



Fellowship of Catholic Scholars NEWSLETTER

Volume 15, Number 3

June 1992

Other People's Letters

Ralph McInerny

I have heard it said that Cardinal Newman will never be canonized because he wrote too many letters. Making a bad argument, one could reverse that and conclude that most of us at the end of the 20th century are apt candidates for the calendar of the saints. What pass for letters nowadays might have been written by, as well as entered-in, stored-on and printed-out from machines. Imagine Newman thinking of his pen as a word processor.

Do not misunderstand. I am no Luddite. I love computers great and small and am never so happy as when I have one sitting on my lap. One could hardly say this of a secretary. I do not think it is the computer that has made us unlettered, at least not all by itself. It cannot be blamed on the typewriter Ezra Pound was a virtuoso of the typewriter, using it to make his letters more personal than any quill pen ever could. No, the telephone did it.

Why do the letters we write not count as letters? The narrator of one of John Updike's stories describes himself as belonging to a generation that dictates its letters, suggesting distance and an absence of oneself from what goes out, as we say, over our signature. (The academic letter of recommendation is a literary genre which cries out for its historian.) But if we do write letters of a sort, they are unlike the letters Newman wrote.

This is not just a point about Newman. The exchange of letters between Evelyn Waugh and Diana Cooper recently edited by her granddaughter makes us privy to what was meant to be private. Reading them is eavesdropping, voyeurism, a species of wiretapping. Well, perhaps not quite. Diana Cooper leant her Waugh letters to Christopher Sykes when he was writing his life of Waugh (with results chronicled in the preface to the edition of letters to which I refer), so she must have seen them as something more than for herself alone. Why do we love to read other people's letters?

There cannot be any one answer to that, of course, since even "real" letters are so different from one another. In recent years, letters exchanged by Jacques Maritain and Julien Green have been published and there have been two collections of Etienne Gilson's letters, those he exchanged with Henri de Lubac and, most recently, those he exchanged with Jacques Maritain.

Contents of This Issue . . .

A "Little" About
Father Keefep. 3

Around the Church
in the 90'sp. 8

John Finnis and
Fraternal Correctionp. 11

Father Connery on
Euthanasiap. 12

Special Fellowship
Itemsp. 15

Fifteenth Annual
Convention Programp. 16

Publications by
Fellowship Membersp. 18

Father Keefe on
"The Historical Jesus" ...p. 20

Book Reviewsp. 29

The de Lubac/Gilson letters are a special case, since they were edited and annotated by one of the correspondents. In the copious notes he supplies the reader, Cardinal de Lubac exercises the survivor's prerogative of having the last word. (Not unlike the lengthy posthumous estimate of Gilson written by his friendly foe Fernand Van Steenberghen.) Gilson emerges as de Lubac's ally in combatting Thomism.

The Gilson/Maritain letters, recently edited by Géry Prouvost, have notes enough to guide us through a correspondence which lasted nearly fifty years and in which we can trace the development of both men. They were never so close as when they joined forces on the vexed question of Christian Philosophy, maneuvering between the position of Emile Bréhier, on the one hand, and that of Maurice Blondel, on the other. Gilson deferred to Maritain as the philosopher of the question, while Maritain deferred to Gilson as its historian. Gilson's fundamental point was that, like it or not, Christian philosophy is an historical fact.

Despite what seems the mutual understanding between the two men, Gilson, after Maritain's death, wrote an amazing letter to Father Armand Maurer on March 18, 1974. In it he says that it was not until he had read Maritain's posthumously published *Approches sans entraves* that he understood how he and Maritain differed from one another. Indeed, Gilson says that he had never before understood Maritain's true position. He himself had spent a lifetime trying to ascertain the authentic meaning of Thomistic doctrine, success in which would make one a Thomist; Maritain, by contrast, "was considering himself a true disciple of St. Thomas because he was *continuing* his thought."

How sobering to think that such a realization took so long. Of course we may not accept Gilson's overly modest portrayal of what he himself did or see as so opposed to Maritain's work. Nonetheless, Gilson provides us with a caveat about letters. However unbuttoned, informal and direct private letters may seem, they obviously do not always wear their meanings on their faces, even for their addressee.

Perhaps as we curl up with our laptops or peruse the printouts of others, we can take some consolation from this: A vast correspondence is an ambiguous thing; God loves the unlettered too.

The Church and American Pluralism

When we consider the role of the Church's hierarchy (without which there is no Catholic Church), I should think that its function first and foremost is a religious one directed toward the members of the Church. That is, to teach the Catholic people the truth revealed by God in and through Jesus Christ, to administer the sacraments as the channels of divine grace, and to guide and inspire Catholics to Christian living. At the present moment, the most urgent of these functions is to remind Catholics of what we all once knew: that God created the world and us in it, that we are a fallen race that above all needs salvation from sin, that in Jesus God became man and died to redeem us from the bondage of sin, and that at the end of life we shall be judged and found worthy either of eternal life in heaven or eternal damnation in hell. The purpose of life is to find God. Jesus came to make it possible for us to find God, and the Church exists to help us to find God – but since we are free and rational creatures, we can lose Him forever by our own choice. This is a message that will not go down easily in what Philip Rieff has called the therapeutic culture. But it is the Christian message, without which Christianity is meaningless, and the Church can do no other than to preach it in season and out of season.

In the past thirty years these fundamental Christian truths have faded in the minds of American Catholics to such an extent that many of them, including a number of clergy, find the idea that anyone might actually lose his soul simply unacceptable. Yet on this issue the future of the Church is at stake, because a weak and watered-down Christianity has no staying power, as a glance at the present condition of the "mainline" Protestant churches reveals. The argument on the other side, of course, is that if the Church insists upon doctrines that the modern psyche cannot tolerate, a lot of Catholics will leave the Church. I have no doubt but that is true. But I do not see how our religion can survive if the teaching Church does not vigorously teach the basic Christian doctrines, however unpopular they may be, or however many people get up and walk out of the Church.

It would help, therefore, if we stopped trying to solve all of people's problems for them. People can create problems faster than the Church or any other institution can solve them, as I am sure welfare departments are fully aware. It would also help if we stopped telling people that they have a right to follow their own consciences when these are in conflict with the teaching of the Church. The essential task is to free American Catholics from the individualism, egalitarianism, and subjectivism that have become the most prominent characteristics of our pluralistic society.

Francis Canavan, S.J.

A "Little" Bit About Father Donald Keefe, S.J.

Father Donald J. Keefe's two-volume work, *Covenantal Theology: The Eucharistic Order of History*, (University Press of America, \$128.00) is, without doubt and by any standard one would care to employ, an extraordinary theological achievement, demonstrating that Keefe has no peers in contemporary systematic theology. While his work will doubtless evoke comparisons with that of Barth and Tillich, we would have to go back more than seven centuries in the Catholic Church, if not further, to find anything rivaling it.

This study is extraordinary on any number of levels. The footnotes alone are worth more than the price of admission. Many of the individual footnotes in these volumes are more substantive than whole books written by most other theologians today. No major or minor theologian of the last two thousand years seems to have escaped Keefe's scrutiny. To master Keefe's footnotes is to master the history of Catholic systematic thought from the early Church Fathers right through to the most recently published works of contemporary theologians. It is also to master the hows and whys of the chaos which prevails in Catholic theology today.

This work subjects the whole of Catholic systematic theology to a scrutiny far more radical than has ever been done before, and finds in that scrutiny no reason why any theologian, liberal or conservative, dissenter or traditionalist, should feel complacent or self-congratulatory. All alike, in Keefe's view, have gone astray. Commenting on the intellectual disarray which prevails in theology today, Keefe remarks at the outset that this disarray finds practical expression in a loss of nerve on the part of the traditionalist, and in a corresponding mood of morose delectation in those who test the Roman Catholic tradition in the terms provided by contemporary secular learning and can find in it no substance sufficient to found a historical faith (I, 1).

Here the reader is fairly warned that Keefe's criticism of today's disarray will find fault not just with the dissenters but (and even more so) with the loyalists as well.

For dissenters, especially for those whose morose delectation is far more delectation than morose, who

have turned the "funeral baked meats" at their own self-proclaimed burial of traditional Catholicism into a personal feast of liberation from all of the restraints of that traditional faith, the bad news of Keefe's work is that the faith of our fathers (and mothers) is alive and well, that it is substantive and coherent, and that it offers the only way out of the chaos of modern life. From the traditionalist point of view, of course, this is unrelievedly good news.

But the traditionalists are also going to have to face some very bad news, bound up with the "loss of nerve" for which Keefe holds them accountable. In fact, Keefe's work is aimed primarily at traditionalists, seeking to "convert" them to a radical new understanding of the "systematic" implications of the Catholic faith which they embrace but which, in Keefe's judgement, they have not yet adequately understood. What is this loss of nerve and what is its remedy?

