



Fellowship of Catholic Scholars NEWSLETTER

Volume 14, Number 1

December 1990

Report from the Roman Synod

by Father Baker

Before the 238 delegates arrived in Rome, all but ten of whom are bishops, they had time to study the Working Document (WD) (*Instrumentum Laboris*) which was prepared by the permanent Synod Council, under the presidency of Archbishop Jan P. Schotte. The topic for discussion is "Formation of Priests in Circumstances of the Present Day" (See *Origins*, Aug. 2, 1990).

The WD contains a brief Introduction and four parts:

1. CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PRESENT DAY.

Under this heading the bishops mentioned aspects of modern life, which seem to work against vocations to the priesthood. They spoke of things like secularization, mass media, individualism and subjectivism, moral relativism, rejection of authority, the pursuit of a false freedom, divorce and the breakup of families, small families, pansexualism and a hedonistic society. Young men who live in this complex and rapidly changing society do not seem to be attracted to the priestly life.

Cardinal Ratzinger, the first one to address the topic of the Synod, zeroed in on a false hermeneutics widespread in the Church, or a false interpretation of the New Testament. He said that an uncritical acceptance of much Protestant exegesis, based on the assumptions of the 16th century Reformers, has contributed to the crisis in the priesthood. Positing a false opposition between Law and Gospel, the Reformers put sacrifice and priesthood as aspects of the Old Law which were rejected by Jesus. So for them there is no place in the New Law for priests and sacrifice - only preaching the Word and accepting it in faith. This view, taken over uncritically by many Catholics, has wreaked havoc with priests in the Catholic Church, according to Ratzinger. He then proceeded to give the Catholic understanding of how Jesus gave authority to the Apostles and how they transmitted it to their successors - the Pope and bishops. This talk was the most potent theological presentation at the Synod.

2. IDENTITY AND MISSION OF THE PRIEST IN THE CHURCH.

Many bishops spoke about the identity and mission of the priest. His identity was linked with his conformity with Christ, Head of the Church. In administering the Sacraments he acts *in persona Christi Capitis*. Many would like to see spelled out more clearly what precisely

Contents of This Issue . . .

The Fellowship 1990 Convention	p. 3
Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities	p. 5
The Church of Christ – Catholic?	p. 7 <i>Msgr. James O'Connor</i>
Around the Church	p. 14
The Evolution of Bernard Haring	p. 17 <i>Prof. William May</i>
CTSA Report on Profession and Oath	p. 20
The State of Religious Life	p. 24 <i>Sr. Joan Gormley</i>

is the difference between the common priesthood of the laity and the ministerial priesthood. That is one of the points to be taken up in the 13 small discussion groups (*Circuli Minores*).

Some said that the priest also receives his identity from the community he serves. This idea brings up the question of the *mission* of the priest. The bishops will be discussing how the mission of the priest fits into his identity. In this regard, Archbishop Daniel E. Pilarczyk from the USA offered a definition of the priest which was greeted favorably by the Synod and will be discussed in the CM. He gave this definition: "The priest is a member of the Christian faithful who has been permanently configured by Christ through Holy Orders to serve the Church, in collaboration with the local bishop, as representative and agent of Christ, the Head of the Church, and therefore as representative and agent of the Church community before God and the world." This definition seems to contain all the necessary elements. It will be interesting to see what the Synod Fathers do with it. No other bishop offered such a complete definition.

During the first two weeks the Fathers have heard 213 eight-minute talks. The subject treated most frequently was that of the spirituality of the priest and the seminarian: The identity of the priest consists in his participation in the Person and Mission of Christ.

3. FORMATION FOR PRIESTHOOD.

Formation was dealt with mainly under four headings: human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral. Several bishops spoke of the need for maturity on the part of seminarians. Some criticized the use of psychology and others defended it. Four bishops suggested considering the ordination of married men in exceptional cases in order to help solve the problem of a shortage of priests. Dozens of bishops, however, spoke about the importance of celibacy and the need to give seminarians a solid formation in the theology and practice of chaste celibacy.

The intellectual formation was surely mentioned, but it did not come through as strongly as one might expect. A few bishops called for a better correlation between philosophy and theology; some called for a more systematic program of teaching dogmatic theology. English was used more often than Latin for the first time in a Synod. It is obvious even here in Rome that Latin is on the wane. One Father, Cardinal Silvestrini from the Roman Curia, urged that Latin not be neglected in priestly formation.

There was a strong reaffirmation of the value of both the Major Seminary and the Minor Seminary; those in favor of the Minor Seminary were mainly from Africa, Asia and Latin America. Also, most of the Fathers are in favor of inserting a special "propedeutic" or "pre-theology" year for all between their previous education and starting the Major Seminary.

4. THE ONGOING FORMATION OF PRIESTS.

This topic has been one of the main themes of the Synod. Everyone is for it, but there is a question of how best to accomplish it.

In conclusion, I would say that the Synod has already shed much light on the formation of priests. The atmosphere is peaceful, serious, meditative, and devoid of any noticeable politicking for special interests, such as has been noted in previous Synods (v.g., for general absolution, optional celibacy, altar girls). The Synod should have a positive influence on vocations and priestly formation in the whole Church.

Friends of the Fellowship

John Cardinal Carberry

Bishop Roberto O. Gonzalez

The Fellowship's 1990 Convention

Archbishop Anthony J. Bevilacqua closed the Fellowship's Thirteenth Convention at Philadelphia's impressive Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul with an inspirational homily. He called upon the one hundred seventy-five members to witness their faith with courage during these critical days. "Be Not Afraid" was his recurring text. Concelebrating with him was Bishop Rene Gracida of Corpus Christi who, with Pittsburgh's Bishop Donald Wuerl, Peoria's Bishop John Myers, New York's Bishop Austin Vaughan, and Gallup's Retired Bishop Jerome Hastrich, graced the three-day meeting.

Eventually, the *Proceedings* will finalize the contribution of the speakers who wrestled with "Teaching the Faith in the 1990's." In a *Newsletter* we can give notice only to the highlights of selected sessions. Certainly Archbishop Bevilacqua's presentation of the Cardinal Wright Award to Father Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap. proved to be a touching moment. Few founding members have edified the Church's academic community better than this first Fellowship president, the chief author of the Church's most popular catechism in English. *The Teaching of Christ* (Our Sunday Visitor) has sold a million copies in twelve languages. Other highpoints included Bishop Myers' stirring address on "Catholic Doctrine in a World of Relativism," the debate between Monsignors Smith and O'Connor over the doctrinal authority of the NCCB, Father Marvin O'Connell's brilliant but often funny review of American historic evangelization procedures and accomplishments, William May's scholarly treatment of present day dissent.

A series of first-rate discussions led by Drew University's James O'Kane, Steubenville's Michael Healy, Rockville Centre's Monsignors Daniel Hamilton and George Graham kept the convention lively, not always an easy thing to do. What undoubtedly attracted the most press coverage was the statement "*Vatican II: Promise and Reality*," issued by the Fellowship's Board of Directors in advance of the Convention. This review of the state of the Church in the United States twenty-five years after Vatican II was partially a response to others made earlier by theologians in Cologne, Tubingen, and Washington, D.C. accusing the Holy See of strangulating the spirit of Vatican II.

The *Catholic News Service* summarized the meat of the statement as follows:

"Widespread dissent from Church teaching and lack of "discipline within the Church" have undermined the vitality of U.S. Catholicism in the past quarter-century, the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars said in a statement issued Sept. 20.

"If the unity of the Catholic faith is to be maintained, we believe that unity of discipline must be re-established within the Church," the 1,000-member organization said.

"Ideally, preaching and teaching, sacramental life especially, take precedence over law and discipline," it said. "But it is the lack of discipline - the refusal to obey - that has rendered ineffective the (Church's) preaching, teaching and norms for worthy sacramental practice."

"The Fellowship said that after the Second Vatican Council widespread "debate and doubt" in the Catholic academic world on a number 'binding teachings' of the Church 'weakened the unity, vitality and dynamism of the Catholic Church in the United States.'

"The Fellowship, founded in 1977 to promote adherence to 'the entire faith of the Catholic Church,' issued its statement in the form of a 27-page booklet titled 'Vatican II: Promise and Reality - the Catholic Church in the United States 25 Years after Vatican II.'

"The statement was released on the eve of the Fellowship's 13th annual convention, Sept. 21-23 in Philadelphia."

"It said the reforms and updating of the Church's self-understanding mandated by the Council 'have faithfully and, in the main, successfully been implemented'."

"But at the same time, it said, the Church in the United States has experienced 'a multitude of dysfunctions' in the intervening years."

"It said two 'especially important' elements affecting the state of the Church today are a decline in 'the general religious observance of U.S. Catholics' and a 'disarray in the contemporary Church' due to 'trends in Catholic academic circles since 1965'."

"Among a 'multitude of unacceptable theories' that 'contributed substantially to this general weakening of the Church,' the Fellowship cited theological dissent against Church teaching on artificial contraception, proportionalist theories of morality and questioning by theologians of a number of Church dogmas, doctrines and policies.

"The statement also criticized 'banal, free-wheeling liturgies' and pastoral practices that it said contributed to a decline in the sacrament of penance."

"It said many religious communities, under the auspices of renewal, 'abandoned religious life as defined by the Church,' and many Catholic colleges and universities 'declared themselves free from oversight by the Church's teaching office and have survived this schism without censure'."

"The Fellowship said the National Conference of Catholic Bishops contributed to problems in the Church when, in preparing a major study on U.S. priests and national pastoral letters on peace, the economy and women, bishops relied on scholars 'already well known for their disagreement with a variety of Church teachings and norms'."

"More than once bishops were urged to include on these drafting committees recognized scholars with different viewpoints This advice generally has not been heeded,' the Fellowship said."

"Among problems in U.S. Catholic practice the Fellowship cited declines in Mass attendance, non-adherence to Church teachings on sex and marriage, sharp losses in religious vocations and the loss of 'a generation of young people who had received inadequate, confused or contradictory religious instruction'."

"The Fellowship compared the situation today with the 'sorry state' of U.S. Catholic belief and practice at the beginning of the 19th century. It said that the bishops of the 19th century responded with strong leadership and legislation to form a Church which, by the early 20th century, had become 'a model of unity and piety for Churches everywhere'."

"The Church's teaching office today should take a lesson from this problem and this solution of more than a century ago,' it said. 'Courageous and wise leadership from diocesan bishops turned the tide then; it can turn the tide, we believe, now'."

Selected Responses to "Vatican II: Promise and Reality"

Many of my brother bishops and I look to the Fellowship as a source of sound theological research in the midst of a sea of often confusing voices.

John Cardinal O'Connor
Archbishop of New York

I thank you for your leadership in all these areas and especially for the very important emphasis in the statement about promoting personal holiness.

Most Reverend Theodore E. McCarrick
Archbishop of Newark

I think it is the finest, most balanced, firm, and helpful statement on the problems (and the solutions thereto) of the Church in the U.S. I have seen in a long time.

Frank King SJ
University of San Francisco

John Paul II's *Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities* (August 15, 1990)

After twenty-two years of discussion with university personnel, Rome has finally issued its directives, not in a letter from the Congregation for Catholic Education, but as an Apostolic Constitution of the Pope himself. (The full text appeared in *Origins*, October 4, 1990.)

This document has the force of law for the universal Church and, while it deals specifically with Catholic universities, the Pope makes it clear that "it is also meant to include all Catholic institutions of higher education," viz. colleges (see No. 10).

There are one hundred eighty-eight dioceses in the United States, of which some one hundred fifteen report (Catholic Directory) the existence of a college, junior college, or university within their confines. Of the two hundred thirty-two institutions listed, about one hundred eighty are called colleges; fifty are identified as universities. However, many of these universities have a small enrollment as low as one thousand students. The main universities reporting more than ten thousand enrollment are St. John's University (N.Y.C.) 19,000; DePaul (Chicago) 14,000; Loyola (Chicago) 14,000; Notre Dame (South Bend) 10,000; Marquette (Milwaukee) 12,000; Seton Hall (Newark) 10,000; Villanova (Philadelphia) 11,000; St. Louis (Missouri) 11,000; Georgetown (D.C.) 11,000. The overwhelming majority of students at these two hundred thirty-two institutions are undergraduates. Even the graduate programs of large universities cover only a minority of the student body. For example, of the 19,000 students at St. John's in New York, 5,000 are graduate students; seventy percent of Notre Dame's 10,000 pursue a bachelor's degree; at Chicago's Loyola 10,000 of the 14,000 are undergraduates, at St. Louis 8,000 of 10,000, Boston 11,000 out of 14,000, Marquette 10,000 out of 12,000 and so on.

When John Paul II speaks of the Catholic university, therefore, as "born from the heart of the Church" (*Ex Corde Ecclesiae* is the Constitution's name), his concerns extend beyond the research labs and projects and beyond the creative scholarship expected to flourish in large universities, to the youth and future Church leaders introduced in colleges and college departments to the advanced exposition of Catholic doctrine; exposure, too, to what the Pope would consider an appropriate model of the Catholic way of life. Of the 550,000 students presently enrolled in this country's Catholic institutions of higher learning, almost a half million are to be found in this eighteen to twenty-two year college age group.

The Apostolic Constitution, undoubtedly will elicit close scrutiny with a view toward discovering what the Pope expects of such Catholic institutions, what norms he establishes for the proper administration of these institutions, and how they are to be implemented. The following seem to be the document's special features.

