commentary rather than scholarly exposition. Physically it is a pleasing book, with thick paper, a large type-font, and an uncrowded page, the whole of which works to inhibit the reader from staining its many penetrating sentences with his marking pen. Brian McNeil's translation is clear and graceful -- even elegant in spots -- and it would be difficult to guess from his rendering the language of the original: not a small accomplishment.

Von Speyr gives us in this book the fruits of her own contemplation on the mystery of God's dominion as it works itself out in the life of Elijah. It would be impudent to attempt to "rate" her success on conventional lines ("3 1/2 stars on her appropriation of Divine Impassivity" etc.) but at least one reader found a shaft of light in every chapter. Occasionally von Speyr indulges a certain mystic recklessness which can cause alarm in those of more pedantic temperament, such as this reviewer, who found himself

reaching for a blue pencil rather than a highlight when faced with this sentence (concerning the sacrifice on Mt. Carmel): "The word of prayer has power over God, power to unleash the power of God." Yet Elijah is not a magician, whose utterances have power over a spirit, but a prophet, who acts in obedience only; all this von Speyr sees perfectly well, but she might have expressed herself better. All in all an excellent work.

Paul Mankowski, S.J.

Biblical Faith and Fathering: Why We Call God "Father." by John W. Miller, Paulist Press, New York and New Jersey, 1989.

Professor Miller, a Mennonite, prepared these collected papers as a response to the radical feminist attack on the biblical idea of God. Their attack was based on the thesis that "biblical references to God as patriarch or father are sexist in that maleness is thereby divinized and men are encouraged to think of themselves as God-like in a way women cannot." Some feminists have extracted texts from the Bible which "either deny that God is male, or portray him as female, or as above and beyond gender altogether" (55f.).

Miller concludes that Yahweh is not simply male, but father to his worshippers. The God of Judaism is a father-symbol and father-image which answers a psychological need (62).

The question of how we name God is not just a speculative question. Miller holds that there is a contemporary crisis of fathering, the result of the industrial revolution which weakened the ties of the extended family and diminished the involvement of older people with young families. The crisis was made acute by the sexual revolution of the 1960's and the 1970's, spurred on by the availability of birth control and abortion.

For Miller, biblical tradition is relevant to our efforts at surmounting this fathering crisis. In connection with the revelation of God as father in the Bible, there emerged in ancient Israel a new appreciation of fathering. Innovations in fathering were introduced that served to consolidate and strengthen the role of men as

(continued on page 25)

Pace 19

PACE (Professional Approaches for Christian Educators) provides each month from October to May articles designed to serve the needs and interests of those in the Church's catechetical ministry; articles sometimes continue for two or more months, and a three-ring binder is supplied for storing them. Now in its nineteenth year and published by Our Sunday Visitor, it is edited by Maria Harris Padraic O'Hare.

The 1989-90 **PACE** series of articles included four by Michael Himes on "creaturely spirituality", four by Gabriel Moran on religion and the ecological movement, three by James A. O'Donohoe on concerns in bioethics, four by Eugene Fisher and Leon Klenicki on issues in Catholic-Jewish relations, two by John J. Pilch on biblical interpretation in the light of culture, two by Richard J. Novak on Byzantine Catholics and their approach to catechesis, three by Art Kubick on parish Confirmation programs, three by Berard L. Marthaler on the saints, two by Elaine Ramshaw on biblical story books for children, two by Lis Lane on resources for religious education (one on the use of "symbols" such as fire, water, earth, and wind and the other on the integration of story, symbol, and dance), two by Patricia Clancy on parish programs for deaf children, two by Carole D. Goodwin on catechesis for ages ten through fifteen, two by Janet Kvamme on child abuse, two by John R. McCall on emotional abuse in families, and four by Henry C. Simmons on ministry with older adults as well as two excerpts from **Fashion Me a People: Curriculum and the Church** by Maria Harris.