First (and for this if nothing else all of us in theology owe him a debt of gratitude) Keefe raises and answers the question as to what systematic theology is. Systematic theology is *not* identical with the Catholic faith. In traditional language, theology is "faith seeking understanding." Faith is therefore distinct from understanding, in that the faith is never to be identified with any theologian's systematic account or understanding of it, no matter how well established in the *theological* tradition that account might be. Concretely, this means that neither Augustinianism nor Thomism is the Catholic faith. The "doctrines" of Augustine and Thomas are never to be identified with the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

Because no system or account of the Catholic faith is identical with the faith, no system or account is "true." The faith is true, not the theologian's account of it. That account is and always remains "hypothetical," in a manner analogous to scientific hypotheses, in that just as any scientific hypothesis about the nature of the universe can be falsified by the data of experimental science, so too can any systematic account of the faith be "falsified" by that faith if it cannot account for the *whole of that faith* in a systematically rigorous fashion. Says Keefe:

"The historical liturgical tradition of the mystery of Christ, safeguarded and uttered by the

magisterial proclamation, is the historical a priori of theology in much the same way in which the historical and intrinsic intelligibility of the physical universe is the a priori of the physical sciences" (I, 17).

Thus, both Augustinianism and Thomism are "hypothetical," not "perennial," and therefore subject to the possibility of falsification.

Now comes the really bad news. According to Keefe, both traditional Augustinianism and traditional Thomism, however they may be interpreted today, can be shown, in light of the faith, to be false understandings of that faith and hence of reality. The "loss of nerve" among traditionalists lies in the fact that they have failed to subject these two accounts of reality to rigorous scrutiny, and therefore have failed to recognize that the disarray in which we find ourselves today stems in large part from the inability to distinguish theology from faith and from the unwillingness to call into question long-regnant but fatally-flawed theological accounts of that faith. As long as theologians such as Rahner and Lonergan, to mention just two, think the problems of Catholic theology can be solved by tinkering around with traditional Thomist metaphysics, for example, in the name of some sort of "transcendental" project which can rescue us from our woes, those woes will continue, because no amount of tinkering around with Thomist metaphysics can save us. Thomist metaphysics is a part of the problem, not the solution. Today's traditionalist theologians must have the courage to face this.

The problem, however, is not solely one of mustering up courage. The real problem is that the traditionalists themselves must first undergo a radical conversion with regard to the faith to which they think themselves already fully converted. According to Keefe, the primary stumbling block in theology today, among both traditionalists and dissenters, is the fact that almost all of us treat the Catholic faith as something to be "added on" to some already-existing understanding of reality garnered from some source outside the revelation itself. Almost all of us start with some "natural" or what Keefe calls "cosmological" account of reality, whether it be Platonism or Aristotelianism or Marxism or feminism or a host of other "isms" one could mention, and into that we try to "insert" the Catholic faith. In short, almost all of us are trying, in one fashion or another, to trim the sails

of Christ's revelation to someone else's winds.

This is not to say that Keefe thinks all of us accept "natural" accounts of reality lock, stock and barrel. Augustine was orthodox precisely because he was willing to part company with Plato when his faith required him to do so, just as Thomas was orthodox because of his willingness to part company with Aristotle in like circumstances. But what neither Augustine nor Thomas nor most of the rest of us have ever fully realized, according to Keefe, is that the Christian faith requires a *total* conversion of Platonism and Aristotelianism and every other "ism," not just partial course corrections. The failure to recognize this *always* introduces into our understanding of the faith some degree of distortion and incoherence and, within the theological community itself, has left countless generations of theologians under the mistaken impression that they can retain the basic elements of some form of "natural" knowledge without compromising the Catholic faith. But the Christian revelation, according to Keefe, is far more radical than this, requiring the *thorough conversion of every other account of reality* not based on the revelation itself. In other words, we already have in the Catholic faith a *Catholic metaphysics*. We not only do not need any other metaphysics; we only distort the Catholic faith by trying to fit it into some other metaphysics.

Keefe takes with full seriousness the traditional understanding of theology as *faith* seeking understanding, and insists that Catholic theology embrace that definition in all of its implications. And the most radical of all of the implications is that Catholic theology starts not with Plato or Aristotle or Augustine or Thomas or the concept of God or the structures of the human mind or the infinite horizon of being or any other human authority or construct, however august, but with the *faith of the church as that faith is Eucharistically-mediated and doctrinally defined*. This is *the truth*, against which every other claimant to the truth must be measured.

Keefe also takes with a degree of seriousness never before seen in systematic theology the Catholic insight that *history* not *cosmology*, is the locus of truth. The Catholic faith, as Keefe points out over and again, stands not on universal, eternal verities, however time-honored, but on particular historical events. The theologian's interest is not God per se, or divine ideas, or ideal forms or universal *ratios*, but the

Eucharistically-mediated historical event of the covenantal union of Christ with his bridal Church. The absolute prime analogate of theology is not and cannot be the *Deus Unus* of traditional theological metaphysics, but is rather the Father sending the Son to give the Holy Spirit, by which our universe is both created and redeemed. Every theological account of the faith which begins with the One God of the philosophers (human reason) must end in failure, because every such account supposes that God's oneness is more fundamental than is His triunity. But God is not primarily "one" and only secondarily "three." God's oneness is constituted by the relations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit and cannot be separated from them.

Likewise, Keefe insists that we have no access to the truth of creation apart from the revelation. Creation is *ex nihilo sui et subjecti*. Human reason has no basis whatsoever for establishing some *a priori* account of "how" God creates. The ideal forms of Plato, imported into the divine mind by Augustine and given a second lease on life there by Thomas, must therefore be abandoned. We have no warrant in the Catholic faith for them, and they impede every effort to give a coherent account of that faith by virtue of the fact that they force upon us a *cosmological* framework which at the outset undercuts the *historical* character of our faith. There is no creation apart from the mission (incarnation) of the Son, just as there is no "natural" knowledge of creation apart from the Christ, who is the Light of the world and the Light that enlightens every mind. In other words, creation itself cannot be separated from the Trinity, because God's unity has no bearing on the created order in abstraction from His plurality, much less in abstraction from the "mission" of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

There is also no "natural" definition of man available to us apart from the revelation in Genesis that we are created in the image of God *as male and female* and the revelation in the New Testament that the God we image is triune and communal, not monist and solitary. For this reason, there is no place in systematic theology today for the notion that every human being is an individual substance who images within himself the divine substance. Just as the divine substance is triune, so is the human substance "analogously triune and tri-relational: husband, wife, the marital covenant or bond" (II, 12).

According to our faith, as Keefe points out, all of creation is trinitarian, covenantal, marital, nuptial, incarnational and sacramental. Everything is created *in Christo*, everything is substantially, not accidentally, graced. There is no natural (cosmological) order into which Christ inserted himself (historically) 2,000 years ago. All of creation is in Christ from the outset, and all of the universe is historical from the outset. There is no impersonal structure, whether it be called the universe or the cosmos or nature. There is no double gratuity (the "natural" gratuity of creation and the "supernatural" grace of Christ). All grace is from Christ, and all of creation is graced from the beginning:

"This time-honored notion of a "double gratuity," the one of the "natural" creation, the other "supernatural" and of "grace," has no warrant whatever, apart from its familiarity, whether in a systematically coherent metaphysics of act and potency [Thomism], in a coherent phenomenology of the Christian historical experience [Augustinianism], or in the doctrinal tradition" (I, 187).

Keefe is not the bearer of bad news only, however. In fact, the good news is considerably more significant than the bad, according to him, and it has a bearing on both faith and theology. The good news of Keefe's work with regard to the Catholic faith is that that faith is far more profound and far-reaching in its implications than most of us had heretofore imagined. It has to do not just with God, not just with Christ, not just with human beings, but with the whole of the universe. As Keefe points out, the implications of a thoroughgoing *Catholic metaphysics* are "that the entirety of the universe of some fifteen or twenty billion light-years' radius is created in Christ and that the whole of it is fallen in the first Adam and redeemed by the second" (I, 27). Indeed, this view of the universe is, according to Keefe, not only the clear implication of the Catholic faith, it is also the only view which can underwrite the integrity of the modern scientific project:

"Simply put, the experimental method of the physical sciences as it has been clarified since the discovery of quantum mechanics requires the real, the interesting and free world of the Judeo-Christian tradition: it can survive in no other. And if even so secular an inquiry as that

of the experimental physicist cannot live in the complacent value-free world of the autonomous, self-sufficient and monadic rationality, there is the more reason to suppose that theology may be similarly situated" (I, 196).

The only common ground between the believer and the unbeliever is the potential conversion of the one or the other to a common faith or to a common infidelity (I, 206), because the only event by which creation is constituted is the sending (incarnation) of the Son by the Father to give the Holy Spirit and the only event by which history (which is to say, the whole of universe) is ordered is the Eucharistic worship of the Catholic Church. It is a measure of the radical character of Keefe's theology that most Catholics will be just as surprised as most scientists to hear this.