4. "Bishops should be seen not as external agents but as participants in the life of the Catholic university." (No. 28)
5. "By its very nature, each Catholic university makes an important contribution to the Church's work of evangelization - a living institutional witness to Christ and his message." (No. 49)

General Principles for a Catholic Institution

1. "Fidelity to the Christian Message as it comes to us through the Church." (No. 14)
2. "An Institutional Commitment," i.e., "an academic institution in which Catholicism is vitally present and operative." (No. 14)
3. "A relationship to the Church that is essential to its institutional identity - one consequence (being) recognition of and adherence to the teaching authority of the Church in matters of faith and morals." (No. 27)

General Norms

Article I THEIR NATURE

1. Are to be applied concretely at the local and regional levels by Episcopal Conferences." (No. 2)
2. Catholic universities other than those established by hierarchy "will make their own the general norms and their regional applications, internalizing them into their governing documents." (No. 3)

Article II INSTITUTIONAL NATURE

1. A Catholic University is linked with the Church either by (a) "a formal, constitutive and statutory bond" or (b) "by reason of an institutional commit-

- ment made by those responsible for it."
2. "Every Catholic university is to make known its Catholic identity either in a mission statement or in some other appropriate document, unless authorized otherwise by competent ecclesiastical authority - to provide means which will guarantee the expression and preservation of this identity."
 3. "Any official action or commitment of the university is to be in accord with its Catholic identity."
 4. "The rights of the individual and of the community are preserved within the confines of the truth and the common good."

Article III ESTABLISHING A UNIVERSITY

With the consent or approval of hierarchy of one kind or another.

Article IV THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

1. Teachers and administrators must be informed of

- "their responsibility to promote or, at least, respect that (Catholic) identity."
2. Theologians are to be faithful to the magisterium of the Church.
 3. "The number of non-Catholic teachers must not be allowed to constitute a majority within the institution, which is and must remain Catholic."

Article V WITHIN THE CHURCH

1. Each institution is to maintain communion with the Holy See and Diocesan bishops.
2. Each bishop has the right and duty to watch over the preservation and strengthening of the institution's Catholic character.

This Apostolic Constitution takes effect on the first day of the academic year 1991.

Fellowship Information

At a meeting of the Board of Directors on September 21st, the following decisions were made:

1. The next Board Meeting will be held in Pittsburgh, March 23, 1991, at a place to be decided.
2. The 1991 Convention will be held in Denver, Colorado, on the weekend of September 27-29. (Archbishop Stafford has already graciously accepted the invitation to confer the Cardinal Wright Award at the Saturday night banquet and to celebrate our Sunday morning Eucharistic liturgy in his Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception.) Further details will be forthcoming.
3. The annual dues was increased from \$20 to \$25 beginning next year, with a lower rate for students.
4. Items such as correspondence between members and the Fellowship Office, up-dating the description of Fellowship objectives, compilation of a list of institutions or departments where sound doctrine is taught, a Fellowship Directory of Scholars, development of a series of books and readers, which would include significant research papers by Fellowship scholars, were all placed on the agenda for future action.
5. A Presidential Citation was voted to Father Joseph Mangan, S.J. for his devoted service, since

1942, to the magisterium of the Church. Shortly after that year he was assigned to teach moral theology at Chicago's Mundelein Seminary, where he taught for almost a quarter of a century. Moving to Loyola University he established a reputation as one of the country's premier moral theologians, along with his confrere the late John Connery, S.J. He is principally known for his writings on "the principle of double effect." At present he is consultant to Chicago's Holy Cross Hospital. He is one of a body of Jesuits, at Loyola University where he lives, who agreed in 1976 that a Fellowship of Catholic Scholars was necessary.

6. Father Ronald Lawler is the fifth member of the Board to receive the Cardinal Wright Award. He is known for his writings on sexual ethics and personalism. His academic career includes teaching assignments at the Catholic University of America, the Pontifical College Josephinum, and St. Thomas University. From 1980-1988 he was Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Catholic Doctrine at St. John's University and Rector of Holy Apostles Seminary in Cromwell, Connecticut from 1988-1990. Presently he is a Catechetical Consultant for the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Is the Catholic Church the Church of Christ?

Lumen Gentium (No. 8) contains the following sentence: "Haec ecclesia, in hoc mundo ut societas constituta et ordinata, subsistit in ecclesia Catholica" appears in the final draft on the proposed Universal Catechism (No. 1687) as: "This Church, founded and organized in the world as a society, has its existence in the Catholic Church." In earlier translations (Abbott) the Latin "subsistit" has been rendered, and Flannery particularly, by the seemingly English equivalent "subsists." Subsequent to the council theologians in the United States and elsewhere began to assert and teach that Vatican II abandoned the notion of the Catholic Church as the "one, true Church of Christ." Very recently, Notre Dame's Richard McBrien would have the Catholic Church subsist in the larger Church of Christ, rather than the other way around, criticizing the Vatican of toning down the recent Council's teaching. (Cf. his column in *The Brooklyn Tablet*, June 4, 1987.) A decade earlier at a Notre Dame Colloquium, Avery Dulles, while confessing that Christ's Church does indeed subsist in Roman Catholicism insisted that, "the Church of Jesus Christ is not exclusively identical with the Roman Catholic Church" (See David Tracy, et al, *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to be Done*, Seabury Press, 1978, pp. 91). Because these views have filtered their way through the catechetical machinery and at the diocesan level teachers are instructed to "tone down" the unique nature of the Church, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (March 20, 1987) challenged the way in which the word "subsist" was being used in many regions of the Catholic world. The retranslation of "subsistit" in the Universal Catechism is only the latest effort by Rome to correct a major misinterpretation of Vatican II.

Msgr. James T. O'Connor, professor of Dogmatic Theology at Dunwoodie Seminary, addressed this issue for the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars several years ago. The major elements of his presentation are relevant to the current dispute:¹

The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, and particularly at no. 8 (Chapter One) of that document contains the disputed phrase "subsists in."

The original draft or schema for the Constitution On The Church was submitted to the Council in 1962. This draft stated that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ were identical and that only the Roman Catholic Church could be called, *sola iure*, Church. As to who belonged to this Church, the Relator Cardinal Franic admitted that membership in an improper or analogous sense was a freely disputed question.²

This draft was not acceptable to the bishops as a working document. It was considered too restrictive, too scholastic and lacking an ecumenical spirit. Nevertheless, even Bishop Christopher Butler, who spoke against the draft, could ask rhetorically: "Who of those (who wish this draft rejected) would deny that the Church in communion with the vicar of Christ, the successor of Peter, is that Church which Christ founded?"³

A second schema or draft was submitted to the bishops in 1963. This draft was accepted for discussion as the working document, and, after emendations, became the *Dogmatic Constitution Lumen Gentium*. Number seven (Chapter One) of this working document read:

This holy Synod teaches and solemnly professes that there is only one Church of Jesus Christ ...which the Savior after His Resurrection handed over to Peter and the Apostles and to their successors Therefore this Church ... is the Catholic Church, governed by the Roman Pontiff and the bishops in communion with him.⁴

Notice that the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church are identified: "Therefore this Church...is the Catholic Church." Along with much else in the working draft, this sentence was to be changed in the emended draft. That draft was presented to the bishops at the 80th General Assembly of the Council on September 15, 1964. This emended draft was accompanied by a written *relatio* for each section or number of the document. What had been section or number seven in the working document had here become section or number eight, where it still remains in the final Constitution *Lumen Gentium*. It read (and reads, since it was not further emended):

This is the only (*unica*) Church of Christ which we profess in the Creed to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic, and which Our Savior after His Resurrection handed over to Peter to be shepherded This Church, established and ordained as a society in this world, subsists in the

Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter and the Bishops in communion with him, although outside her bodily structure there are found many elements of sanctification and truth which, as gifts proper to the Church of Christ, impel toward Catholic unity.⁵

Notice that, along with minor changes not pertinent to our theme, the "subsists in" has been substituted for "is." What, then, is the significance of this substitution and how is one to understand the entire number or section eight? The written *relatio* or explanation on the section reads as follows as found in the *Acta*.

From the great number of observations and objections which were brought forth by the bishops in respect to this paragraph (as it appeared in the working draft), it is evident that the intention and context of this section were not clear to all.

Now, the *intention* is to show that the Church, whose deep and hidden nature is described and which is perpetually united with Christ and His work, is concretely found here on earth in the Catholic Church. This visible Church reveals a mystery - not without shadows until it is brought to full light, just as the Lord Himself through His "emptying out" came to glory. Thus there is to be avoided the impression that the description which the Council sets forth of the Church is merely idealistic and unreal.

Therefore, a clearer subdivision is set forth, in which the following points are successively treated:

a) The mystery of the Church is present in and manifested in a concrete society. The visible assembly and the spiritual element are *not two realities*, but one complex reality, embracing the divine and human, the means of salvation and the fruit of salvation. This is illustrated by an analogy with the Word Incarnate.

b) The Church is one only (*unica*), and here on earth is present in the Catholic Church although outside of her there are found ecclesial elements.⁶

I do not think the statement could be clearer. Number eight of *Lumen Gentium*, according to official

explanation, intends to teach that there is only one Church of Christ and that this Church is found concretely in the Catholic Church. Every Platonic-type of thinking is excluded. The concrete society and its spiritual element are not two realities, but rather one complex reality, the spiritual reality being both revealed and hidden by the concrete society, just as the humanity of Christ both revealed and hid the divinity of the Word.

The oral *Relatio* on the whole of chapter one of *Lumen Gentium* makes the same points succinctly:

The mystery of the Church is not an idealistic or unreal creation, but rather exists in the concrete Catholic society itself, under the leadership of the successor of Peter and the bishops in communion with him. There are not two churches, but only one...⁷

In the face of such unequivocal declarations concerning the Church of Christ-Catholic Church, what is to be said of the substitution of "subsists in" for "is"? The written *relatio* gives the official explanation.

Certain words have been changed: in place of "is," "subsists in" is used so that the expression may be in better harmony with the affirmation about ecclesial elements which *are present elsewhere*.⁸

The reason for the change from "is" to "subsists in" is, therefore, *technical precision*. The Council did not wish to appear to deny in one sentence what it would affirm in the next, namely, that ecclesial elements of sanctification and truth are present outside the visible society of the Catholic Church. We must now examine the nature of this technical precision more closely.

The phrase "subsists in" or "subsisting" is not peculiar to our text in *Lumen Gentium*, no. 8. It occurs five other times in the final documents of Vatican II, and it is informative to see how the popular Abbott translation of the Conciliar texts translates these other appearances of the term or its variants.⁹

1. In the Decree on Ecumenism, no. 4, we find the sentence:

This unity, we believe, dwells in the Catholic Church as something she can never lose.¹⁰ (The latin reads: "in Ecclesia catholica subsistere credimus.")

2. The Declaration on Religious Freedom, no. 1, reads:

First, this sacred Synod professes its belief that God Himself has made known to making the way in which men are to serve Him, and thus be saved by Christ ... We believe that this one true religion subsists in the catholic and apostolic Church.¹¹

3. The Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, no. 13, reads:

Upon the Moslems, too, the Church looks with esteem. They adore one God, living and enduring (Lat. "viventem et subsistentum.")¹².

Gaudium et Spes, no. 10, reads:

What is this sense of sorrow, of evil, of death, which continues to exist despite so much progress?" (Lat. "Quinam est sensus doloris, mali, mortis quae ... subsistere pergunt?")¹³

The fifth instance I shall leave for consideration below. Looking at the above usages, it can be seen that the word "subsistere" is variously translated as "to dwell in," "to exist," "to endure," as well as the literal "to subsist in." Depending on which translation one chooses, one gets a slightly different understanding of *Lumen Gentium*, no. 8. It would read:

This Church (of Christ)...dwells in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter.

This Church (of Christ)...exists in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter.

This Church (of Christ)...endures in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter.

This Church (of Christ)...subsists in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter.

The rejections are significant

The question is: which of the translations best preserves the stated intention of L.G., no. 8 which is to assert that the Church of Christ is "concretely found here on earth in the Catholic Church"? The importance of the question is highlighted when one realizes that the Council, in its Decree on the Catholic Oriental Churches (promulgated on the same day as *Lumen Gentium*), did not say that the Mystical Body of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church, but rather that the Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ. We read in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, no. 2: "The holy and Catholic Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ..."¹⁴

An accurate answer to the question about the meaning and translation of "subsists in" can only be given if one examines the Council's teaching concerning the relationship between the Catholic Church and the "ecclesial elements" present outside her visible boundaries, for, by official explanation, it is because of these ecclesial elements that "subsists in" was introduced into the text. We must, therefore, look briefly at the *Decree on Ecumenism, Unitatis Redintegratio*, and particularly at number 3 of that document. That number reads in part:

In this one and only Church of God certain schisms arose even from the very beginning...; in later ages wider dissensions were born, and large Communities were separated from full communion with the Catholic Church, and sometimes not without the fault of men on both sides. Those who are now born into these Communities and are imbued with the faith of Christ are not to be convicted of the sin of separation, and the Catholic Church embraces them with fraternal reverence and love. For those who believe in Christ and are properly baptized are established in a certain, although imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church ...

Furthermore, of the elements or goods, which taken together build up and vivify the Church herself, certain and even many outstanding ones are able to exist (the Latin is *exstare possunt*, not *existere possunt*) outside the visible bounds of the Catholic Church; ...; all these, which come from Christ and lead to Him, belong *by right* to the only Church of Christ (Lat. "haec omnia, quae a Christo proveniunt et ad Ipsum conducunt, ad unicum Christi Ecclesiam iure pertinent.").

It follows that these separated Churches and Communities, although we believe they suffer from the cited defects, have not at all been deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. The Spirit of Christ has not refused to use them as means of salvation, the efficacy of which is derived from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church. (Lat. "quorum virtus derivatur ab ipsa plenitudine gratiae et veritatis quae Ecclesiae catholicae concredita est").¹⁵

Before the final votes, this entire section had been the subject of much discussion, and many suggested changes. Most of the suggestions were rejected by the commission responsible for drafting the document, but the reasons given for the rejections are significant for understanding the text itself.