The list gives the prospective subscriber some sense of the scope of **PACE 19**; the comments which follow may give some sense of its value.

Explicitly locating himself in the tradition which includes Augustine and Thomas Aquinas (not to mention John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards), Michael Himes of the University of Notre Dame, equally explicitly, dissociates himself from much of the thought of Matthew Fox in his articles on "creaturely spirituality". He begins his series with the argument that, because it comes from God, all of creation (including the human person) is characterized by "goodness, dignity, and glory", but, contra Fox, that a "creation spirituality" does not entail either denying or downplaying the fall and the redemption. From this basis he argues that an authentic Christian spirituality must have a place in it for the tragic (since human life is subject to suffering as well as joy), the time-bound (versus, for example, fundamentalism and gnosticism), and

the Trinity (which reminds us that "God cannot be thought of under any single image").

Although Gabriel Moran of New York University may be overstating the case when he says that the ecological movement "is today's meeting ground for science and religion," he correctly criticizes the insistence of many in the movement that Christianity - with its alleged idea of "man's limitless rule of creation" - is the cause of our ecological problems. He argues, instead, that Christianity has much to offer a world in search of solutions to such problems, particularly in the concepts of creatureliness and giftedness in virtue of which our lives and natures and those of all other creatures are gifts from God and should be treated as such.

The articles by Eugene Fisher and Leon Klenicki (respectively, the Director of Catholic-Jewish Relations for the NCCB and the Director of Jewish-Catholic Relations for B'nai B'rith's Anti-Defamation League) quote extensively from Church documents of the last twenty-five years. They note that Catholics should have a "positive appreciation" for the attachment of the people of Israel to the land of Israel, but that the land of Israel is to be distinguished from the state of Israel. Somewhat paradoxically, however, after reminding us that the Jews as a group cannot be charged with the death of Jesus, they argue that, unless Christians repent for the Holocaust, Jews cannot forgive them for it!

In the first of his articles on bioethics James A. O'Donohoe of Boston College gives the good news that scientific and technological developments "have made some significant contributions to the quality of life in contemporary society" and the bad news that "they have also occasioned a myriad of moral dilemmas which go to the very heart and meaning of human existence." He defines ethics as "a systematic study of the behavioral implications of being human" and declares that it has the three-fold function of establishing norms for human action, validating them, and helping people appropriate them. His second article studies the question of artificial nutrition and hydration in a clear, balanced fashion, and his third article in similar fashions explains what is involved in DNR ("Do Not Resuscitate") orders.

With articles of varying value, Pace 19 is a useful tool for chatechists.

Rev. Francis J. Corry
Cardinal Spellman High School
New York

Books in Brief

O filozofii chresci janskiej w Ameryce Polnocnej by Bronislaw Dembowski, Catholic Theological Academy, Warsaw, 1989.

Lublin Thomism is starting to become known on this continent, even if only the tip of the iceberg is so far available in translation. With Father Dembowski's new book, whose English translation would be On Christian Philosophy in North America, the reciprocal process of making known the American contribution has gone forward. Dembowski reviews the history of various philosophical journals and the main American Catholic universities in the twentieth century, as well as reporting on the philosophical work of such figures as Joseph Owens, James Collins, Ralph McInerney and Bernard Lonergan.

Most Ancient of All Splendors by Johann Moser. **By Love Refined** by Alice von Hildebrand, Sophia Press, Manchester, N.H., 1989.

Fellowship members may be interested in two new titles from Sophia Press. Johann Moser's poetry is a rich, religious treat. It is directed outward toward creation and the majesty of God, in sharp contrast to the inward self-obsession of much poetry published today. Alice von Hildebrand's By Love Refined is a book of intensely sensible advice for young married couples in the form of letters to a young bride. Like Flannery O'Connor's Habit of Being, it contains a wealth of profound philosophy, but channels the insights it means to convey into epistolary form as comments on very typical life-

situations. It is an exemplary piece of spiritual direction by a member of the Fellowship.