With regard to theology, the good news is that, while we cannot accept any metaphysical system as the prius of theology, we can convert those systems into *methodologies* which can be used by the theologian to explore the implications of the Catholic faith. It is the burden of the second volume of his work to show in what fashion both Augustinianism and Thomism can be converted to this purpose. The conversions he offers will undoubtedly shock a good many Augustinians and Thomists, inasmuch as Keefe insists that the prime analogue of a genuinely Catholic methodology, whether Augustinian or Thomist, must be historical and therefore cannot be found except in:

"the New Covenant, the Trinity-imaging correlations of Christ-Church-New Covenant whose antetype is the Incarnation understood as the free historical Event of the Immanence of God in our humanity – that is, understood as the Event of the Father's sending of the Son to give the Spirit, the primordial Event in which the personal, created and integral freedom of Mary, the second Eve, is at one with the personal freedom of her Son in the One Flesh of the New Covenant" (I, 22).

All terms therefore of the Augustinian universal hylomorphism (form/matter) and of the Thomist act/potency analysis (*esse/essence*, form/matter, substance/accident) must be radically redefined in accordance with the recognition that, for both, "the prime analogue of substance is the New Covenant" (II, 89) and the Eucharist is "the permanent criterion of metaphysics" (*ibid.*).

Rarely is it fitting for the reviewer of a book to inject a personal note into the review, but the circumstances here are exceptional. It is no secret that Fr. Keefe directed my dissertation when I was a student at Marquette. What is not generally known, however, is that I would probably be doing something other than theology today were it not for him. I can personally attest to the disarray of theology as I found it at Marquette. After two years of coursework, I knew two things, was beginning to suspect a third and fear a fourth.

First, I knew that no contemporary theologian whose work I had read (and I was introduced to all of the current luminaries of Catholic theology) gave a coherent account of the Catholic faith. Second, although I could not have spelled out precisely what the problems were, I knew that the problems were rooted somewhere in their accounts of the relationship between nature and grace and of the relationship between creation and redemption. Third, I had begun to suspect, on the basis of the fact that so many of them were claiming to be the rightful heirs of St. Thomas, that some of the problems just might be rooted in Thomism itself. And, fourth, I was beginning to fear that I might never make it through the program, because I could see no direction in which to go that made any sense. Only the dissenters were making any sense, and I could not follow them, because their coherence was bought at the price of the Catholic faith itself.

My frustrations, in short, were not with the dissenters, but with those who were trying to remain Catholic but who could offer no coherent account of their faith and who, as far as I could tell, could not even recognize their own incoherences. In this sense, the traditionalists have contributed to dissent in the Church, because many of today's students are bright enough to see the inconsistencies but not bright enough to avoid them without compromising their faith. The traditionalists are of no help to such students, whereas the dissenters seem to offer a way out.

I heard about Father Keefe from another student to whom I had expressed my various concerns. I caught Keefe at the end of that semester just before he left for the summer, and he advised me to read his first book, *Thomism and the Ontological Theology of Paul Tillich*. I spent the entire summer reading that book (with my finger) and didn't understand more than

10% of it, if that much. But I did understand enough to know that Keefe, unlike everyone else with whom I had studied at Marquette, recognized Catholic theology to be in profound trouble and that the trouble was not of recent origin but had roots deep in the theological tradition itself. I also understood enough to know that Keefe saw the various theological accounts of the relationship of nature and grace and of creation and redemption to be at the locus of the trouble. Most important of all, I recognized in Keefe's work a man not only in no mood to sacrifice the Catholic faith on the altar of theological coherence, but also so convinced of the truth *and* the coherence of that faith that he had never seriously entertained the notion that such a sacrifice was necessary. Needless to say, I was one of the first to greet him on his return in the fall, and shortly thereafter became almost a permanent fixture in his office. And I got the degree from Marquette and became a *Catholic* theologian, because Keefe forced me to learn the meaning of theology and of method, to use language in rigorously systematic ways, to think on levels I didn't even know existed and thereby to recognize for myself that coherent Catholic systematic theology is a do-able project.

If Keefe's work does no more than alert a new generation of theologians to the fact that traditional Catholic systematic theology is bankrupt, it will have performed an invaluable service. Happily, there is good reason to suppose that it will do much more than that. Keefe's own conversions of Augustinianism and Thomism into theological methodologies, which he himself is the first to acknowledge as "hypothetical," are so cogently presented that there is little doubt, on their own merits alone, that they will earn serious exploration by future Catholic theologians.

There is another factor, however, which I think guarantees beyond doubt that Keefe's systematic ac-

count of the faith will be given enormous attention in the decades ahead. That is the fact that the reflections of Pope John Paul II on the meaning and significance of the Catholic faith lend enormous support both to Keefe's criticisms of traditional theology and to the direction in which Keefe's own theology moves. The current pope points out that both creation and redemption are a part of the single "mystery" of which Ephesians speaks, such that the "divine plans begin to be put into effect already in the entire reality of creation." He therefore insists that the whole of creation is covenantal and sacramental from the outset, that the order of the cosmos manifests the trinitarian order of relations in God, and that the world which "emerged from the hands of God the Creator is itself structured on a basis of love" and as such will participate with human beings in salvation. He has also reflected at length on the human imaging of God as trinitarian and therefore marital, concluding that the 'nuptial' meaning of the body is, as he puts it, "the fundamental element of human existence in the world."

There would appear to be no room in John Paul II's reading of the Catholic faith for any "cosmological" or "natural" order created by the *Deus Unus* on the basis of the divine ideas and available to unaided human reason, nor does he appear to entertain in his reflections any serious possibility that we can understand man himself apart from the revelation of his marital imaging of the Trinity. The Pope, like Keefe, has concluded that the whole of reality, according to the Catholic faith, is trinitarian, covenantal, sacramental, marital, nuptial and historical, in short, created in Christ from the outset. Under these circumstances, Keefe's criticisms of traditional Catholic systematic theology could not be more timely nor his alternative to it more important.

Joyce A. Little

The City University of New York has replaced Dr. Leonard Jeffries as head of the City College Black Studies Department. He was removed for alleging in a 1991 speech that "the Jewish Community" conducted a systematic, unrelenting attack against himself and other black scholars" and that "a conspiracy, planned and plotted and programmed out of Hollywood" by Jews and Italians denigrated blacks in films. The vote of the Board to replace him was 13 to 0.

Around the Church in the 90's

- ✧ That old pro from NCWC Family Life Days, Father H. Vernon Sattler, C.S.S.R., has a new book out *Challenging Children to Chastity: A Parental Guide*, published by Father John Miller's Central Verein in St. Louis, (\$7.00). It will be reviewed in a later issue of the *Newsletter*.
- ✧ Sister Bernadette Counihan, OSF, informs the Fellowship that her new community, The Franciscan Sisters of Christ, the Divine Teacher, has grown from five to thirteen members. They now teach in three Catholic schools which is their special apostolate. Her community is receiving postulants, not unlike the Nashville Dominican Sisters who have fifteen postulants and twenty novices. Sister Bernadette says there are five "goods" required for religious life: Good faith and morals, good sense, good will, good health, and a good sense of humor.
She can be reached at 2605 Boies Avenue, Davenport, Iowa 52802.
- ✧ Bishop Rene H. Gracida of Corpus Christi has written an excellent pastoral letter entitled "*Racism and Abortion*." It is available from Post Office Box 2620, Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-2620.
- ✧ Professor William May gave the inaugural lecture of the Michael J. McGivney Chair of Moral Theology for the John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and the Family on March 10, 1992. As chairholder, he chose to address the important subject: "Marriage and the Complementarity of Male and Female."
- ✧ Professor Janet Smith, author of an excellent new book on the history and meaning of the Catholic teaching in *Humanae Vitae*, will be teaching in Rome during the 1992-1993 academic year.
- ✧ Dr. Anne Paolucci, of St. John's University, and a Fellowship member, herself Roman born, is founder and director of Columbus Countdown 1992 to promote the multi-ethnic legacy of Christopher Columbus, the first immigrant to the New World.
A 48 minute original videoplay about Columbus, Queen Isabella, Martin Pinzon and Washington Irving is available. Educational/community group orders: \$44.95. Extra discounts for bulk orders: 10 to 99: \$19.95 each. All checks to "Columbus: Countdown 1992," 166-25 Powells Cove Boulevard, Beechhurst, New York 11357.
- ✧ Michael Buckley, S.J., president of the Catholic Theological Society, has notified his membership that he, CUA's Father James Provost and Msgr. Frederick McManus of the Canon Law Society, have already met with the NCCB's Committee on Doctrine to discuss the Holy See's Profession of Faith and the Oath of Fidelity. Both organizations are strongly opposed to its implementation.
- ✧ Father Richard Neuhaus' *First Things* (February 1991) took note of Ralph McInerny's item in the December FCS *Newsletter* to ask this question: "Who would have thought, say twenty-five years ago, that Catholic academics who are supportive of the Pope would be described as a conservative minority?"
- ✧ The newly-elevated Monsignor M. Francis Mannion, of Salt Lake City, in his Diocesan newspaper, recently addressed the attention given by churches in the United States to serving non-religious functions, e.g., creating a sense of belonging for the membership. He concludes:
"Indeed, the theology of small communities seems to be increasingly inspired more by the therapy session and the psychological support group than by the Gospel. The prime focus here is not the proclamation of the Gospel and the deepening of sacramental communion with Christ and his body, but personal experience, psychological wholeness and lifestyle needs."
- ✧ *Education Week* (February 12, 1992) printed Fellowship member William Ball's article "False Assumptions on Voucher Programs and the Law," three of which are the following:
 1. That the State is the superior and sole educator;