It was suggested, for example, that to the sentence "all these (elements and gifts) ... belong by right to the only Church of Christ" there be added the phrase "and through her are derived to all those who err in good faith." This was rejected on the grounds that these gifts are derived from Christ himself and that "the validity and efficacy of the many sacraments and other means of salvation are not able to be impeded by the Church since they depend not on the will and jurisdiction of the Church but on the salvific will of Christ."¹⁶

The understanding is confirmed

Such a response would seem to indicate that the separated Churches and Communities function as means of salvation by or of themselves, directly dependent on Christ. That such is not the meaning, however, is immediately clarified by two subsequent responses. It is said that

Without doubt God uses the separated Communities, not indeed as separated, but as informed by the aforesaid ecclesial elements...¹⁷

and that

The necessity of communion with the Catholic Church to obtain the grace of Christ and salvation is sufficiently indicated in the whole context (of the document).¹⁸

From these responses, found in the Acta, it can be deduced that the ecclesial elements and the means of sanctification which are present in the separated Churches and Communities are present there to the extents of their union with the Catholic Church. This truth is, in fact, affirmed by both *Lumen Gentium* and by *Unitatis Redintegratio*. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 8 says that these elements are "gifts proper to the Church of Christ and impel toward Catholic unity." Even more clearly, the Decree on Ecumenism, no. 3 states that the efficacy of these elements and means of sanctification "is derived from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church." The insertion of "Catholic" is the clarifying point, avoiding efforts to invent the false distinction between "Church of Christ"

and "Catholic Church." The present tense of the verbs in both sentences is also important. The Council is not speaking about "vestigia Ecclesiae," "traces of the Church" which the separated Churches and Communities retain and now hold as their own because they once were in full communion with the Catholic Church. Rather, the elements are operative here and now because they belong by right to the Church and *presently* derive their efficacy from the plenitude of grace entrusted to the Catholic Church. In other words, the ecclesial elements are elements of the Catholic Church presently operative in the separated Churches and Communities because of their real, although imperfect, unity with the Catholic Church.

This understanding of the nature of the ecclesial elements and their relation to the Catholic Church is confirmed in the Decree on Ecumenism in that fifth use of the word "subsists in" which we postponed mentioning above. In no. 13 of the Decree, we read:

(At the time of the Reformation), many national or confessional Communion were separated from the Roman See. Among these, in which Catholic traditions and structures continue to subsist in part (Lat. "in quibus traditiones et structurae catholicae ex parte subsistere pergunt"), is the Anglican Communion.

Thus, not only does the Church of Christ subsist in the Catholic Church but elements of the Catholic Church subsist in the separated Churches and Communities. To that extent, and for that very reason, they function as means of salvation, drawing their efficacy from the fullness of grace and truth in the Catholic Church. For this reason it would seem to be true to say that if it were possible that the Catholic Church disappear the Catholic elements in the separated Churches and Communities would be deprived of their efficacy, having lost the source from which they draw here and now. It is also for that reason, I think, that Bishop Charue, giving the *relatio* for no. 14 of *Lumen Gentium*, could say that the Roman Catholic Church is necessary for salvation.¹⁹

These conclusions follow

It is true, indeed, that the ecclesial elements in the separated Churches and Communities do not function because of a permissive act of jurisdiction of the Catholic Church. But this, as a general rule, is true within the visible bounds of the Church herself. Even a sus-

pended archbishop can serve the Lord, but does so - like the separated Churches and Communities - not inasmuch as separation exists, but only because of the incomplete communion preserved with the Catholic Church.

Any student of St. Augustine's works will recognize that the teaching of Vatican Council II on the ecclesial elements present outside the visible bounds of the Catholic Church, as I have just attempted to outline it, is similar to Augustine's position on the matter taken during his controversy with the Donatists. He wrote in his tract *On Baptism*:

... there is one church which alone is called Catholic; and whenever it has anything of its own in these communions of different bodies which are separate from itself, it is most certainly in virtue of this which is its own in each of them that she, not they, has the power of generation.²⁰

If I may now summarize the conclusions of this study and draw it to a close:

1. The official *relatio* on no. 8 of *Lumen Gentium* states that the intention of the paragraph was to show that the Church of Christ is concretely found here on earth in the Catholic Church.

A response of the Commission to a suggested change in no. 3 of the Decree On Ecumenism states the Decree "clearly affirms that only the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ."²¹

The bishops voted on the final drafts of *Lumen Gentium* and *Unitatis Redintegratio* in the context of these and many other like explanations. And the final documents, apart from an arbitrary reading or one done out of context, testify to a clear affirmation that the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church are not two realities, but one only.

2. It is affirmed that the Lord himself is the founder of this one Church.

3. The statement of *Mysterium Ecclesiae* that "Catholics are bound to profess that by the gift of God's mercy they belong to that Church which Christ founded ..." is a fully accurate and concise restatement of the intention and teaching of the Church in Council at Vatican II.

4. Elements of this one Church are present outside her visible boundaries and are operative as means of salvation within the separated Churches and Com-

munities. These elements belong to the Church by right, derive their efficacy from the Catholic Church, and are forces which impel to full communion with the Church.

5. The presence of these Catholic elements outside the visible bounds has occasioned a new terminology - not a new fact since the fact was seen already by Augustine. This terminology speaks of the Church of Christ as subsisting in the Catholic Church and of elements of this Catholic Church subsisting in the separated Christian Churches and Communities.

6. The separated Churches and Communities, despite the presence of Catholic elements, are structurally deficient. This structural deficiency admits of greater and lesser degrees, depending on the nature and extent of their imperfect communion with the Catholic Church. The extent of that imperfect communion also determines their ability to be greater or lesser partial realizations of the one Catholic Church.²²

7. The presence of Catholic elements outside the visible boundaries of the Church cannot be understood in such a way as to imply a diminishment of these elements within the Church herself.

When a man is ordained a bishop, the element of apostolicity is not increased in the Church. Rather, there is extended to him a participation in what the Church herself fully possesses. Likewise, when he dies, the Church on earth is not diminished in respect to apostolicity.

So while there are Catholic elements in the separated Churches and Communities these elements are not like pieces of pie which have been carried away to exist elsewhere. The Catholic Church of Christ remains fully one even when the separated Churches share imperfectly in that unity. The diminishment occurs in what has been separated - and to the extent to which it is separated. To imagine otherwise would be to understand the ecclesial elements as material not spiritual realities. The number of those united to the Church may increase or decrease; the unity of the Church herself does not increase or decrease. And so with the other ecclesial elements.

Much more could be said

An analogy with the mystery of the Eucharist is appropriate. The number of consecrated Hosts in a

Church of Christ?

ciborium has nothing to do with the fullness of the Lord's Presence. He is as fully present in one as he is in a hundred. So with the Church. Her unity does not grow; it is extended for others to share in.

There is much more that could and should be said. I am aware that there are many "loose ends." Something should be said about what makes some of the separated Communities Churches and other not. Something should be said about how the ecclesial elements present in the separated Churches and Communities manifest themselves in a richness of form and spirituality which would serve to enrich the Catholic Church herself. Much should be said on the whole notion of the Church as communion. Much more should be said about Our Lady as Mother of Unity. Enough could never be said on the role of the Eucharist. But, for now, the purpose of this article has, I hope, been achieved. According to the teachings of Vatican Council II, the Church of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same complex reality.

Footnotes

1. *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, Typis Polyglotis Vaticanis, Rome, vol. I, pt. 4, p. 15.
2. *Idem.*, p. 122.
3. *Idem.*, p. 389.
4. *Idem.*, vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 219-220. "Docet autem Sacra Synodus et sollemnite profitetur non esse nisi unicum Jesu Christi Ecclesiam ... Salvator post resurrectionem suam Petro et Apostolis eorumque successoribus tradidit Haec igitur Ecclesia ... est Ecclesia Catholica, A Romano Pontifice et Episcopis in eius communione directa
5. *Idem.*, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 167-168. "Haec est unica Christi Ecclesia, quam in Symbolo unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam profiteamur, quam Salvator noster, post resurrectionem suam Petro pascendam tradidit, eique ac ceteris Apostolis diffundendam et regendam commisit, Haec Ecclesia, in hoc mundo ut societas constituta et ordinata, subsistit in Ecclesia catholica, a successore Petri et Episcopis in eius communione gubernata, licet extra eius compaginem elementa plura sanctificationis et veritatis inveniantur, quae ut dona Ecclesiae Christi propria, ad unitatem catholicam impellunt."
6. *Idem.*, p. 176. "Ex magno numero observationum

et obiectionum, quae de hac paragrapho a Patribus prolatae sunt, papet intentionem et contextum huius articuli non omnibus fuisse perspicua.

Intentio autem est ostendere, Ecclesiam, cuius descripta est intima et arcana natura, qua com Christo Eiusque opere in perpetuum unitur, his in terris concrete inveniri in Ecclesia catholica. Haec autem Ecclesia empirica mysterium revelat, sed non sine umbris, donec ad plenum lumen adducatur, sicut etiam Christus Dominus per exinanitionem ad gloriam pervenit. Ita praecavetur impressio ac si descriptio, quam Concilium de Ecclesia proponit, esset mere idealistica et irrealis.

Ideo magis dilucida *subdivisio* proponitur, in qua successive agitur de sequentibus:

a) Mysterium Ecclesiae adest et manifestatur in *concreta societate*. *Coetus autem visibilis et elementum spirituale non sunt duae res, sed una realitas complexa, complectens divina et humana, media salutis et fructus salutis. Quod per anaogiam cum Verbo incarnato illustratur.*

b) Ecclesia est *unica*, et his in terris adest in Ecclesia catholica, licet extra eam inveniantur elementa ecclesialia."

7. *Idem.*, p. 180. "Mysterium Ecclesiae tamen non est figmentum idealisticum aut irrealis, sed existit in *ipsa societate concreta catholica*, sub ductu successoris Petri et Episcoporum in eius communione. Non duae sunt ecclesiae, sed una tantum"

8. *Idem.*, p. 177. "Quaedam verba mutantur: loco 'est' dicitur 'subsistit in' ut expressio melius concordet cum affirmatione de elementis ecclesialibus quae *alibi* absunt."

9. *Documents of Vatican II*, Walter M. Abbott, S.J., America Press, New York.

10. *Idem.*, p. 348.

11. *Idem.*, p. 676-677.

12. *Idem.*, p. 663.

13. *Idem.*, p. 208.

14. "Sancta et catholica Ecclesia, quae est Corpus Christi Mysticum"

15. The underlined words in the text have a history of their own. They were not present in the penultimate draft of the text, nor in the accepted emendations which the bishops voted upon chapter by chapter. On the 19th of November 1964, the Secretary General of the Council, Pericles Felici, announced that, on the following day, the vote on the final text as a whole would take place. In preparation for that vote, a printed version of the final text was circulated. It

included 19 emendations "inserted by the Secretariat for Christian Unity, which in the way accepted suggestions of good-will which had been authoritatively expressed" (*Acta*, vol. 3, pt. 8, p. 422). Felici then listed the emendations. These corrections, in fact, had been proposed by Pope Paul VI and accepted by the Secretariat for Christian Unity which was responsible for drafting the Decree on Ecumenism. They were approved by the bishops in the final vote, held on Nov. 20 (cf. *Idem.*, p. 553 and 636-637).

Felici referred to these last minute additions as "clarifications" and such in fact they were. They clarify in the final text itself what might not otherwise have been clear, apart from a close reading of the *Acta*. 16. *Acta*, vol. 3, pt. 7, p. 33. "... bona enumerata ab ipso Christo in fratres separatos derivantur; ... validitas et efficacia plurium sacramentorum et aliorum mediorum salutis ab Ecclesia impediri nequeunt, cum non a voluntate et iurisdictione Ecclesiae, sed a voluntate salvifica Christi pendeant."

17. *Idem.*, p. 35. "Deus procul dubio utitur ipsis Communitatibus seiunctis, non quidem qua seiunctis, sed qua informatis praedictis elementis ecclesialibus, ad conferendam credentibus gratiam salutarem."

18. *Idem.*, p. 35. "Necessitas communionis cum Ecclesia catholica ad gratiam Christi et salutem obtinendam sufficienter indicatur in toto contextu."

19. *Acta*, vol. 3, pt. 1, p. 202. He later stated that the ratio retained its value and repeated the cited remark (*Idem.*, p. 467).

20. St. Augustine, "On Baptism," *An Augustine Reader*,

ed. by John J. O'Meara, Doubleday, Image, Garden City, N.Y., 1973, p. 220. The theme is frequent in Augustine. On the fact that the "ecclesial elements" belong *by right* to the Catholic Church, cf. *In Johannem*, VI, 15-16.

21. *Acta*, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 12. "Postea clare affirmatur solam Ecclesiam catholicam esse veram Ecclesiam Christi."

22. It is in this sense that the following statement must be understood. "In his coetibus unica Christi Ecclesia, quasi tamquam in Ecclesiis particularibus, quamvis imperfecte, praesens et madiantibus elementis ecclesiasticis aliquo modo actiosa est." (*Acta*, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 335).

"On March 11, 1985, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, in criticizing Leonardo Boff's work, *Church, Charisma and Power*, made the following statement on the unicity of the Church: "From the Council's famous expression *Haec Ecclesia (scl. unica Christi Ecclesia) ... subsistit in Ecclesia Catholica*, he [Boff] extracts a thesis exactly contrary to the authentic meaning of the Council text, when he asserts "in fact it (the one church of Christ) can also subsist in other Christian Churches" (p. 131). The Council, on the contrary, chose the word *subsistit* precisely to make clear that there is only one "subsistence" of the true Church, while outside her visible framework there exist only "elementa Ecclesiae" which - being elements of the same church - tend and lead towards the Catholic Church."