The Miracle of Jesus: Wonders and Signs by John Paul II, Daughters of St. Paul, 68 pp., \$4.95.

One of the major contributions of St. Paul books is their publication of papal addresses. But as Father Groeschel says in his introduction, this little book is valuable not only for meditation but for "authoritative arguments for correcting popular prejudice against the supernatural in the story of the Gospels."

Love Responds: Reflections on Christian Morality by John H. Miller, C.S.C., S.T.D., Catholic Central Union, 3835 Westminster Place, St. Louis, Missouri 63108, 149 pp., \$7.00.

Father Miller's Love Responds is a follow up to his recent volume Called by Love: Reflections on God's Intervention in Human History announced in the June 1990 Newsletter. Both are available from his office in St. Louis.

This little volume takes up well-discussed subjects - God's call to Holiness, God's Revelation, Personal Conscience, sin, vice, sex, grace, the Beatitudes, the place of Christ, faith, hope and charity, the natural human virtues, reward and punishment.

A good book to give to laity by a founding member of the Fellowship.

(continued from page 23) Book Reviews

fathers. These new factors included rituals such as the passover meal, the redemption of the first born, and circumcision.

In this time of crisis, Miller recommends identifying our strengths (The Lord's Prayer, marital commitment, ceremonies for children, prayer before meals led by the father) and

dealing with our weaknesses (rituals, guidance for fathers).

As a collection of papers the book is a little repetitive. Nevertheless it is interesting. It gave me new insights into the biblical tradition, and it challenged me to confront and reassess the contemporary crisis of fathering.

Msgr. George P. Graham

Books Received

FRANCISCAN HERALD PRESS

Christian Moral Principles by Germain Grisez.

The Principles in Catholic Moral Life by William May.

John Paul II and the Family and John Paul II: Catechist by Monsignor Michael J. Wrenn.

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR

The Teaching of Christ and The Catholic Catechism by Bishop Donald W. Wuerl and Reverend Ronald Lawler, O.F.M., Cap.

ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLICY CENTER

Pursuit of a Just Social Order by Brian Benestad.

NCCB

Quest for Justice edited by Brian Benestad and Francis Butler.

DOUBLEDAY

Inside My Father's House (1989) and **Keeping The Church Catholic with John Paul II** (1990) by Monsignor George A. Kelly.

(continued from page 10) **Draft of the Universal...Dubay**

Number 3215 is likewise out of accord with much in Scripture. In the Psalter it is continually supposed that all of God's people, not merely a small elite, are to be radiant with joy, are to taste and drink deeply of the Lord, to experience how good he is (Ps 34). Their hearts and their flesh are to tingle with joy in Him (Ps 84). These expressions and others like them clearly point to what we now call mystical prayer, something more than can be generated by human emotions. St. Paul tell the Ephesians that they are to be "filled with the utter fullness of God" (c. 3:19). The catechism draft unfortunately does not make clear that this high degree of union is meant for everyone. St. Paul would be disappointed, and so would the psalmists.

There is among the best of the faithful a great current yearning for deep prayer, something more than they usually hear about on Sunday morning. Where can this yearning arise but from the same Holy Spirit who inspired both Scripture and Vatican II? It would be tragic if the universal catechism did not support and further this divine initiative.

Number 3216 rightly indicates that holiness flows from the cross: "there is no holiness without renunciation." While this is

true, it is incomplete. We should read: "There is no holiness without renunciation and purification." The first is what we can do to overcome our faults, the second emphasizes what God does to supplement our efforts and limitations. As Jesus himself put it in John 15:2, the Vine-dresser prunes the branches which are bearing fruit that they may bear still more.