2. That a voucher system would entail pervasive State regulations;
 3. That non-public schools are not subject to public law (e.g., civil rights) now.
- ✧ Bishop Donald Wuerl's catechism, *The Teaching of Christ*, (written in collaboration with the Lawler brothers) is now listed as a "best seller." It has sold 22,000 books a year since 1976 and has been translated into twelve languages, recently Russian.
 - ✧ *Providence: Studies in Western Civilization*, a scholarly journal, is published quarterly by Providence College. Manuscripts and editorial correspondence should be addressed to Leonard P. Hindsley, O.P., *Providence: Studies in Western Civilization*, The Priory, Providence College, Providence, R.I. 02918-0001. Manuscripts, not to exceed 7,5000 words, should be submitted on disk, if possible, with the operation system specified. Unsolicited book reviews are not accepted.
 - ✧ Judy Lafferty, superior of the Our Lady of the Way Secular Institute in Los Angeles, reports that the booklet commemorating the life of Andree Emery, a Fellowship founder, is working its way toward final publication.
 - ✧ A comparatively new college student newspaper called *Campus* is making its way around university campuses. Its Winter 1992 issue takes up the question: "How Catholic are American Catholic Colleges?" Publisher: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 14 S. Bryn Mawr Avenue, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19019-3275.
 - ✧ Fellowship member Joseph Schwartz provides information that Marquette University has established a Center for Parental Freedom in Education dedicated to Father Virgil C. Blum, S.J. (1913-1990). Father Blum was a pioneer in energizing American voters to the political importance of parent choice and aid to parents.
 - ✧ Network, a National Catholic Social Justice lobby in Washington D.C.'s Congressional circles, in its 1992 proposals listed areas calling for intense political action by members - federal budget, taxes, poverty and housing, military spending, Third World living standards, health care, civil rights and electoral reform. Abortion was not one of the critical issues. The text of the proposal was drafted chiefly by members of four major religious communities of women.
 - ✧ *Catholic International*, the documentary publication from France, reported the Fellowship's Convention in Denver in its November 1991 issue.
 - ✧ *The Family in America* exposes what it calls the country's "Divorce Industry" in its March, 1992, issue (P.O. Box 416, Mt. Morris, Illinois 61054).
 - ✧ Father John McCloskey forwarded to the Fellowship an official response to *Newsweek's* January 13, 1992 article questioning the propriety of beatifying the Venerable Josemaria Escriva, the founder of OPUS DEI. In part, it said: "All the objections sent the Holy See by those who are now raising criticisms against the cause of Msgr. Escriva have been investigated and determined not to correspond to the truth." The full response is available from William Schmitt (914) 235-1201.
 - ✧ Father Paul Mankowski, S.J. raised this question with his Jesuit Confreres: "If there is no conviction so alien to the mind of the Church as to place its partisans outside the Church, then membership in the same Church has ceased to have any meaning. Reasonable men may disagree as to what counts as an error grave enough to earn an anathema, but this is not the same as denying the possibility of ortho- and hetero- doxy in principle." (*National Jesuit News*, December 1991.)
 - ✧ The Ethics and Public Policy Center Newsletter (Winter 1992) cited a King's College professor of philosophy as saying:

"Albert Schweitzer was a *very bad* model for medical practice. He may have been a good organist, he may have had his heart in the right place, but he was a *lousy* doctor. For him the fly had as much right to survive in the operating theater as the patient. In fact, since the patient was human and easily guilty, probably at fault, he should die first."
 - ✧ German theologians urge radical change. The German theologian Norbert Greinacher and four other German-speaking theology professors have publicly stated that there is a "pastoral

emergency" of such dimensions in Germany as to necessitate the abolition of celibacy for priests, and the ordination of married men (*virī probati*) and, eventually, of women. Greinacher and his colleagues demand that the Church should openly and honestly discuss the lack of priests and allow "alternative ways of pastoral leadership." They say that the Church still gives too much importance to its hierarchial structure and allows too little participation of lay people. *Tablet*, January 11, 1992.

- ✧ The National Right to Life Committee, through its Federal Legislative Office, makes available the Roll Call votes in the U.S. Congress on abortion for the year 1991. For further information write to 419 7th Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20004, (202) 626-8820.
- ✧ The charge that the relatively new and comparatively small *Legionnaires of Christ* are drawing seminarians, while established religious orders are not, has begun to draw strong reactions. The Legionnaires, with thirteen members in 1941, eighty-one in 1951, one-hundred-eighty-one in 1961, four-hundred-twenty-three in 1971, nine-hundred-fifteen in 1981 and two-thousand-ten in 1991, today have twelve-hundred seminarians in training. In contrast, two Jesuits from Rome's Robert Bellarmine College attribute their own diminishing manpower to the Society's internal confusion: "The Society of Jesus is so secularized that it no longer appears to have anything to do with the one true God"; "We no longer give that prompt and diligent service to the hierarchical Church which was once our hallmark." (*National Jesuit News*, January, 1992).
- ✧ Randy Engel attacks the *Teen Star Program* for sexuality teaching in *The Eternal Call*, January, 1992, to which Sister Miriam Paul Klaus, M.D. has replied in part:

"Mrs. Engel accuses us of using values clarification. We use value education, not value clarification. Our behavioral outcomes show that the program undergirds chastity. In response to the accusation that learning one's mucus is potentially masturbatory, the accuser evidently does not realize that learning to understand

one's mucus discharge involves no more than the ordinary wiping after using the toilet.

The pediatrician who is not aware of the hormonal rise during early and middle adolescence and its effect on youngsters' thinking, feeling, and fantasies, must not be dealing with children in that age group. Most pediatricians are only too aware that many girls, particularly those from minority populations, already menstruate at age 9, and that sadly, pregnancies among 12-year olds are on the rise. Merely telling children to do their homework, is grossly inadequate."

- ✧ Fellowship member Donald DeMarco has an article in Father Paul Marx's *Human Life Review* (Winter, 1992) on "Politics and Motherhood."
- ✧ The Couple to Couple League's magazine, *Family Foundations* (February 1992) has a valuable article "Unplanned Children are Inherently Valuable" and a charge by Mother Molly Kelly that "women who chant such slogans as 'my body, my choice' are, in my mind, sexually harassing men." (P.O. Box 111184, Cincinnati, Ohio 45211.)
- ✧ Pope John Paul II conferred the Grand Cross of the Order of Pius IX on **Thomas Melady**, the U.S. ambassador to the Vatican. Melady was honored for his public service in education and as an ambassador. He is president emeritus of Sacred Heart University in Fairfield, Conn., and has served as ambassador to Burundi and Uganda. He was named ambassador to the Vatican in 1989.
- ✧ John Doebele died March 1, 1992. Pray for him.
- ✧ John M. Haas, whose ninth child graces the family household, while he graces the Cardinal Krol Chair at Overbrook Seminary in Philadelphia, is a busy moral theologian this Summer. As executive for the International Institute for Culture, he has an eight-week program on the half millenium of Christianity in the New World, June 14-August 8, 1992, in Pueblo, Mexico, and a similar Institute on Faith and Culture June 20-July 11, 1992, to be held in Eichstatt, Bavaria. For further information telephone/FAX (215) 449-5161.

An Exercise in Fraternal Correction

By John Finnis

(Editor's Note: One of the myths about Vatican II suggests that somehow John XXIII intended to up-date Catholic doctrine, even against some traditional understandings. Fellowship member John Finnis takes up that claim from Oxford in a letter to The Tablet, London, December 14, 1991.)

"Sir: Your issue of 7 December publishes two separate statements that 'at the opening of the Second Vatican Council' Pope John XXIII said: 'The substance of the ancient deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another.' Cardinal Hume goes on to say that this sentence 'was considered at the time to be quite controversial,' and Canon Hill links the 'nervousness about this distinction in Rome at the time' with the fact (he says) that the Pope's sentence 'became' something different in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* version published six weeks later.

A form critic would, I think, opine that behind both these statements stands page 432 of Peter Hebblethwaite's *Pope John XXIII* (1985) which asserts that the quoted sentence, being 'an object of controversy,' became something different 'when the Latin version of the [Pope's] inaugural speech [of 11 October 1962] appeared in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*' of 26 November 1962. 'Pope John discovered these outrageous changes in late November 1962,' writes Mr. Hebblethwaite, but 'was too canny to sack the editor of *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.'