(*L'Osservatore Romano*, Eng. ed., 4/9/85, p. 11)

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights

It has never before been questioned that churches have the right to govern their own affairs and, as part of that, to exercise discipline with respect to their members. More than a century ago, that issue was thoroughly thrashed out before the Supreme Court in *Watson v. Jones*. That case involved the question of whether the Presbyterian Church could legally expel pro-slavery members - a question loaded with political implications. The Court emphatically held that it could, and for the intervening 119 years has solidly reaffirmed that holding. The Court there said, in sum: when people join a church, they consent to its government, "and are bound to submit to it." If they dissent from its teachings, they are free to leave - and the church is free to expel them. That is part of our churches' liberty under the Constitution. It is not too different from the liberty which Kiwanis, AFL-CIO, or the U.S. Department of State, or any media organization have with respect to their employees. That liberty is not erased where the dissenting member happens to be an elected official.

(Issued September 29, 1990)

Around the Church in the 90's

- ◇ The *John Paul II Institute* for Studies on Marriage and Family is the only institute in the United States devoted to graduate studies on marriage and the family, offering degrees such as Master of Theological Studies (M.T.S.) or a Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S.T.L.). Its faculty include Carl Anderson (Dean), Ralph McInerney, John Finnis, John Haas, Paul Vitz. William May, former president of the Fellowship, will join the Institute full-time as the McGivney Professor of Moral Theology in September 1991. For further information write Dean Anderson at 487 Michigan Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017 (202) 526-3799.
- ◇ In the wake of the postponement of the Bishops' Pastoral on Women's concerns, the NCCB's Secretariat for Laity and Family Life conducted a national symposium in Arlington, Virginia, November 29th-December 2nd, to discuss the *Wisdom of Women*. Featured speakers included Rochester's Bishop Matthew Clark (Keynote), Joliet's Bishop Joseph Imesch, Dr. Sydney Callahan of Mercy College, Helen Alvare of the USCC's office of General Counsel. Prayer sessions were led by representatives of the dioceses of Milwaukee and Saginaw. The three-day meeting was organized by Dolores R. Leckey, Executive Director of the NCCB's Secretariat.
- ◇ Father William J. Byron, S.J., President of The Catholic University of America, responded to charges by the AAUP (contained in the September-October 1989 issue of *Academe*) that CUA violated Charles Curran's academic rights. His statement, made on June 18, 1990, read in part:

"In the final analysis, an institution must be faithful to its own goals and objectives. Judged by that standard, the university's actions in this case have been vindicated completely by a fair and impartial trial judge who presided over a lengthy trial, heard from all of the relevant witnesses, and considered all of the relevant facts...

...Academic freedom is not absolute freedom. It is, in every instance, limited by the discipline itself. Internal to the discipline of Catholic theology is respect for and fidelity to the magisterium of the Church. Censure by AAUP in this case touches directly on the question of the nature of Catholic theology. It is presumptuous on the part of AAUP to attempt to decide that question."

Father Byron concluded: "Censure by the AAUP will alter neither that conclusion nor the conviction which supports it."
- ◇ *Melbourne Mass Attendance*. The Catholic Research Office for Pastoral Planning (CROPP) recently published its annual "Mass Count Report." Of the estimated 950,000 baptized Catholics, approximately 22.4 percent (212,922) attended Mass during the May, 1990 count, a 4.3 percent decline from the previous year. The decline is attributed to the rapid dying off of the over fifty-five section of the Catholic population without a compensating entry by young Catholics into regular religious practice. (Similar reports have been made about comparable large American dioceses.) Melbourne has long been considered the Australian Archdiocese with the strongest Catholic tradition.
- ◇ Persons who have done, or are willing to do, translations of any materials related to canon law are asked to contact FCS member Edward Peters for information on an informal canonical translation service he is organizing. Write Diocese of Duluth, 2830 E. Fourth St., Duluth, MN 55812.
- ◇ In a letter to its members, the Catholic Theological Society of America included a draft (dated April 7, 1990) of a statement eventually intended for publication which, in part, expressed its concern over the way Rome carried on collegiality with local conferences of bishops. The following were the examples cited:

Visitations and public statements which "humiliated respected bishops" and followed no known rules.

Roman officials by-passing and criticizing local bishops while dealing with individuals and groups, "some of them clearly reactionary."

Impugning the authority of bishops' conferences and questioning their authority to teach.

Choosing new bishops with an eye to their adherence to a prescribed position on a few issues, thus overriding consultation with the local Church.

Rejecting local churches' mature pastoral judgments about religious education and sacramental life.

- ✧ An article by John Rich, M.M. appeared in the September 1989 issue of *Sisters Today*, a magazine published by the Liturgical press for Religious Women with a paid circulation of approximately 10,000. Entitled "Sexuality and Spirituality," it faults the Church's approved options while endorsing "the less absolute and more realistic" approach provided by Brother Luke Salm in the Winter 1983-84 issue of the *Maryknoll Formation Journal*. Brother Luke's summary of recent developments in Catholic thinking reads as follows:

"In the practice and in the concrete it is possible to find theologian support for the view that isolated acts of masturbation are not always and objectively sinful (much less gravely so); that under certain circumstances it may be objectively licit for confirmed homosexuals to express mutual love and commitment in a sexual and genital way; that not all premarital and extramarital sex is to be condemned; that married couples may have not only the right but the duty to engage in contraceptive intercourse; that the responsibility of remarriage after divorce ought to be made available to Catholics whose first marriages have effectively died."

- ✧ Fr. Richard McCormick, now the John A. O'Brien professor of Christian ethics at the University of Notre Dame, marked his 50th anniversary in the Society of Jesus with a concelebrated Mass August 31 at St. John High School, Toledo.

Fr. Howard Gray, head of the Jesuits' Detroit Province, and Fr. Walter Burghardt, editor of *Theological Studies*, concelebrated with him. A half dozen or so bishops, including Toledo Auxiliary Bishop Robert W. Donnelly, were among the score of clergy who joined him at the altar for the consecration.

Fr. Burghardt measured the jubilarian against the standard that every Jesuit should be a man open in mind and heart, a man of the church, a man of faith that does justice.

"He has, in consequence, changed the face of moral theology. Not only in its cold textbook content, but just as importantly by the power of his Christian personality, by his clarity, his courage, and his compassion."

The Society of Jesus exists and makes sense "only because we are in service to the church," Fr. Burghardt said.

"Even if we are no longer the pope's light cavalry, we are by profession his faithful servants."

At times, said Fr. Burghardt, that service has involved Fr. McCormick in conflict with the official church.

"He jousts, tilts, clashes with authority because, as a theologian, he is in service to the whole church, in service to God's word within the church, in service to the spirit who is the church's soul. He clashes only when he sees faith and the faithful poorly served. (Reported in the *Toledo Catholic Chronicle* September 14, 1990, Page 7.)

- ✧ A new semi-monthly documentary publication called *Catholic International* has appeared on the scene, which is impressive. Its first issue deals with the missions and the Roman Synod, not only the texts of appropriate documents but cogent summaries. One learns some interesting data about the far-away Church. In reproducing the March Memorandum of the Episcopal Conference of Zaire (formerly the Belgian Congo), the editors compare major Sees on three continents.

KINSHASA: How it compares with other large dioceses

	Kinshasa	Paris	Brooklyn
Population	3,400,000	2,254,000	4,230,000
Catholics	1,700,000	1,768,000	1,506,000
Parishes	94	113	219
Diocesan priests	113	755	828
Religious priests	212	945	228
Major seminarians	168	47	75
Men religious	498	1,314	484
Women religious	383	2,850	1,865
Educational Institutions	287	260	350
Baptisms	32,231	8,034	26,300

Statistics given in the *Annuario Pontificio* 1990.

- ✧ The University of Navarre (the Opus Dei affiliated school) has published a Spanish language commentary on the 1983 Code. The Canadian Canon Law Society has translated it into French (some 1,500 pages), and it is selling in Canadian outlets

now. Its title reads as follows:

E. Caparros, M. Theriault, & J. Thorn, Code de Droit Canonique, Edition bilingue et anote, sous la responsabilite de L'Institut Martin de Azpilcueta, Traduction francaise etablie a portir de la 4* edition espagnole (Montreal: Wilson & Lafleur, 1990).

- ❖ **Allentown College of Saint Francis De Sales** invites applications for a full-time, tenure-track faculty appointment in *Moral Theology* beginning September 1991. Candidates should be able to teach the *historical and/or systematic foundations of Catholic moral theology*. The position involves teaching four courses each semester and normal non-teaching duties. Successful college teaching, grasp of Catholic moral teachings, commitment to scholarly research, and doctorate are required. Candidates must be supportive of the mission of a Catholic, liberal arts college. Salary commensurate with experience and qualifications. EO/AAI. Send CV, 3 letters of reference, transcripts to: Dr. Bernard F. O'Connor, O.S.F.S., Dept. of Philosophy/Theology, Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales, 2755 Station Ave., Center Valley, PA 18034-9568. To ensure consideration, all application materials must be received by **December 15, 1990**.
- ❖ Canada has Father Ian Boyd, C.S.B. and his *Chesterton Review* of which he is editor. His newly established Chesterton Review Press has just published its first book *Chesterton and the Modernist Crisis*, compiled and edited by Aidan Nichols, O.P.; a professor at the Angelicum. Although the book brings together the leading historians of the movement and its critics, it accentuates how Chesterton, then a young Anglican, reacted to the cultural and political crisis modernism created for society and religion; particularly its long range effect on Catholicism. The book's two hundred pages are contemporary, particularly for Catholic intelligetiae. Available from Father Boyd's Press at 1437 College Drive, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 0W6, \$24.50 paperback, \$34.50 hard cover.
- ❖ The claim is made by Father Richard McCormick, S.J. and Father Richard McBrien that over seven hundred fifty theologians have signed a statement in support for Father Charles Curran, attesting to his excellent reputation in his field of moral theol-

ogy (Cf. *America*, September 15, 1990, pp. 127 ff). Another authoritative written source, as yet only privately circulated, reads the extent of dissent in the U.S. Church differently, and deals with the responsibility of the diocesan bishop in an interesting manner.

"Dissent cannot be dismissed as a creation of the media nor always as a popular misreading of serious discussion. Dissent is present within the Church in the United States, though studies have shown that it is neither as pervasive nor as profound as has been often suggested. Some American Catholics disagree outspokenly with individual moral doctrines of the magisterium, such as the condemnation of contraception and *in vitro* fertilization. In a very different mode, disciplinary determinations such as those about priestly celibacy or first confession before communion have also evoked public contradiction. The issues which have evoked public dissent are serious as well as very different among themselves; but in contrast to the consensus on the core-content of the faith within the Church, their number should not be exaggerated.*

"Any attempt to control this dissent by the use of authority may be read as repression and become the matter of headlines - an imposition of an external discipline foreign to the free expression of opinions. The United States is a nation founded on trust in public, open discussion and the frank interchange of opinions. The people of this country are deeply distrustful of what is perceived as an attempt to prevent or diminish freedom of speech."

* Dissent in the Church in the United States seems to arise chiefly in areas of sexual morality and ecclesiastical authority. See George Gallup, Jr. and Jim Castelli, *The American Catholic People* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1987); Andrew M. Greeley, *Religious Change in America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989); Wade Clark Roof and William McKinney, *American Mainline Religion. Its Changing Shape and Future* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1960). Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, *Christian Belief and Anti-Semitism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), especially Chapter 1.

The Evolving Thought of Bernard Häring, C.S.S.R.

Father Häring, in many ways "the Father" of the contraceptive movement within the Church, and the mentor of many American theologians, recently wrote a letter to John Paul II expressing his reservations about the Pope's "overemphasis on too rigorously interpreted norms in the field of sexual ethics." (See *Tablet*, London, August 4, 1990.) He has also written a book which illustrates the evolution of his thinking beyond the issue of contraception.

William May, former president of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars and member of the Pope's International Theological Commission, analyses this development for the Newsletter:

In 1989 Bernard Häring published *Ausweglos? Zur Pastoral bei Scheidung und Wiederverheiratung: Ein Playoder* (Frieburg: Herder, 1989). Häring, who obviously regards the practice of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, grounded in their spirituality of economy, as superior to the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, sets forth many positions that are not compatible with Catholic teaching. Attention here will center on the most harmful aspects of his work.

The first of these concerns his interpretation of our Lord's teaching on the indissolubility of marriage (Mk 10.2-12; Mt 5.31-32, 19.3-12; Lk 16.18). Häring rightly rejects the view that this teaching presents us only with an ideal or a "mere" ideal. But he claims that our Lord's teaching is a "goal-command" (*Zielgebot*) or "normative ideal," i.e., an ideal or goal toward the attainment of which one is obliged to strive with all one's energy (p. 33). This interpretation, however, is not in conformity with the Church's understanding of this teaching of our Lord. Jesus, in presenting his teaching on marriage, contrasted it with the Mosaic teaching, which permitted divorce and remarriage because of "the hardness of heart" to his Father's original plan for marriage at creation. Moreover, in the person of Jesus God's kingdom has come, and those united with him are given a "new heart" and the grace to live in conformity with his Father's design. Thus, the Church understands our Lord's teaching as a *truth*, namely, that marriage, by the will of the Creator, is of its own nature intrinsically indissoluble, i.e., that no human power can dissolve it, and that any attempt to do so is not effective, with the result that attempts to "remarry" are not efficacious and that sexual relations of

divorced persons who have attempted remarriage are not marital but rather adulterous (cf. Mk 10.11-12; Mt 5.32; 19.9; Lk 16.18; cf. Council of Trent, Session XXIV, 11 Nov. 1563, canon 7; Pius XI, Enc. *Casti Connubii*, 31 Dec. 1930 [AAS 11 (1930) 574]). While the Church has the power, divine in nature insofar as it has been given to the Church by God, to dissolve nonsacramental marriages and nonconsummated sacramental marriages, it has no authority to dissolve the consummated sacramental marriages of Christ's faithful: "To those [of the faithful] now married, however, I give this command (though it is not mine; it is the Lord's): a wife may not separate from her husband; if she does separate, she must either remain single or become reconciled to him again. Similarly, a husband must not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7.11; emphasis added).