If these two numbers, 3215 and 3216, are the sum total of the catechism's treatment of the higher reaches of our union with the indwelling Trinity, it is inadequate. It entails the same sort of egregious omission that we find in moral theology and in seminary training. Lay people and religious who want God deeply commonly complain that they cannot find competent spiritual directors, that is, guides who know what growing contemplative prayer is about and can lead people into it. If the catechism does not show the way to the higher reaches of gospel life, it will be helping to perpetuate the notion that a minimal state of grace is all most of us need to be concerned about. It may even further the idea that one may engage in spiritual direction by taking a few summer school courses and then hang out one's shingles. The catechism should contribute to the elimination of mediocrity and incompetency, not accept them.

Thomas Dubay, S.M.
St. Paul, Minnesota

(continued from page 2 (From Our President...))

It is difficult to come right out and say so, but it seems to me that we have two different Catholic Churches in the United States. This is also the case in Western Europe but I am not considering that situation here. We have a de facto schism which has not yet become de jure. Those who live in religious houses or work in theological faculties know that there are two radically different views of the Church operative today. On the one side are those who support the Pope and the Magisterium, especially in the areas of sexual morality and liturgy, and those who oppose that Magisterium and propose alternative ways of thinking and acting. Simply put, many Catholics have become Protestants in fact but still call themselves "Catholics."

Sooner or later, at some point, this tragic situation of division and confusion will have to be corrected. It could be that this mild-mannered Instruction is a warning to errant theologians to be converted and to submit to the Teaching Authority of the Church. There are no explicit threats which were common in papal pronouncements before Vatican II, but it is not inconceivable that disciplinary measures will be taken in the future, for the sake of the unity of the faith, if dissident theologians do not submit to the Magisterium in those areas where it is clearly called for by the Catholic faith which they freely profess.

Kenneth Baker, S.J.
Homiletic & Pastoral Review

(continued from page 16) Comments on Selected Portions...Smith

3672: Again, the exact referent of "these rights" is not clear.

3778: This seems a very important qualifier on lying. Does it apply only to situations of "brotherly love?" What about instances of national security that may be endangered if the truth were told to the press, for instance, about covert operations? This seems a "nuance" that needs further nuancing.

3781: Again, perhaps it should be made clear that the need for protecting the right of privacy of clients is not always absolute for doctors, for instance, i.e., when the condition of behavior of his clients threatens the lives of the innocent.

3815: This paragraph introduces a host of problems that are very controverted in scholarly

discussion about moral decision-making. It is greatly contested whether one can ever find oneself in a situation where one is forced to choose between two actions, each of which violates divine law. The principle of double effect generally aids one in sorting out one's responsibilities. One can never do what is intrinsically wrong. The "criterion of the lesser evil" is vague and very much lends itself to a consequentialist calculus. It is most surprising to find this criterion invoked in a conclusion which has not been discussed in the text.

Janet E. Smith
Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy
University of Dallas
Irving, Texas

(continued from page 19) Draft of the Universal...Vitz

At the very least this document should be called something like a universal compendium of doctrine, and not a catechism. Better still, the present document should provide very specific guidelines on what must be included -- on what constitutes a minimum -- in any regional catechism. In short, the present "universal catechism" with its wimpy proposal that it should serve as a "point of reference" is a universal prescription for disaster. It is unworthy of our Lord and His Church; of St. Peter and his successors.

It is my recollection that after the Council of Trent, the first attempt at a new catechism also failed. Later the task was given to Cardinal Borromeo; after some years, under his supervision, a masterful catechism was produced, one that served the Church well for centuries. Let us pray that another Charles Borromeo can be found to oversee the composition of this new and equally important catechism.

Paul C. Vitz
New York University

The 1990 FELLOWSHIP CONVENTION

September 21 - 23, 1990
Holiday Inn Center City
1800 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**TEACHING THE FAITH IN 1990:
SOME CENTRAL QUESTIONS**

For further information, write or call:
Terry Archer, Bent Hall, Room 337
St. John's University
Jamaica, N.Y. 11439
718-990-1392

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