The facts discoverable by anyone with access to a library are quite inconsistent with the grave allegation now retailed by Canon Hill. Nor do they support the peculiar significance ascribed to the quoted sentence by Cardinal Hume, Canon Hill and your own editorial.

Pope John's address of 11 October 1962 was in Latin and was published *the very next day*. In *L'Osservatore Romano* for 12 October, page 2, column 3, one reads:

"Oportet ut haec doctrina certa et immutabilis, cui fidele obsequium est praestandum, ea ratione pervestigetur et exponatur, quam tempora postulant nostra. Est enim aliud ipsum depositum Fidei, seu veritates, quae veneranda doctrina nostra continentur, aliud modus, quo eadem enuntiantur, eodem tamen sensu eademque sententia."

There, for the Holy Father (and every Council father who had heard him) to read over his lunch on 12 October, and *the very words* later republished, unchanged, in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* and in the Council's own *Acta*, and ascribed to the Pope by the Council Fathers when they repeated his key words, not least the last five, in their Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes*, para 62.

A sound translation of the Pope's words: "This certain and unchangeable teaching, to which faithful assent [or: submission] should be given, needs to be explored and expounded in the way that our times call for. For the Deposit of Faith, i.e. the truths which are contained in our venerable teaching, is one thing; another thing is the manner in which those truths are enunciated, *keeping the same meaning and the same judgment* [or: opinion]."

John XXIII was here using Vatican I's teaching on stability and progress in doctrinal understanding to recall two truths conveyed in the passage of St. Vincent of Lerins (c.434 AD) quoted expressly by Vatican I and tacitly by Pope John. First: there are *propositional truths* of faith, and (like every proposition) they can be expressed and restated in various ways. Second: every *true* restatement and development of doctrine is consistent with all the propositions which the Church has at some time defined or otherwise judged to be one that followers of Christ must hold definitively."

QUALITY OF MEANS, QUALITY OF LIFE AND EUTHANASIA

The late John R. Connery, S.J.

(Editor's Note: The March 14, 1992 issue of America magazine contained an article by Richard A. McCormick, S.J. on the morality of withdrawing artificial nutrition and hydration from patients in a persistent vegetative state (P.V.S.). In that article he disputes the views of the Bishops of Pennsylvania (see Origins, January 30, 1992) which insist that outside imminent death or the inability of a comatose patient to assimilate, the withdrawal of nutrition and hydration from such a P.V.S. patient is "euthanasia by omission." McCormick, arguing from "a quality of life perspective" disagrees and attributes, in all likelihood, the Pennsylvania analysis to the earlier thinking of the late Father John Connery, S.J., "though I am told (writes McCormick) that he changed his view shortly before his death."

Father Joseph T. Mangan, S.J., Professor Emeritus of Theology at Loyola University (Chicago) has informed the Fellowship that the McCormick article misrepresents the facts. Father Mangan was one of Father Connery's close circle of scholarly friends who regularly reviewed the latter's papers. Says Father Mangan: "I am not aware of any change in his opinion." The following article, never published, was the last scholarly writing (July, 1987) of Father Connery.)

In their article on withdrawing nurture and fluids, "The Catholic Tradition" (5/2/87), McCormick and Paris wrote that I maintained that long-term use of a nasogastric feeding tube could be very burdensome in the Conroy case, and therefore optional. They added that in the Brophy case I argued against removing a gastric tube, urging that we do not fall into a "quality of life" standard. I would like to call attention to a few important nuances in my position. As presented, it sounded somewhat simplistic, if not inconsistent, and certainly not very suasive.

The authors were on target in pointing to the limitation the Catholic tradition puts on the duty to use means to preserve life. Those who followed my argument in the cases for which I wrote testimony (Brophy and Jobes) knew that it was based strictly on the tradition that the use of a means to preserve life becomes optional if excessively burdensome or if useless. I felt that long-term use of a nasogastric tube could become very burdensome, and if so, would be optional on this score. It was less clear, although not impossible, that a stomach tube of itself would over time become generally burdensome. Nor did the evidence in the Brophy (also Jobes) case seem to indicate that the stomach tube was becoming burdensome. The argument seemed rather to focus on the condition of the patient, the claim that the patient was in an irreversible coma, persistent vegetative state, etc. It never became clear that the gastric feeding was in itself an extraordinary means.

My concern about yielding to quality of life considerations was related to the actual arguments being used to justify removing the tube in the Brophy (and the Jobes) case. As just pointed out, they were not derived from the difficulty of the means as such but from the difficulty or uselessness of the life of the patient. Briefly, those advocating withdrawal were arguing that the quality of life of the patient (e.g., in an irreversible coma, although not terminal) was such that there was no reason to continue it. The only reasonable solution was to bring on death, and this was the intention in removing the feeding. In my opinion this constituted intended euthanasia by omission.

What was disturbing is the fact that this was not recognized as euthanasia. Most of the literature on the duty to preserve life, living wills, etc., explicitly condemns euthanasia when done by positive act. But there seems little sensitivity to the fact that withdrawing treatment, etc., for quality of life reasons might constitute euthanasia. The underlying reason for this insensitivity is probably the failure to define euthanasia or its parameters. This results in a tendency to identify it with some positive act, with subsequent failure to detect it in the omission of treatment for quality of life reasons as such. The same document which condemns euthanasia will frequently authorize such omissions.

The condemnation of euthanasia is also a long standing tradition in the Church. My complaint about

the present article is not that it mistakenly asserts as traditional a right to withhold treatment, but that it glosses over a second tradition, the condemnation of euthanasia, thus muting an essential limitation on this right. In my judgement this tradition is also very important and seems much more in jeopardy.

Quality of life can indeed be a legitimate consideration in judging moral obligations to preserve life, but only if it affects the means, i.e., makes them useless or very burdensome. Thus, if a person is actually dying, and death is imminent whether a certain means is used or not, such means will be useless. Or if a patient does not have full use of his senses, the defect can make a means to preserve life very burdensome. But if it does not make the means useless or burdensome, the quality of the patient's life will not remove the obligation to use the means. Thus, quality of life may not make antibiotics any more useless or more burdensome for the comatose than for the conscious.

One cannot argue, as some would like, that a means could be judged useless if it did not cure the disease. Certainly, if some particular means would not prolong the patient's life, it would be useless. *But if feeding kept the patient alive indefinitely, it could not be considered useless even though it did not cure a particular disease.* The whole sense of the question: Can a means be considered useless? has to do with preserving life. *If it will preserve life, it is useful.* One may judge that the life itself is useless and conclude that it is useless to prolong it. But this is a judgment about the uselessness of the life, not the uselessness of the means. *The means remain useful to do what they always do: preserve life.*

The tradition of which the authors speak with such favor had to do with quality of means, as described above. The duty to use means to preserve life depended on the quality of the means. If the means were excessively burdensome or useless, they were not of obligation. This limitation did not extend to the quality of life as such.

Pius XII put this, at least in part, in terms of interfering with a higher good. He said that it would be permissible to forego means to preserve life because making them obligatory would interfere with a higher good. In other words, pursuing life or health with some particular means could become optional if some higher good is at stake. Such means would become extraordinary.

Technically, the tradition was able to justify omission of these (extraordinary) means within the broader context of the principle of double effect. More precisely, the death of the patient, the bad effect, could be justified by the good effect (higher good) achieved by the omission. But all this had to be carried on within the parameters of respect for life. It would be wrong to take human life, or to intend killing in some other act or omission. Even if this was done out of mercy, it could not be justified. The Declaration on Euthanasia defined euthanasia as an act or omission which either by nature or intention brought on death. If death was not intended, but an unwanted side effect resulting from pursuing some higher good, it was acceptable. But if death was intended either because it was a sole effect of the act or even as one of many actual effects, it constituted euthanasia. In other words, *it was not permissible to withhold means with the intention of bringing on death.*

For a fuller understanding of the principle of double effect, although only tangential to the present case, it might be relevant to point out that in the tradition the term "effect" was not used in a strict philosophical sense. Even if an act was a true cause of death, it did not of itself dictate the morality of this effect. Nor if it was less than a cause (a condition or occasion of the death) did it leave its morality entirely open. In either case the intention had to be taken into consideration. If the death-bringing act was placed and death was the intention, it was considered wrong, whether the act was a cause, condition, occasion or even omission.

As mentioned, some would like to omit treatment, etc., in cases where the means themselves are not burdensome or useless. They would like to add to those cases where a higher good may be interfered with cases where a higher good cannot be achieved at all. This higher good is sometimes envisioned as the ability to develop human relations. Others speak of it in terms of pursuing spiritual good, the goal of life, etc. No one has yet mentioned the use of reason as this higher good, but one wonders how far from it we may be. The norm is that if one cannot pursue this good, he has no obligation to preserve life. The classic example is that of a person in an irreversible coma, even though not terminal. Presumably, such a patient will never be able to pursue this higher good because of his condition. And if he cannot, preserving life is not considered a duty.