The second dangerous position taken by Häring is his attempt to apply the "economy" of the Eastern Churches to the practice of the Catholic Church. He claims that should a divorced person, after a period of pastoral counselling, come to the conscientious judgment that it would be better for him, his children, and others to "remarry," "we, as representatives of the Church cannot *directly* support this decision" (p. 60; emphasis added). But, he continues, "we can point to the solution afforded by the economy of the Eastern Churches and express our own modest opinion whether or not the decision of the one before us is in conformity with the basic principles of economy" (p. 60). Surely, if a Catholic spiritual advisor were to follow Häring's proposal here, this spiritual advisor would in fact be offering support to and confirmation of a divorced person's decision to remarry. But a Catholic spiritual advisor ought not to offer such counsel. To do so is to abdicate his responsibility, for he cannot give someone leave to commit adultery, yet this is precisely, if one objectively and rightly considers the matter, what is being proposed.

A third pastorally dangerous position advanced by Häring concerns the virtue of *epikeia*, whose nature and use Häring seriously misrepresents. Häring first alleges, improperly, that the annulment procedures operative within the Church are based upon a legalistic mentality that subordinates the real needs of human persons to laws and fails utterly to manifest the love and mercy of Christ. He claims that a vicious "tuti-

orism" vitiates Church tribunals, which place upon the parties the burden of proving that their first marriages were invalid. He contends that the burden of proof should rest, not on individuals claiming that their first marriage was invalid, but on those who assert that it is. He claims that, whenever there is reasonable doubt about the validity of the first marriage and whenever the party seeking an annulment is conscientiously convinced that the marriage is in fact invalid, the marriage ought to be annulled (pp. 66-67). If the first marriage has not been annulled because of a "tutoristic" demand for proof, and if the party involved and the spiritual counsellor are both convinced that the first marriage was invalid, then, he says, *epikeia* can be applied and the pastoral counsellor can "in as quiet a manner as possible (*in aller Stille*), go ahead with the wedding" (p. 79).

Here Häring's proposal is not only incompatible with the Church's understanding of marriage but also with reality. The reason why the first marriage is presumed valid unless the contrary is clearly demonstrated is that the Church respects the dignity of human persons and presumes that they speak the truth when, through "an act of irrevocable personal consent" (cf. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 48), a man and a woman freely give themselves to one another in marriage, a reality whose "holy bond (*sacrum vinculum*) no longer depends on human choice" (ibid.). While a person may be sincerely convinced in his or her own conscience that a marriage was invalid, one may be sincerely mistaken, for reality does not depend upon sincere convictions.

In addition, *epikeia* is a virtue whereby one is able to determine whether, in given circumstances, the intent of the lawgiver is respected or not if a specific law is followed. The determination of the validity of marriage, however, is not a matter of determining whether a law is applicable or not. Rather, it is the determination of a *fact*, i.e., whether in truth the union between this man and this woman is a marriage or only the appearance of a marriage. Nor can *epikeia* be used when the "law" in question is one that admits of no exceptions, such as the norm proscribing adultery.

In his work Häring consistently and rhetorically distinguishes between a legalistic understanding of morality (which, he clearly indicates, is at the heart of the practice of the Church) and a more Gospel-inspired understanding of morality that stresses the love and mercy of God. He apparently thinks that all specific

moral norms or "laws" (to use his preferred way of speaking), with the exception of those proscribing torture and rape, are open to exceptions. He seems to think that moral norms or "laws" are extrinsic limitations of human freedom - useful, for the most part, in protecting basic human values, but to be set aside whenever they needlessly curtail human choices. He does not seem to think of them as *truths* in light of which persons can choose well and in this way make themselves to be, through their freely chosen actions, the beings God wills them to be. He fails to recognize that *some* norms are absolute, i.e., without exception. Among these is the norm proscribing adultery. Adultery is wrong because a man or a woman ought to be true to their word, and they ought not to substitute in the marriage bed some other person for the one whom they have made irreplaceable and nonsubstitutable by their irrevocable choice to give themselves to that person as husband or wife. Adultery is not compatible with a heart open to what is good and lovable, to the "new heart" given to us when, through baptism, we became new creatures in Christ. This is the teaching of Christ and of the Church, and the reason why "remarriage" after divorce is not permitted; for the Church cannot permit adultery.

In addition, Häring insinuates that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, in a letter to Cardinal Bernardin (21.3.1975), held that those Catholics unfortunately living in an irregular "second marriage" can be admitted to the sacraments *without* resolving to abstain from genital acts (i.e., to live in as "brothers and sisters") (cf. pp. 85-86). This insinuation is quite misleading.

Häring pointedly observes (p. 96, note 7) that he had advanced some of his ideas on divorce and remarriage in earlier writings, in particular his essay "Internal Forum Solutions to Insoluble Marriage Cases" in *The Jurist*, 30 (1970) 21-30, and that he had received no reprimand from Church authorities. He thereby implies that such silence on the part of Church authorities signifies acceptance or at least toleration of his views.

Finally, Häring clearly indicates, during his presentation of the "oikonomia spirituality" of the Eastern Churches, that he thinks marriages can "die" not only a physical death (when one of the spouses dies) but also "moral," "psychical," and "civil" death (cf. pp. 47-52). This way of understanding the "death" of a marriage is predicated upon a philosophy that regards as real and important what appears in consciousness

and ignores other aspects of reality. It makes a mockery of the promise mutually given by man and woman when they marry that they will forswear all others and be faithful to each other until death, i.e., until the life of one of them ends.

In short, Häring's work is misleading and dangerous, setting forth in an uncritical way positions completely incompatible with Catholic truth. His frequent appeals to the teaching of St. Alphonsus Ligouri are especially to be lamented, since he seeks to apply the teaching of this great Doctor in ways that are quite

foreign to the saint's mind. Häring's rhetoric, whereby he seeks to portray the present practice of the Church as heartless and cruel, is precisely that, rhetoric. Häring presents himself as one who seeks only to make manifest the mercy and love of Christ; he seeks to portray the teaching and practice of the Church as a legalistic, pharisaical betrayal of our Lord's gospel of love and mercy. But in reality, it is Häring who distorts and misrepresents Christ's teaching and in this way seriously endangers the life of the faithful.

Cardinal Bernard Gantin and National Episcopal Conferences

This head of the Congregation of Bishops reported to the 1990 Synod of Bishops (reported in *Origins*, November 8, 1990) on the status of the 1985 Roman document concerning the "munus docendi" of conferences vis-a-vis individual bishops. Almost half of the world's episcopal bodies responded to the original draft by Rome. Gantin's most significant paragraphs were these: "With no less intensity in the documentation is the personal and non-transferable role of the individual bishop as *jure divino* vicar of Christ in his diocese stressed (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, 27, a-b). It shows that by virtue of belonging to a conference of bishops the relationship of the bishops that compose it with the particular church which they are put in charge of does not change."

"Thus the pastoral ministry which they together exercise as a conference is really distinct from and at the same time connected with the pastoral governance which each bishop exercises in his respective particular church. This personal and inalienable role of the bishop is clearly affirmed as incapable of being delegated to anyone else, not even to the conference of bishops which is not an intermediating subject between the bishops and the college of bishops: each belongs automatically to the college, that is, not by virtue of his belonging to a conference, but solely by reason of sacramental consecration and through the hierarchical communion with the head and members of the college itself" (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, 23) . . .

"Since not everyone is in agreement as to the manner of drafting and ordering in a unified way the individual elements of this episcopal mystery and since there subsist also diverse doctrinal positions in the ecclesiological field, it is not the aim of the new document to settle the open theological issues, but rather to allow time for them to mature."

CTSA Report on Profession and Oath

The Catholic Theological Society of America is not pleased. Indeed, the displeasure is evident on virtually every page of its April 15, 1990 *Report . . . on the Profession of Faith and the Oath of Fidelity*. As is well known, the Profession and Oath are now required by the Holy See of a large class of Catholics assuming specified offices in the Church. The CTSA, however, is pleased neither with the content of the Profession and the Oath nor the manner of their promulgation nor – most especially – with the thought of their implementation. One fact, however, which the CTSA must concede is that the norms regulating the administration of the Profession and Oath are now official, legitimate and binding laws of the Church.

The *Report* makes much of the manner in which the Profession and Oath were promulgated. It is to be noted that they were first announced in an article in *L'Osservatore Romano* on February 25, 1989 (March 13, 1989, English edition). They had, however, appeared previously in the January 9, 1989 edition of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Yet that edition of the AAS did not arrive in North America until the month of March, and the documents appeared without the signature of Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the CDF, or its Secretary Archbishop Bovone. Indeed, there was not even an indication of the fact that the statements had been seen and approved by the Holy Father who would have been the legislator giving them binding power. The initial legality and binding character of the Profession and Oath were thus called into question.

However, the CTSA *Report* does point out that a "Rescriptum ex Audientia SS.mi Formulas Professionis Fidei et Iuris Iurandi Fidelitatis Contingens Foras Datur" dated September 19, 1989, and signed by Cardinal Ratzinger did appear in the AAS of October 7, 1989. This rescript removed any doubt regarding the binding, legal character of the Profession and Oath. But because the rescript did not appear until October 7 the *Report* suggests that the Profession and Oath did not become legally binding at least until this date and perhaps not until January 7, 1990, when the usual three-month *vacatio legis* would have expired (Cf. pg. 68, footnote 161).

Such preoccupation with the legality of the Profession and Oath is characteristic of the CTSA *Report* and can certainly be vouchsafed since they are legal docu-

ments binding on those who take them. Despite the fact that the original announcement of the documents in *L'Osservatore Romano* stated that they were to "come into force from March 1, 1989", it does seem that a legal case might be able to be made that perhaps they did not have the full force of law until January 7, 1990. But even conceding this, one can hardly suppress the sentiment of "So what!"

Let the canonists have their way. Let certain legalists out there relish the fact that they may have assumed their office at a time prior to the Profession and Oath becoming obligatory and that they will never have to submit to them. But the larger question is why should any Catholic mind making the Profession and taking the Oath in the first place? What is contained in these documents would seem to reflect no more than the response to magisterial teaching expected of any faithful Catholic as taught in *Lumen Gentium* 25. Why would those assuming a public office in the Church have any reluctance stating publicly what any Catholic individually and privately is expected to hold as a faithful member of the Church?

The Profession of Faith and Oath of Fidelity are consistently presented in the worst light possible in the *Report*. They are judged to be coercive, restrictive and ambiguous. Indeed, the authors of the *Report* cannot understand why they should even be necessary.

It is not difficult to see the ironies and potential tragedies when it is noted that the persons to whom the new requirements for oaths of fidelity and professions of faith are addressed are not in fact persons of unfaith or disloyalty. That is, those persons affected by the requirements most directly – those of whom they are demanded, on whom they are imposed – are likely to be persons of great faith and tested loyalty. (p. 29)

Remarkably, this sentiment is expressed by the very Society which a few years ago offered us a book entitled *Human Sexuality* which so deviated from the norms of Catholic teaching – and, indeed, even common sense – that the bishops of the country had to warn the faithful not to use it. The wonderment of the CTSA that Church authorities would perceive a need "to impose" the Profession and Oath on Catholic officials comes from a Society which has officially supported a theologian, Charles Curran, whom even

any evening news anchor-person knows to be disloyal to true Catholic teaching. It is precisely because of actions by organizations such as the CTSA that the Holy See probably considered itself obliged to issue these new legally binding documents to achieve what St. Paul asked of the Philippians (2:1-2): "In the name of the encouragement you owe me in Christ, in the name of the solace that love can give, of fellowship in spirit, compassion, and pity, I beg you: make my joy complete by your *unanimity*, possessing the one love, united in spirit and ideals." The truth is that "persons of great faith and tested loyalty" do not seem to have difficulty in giving public testimony to their faith and their commitments through these controverted statements.

In their resolve to undermine the documents in question the authors of the *Report* resort to emotional allusions to ancillary subjects which are not pertinent to a historical, theological and canonical analysis of the Profession and Oath themselves. Incredibly they appeal to historical abuses of the use of oaths to discredit the one under consideration. They point to the suffering, deprivation, indeed, even forfeiture of life which resulted when faithful Catholics refused the Oath of Supremacy (1534) in England after the break with Rome! Also, considerable space is given to some of the abuses of the civil loyalty oaths imposed by the House Un-American Activities Committee during the McCarthy Era. Neither of these, however, have any relevance to the Oath under consideration. The question is not that of oaths themselves but the use to which oaths are put. As St. Thomas Aquinas puts it with his usual clarity:

Nothing prevents a thing being good in itself, and yet becoming a source of evil to one who makes use thereof unbecomingly . . . it must be stated that an oath is in itself lawful and commendable. This is proved from its origin and from its end. From its origin, because swearing owes its introduction to the faith whereby man believes that God possesses unerring truth and universal knowledge and foresight of all things; and from its end, since oaths are employed in order to justify men, and to put an end to controversy (Heb. vi. 16) (ST 2a2ae, 89, 2).

The Oath of Supremacy imposed on the subjects of Henry VIII at the point of a sword was impious, heretical, unjust, and immoral both from its origin and its end. The Oath of Fidelity upon the assumption of an office in the Catholic Church is salutary, wholesome and just, giving public witness to one's solidarity with

the Holy See and the Universal Church and expressing a willingness to accept just penalties imposed by competent authority for a violation of the trust which has been given.