Usually, not only the physical capacity of achieving these goals is considered but the moral possibility as well. In other words, even though a patient may be endowed with this power, it may be too difficult for him to realize it in practice. Those who hold this position relieve the patient of the duty to use any means to preserve his life. The low quality of his life will in itself warrant the omission of means to preserve it.

This goes beyond the tradition which Paris and McCormick rightly commend and actually puts those who follow it on a collision course with the tradition against euthanasia. Superficially, the move from burdensome means to burdensome life may not seem significant. But in the move the act in question takes on a totally new perspective. The death of the patient is no longer an undesirable effect. It becomes the desired goal of the omission, since it is the solution to the problem. In terms of the Declaration on Euthanasia it is hard to see how it does not constitute intended euthanasia by omission. In quality of means cases the intention is to spare the patient a burdensome treatment. But in these cases nutrition and fluids are withdrawn because the patient cannot pursue spiritual goals, etc. Death results from this withdrawal and is intended as the solution to the problem. If this is done out of mercy, how does it differ from intended euthanasia by omission?

Some theologians may feel that they can dissent from the teaching of the document and allow euthanasia in these cases. But if what they are holding is euthanasia, they should be willing to admit it. It should not be presented as part of Church tradition.

A secondary problem is the impossibility of applying their norm in a sufficiently precise way. If a norm is to be useful, it should be relatively easy to apply to the ordinary case. I doubt that this can be said about a norm regarding the possibility of pursuing spiritual goals, etc., especially if one is speaking of the moral capability. And if one cannot apply it easily, he cannot determine with any precision when it is permissible to withhold treatment and when it is not. In other words, he cannot accurately discern between what he considers permissible and forbidden euthanasia.

The primary problem is, of course, the fact that euthanasia as such is accepted. This problem becomes aggravated when the norm for deciding cannot fulfill its role. One is trapped into a situation in which he cannot even make a clear judgment according to his own standards about when an act becomes acceptable euthanasia and when it does not.

In summary, the judgment I made in the Conroy case, although not the result of a thorough analysis, was founded on solid reasoning. The judgment in the Brophy case was based on a thorough analysis of the case. On the basis of this analysis I judged that the use of the gastric tube might not be excessively burdensome even over the long haul. Nor did the evidence in the Brophy case show that it was. Rather the quality of the patient's life was appealed to. Death was the only solution to the problem and intended as such. In my opinion, in terms of the Declaration on Euthanasia, this constituted intended euthanasia by omission. There was no acknowledgment of this in the article.

Postscript

On June 15, 1987, Father Connery wrote the following note commenting on the article he had just finished:

"Having been on a ventilator and artificial feeding for two distinct periods over the past six months, I may have acquired a peculiar right to speak about them. The enclosed was originally intended as a letter to the editor. But it soon became clear that it could not be kept within these bounds. On the other hand it would not be proper to print a response of the same proportions as the article itself. So this is a compromise."

Fr. Connery, who received the Fellowship's Cardinal Wright Award in 1983, died December 22, 1987 after a long illness.

SPECIAL FELLOWSHIP ITEMS

1. Because the September 25-27 Convention weekend in Pittsburgh is a busy one for the city (Special events, including three nights of the N.Y. Mets), it is recommended that attendees book their air travel early.
Mr. Jack Rook, of Steubenville, has arranged for special rates for Fellowship members through the good offices of: FORBES TRAVEL SERVICE, INC., Sandy Rim, CMP, 4 North Shore Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15212, 1-800-433-8785
Those who can afford to do so may wish to arrive Thursday night, rather than Friday morning.
2. A meeting of the Society of Catholic Social Scientists will be held immediately following the conclusion of the Pittsburgh convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. Date: Sunday, September 27, 1992. Time: Early afternoon. Location: To be announced. All Fellowship members who are social scientists or who have an interest in the social sciences are urged to attend. For more information, please contact either Dr. Stephen Krason, the Acting President (Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio, 43952, phone (614) 283-6416) or Dr. Joseph A. Varacalli, the Acting Secretary and Membership Chair (Nassau Community College-SUNY, Garden City, New York, 11530, phone (516) 222-7452 (also 7454).
3. **News Items to Dr. Ralph McNerny after August 1st**
Address: Jacques Maritain Center, 714 Hesburgh Library, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Please compose and type your own item. Please do not send a ten-page booklet, or even a one-page press release and expect the forthcoming editor of the Fellowship *Newsletter* to assume a reporter's role.
4. Dr. John H. Walsh, of California University of Pennsylvania, would be interested in meeting **privately** (lunch, supper, after hours) during the September Convention to discuss "*Catechesis and Parental Rights*." Those interested may contact him at (412) 938-4250. He will provide the questions he would like to discuss.
5. The *Proceedings* of the 1991 convention in Denver have been published. Entitled: *Church and State in America: Catholic Questions*. It will be distributed to the membership in due course by Dr. Scottino.

FELLOWSHIP BOARD MEETING, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA, MARCH 21, 1992

1. Mr. Jack Rook and Dean Michael Healy of Steubenville University reported in remarkable detail on the arrangements they are making for the September Convention there. Almost three hundred members and associates have replied indicating interest in the proceedings. Hotel reservation cards will be in the hands of the membership by the time they receive this *Newsletter*. Further details will accompany that mailing.
2. President Ralph McNerny becomes Editor of the *Newsletter* in December 1992 with the first issue of the sixteenth volume.
3. All applications for membership and renewals, plus questions about dues, should be referred to the Executive Secretary, Joseph P. Scottino, Ph. D., Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania 16541.
Those delinquent in their 1992 dues payments may contact Dr. Scottino accordingly.
4. Father Donald Keefe, S.J. was nominated and approved as the Cardinal Wright Awardee for 1992. The honor will be conferred by Father Michael Scanlon, TOR, president of Steubenville University.
5. The Board approved as the theme of the 1993 convention in Orange, California – September 24-26 – "Familiaris Consortium and the Family." Professor Carl Anderson, Dean of The John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and the Family (Washington, D.C.) was nominated to be General Chairman.
6. The Board accepted the invitation of Bishop Rene Gracida (Corpus Christi, Texas) to hold the 1994 convention under his auspices. The General Theme will deal with "evangelization" and the new Hispanic migration to the U.S.

**FIFTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
of
THE FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS**

SEPTEMBER 25 - 27, 1992

**The Pittsburgh Hilton
Gateway Center
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222
(412) 391-4600**

**Theme:
The Church and a Universal Catechism**

**Most Reverend Donald W. Wuerl
Bishop of Pittsburgh**

Friday, September 25, 1992

**11:00 A.M. MEETING OF THE FELLOWSHIP BOARD OF
DIRECTORS
LIBERTY ROOM**

**12:00 NOON/ Registration for Hotel and Convention
THEREAFTER HILTON LOBBY**

**All General Sessions Will Be Held In
LeBATEAU/KINGS GARDEN SOUTH ROOMS**

**1:00-3:00 P.M. CATECHESIS AND THE MISSION OF THE
CHURCH**

**Msgr. George Graham, JCD, Ph.D., Research
Director, Pastor, St. Bernard's Church, Levittown,
New York**

Keynote Address:

**Most Reverend George Pell, MELBOURNE,
AUSTRALIA
Member of the Sacred Congregation for the
Doctrine of the Faith.**

**American Response: Msgr. William B. Smith
Dunwoodie Seminary, Yonkers, N.Y.**

3:00-4:00 P.M. Registration Concluded

**4:00-6:00 P.M. ASSESSMENT OF THE CONTEMPORARY
CATECHETICAL QUESTION: VATICAN II
PROMISE AND POST-VATICAN II REALITY**

**Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Wrenn, Research Director
Special Consultant for Religious Education to
John Cardinal O'Connor
St. John the Evangelist Church, New York**

**Rev. Alfred McBride, Ph.D., O. Praem.
Spiritual Director, Aid to the Church in Need,
USA
Washington, D.C.**

**Rev. Norman Belval, S.T.D.
Director of Religious Education
Archdiocese of Hartford, Connecticut**

6:00 P.M. Reception

**6:30 P.M. Banquet
PRESENTATION OF THE CARDINAL WRIGHT
AWARD**

9:00 P.M. Social Hour

Saturday, September 26, 1992

7:00 A.M. MASS AT ST. MARY OF MERCY CHURCH

Joseph Varacalli, Ph.D.
Nassau Community College, New York

9:00 A.M. THE WORSHIP OF GOD AND TEACHING HIS

10:45 A.M. WORD

Sister Joan Gormley, S.S.M.W., Research Director,
Associate Professor of Scripture, Mount Saint
Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, MD

Msgr. Paul Langsfeldt, STD
Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, MD

11:00 A.M. THE CONTENT AND COMMITMENT OF

1:00 P.M. CATHOLIC CATECHESIS: DOCTRINE,
ACCULTURATION, EXPERIENCE

Professor John Haas, Ph.D., STL, Research
Director, St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Professor Scott Hahn, Ph.D.
Franciscan University of Steubenville, Ohio

Rev. Stuart Swetland, M.A., Oxon
Theological Adviser to Bishop John Myers

1:00 P.M. Lunch at will.

2:00-3:30 P.M. CATECHESIS AND THE CATHOLIC FAMILY:
THEME FROM FAMILIARIS CONSORTIO

Professor Robert George, Ph.D., J.D., Research
Director, Princeton University, New Jersey

Germain Grisez, Ph.D.
Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, MD

3:45-5:30 P.M. CATECHESIS AND THE DIOCESAN BISHOP
Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM, Cap., Research
Director, Saint Paul Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA
Consultor for Religious Education to Bishop
Donald W. Wuerl

Most Reverend Edward Egan
Bishop of Bridgeport, Connecticut

Most Reverend Thomas Welch
Bishop of Allentown, Pennsylvania

5:30-7:00 P.M. Supper at will.

7:00-9:00 P.M. CATECHESIS AND CHURCH GOVERN-
MENT: THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PASTORS

Msgr. George A. Kelly
Research Director

Most Reverend Donald W. Wuerl,
Introducing

John Cardinal O'Connor
Archbishop of New York

9:00 P.M. Social Hour

CARDINAL WRIGHT AWARD TO FATHER KEEFE

Donald J. Keefe, S.J., theologian-in-residence for the Archdiocese of Denver, will be the thirteenth recipient of the John Cardinal Wright Award for outstanding scholarly service to the Church. The Wright Award came into being in 1979 when John and Eileen Farrell, two of Chicago's early social activists, persuaded the Fellowship to sponsor this award in the name of the recently deceased head of the Clergy Congregation in Rome, and a native Bostonian.

Father Keefe is a specialist in systematic theology and jurisprudence, trained at the University of Strasbourg and at the Gregorian where he received his S.T.D. degree. A Navy Lieutenant during World War II, he entered the Society of Jesus in 1953, to be ordained a priest in 1962. He has taught since at the University of St. Louis, and at Marquette from 1978-1991. Considered one of the better theological minds of his time, he is the author of three major works, the most important of which is evaluated by Joyce Little in this issue of the *Newsletter*. His writings for theological journals deal with existential theology, the interaction of law and religion, the Eucharist, Dogma, Prayer, and biblical criticism. He has evaluated, among other authors, the writings of Henri DeLubac, Paul Tillich, Richard McBrien, Charles Davis, Tad Guzie, Karl Rahner, Hans Urs von Balthasar, and Hans Kung.

Father Keefe is a member of the Catholic Biblical Association, the Mariological Society, and the National Association of Scholars. He has also participated in anti-abortion protests.

The Fellowship Board is gratified at his selection, the fifth Jesuit to be so honored.

Publications by Fellowship Members

(Editor's Note: We are asked from time to time to find scholarly publications dealing with the interdisciplinary work of Fellowship Scholars. With this issue we will begin to provide names of authors and their respective works from 1976 onward, beginning with some of the Fellowship's Founding Members.)

Eugene F. Diamond, M.D.

This Curette for Hire. Acta Press, 1977.

The Positive Values of Chastity. Franciscan Herald Press, 1984.

AIDS and the Contraceptive Mentality. John XXIII Institute Publications, 1989.

Passion of a Believer. Liferose Press, 1988.

Rev. Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.

Frederick Ozanam, A Life in Letters. St. Vincent De Paul Society, Council of the United States, 1986.

St. Catherine Laboure of the Miraculous Medal. New ed. Rockland, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, 1984.

The Soul of Elizabeth Seton, A Spiritual Portrait. Ignatius Press, 1990.

Germain Grisez

Free Choice: A Self-Referential Argument. Joseph M. Boyle, Jr., co-ed. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1976.

Beyond the New Morality: The Responsibilities of Freedom. Russell Shaw, co-ed. Notre Dame, Indiana: U of Notre Dame Press, 1980. 3rd ed. 1988.

The Way of the Lord Jesus: Christian Moral Principles. Vol. 1. Chicago, Illinois: Franciscan Herald Press, 1983.

Nuclear Deterrence, Morality and Realism. John Finnis and Joseph M. Boyle, co-ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1987.

The Teaching of "Humanae Vitae": A Defense. et al., Eds. Ignatius Press, 1988.

Fulfillment in Christ: A Summary of Christian Moral Principles. Russell Shaw, co-ed. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1991.

James Hitchcock

Catholicism and Modernity. Seabury, 1979. Servant, 1983.

What is Secular Humanism? Servant, 1982.

The Pope and the Jesuits. National Committee of Catholic Lawmen, 1984.

Years of Crisis 1970-1983. Ignatius Press, 1984.

Mary R. Joyce

How Can a Man and Woman Be Friends? Liturgical Press, 1977.

Women and Choice: a New Beginning. LifeCom, 1986.

Friends and Teens. LifeCom, 1990.

Robert E. Joyce

Human Sexual Ecology: A Philosophy and Ethics of Man and Woman. University Press of America, 1980.

Women and Choice: a New Beginning. Ed. LifeCom, 1986.

Friends and Teens. Ed. LifeCom, 1990.

Rev. Donald J. Keefe, S.J.

Covenantal Theology: The Eucharistic Order of History I: Method and System in Theology; II: The Metaphysics of the Covenant. Pp. xxiv + 553; x + 536. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1991.

Ronald D. Lawler, OFM Cap.

The Teaching of Christ. Co-author, Huntington, Indiana: OSV, 1976, 1983, 1991. Has gone through three American editions and very many printings; translated into twelve other languages, including: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Croatian, Lithuanian, Russian, Korean.

Philosophy in Priestly Formation. Co-Author, Washington: Catholic University Press, 1978.

The Christian Personalism of John Paul II. Chicago, Ill.: Franciscan Herald Press, 1981.

Catholic Sexual Ethics. Co-Author, Huntington, Indiana: OSV, 1985.

The Catholic Catechism. Co-Author, Huntington, Indiana: OSV, 1986.

Excellence in Seminary Education. Co-Author, Erie, Pa.: Gannon University Press, 1988.

William E. May

The Nature and Meaning of Chastity. Franciscan Herald Press, 1976.

Human Existence, Medicine and Ethics: Reflections on Human Life. Franciscan Herald Press, 1977.

On Understanding "Human Sexuality." John Harvey, O.S.F.S., co-ed. Franciscan Herald Press, 1977.

Catholic Perspectives: The Right to Die. Richard Westley, co-ed. Thomas More, 1980.

Sex, Marriage and Chastity: Reflections of a Catholic Layman, Spouse and Parent. Franciscan Herald Press, 1981.

Contraceptives and Catholics. Christendom Press, 1983.

Principles of Catholic Moral Life. Ed. Franciscan Herald Press, 1981.

Sex and the Sanctity of Human Life. Christendom Press, 1984.

Contraception, Humanae Vitae and Catholic Moral Thought. Franciscan Herald Press, 1984.

Catholic Sexual Ethics: A Summary, Explanation and Defense. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap. and Joseph Boyle, co-eds. Our Sunday Visitor, 1985.

Moral Absolutes: Catholic Tradition, Current Trends and the Truth. Marquette University Press, 1989.

Introduction to Moral Theology. Our Sunday Visitors, 1991.

The Teaching of Humanae Vitae: A Defense. et. al., eds. Ignatius Press, 1988.

Reverend H. Vernon Sattler, C.Ss.R., Ph.D

Challenging Children to Chastity. A Parental Guide, Central Bureau, 2835 Westminster, St. Louis, MO. 1992.

All About Love. Stafford, VA, Anastasia Press, 1986.

Sex Education in the Catholic Family. Front Royal, VA, Christendom Press, 1984.

Secular Humanism? Stafford, VA, Anastasia Press, 1982.

Sex Is Alive and Well and Flourishing Among Christians, Huntington, IN. Our Sunday Visitor, 1980, reprinted Montrose, PA, Ridge Row Press, 1983.

Recipients of John Cardinal Wright Award

1979
Msgr. George A. Kelly

1980
Dr. William May

1981
Dr. James Hitchcock

1982
Dr. Germain Grisez

1983
Rev. John Connery, S.J.
(Deceased)

1984
Rev. John Hardon, S.J.

1985
Dr. Herbert Ratner

1986
Dr. Joseph P. Scottino

1987
Rev. Joseph Farraher, S.J.
Rev. Joseph Fessio, S.J.

1988
Rev. John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S.

1989
Dr. John M. Finnis

1990
Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM. Cap

1991
Rev. Francis Canavan, S.J.

Recipients of Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle Award

1988
Father John C. Ford, S.J.
(Deceased)

1991
Mother M. Angelica, P.C.P.A.

"The Historical Jesus"

Father Donald J. Keefe, S.J.

Editor's Note: Late last year Doubleday, a branch of the Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group in New York, published the first volume of a two-volume exegetical work entitled A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. The author is Father John Meier, currently (1992-92) president of the Catholic Biblical Association. The present review is of Volume I: The Roots of the Problem and the Person (484 pp.). Father Keefe is well known to Fellowship members.