The authors of the *Report* maintain that divisiveness and resentment can arise when oaths "are exacted on the basis of fear, a sheer sense of duty, enforced obedience, or a perception of some other form of unfreedom" (p.26). This is most certainly true, and such an attitude would certainly vitiate an otherwise morally good act of taking an oath. The Church, however, coerces no one to take the Oath of Fidelity; it does, though, provide its official representatives the opportunity to give public expression to their allegiances and their commitments through the Oath. It also provides them with "moments of truth" in which they can examine their commitment to the common enterprise. Should they find that there is simply too great a divergence between them and the magisterium concerning the understanding of the faith and the Church's mission at this moment in history they are provided the opportunity to be honest with themselves, with the community of faith and with the world. The Profession and Oath provide a "kairos" for integrity.

The authors of the *Report* do see some value to the types of statements under consideration. "They ritualize and thereby strengthen the relation of community members to a common center". The problem is that the magisterium is out of touch with the "common center". As the *Report* puts it, "a profession of faith yields . . . positive results only when it is made in a way that is consonant with the movement of life in the community, and when the desire of the one who makes it is alive with a sense of its meaning in relation to the life and faith of the community." Clearly, in the judgment of the CTSA, Cardinal Ratzinger and the Holy Father are not "with the movement of life in the community." The implication is that the CTSA itself could come up with a Profession and Oath which would serve the life and faith of the community better! The historicist presuppositions underlying the *Report* are here rather obvious.

Remarkably, the authors also fall into a kind of Biblical Fundamentalism. Although they concede some value to oaths, they make their distaste of them quite clear and point out repeatedly Our Lord's injunction recorded in Matthew, "Do not swear at all . . . Let your yes be yes and your no, no." They suggest that Pope

Paul VI wanted to eliminate the use of all oaths based on this Scriptural text and indeed state baldly "The Sermon on the Mount teaches against (oaths)" (p. 110). Here we encounter a very simplistic approach to Scripture which makes no use whatever of the creative scholarship which they claim will be jeopardized by the new Profession and Oath. They sound like our Fundamentalist friends who will not address a Catholic priest as "Father" because Jesus said "Call no man Father."

The Tradition has dealt in various ways with the apparent contradiction between Jesus' words and the persistent use of oaths in the Church and in Christian societies. The *Report* seems to want simply to ignore them.

The preceding is just one example of the fact that the biblical and theological analysis of the Profession and Oath in the CTSA *Report* is decidedly inferior to the canonical. But the fact that the canonical analysis is perhaps the best part of the *Report* also points to its fundamentally legalistic and minimalist approach to the subject.

There are many points in the *Report* worthy of a full, scholarly article in response. However, it might be illustrative of the *Report's* general approach to look briefly at one of the authors' principal areas of concern. In line with the CTSA's general position that the Catholic is free not only to withhold assent from, but even to dissent publicly with, non-infallible, authoritative magisterial teaching, the *Report* has great difficulty with the second and third paragraphs added after the recitation of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the Profession of Faith. Their difficulty derives from the Profession's statement that one "firmly accept and hold" each and every thing that is proposed by that same (Church) definitively with regard to teaching concerning faith and morals.

The debate is whether "definitively" means infallibly and hence refers to teachings which must be accepted as "de fide". If that is the case, then the question is raised why it is even included in the Profession since the preceding paragraph speaks of accepting in faith that which the Church has taught ordinarily or extra-ordinarily as being divinely revealed.

That there is debate surrounding the interpretation of this paragraph should be no more surprising than the fact that there are debates surrounding the interpretation of Scripture or the documents of the Coun-

cils. That there are grounds for debate in no way precludes the possibility of resolving the debate.

The Profession clearly has to be interpreted in the light of the documents of the Second Vatican Council and the Code of Canon Law which is presumed by the Holy See. This alone would seem to obviate some of the apparent ambiguities in the text. Since both the conciliar documents and the Code use "definitive" interchangeably with "infallible" (LG 25 and Canon 749) one would understand these teachings to be irreformable and infallible requiring our unqualified assent if not, the "assensus fidei". The Deputation for the Faith at the First Vatican Council, the Theological Commission at Vatican II and the CDF (in *Mysterium Ecclesiae*) teach that there are secondary objects of revelation which can be defined and which are absolutely required to safeguard the deposit of the faith even though they are not themselves of the faith (Cf. p. 78). This would seem most probably then to be the object of the second paragraph after the Creed in the Profession. There is, admittedly, no attempt here to resolve the debate surrounding this paragraph, but simply to point out that there is no reason to think that it might be somehow irresolvable or that it reflects blameworthy carelessness on the part of the Holy See. There can be no doubt that it can and will be settled through already existing ecclesiastical organs.

The third paragraph after the Creed also causes problems for the authors' of the *Report*. Here the reference to LG 25 and Canon 752 are very clear as they call for a religious *obsequium* of intellect and will to be paid to the non-infallible yet authoritative teachings of the magisterium. This is a particular sticking point for the CTSA since *obsequium* is the last thing they want to be with regard to certain non-infallible, authoritative magisterial teaching.

The *Report* carries on considerable debate over the exact meaning of *obsequium* as "respect" or "due respect" or "religious respect" or "submission" or "conditioned assent" or "religious assent" as distinct from the "assent of faith". No translation the *Report* comes up with, however, would seem able to justify the kind of public, querulous dissent which many theologians have practiced ever since the issuance of *Humanae Vitae* in 1968.

Lumen Gentium 25 makes it very clear that a "religious submission of will and of mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking ex

cathedra." When Karl Rahner comments on this text in the *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* edited by Vorgrimler, he speaks of the possibility of a *silentium obsequiosum* when internal assent to a non-fallible yet authoritative magisterial teaching cannot be conscientiously accepted. Instead today we have a grating and demoralizing cacophony of disagreement.

The CTSA *Report* laments the supposedly repressive climate arising out of suspicion and distrust in the contemporary Church. However, they seek the source of it in the wrong place. They ought to look within. Through the Profession and Oath the magisterium is only again expressing its solicitude for the members of the Church and those would-be members of the Church

(all humankind) to receive the faith in its fullness by using gentle means of bringing certain people who represent the Church publicly to their "kairos" of integrity.

The *Report* does a good job of narrowing the field of those who would be subject to the Profession (Canon 833, 1-8) and the Oath (Canon 833, 5-8) and insisting they need not be taken by any others (which, indeed, they need not). Not surprisingly, of course, the *Report* never addresses those Catholics who, though not legally bound to make the Profession and take the Oath, would *want* to do so out of a desire to show their love for an solidarity with "the common center".

John M. Haas, St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia

Would Democracy Solve the Problems of the Church?

This is a question asked by the Editors of Critic Magazine of Msgr. George A. Kelly. His answer published in the Fall 1990 issue was the following:

IT SEEMS TO ME that this is the wrong inquiry.

The last question Christ asked of his apostles in the upper room is really the basic one for Christians: "Do you believe now?" (John 16:31).

To the extent that we can speak of "Church problems" at all, we will find them to be the same as Christ's, the very ones that brought about this crucifixion: hostility from elites to the content of the message, opposing religious claims, government's secular priorities, the fickleness of public opinion and among followers, little faith, personal failures, including greed, lack of courage, betrayal, need for worldly approval and unwillingness of many to suffer or die for Jesus' cause.

Christianity is basically a Christocracy. Its existence and its faith belong to Christ alone. Its ongoing guarantors are the successors of Peter. Liberal democracy, conservative democracy, social democracy, democratic socialism cannot solve problems that arise from the failure of Christians to live, or die if need be, according to the precepts laid down by Christ himself.

The Catholic Church, therefore, must be seen as a voluntary community of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ, whose baptismal affirmation commits them to that faith and its moral code. It is governed by those who have received the sacrament of Holy Orders. A plebiscite, the kind to which Pontius Pilate appealed, cannot define or advance faith in Christ or in his proposed way of holiness—the two essential ingredients of Christian discipleship (Luke 10:16; John 8:31-32). Contrariwise, voting procedures have value in settling political differences among populations whose secular faiths or ideologies are different.

Witnessing Christian faith is the responsibility of all believers whose primary public role is not so much to vote on the faith but to witness it. Different members of the Catholic community falter along the way, as prelates and clergy are known to do, and pastors must know the minds and habits of their people. But they, too, are bound by the demands of the Christocracy.

A great deal of time is spent these days worrying about the democratization of the Church, whether there is too much or too little. Everyone knows that the Church adapts to changing conditions without altering or contradicting the deposit of Christ's faith revealed two millennia ago. The Second Vatican Council, for example, created a new body of ecclesiastical law consistent with the Catholic Tradition. It did so without the "vote of the people." "Progress" may or may not mean change for the better; "tradition" may or may not represent "the wisdom of the Saints"; so-called democrats, once in power, are often autocrats for their own ideology, not Christ's; "progressives," usually the initiators of change, can be primitive in their understanding of acceptable development; "conservatives" who normally resist change, often are the ultimate institutionalizers of acceptable change. During this interplay the actors are the Church's people who, if they are true to the demands of their faith commitment, should be recognized more for their assent to the Catholic creeds than for their dissent, known, too, for their obedience to the Church's pastors than for their rebellious spirit or disruptive conduct.

Only the Pope and those bishops in union with him can generate the discipleship expected of the Catholic community. They can fail in the holiness of their personal witness. They can err in their practical judgments about how to teach and rule in a way consistent with Christ's imposed mission. They may lack the governing skills necessary to deal with revolutionary forces within the Church. They may even submit to the violence of elite mobs as some of their predecessors once did before emperors and kings. But together they cannot suborn the faith handed on by their predecessors, even to please the public opinion of particular climes or times. Vatican II certainly did not alter their particular role of their ultimate responsibility. Christ himself denied that possibility.

Book Reviews

The Crisis in Religious Vocations: An Inside View

Edited by Laurie Felknor, Paulist Press, New York, 1989, vii +232 pp., \$8.95.

When in the Spring of 1983, Pope John Paul II appointed a Pontifical Commission of three bishops to aid the bishops of the United States in their pastoral service to religious, he singled out for special consideration the question of the sharp decline in the number of young people entering apostolic religious life. He asked for an analysis of the reasons for the decline, so potentially damaging to the Church in its apostolic mission and to the spiritual life and health of the religious themselves. The sixteen essays in the present volume were among those written at the request of the Pontifical Commission at an initial stage of its work.

The chairman of the Commission, Archbishop John R. Quinn of San Francisco explains in the introduction the process which led to composition of these papers. Factual sociological data relating to decline in vocations was made available to the "nearly forty" religious, "experts in various fields," who were asked to review the data and then, "on the basis of their expertise and their own experience" to write a paper "in light of the main question proposed: Why the decline in religious vocations? Why do not more young people enter religious life?" The editor of the book, Laurie Felknor, relates that the writers were given two sociological studies: *Religious Life in the United States: the Experience of Men's Communities*, a study prepared for the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA); and *Catholic Sisters in Transition* by Marie Augusta Neal, SND.

Knowing the background of the book helps but the variety of perspectives on the question, sought by the commission and promised by the publisher's blurb, is not found in the present collection, in spite of the fact that the individual writers are characterized as experts in a wide assortment of disciplines: spiritual theology, history, scripture, sociology, psychology, anthropology, canon law. Instead - aside from a few essays - one finds a certain uniformity of outlook and response, even when recourse is had to different schemata or models or studies. (The most notable exceptions are the essays by Gerald Arbuckle, S.M. and Rose McDermott, S.S.J.) The division of the essays into three sec-

tions ("Introduction to the Question," "Factors in Change," "A Variety of Perspectives on the Question") seems to be a distinction without a difference, given the absence of any real change in emphasis, outlook or conclusions from the beginning to end of the book. Possibly, the writers were constrained by the sociological data given them before they wrote. It is also possible that, in selection of the writers, not enough attention was paid to ensuring a variety, not just of fields of expertise, but of perspectives. This statement relates particularly to the selection made by the publisher from among the thirty-four essays provided by the coordinator of the Commission's study, Bette Moslander, C.S.J. One can only hope that the Commission itself did have available to it other perspectives than those found in the present book.

Given the homogeneous character of most of the essays in this collection, we might approach the book through two interrelated themes expressed in most of the essays.

The first is that the decline in vocations should be viewed as a positive development consonant with recent changes or shifts in society as a whole and, more specifically in the Church and especially as a result of the Second Vatican Council. The second underlying theme is that the decline in vocations has come about because of the failure of the hierarchy of the Church to adapt to the new situation.

The positive views of the decline in the number of religious vocations are generally associated with the author's perception of changes wrought by Vatican II. Kirstin Wombacher, O.P. cites Richard McBrien's view that the shift from the pre-Vatican to the post-Vatican Church represents a movement from the static to the dynamic, from a classicism which sees reality as unaffected by history and able to be captured in unchangeable propositions, to a historical consciousness which gives importance to the effects of history on thought and action; from a concern with the rightness and wrongness of individual acts and obedience to law, to personal responsibility and adult decisionmaking which does not reject norms but sees them as related to historical situations (p. 70). John Staudenmaier, S.J. and Donald Senior, C.P. endorse Karl Rahner's theory of three epoches in the Church's life: the brief period of Jewish Christianity still in direct contact with Jesus; the long period of Hellenistic and European Christianity

initiated by Paul, and the period inaugurated by Vatican II when the Church truly became a world church.

Alongside these schematic and somewhat superficial renderings of Church history, we find analyses of the stages of individual growth and development. Sherman cites a study in which the pre-conciliar church is likened to early puberty, characterized by "strict conformity to the unwritten rules and regulations of the gang." Then "Holiness was defined in terms of a legalistic and stifling conformity ... to a body of doctrine, a static set of rules or the status quo of the establishment." Maturity is reached, we are told, when the person discovered truth not as conformity to a thing but as "a creative self-revelation of the Spirit," when goodness is seen as "being an integral person" rather than doing the right thing, when faithfulness is not strict adherence to what is but "the 'creative fidelity' of personal involvement" (p. 9). In similar fashion, Kristin Wombacher parallels Erikson's stages of the life cycle and the development of religious in the last few decades. The archaism and childishness of pre-Vatican II religious life has been taken care of by adaptation and maturation (p. 66). Joseph Fichter, S.J., in an essay entitled "Vanishing Church Professionals," though he does not offer any analysis of stages of growth, similarly offers a positive assessment of the post-Vatican II attitude toward religious vocations held, he says, by a significant number of priests and religious. Fichter considers it a "breakthrough" that, in the aftermath of Vatican II, 63.8% of priests participating in a survey approved the statement that "the Church should allow voluntary resignation, or honorable discharge from the priesthood." The situation for religious, he writes, is similar, with departure from religious life no longer considered a disgrace. Father Fichter appends to his paper, without comment, the statement of a woman who left religious life after thirty-one years of profession. Her reason was that she became another person than she was when she entered: "Today I am convinced that God has really no plan for me other than the one I evolve for myself" (p. 112).

Most writers of the essays in the book share this basically positive assessment of the decline in vocations, closely connected with their view of the progress of development in the Church and in the lives of individuals. If paradoxically, a negative judgment of the situation is also made, it rests upon the hierarchy, perceived as standing in the way of historical develop-

ment. A few examples will suffice.

Describing the forward movement of religious in searching for new ministries suitable for the "new era," Bergant laments the opposition experienced "from unexpected quarters."

The very church they believed had commissioned them seemed unconcerned with, even resistant to their work. It appeared to many that maintaining the status quo was preferred to evangelization and that outdated ecclesiastical structures were preferred to the dynamic Spirit of God. Many of these religious lost confidence in the church and left their congregations. (p. 81).

Wombacher contends that the fourth stage in the change process brings with it a transformation by which "religious became aware of having their *own* eyes and ears of faith, their *own* gospel vision." In their deeply personal relationship with God, they "were no longer dependent on the 'switchboard' approach to God's will through a superior. They could dial direct! (p. 71). This view is closely akin to the freedom from mediation which Bechtle describes in the words of Sandra Schneiders (p. 56). Mary Ann Donovan, S.C. ("A More Limited Witness") describes the "face" of the institutional Church, which lay people and religious must see, as having lineaments "often hardened by clericalism and by the accompanying patriarchalism which is destructive of healthy relationships among adults, and in particular between men and women" (p. 88). In short, maturation among individual religious has brought them to a point where they can act independent of any mediation.

The problem with the hierarchy in the Church as seen by several of the authors is not confined by an attitude. The decisions and actions, especially of the Roman curia, pose a problem for retention and recruitment according to John W. Padburg, S.J. ("The Contexts of Comings and Goings").

Even though someone genuinely realizes that to follow Christ is to partake both of his joys and his sorrows, it is not ordinarily going to be possible to do so without extraordinary graces ... if those who are supposed to be Christ's representatives in the church appear to be acting in contrast, if not in downright opposition, to what the church itself has said so very recently (pp. 27-28).

What are these actions of the hierarchy which are

considered so destructive? Most writers content themselves with vague allusions but a few speak more concretely. The principle action is that taken with regard to those who signed the ad about abortion in the *New York Times*. Carrol Stuhlmüller, C.P., in a paper entitled (but little concerned with) "Biblical Observations on the Decline of Vocations," asserts that while the Church, after 1960, "provided the wonderful experience of Vatican II," it has since then "some very bad moments to live down," the Vatican response to the *New York Times* ad being one of two examples. The author considers that response to have been "as harsh as could possibly be." Donovan concurs with this judgment characterizing the action against the signers as "a heavy-handed use of power." Fichter notes that even superiors were "rankled" by Rome's handling of this case. Stuhlmüller and Donovan both distance themselves from the "details" of the case, professing to be interested only in the Vatican response.

Another concrete grievance against the Roman authorities is expressed by Fichter who reports growing "tension and resentment" over "vacillating" instructions from Rome concerning renewal of religious life. According to him, John Paul II has reversed the mandate for renewal given by Paul VI (p. 105). Fichter uses the words of Jeanine Grammick, S.S.N.D., who sees the document *Essential Elements in the Church's Teaching on Religious Life*, as reversing the process of renewal in favor of "a preconiliar closed system of religious life."

We are also told that still another area of concern contributing to vocational decline is that of the Church's teaching. Fichter notes that 35% of priests who left had a problem with *Humanae Vitae*.

Stuhlmüller thinks that the Church has not adequately addressed the area of sexuality. He sees evidence of this in the opposition of many to the Church's teaching on contraception and in the lack of conviction among many young people about the gravity of sexual sin. While this situation prevails, parents will hesitate to encourage their children to consider a celibate life, made especially difficult when lived "in an unresolved area of morality." Stuhlmüller suggests study by an international body of scholars who would be nominated by bishops' conferences "in consultation with theological societies" (p. 162).

Joseph Pieper, in an essay on "The 'Intellectual' and the Church" comments on the difficulty of critics applying their critical judgement of matters like Trin-

ity, the Incarnation, the priesthood, and the sacraments (and we might add, Christian vocation). Who can qualify as "expert" with regard to these mysteries at the heart of the Church's life at every moment of her history? Immersion in God's life in Christ, communicated by the Church is Pieper's answer.

No other schemata, patterns, models can penetrate to the heart of such mysteries. This book is proof of that. How understand the events and movements of the last few years, within and outside the Church, if one isolates the second Vatican Council and its aftermath from the rest of the history of the Church where alone it yields its true meaning? How understand the mystery of religious vocation when the hierarchical ministry, integral and essential to the Church as constituted by Christ, is considered an intruder when it calls religious to fidelity to the Church's teaching and fidelity to their vocation, and when the teaching of the Church is considered not settled as long as it does not conform to the views of the modern world?

Sister Joan Gormley, S.S.M.W.
Mt. St. Mary's Seminary
Emmitsburg, Maryland

Compassion & Solidarity: The Church for Others

Gregory Baum, New York and Mahwah, J.J.: Paulist Press, 1990.

In the Eighteenth Century, philosophy gave up its quest for certitude about God and religion. Instead, philosophy became an attempt not to understand the world but to change it. The goal of the philosophers of the Enlightenment was "to ameliorate the temporal condition of man." Rousseau said that everything is basically related to politics.

But while philosophy, especially in Europe, followed this path of Enlightenment, theology in the Catholic Church continued to reflect on God's word, mediated through scripture and tradition, and interpreted by the magisterium.

Then came Liberation Theology. Theology was no longer seen by the liberation theologians as a quest for wisdom grounded in faith, but as an ideology which attacked the dominating social forces. Latin American bishops professed to have made a "preferential option for the poor." Theologians claimed to look at society from the perspective of the victims and to join in solidarity with those who struggle for justice.

Into this current of liberation theology Gregory Baum wades with his radio lectures on *Compassion and Solidarity: The Church for Others*. The statements of the Canadian bishops are drawn upon as Baum formulates a Canadian liberation theology. This Canadian brand of liberation theology calls for bold changes in the unjust structures of the economic order.

A structural analysis shows five harmful trends: the concentration of capital, its centralization, its internationalization, foreign ownership of industries, and computer technology.

Baum is confident that all these trends can be analyzed by social scientists, and that, with proper stimulation, creative thought can develop alternative models for social and economic development. He does not seem to appreciate how difficult it is to make even minor adjustments in complex economic and social systems.

Who are the opponents of liberation theology? According to Baum, they include good people who do not have a very developed political consciousness. Others oppose this movement because they have high stakes in the existing social order and do not want to lose their privileges. Bishops and popes oppose the movement because they wish to defend the existing order or to protect their own power.

Scattered through the book are *obiter dicta* with Baum's dissenting opinions on several teachings of the Church. Without commenting on these remarks but on the main thrust of the book, it seems fair to say that social doctrine seems to be reduced to a criticism of capitalism and a naive trust in scientific analysis. Surely the Church and the world need more than this today.

Msgr. George Graham, J.C.D.

Unmasking the New Age

Douglas R. Groothuis, (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1986, pp. 192).

Confronting the New Age

Douglas R. Groothuis, (Downer Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988, pp. 230).

One of the biggest threats to the Gospel today comes from a most unlikely source - the New Age Movement. In the not too distant past its tenants and beliefs would have been considered exotic and bizarre. This movement is so eclectic and diverse it is difficult to know exactly what it is and what it is all about. It

blends Eastern Religious thought with the occult, the psychology of self-fulfillment, evolutionary optimism, and the moral relativity of secular humanism. It embodies what the popular mind might call "The California Syndrome." Because some New Agers speak favorably of Jesus, even some "Christians" think that this movement is an authentic expression of Christianity. Two books by Douglas Groothuis, an evangelical Protestant, are excellent for anyone interested in a Christian critique of this movement and are *admirable pastoral tools* to give to Catholics who are confused by it.

Douglas Groothuis' *Unmasking the New Age* is a straightforward introduction to the New Age Movement. He also clearly demonstrates, without hysteria and fanaticism, that New Age thought is incompatible with Christianity and is actually an attack on the very heart of the Gospel.

Groothuis superbly captures, in his opening chapter, six distinctive tenets of the New Age creed. It would be helpful to briefly examine these in light of our Christian faith.

1. ALL IS ONE. This is a fundamental New Age axiom. Philosophically this is known as monism, meaning "oneness." "Monism is the belief that all that is is one. All is interrelated, interdependent and interpenetrating. Ultimately there is no difference between God, a person, a carrot or a rock" (p. 18). This is contrary to Christian doctrine. While God, human beings and the universe are inter-related and creatures are dependent upon God for their existence, they are all distinct beings. God exists in and of himself and is related to us as Creator. Each of us was created as singular human persons with inherent dignity and value.
2. ALL IS GOD. This is pantheism - everything is god and god is everything. The sum total of all that is is god. Thus the One is god. God then is not the transcendent, all-powerful, almighty, all loving, all good, personal God of Judaism or Christianity, but an impersonal, amoral force or energy that permeates all that is.
3. HUMANITY IS GOD. "This is one of the seductive claims of the New Age: we are not only perfect; we are, in fact, gods" (p. 21). New Agers contend that western culture and specifically Judaeo/Christian belief have done a grave disservice to humanity by imposing upon men and women a God who is superior to them. Humanity is called to render

humble, obedient service to this tyrannical God. New Agers free themselves from this servile bondage by claiming their own divine status.

Christians believe, nonetheless, that God has revealed that, while we are created in his image and likeness, we are not God. He alone is all perfect, all knowing and eternal. Though God is unimaginably greater than us, he is not a tyrant, but an affectionate Father who desires our loving obedience so that we might share in his intimate fellowship and eternal blessings.

4. **A CHANGE OF CONSCIOUSNESS.** If we are all gods, what keeps us from recognizing our divinity? Ignorance. All the various New Age techniques and methods - Est, Forum, A Course in Miracles, Lifespring, Eckankar, Scientology, to name but a few - promise to awaken in us our divine selfhood. Groothuis states: "There are many names for this transforming experience: cosmic consciousness, God-realization, self-realization, enlightenment, illumination, Nirvana (Buddhist), satori (Zen), at-one-ment or satchitananada (Hindu)" (p. 25). Coming to know our true divine self gives us new power and well-being.

Since we are all sinners, Christianity also believes we must undergo a change, a radical transformation called conversion. However this new spiritual power does not lie within ourselves, but comes through faith in Jesus Christ. This new life and power is the Holy Spirit who recreates us in God's image, creating in us a new mind and heart (see Ephesians 4:22-24).

5. **ALL RELIGIONS ARE ONE.** New Agers believe that all religions are basically the same. They are but different expressions of the same truth. Jesus, Buddha, Krishna and others all taught and experienced the same cosmic oneness.

This is unacceptable to Christians. While different religions may express some element of truth, yet Christians hold that God has specifically and singularly revealed himself within the history of the Jewish people and definitively manifested himself in Jesus Christ. Unlike Buddha or any other founder of a religion, Jesus is the eternal Son of God, the one Lord and Savior. In his name alone can we be saved (see Acts 4:12). "Christ will not join the pantheistic pantheon, but instead stands above it in judgment" (p. 29).

Some New Agers do speak of "Christ-con-

sciousness," meaning by this that like Jesus we can become conscious of our divine oneness within the cosmos. However, they do not believe that Jesus is both God and man and that, having risen gloriously, now reigns as the Lord of all.

6. **COSMIC EVOLUTIONARY OPTIMISM.** New Agers are convinced that humanity, because of its new found god-consciousness, is on an evolutionary trajectory. Humanity is on the verge of a new transformation which will herald a new age of peace, solidarity, unity. We will become a suprahuman species.

Christians, Groothuis argues, can and must be both more optimistic and more pessimistic. Christians are realists. We can look sin in the face and know its evil without pretending that our earthly future offers us a sparkling but hollow Disney World. Christians know that despite the horrendous evil in the world, there is the promise and guarantee of eternal life. "The culmination of history will not be a great planetary consciousness but the return of Jesus Christ to separate the sheep from the goats for all eternity. For some the future will be much better than we could ever imagine - for others, much worse" (p. 31).

Groothuis clearly explains how these fundamental beliefs influence the New Age view of health, psychology, science, politics, and spirituality. He confirms too that the Christian churches have not been immune from New Age thinking. Fr. Matthew Fox's *Creation Spirituality*, he rightly proposes, exemplifies how New Age theology can infect and disfigure Christian doctrine. He specifically treats such topics as channeling, reincarnation, witchcraft, neo-paganism and the occult.

Groothuis in his second book, *Confronting the New Age*, examines how Christianity can better respond to the challenge the New Age Movement presents. It is a very practical book. For example, Groothuis suggests how Christians can witness to people who are either involved in New Age or are attracted to it. He also offers arguments that one can use to demonstrate the validity of Christian beliefs in light of the New Age agenda. He shows, for example, how New Agers misuse the Bible and how Christian truth answers our greatest human longings and needs as opposed to the deceptive assurances of the New Age. He provides Christian principles of discernment regarding New Age visualizing, music, holistic health, and business seminars. He gives practical advice on what Christian

parents can do when they discover that the New Age has infiltrated their children's schools. If a person is confronted with the every day reality of the New Age movement, this book would be an excellent companion volume to Groothuis first. (At present he is writing a third book on the New Age understanding of Jesus which, judging from his previous two books, should be excellent.)

Our culture is starved for God and spiritual nourishment. The New Age Movement, by its success, documents this craving. These three books will give Christians a working knowledge of this contemporary religious phenomenon, and allow them to confront it with truth and attract its followers with love. As Christians we know that Jesus is our only way to the Father and that our true life is lived in the Holy Spirit.

If you, your students, or your parishioners have specific questions about the New Age Movement or particular New Age groups, I would suggest you write to the following Christian Evangelical organization: Spiritual Counterfeits Project, P.O. Box 4308, Berkeley, CA 94704. They answer enquiries and produce an excellent newsletter.

Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M. Cap.

Priesthood: A Re-Examination of the Roman Catholic Theology of the Presbyterate

Edited by Patrick J. Dunn, New York, Alba House, 1990, pp. XII + 232.

Father Dunn, a pastor in Auckland, New Zealand re-examines here the identity of the ordained presbyter in the light of questions raised concerning the distinction between clergy and laity in the Church.

He first gives an overall glimpse of the present situation, the crisis of a fall-off in numbers of candidates for ordination, the sociological explanations ("Someone's to blame", perhaps parents, educators etc., the anomalous position of the clergy in society, the colleges of the ghetto, the cultural revolution of the '60's) and the theological factor (the "priestly" laity).

The author then examines a cross-section of contemporary writing on ministry including works by J. Martos, R. McBrien, T. O'Meara, H. Kung, and especially E. Schillebeeckx. He presents a fair synthesis and critique of their teaching.

To propose an answer to the crisis, Dunn explores the foundations of the Christian ministry, beginning with the New Testament. Here he relies on the views

of R. Brown, J. Galot, A. Lemaire, and A. Vanhoye, and criticizes those of H. Kung, D. Power and E. Schillebeeckx. In his treatment of the Pre-Nicene centuries, he draws on the views of B. Cooke and H. Crouzel.

In surveying the medieval influences on the understanding of the priesthood, Dunn describes the accentuation of the clergy-laity distinction, the growing influence of monasticism, the "ritualization" and simplification of the sacraments, the development of the "private" Mass, the effects of the reaction against Arianism and the increased bonding of the priesthood to the Eucharist.

In his chapter on the sixteenth century, the author describes the attacks of the Reformers on the ordained priesthood, the sacramental system and the "private Mass", as well as the response of the Council of Trent, linking the priesthood more than ever to cult.

Dunn attributes to Vatican II, through its rediscovery of the sources and its distancing itself from Counter-Reformation polemics, the integration of Trent into a broader and more coherent tradition including the priesthood of the laity, the sacramental nature of episcopal ordination, the collegial nature of the episcopate, the threefold office of the bishop as prophet, priest, and ruler, the primacy of the concept of "mission" and the recovery of the title "presbyter".

Then Dunn re-addresses the present problem, beginning with the eleven options of the sociologist Dean Hoge and asking "Should the availability of the Eucharist be our first priority?", "Should the one who presides over the community also preside over the Eucharist?" Here he discusses and disagrees with the views of H. Legrand and P. Chirico. His next chapter, "The 'Permanent' Aspect of the Sacrament of Orders", takes up the priestly character. He disagrees with Vogel and those who see the priesthood as functional. In finally discussing the identity of the presbyter, he writes that the priest's special vocation is to represent Christ as Head of the Body. In this he agrees with G. Gershake (*The Meaning of Christian Priesthood*) and with A. Dulles.

There is a postscript on the ordination of women which supports the recent popes' teaching and gives special weight to the significance of religious symbols.

The author has read widely and reports fairly the views of theologians of diverse tendencies. His book offers an interesting, convenient, coherent and thoughtful presentation of today's "crisis" of the priesthood and various proposed solutions. However, Dunn

mistakenly relies on B. Cooke in saying that the Council of Nicaea reacted strongly against any attempt to make celibacy compulsory (p. 78). Here Cooke is probably crediting a false interpretation of Canon 3 and the story of Paphnutius which C. Cochini (*Origines Apostoliques du Celibat Sacerdotale*, soon to be published in English by Ignatius Press) and others, including R. Grayson, now take to be a legend. R. Cholij (*Clerical Celibacy in East and West*, England, Fowler and Wright, 1988) offer impressive support for the view that celibacy for the clergy, whether single or previously married, was of apostolic origin and accepted as such from the beginning in both East and West.

Rev. John Quinn, St. Joseph's Seminary

Austin Cooper: The Cloud: Reflections on Selected Texts

(NY: Alba House, 1989), 184 pp., \$8.95.

Any number of commentaries will give the reader more than adequate scholarly information about the anonymous author of *The Cloud*. Those of Phyllis Hodgson and James Walsh are perhaps the most distinguished. Austin Cooper, a member of the Australian province of the Oblate Fathers offers something else: a devotional and reflective appreciation which manages to distill in unaffected and clear form the common sense and good humour of the subject. This is all to the good, given some of the esoteric use that some neo-gnostic spiritualists have made of *The Cloud* in the last few decades, as they have also appropriated among fourteenth century contemporaries, Julian of Norwich, Richard Rolle, and Walter Hilton.

The Cloud is the fruit of a time hardly more placid than ours: its author knew of the Great Schism, the Hundred Years War, the Black Death, and the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. Probably a Carthusian, if not a Cistercian, he seems to have enjoyed information of St. Gregory of Nyssa in addition to his obvious affection for Pseudo-Dionysius, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great. With Hilton he owned particular debts of style and insight to St. Bernard and Richard of St. Victor. In the history of spirituality, his anticipation of St. John of Cross cannot be neglected; but Evelyn Underhill has well insisted on his equally important significance for English letters: *The Cloud* is one of the early powerful vernacular texts.

Faithful in his promise to avoid an archeological approach, Father Cooper draws on selected, though

representative, texts, to point out the brilliance of their moderation and balance. For equanimity in spiritual discourse is not a common thing, and shines by its very rarity. On the length of prayers, for instance, "This work does not require a long time to be truly done, as some people think, for it is the shortest work of all that you can imagine. It is neither longer nor shorter than an atom...it is neither longer nor shorter but is exactly equivalent to one single stirring of the chief power of your soul, namely your will." Sensible consolations do not impress the author of *The Cloud* unduly and they are in fact the object of some of his most vivid satire: "Some squeak instead of speaking as if there were not spirit in their bodies..."

Much in the treatises, instance those on the Church, Freedom, Growth, and Christian Maturity, could be lost without Father Cooper's own original insights and guidance. His salutary citation of St. Athanasius on St. Anthony is a definitive type of what the anonymous author wanted himself and his readers to be:

When they saw him, they wondered at the sight for he had the same habit of body as before, and was neither fat, like a man without exercise, nor lean from fasting and striving with demons, but he was just the same as they had known him before his retirement. And again his soul was free from blemish, for it was neither contracted as if by grief, nor relaxed by pleasure, nor possessed by laughter or dejection, for he was not troubled when he beheld the crowd, nor overjoyed at being saluted by so many. But he was altogether guided by reason, and abiding in a natural state.

Rev. George W. Rutler

The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic

by Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. Paulist Press, 241 pp., \$9.95 paper.

The author has been a professor of theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome for more than 30 years, was, in fact, appointed to its faculty immediately after completing his doctoral studies there in 1956. He is well known for his book *Magisterium*, widely used in the U.S. not only in university classes but also in high-level seminars peopled by bishops and university presidents.

In his latest book he takes up his customary systematic way the notes, or marks, of the Church as we find them listed in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed,

(Continued on page 32)

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger on the Proposed Universal Catechism

The Chairman of the International Catechism Commission reported to the Synod (also on October 25th) that Rome had received 1,000 replies, mostly from bishops or their conferences, and 24,000 suggestions for improvement. He also told the Synod that only five percent of the respondents rejected the document as "unacceptable," while seventy-nine percent considered it "satisfactory" or "very good."

Ratzinger took up the "hot" issues that were raised upon the publication of the first draft.

The Aim of the Catechism

"The term catechism expresses the purposes, the aim of the document."

Hierarchy of truths

a) "A recurring criticism, which has had wide echo in the mass media, is that the text does not properly respect the principle of the hierarchy of truths. It is not always easy to know what everyone means by this formula and even less to find clear guidelines as to the manner of accomplishing it. However, the connection of all truths with the nucleus of revelation constitutes a serious issue. This problem is often confused with that of theological notes: Some would like degrees of certainty as regards the different doctrines to be given."

b) "In the preface to the catechism, the term is to be explained in the light of Vatican Council II and by the General Catechetical Directory. It is not a matter of establishing a criterion for the elimination of some truths, but of organic unity, the "symphony" of truth, the central reference of which is Jesus Christ. The four-part structure of the catechism is itself already an organic articulation of the truths of faith. In the text of the catechism, the truths solemnly defined will be given in an explicit fashion.

Use of Sacred Scripture

a) "The way sacred Scripture is used in the revised draft has been greatly criticized. However, the reproach of using Scripture simply as *dicta probantia*, as "proof texts," is often done without much explanation and examples. Certainly this is one of the greatest problems to be solved. It is necessary that criteria for the use of Scripture in the definitive text be proposed."

"...The methods indicated in *Dei Verbum* guide the use of Scripture in the final version of the catechism. The problem is to be examined by a mixed group of experts, theologians and exegetes..."

The Summaries

a) "The summaries have been the subject of a vast debate. Many appreciate them, others feel it would be sufficient to publish only them as a catechism, whereas others fear that this is impossible. As for presentation, opinions vary: Some find that the "precis" in the second part better correspond to what is required – a clear and complete summary of what is stated in the text. Others find them too long. Some would like formulas in the form of "question-answer"; others still hope that they will be placed at the beginning and not at the end of each article..."

Exposition on Christian Morals

a) "This part has been a particular target of criticism, often orchestrated, in regard to the catechism project. The press has fully played on it. It was to be expected that the mass media would be particularly interested in the moral part and, since the revised draft proposes to give the entire Catholic doctrine in this field, it is not surprising that it has aroused the same criticism that moral teachings encounter today. Nevertheless, it is also true that this is the part that receives the most criticism also in the reports of bishops and episcopal conferences. After all, this is explained by the fact that no other area of Catholic doctrine is so controversial, so difficult to treat, as that of morals. All the same, there is wide acceptance of this section as a basic text, and many have praised the effort to present Catholic moral teachings in a synthetic manner, open to contemporary problems."

"Some say that that is the part of the revised draft that is best suited to modern Christian life."

Gaps to be Filled

"In the revised draft, there are some gaps to be filled, themes to be developed, aspects to be better emphasized. The commission will bear in mind in the final draft the following points:

- The consecrated and religious life (evangelical counsels).
- References to levels of authority of documents of the magisterium (avoiding theological notes, but making a distinction in Christian doctrine between that which is essential and that which is derived)."

(The full statement appears in *Origins*, November 8, 1990.)

(Continued from page 30)

focusing on them in the manner of renowned predecessors such as G. Thils, and, like Thils, finding in them a great source and stimulus for reflection on the nature of the Church and its relationships to other Christian assemblies. Those acquainted with Sullivan will find here his characteristic clarity as well as his broad knowledge of the data and its context, mediated to him through the work of such other scholars as Gregory Dix, Juan Alfaro, and Jared Wicks.

In addition to taking up the interesting question of the real meaning of *subsistit* in *Lumen gentium* n. 8, he also deals with matters like liberation theology in a broad setting and the Church as a "sacrament of integral salvation." *Subsistit* is, of course, Vatican II's verb in the passage "This...one Church of Christ...subsists in the Catholic Church...." Those who disagree with

Sullivan's exegesis will have to come up with equally forceful rejoinders based on correspondingly austere logic.

There is close study here of Vatican II's documents and intimately related material. This is a book that should touch a central concern of members of the Fellowship. It deserves their consideration. Even though some members of the Fellowship were disappointed with at least one of the conclusions of *Magisterium*, there is one thing about the author's presentations which they cannot help but find admirable: the data on which he bases his conclusions are clearly set forth for all to ponder, and if one wants to disagree with him, it is easy to pinpoint the locus at which the disagreement occurs.

Earl A. Weis, S.J.

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

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

Books Received

The Couple to Couple League (P.O. Box 111184 Cincinnati, Ohio 45211-1184 (513) 661-7612) has recently published *Fertility Cycles and Nutrition* by Marilyn M. Shannon, 176 pp., \$10.95. Recommended by John Kippley.

From Ignatius Press

Hans Urs Van Balthasar – *The Glory of the Lord* Vol. II *Man in God*, 432 pp., \$35.00, Vol. VII, *The New Covenant*, 571 pp., \$35.00. Also *Test Everything: Hold Fast to What is Good*, 96 pp., \$6.95.

Henri de Lubac, *Christian Resistance to Anti-Semitism: Memories from 1940-1944*, 250 pp., \$15.95.

Marriage and Family: Experiencing the Church's Teaching on Married Life from Cardinal Gagnon's Pontifical Council on the Family, 180 pp., \$9.95.