In this volume, the first of two projected under its major title, Father Meier presents a reductionist account of the "historical" Jesus whom he insists cannot be the object of the Catholic faith. His study combines an impressive learning and brilliant technical scholarship with the theological naiveté, now conventional in Catholic circles, which in the name of an empiricist historicism eliminates the historical objectivity of the Christian revelation. The result is an evident and dazzling *tour de force*, but one locked within such methodological limitations that it is not much more than a gloss on the attack, going on for two centuries, of liberal theology upon the historicity of the faith.

In common with most of his peers, the author dismisses as fundamentalist any Catholic scholarship that may still reject his methodology. It would be passing curious for a scholar of his evident attainments to find himself reduced to this *ad hominem* reliance upon epithet, were not the alternative unthinkable: an admission that the historical-critical methodology upon which he so confidently and uncritically relies is not in fact self-validating. That admission would open up a wide-ranging theological inquiry into the meaning of history: it is an inquiry with which he shows himself quite unprepared to deal, despite his emphasis upon the "great questions" which are his concern as a historian. Nor is his incapacity singular: the secularity of history has been a truth intuitively clear to Catholic exegetes and consequently has been incapable of discussion by them since at least the end of the second Vatican Council. Fifteen years earlier J. L. McKenzie had found himself unable to understand how de Lubac's sophisticated defense of the historicity of Origen's allegorical hermeneutic could comport with "scientific exegesis." But de Lubac's monumental defense of the patristic hermeneutic is ignored by Meier as simply beyond the pale.

At bottom, Meier's simplistic acceptance of the determinist character of rationality and of historical

reality deprives him, as it deprives those historians and exegetes who are his intellectual allies, of the historical consciousness indispensable to the freedom of inquiry which his commitment to historical learning presupposes. The false notion of history which guides most contemporary exegetes into comparable hermeneutical dead ends is the invention of the Enlightenment, whose confidence in the autonomous mind's power to render the world coherent has been left without support for sixty years and more. Kurt Gödel has long since proven the incapacity of arithmetical reasoning, the purest form of abstract rationality, to construct the coherent closed universe of discourse which the autonomous mind requires of rationality as such. The Enlightenment project is by definition pursued in vain. Any criticism reliant upon it is simply uninformed.

The imposition of the discredited Enlightenment criteria of abstract intelligibility upon the concreteness of historical reality has been abandoned in the hard sciences. Only a few "cosmologists" ignore Gödel's incompleteness theorems in order to pursue the Grail of all dehistoricized inquiry, the transcendent theory whose rational necessity will trivialize the experimental mode of knowledge. For the rest, the Enlightenment's fictitious autonomous mind survives only in the humanities. There it operates most arrogantly in the application of the Enlightenment notion of historical consciousness to the task of historically critical exegesis, whether of ecclesial monuments or of Scripture.

That nonhistorical notion of history persists also in the Catholic academy's disinterest in the theology of history, a topic made unfashionable by the Catholic scholars who subscribe to the triumphalism of the dehistoricizing historical method taught in the more prestigious American, English and Continental universities. For such scholars, objective history is very much what von Ranke thought it to be, that which

"actually" (i.e., with empirical verification) happened. When the logic of that abstract analysis is pursued, history becomes what Meier supposes it to be, a multiplicity of more or less probable, *but always unverifiable*, interpretations of intrinsically meaningless data.

The Augustinian tradition knew better. However unfashionable it may have become, the Augustinian insistence upon the confident Christian interpretation of history, which finds history's intelligible unity only in the freedom of Catholic worship, offers the single alternative to the rationalist dehistoricization of historical reality. Only this perception of the sacramental significance of history – which is to say, the sacramentality of historical objectivity – can displace the historicism that has been passing as historical consciousness for the two and a half centuries since Voltaire, whose supposed emancipation of the mind from *l'Infame* was applauded by an academy then discovering the equivalence of autonomous reason and "postulatory atheism." It is this consensus which dominates the notion of academic freedom governing Catholic scholarship in the late twentieth century.

Those who find tedious the dogmatic postulates of the contemporary academic magisterium will profit from examining the alternative interest provided by the Augustinian theology of history. Not only will they find it loyal to the Catholic historical consciousness that Jesus is the Lord; they will also rediscover in the analysis the import of the Catholic convictions that historical existence is interesting, that one learns from it and that the learning, because it is in Christ, does not issue in negation piled upon negation but in discovery of history as salvific, as ratified in the Kingdom of God.

The Augustinian theology of history is encapsulated in the twelfth century development of Augustine's doctrine of sacramental efficacy, probably perfected by the school of Laon. This fulfillment of Augustine's central insight was integrated into the Western theological tradition as the tripartite paradigm of *sacramentum tantum*, *res et sacramentum*, *res tantum* by way of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and the commentaries upon that classic work. These were a standard exercise for budding theologians from the late twelfth through the fifteenth centuries. Augustine's genius is systematically explicit in the methodologically controlling perception of the free coherence of the component elements – past, present

and future – of every salvifically – and therefore historically – significant, free, and moral event, and in the methodological insistence upon the *free* intelligibility of this free *historical* objectivity.

For the Augustinian theology, history is actual only in the free coherence of the concrete historical event; the past is subsumed therein as the intrinsic signing or foreshadowing (the *sacramentum tantum*) of a present that is at once the free and irrevocable historical effect (the *res et sacramentum*) of the past, and the free intrinsically signifying cause of a dynamically free future (the *res tantum*), the Kingdom of God that is the free integration and fulfillment of the past and the present. From this Christian stance, the objective meaning of history is the free unity of these intrinsic causes of history, and its truth can never be reduced to a rationale, for it is a free truth.

So understood, history is precisely salvation history, for participation in its freedom is *eo ipso* participation in the salvation which that freedom causes by signing it. This final effect, the good creation that is in Christ, is the free and intrinsically significant unity of the past, the present, and the Kingdom of God. Because this historical consciousness is free, it is personally appropriated only in the covenantal worship of the risen Christ, whose Eucharistic presence in the Church, by which he is the Lord of history, is the integration of an otherwise meaningless temporality into a free unity, a free objectivity: the history of which Christ is the Lord by his Eucharistic transcendence and integration of the past, the present, and the future.

In this classic theological usage, the Augustinian paradigm of *sacramentum tantum*, *res et sacramentum* and *res tantum* has the fundamental function of interpreting and upholding the dogmatic realism of the sacramental worship of the Church. In doing so, it states also that free unity and truth is intrinsic to historical objectivity, and does not wait upon historical method. Put very briefly, it forbids what every historicism demands, the rational disintegration of the freedom of history into mutually exclusive "clear and distinct ideas" which are then to be re-assembled to suit the historian. By insisting that all historical objectivity is intrinsically free, the Augustinian understanding of history implies that objectivity is therefore sacramental. History is from the outset a religious reality, available only in and through the normative

sacramental signs of the Church's worship in truth.

The application of the Augustinian paradigm of historical objectivity to Meier's Christological project immediately reveals the latter's absurdity. The "historical Jesus" conjured up by Meier's method is a vivid illustration of what happens to the *sacramentum tantum*, the concrete free event that is the historical Jesus – his life, death and Resurrection – when it is rationally dissociated (by the dehistoricizing truism that whatever is freely asserted may be freely denied) from its irrevocable historical consequence, at once an effect and an effective sign, (the *res et sacramentum*) that is, the nuptial unity, the One Flesh of the second Adam and the second Eve, in which the free and nuptial sacrifice of praise of the historical Church is in covenantal union with her Lord's One Sacrifice; this union, the New Covenant, effectively signs the Kingdom of God, the *res tantum* that is the effect, finally, of the *sacramentum tantum*.

An ancient Greek expression of the permanent puzzlement of autonomous reason, the relation of the one and the many, is set out in the paradoxes of Zeno, which assumed the disintegration of reality into infinitely divided units, and reasoned from the absurdities which follow (e.g., motion becomes impossible) to the absolute unity of material being and the consequently illusory character of all multiplicity and relativity. This had been urged by his mentor, Parmenides, and Zeno's paradoxes were designed to defend its truth. The centuries since Parmenides and Zeno have shown the genius of Parmenides' insight: all merely rational quest for truth and unity is necessarily a rejection of the presence of truth and reality in the historical order of multiplicity and change. The rational quest initiated by Plato for a material unity and intelligibility, for an indivisible particle or moment, the *infima species*, turns out always to be the quest for an ideal unity and truth that is unrealized and unrealizable in the material order, for no proposed atom of time or space is indivisible: all yield yet smaller units, forever.

Reality as appropriated by the autonomous mind, reality as rationalized, is always found, at least by implication, to be ideal, immune to the fragmentation characteristic of time and space. No other possibility is open to the autonomous mind.

When anyone, including a scholar, tries to establish the historical objectivity of Jesus (the significance

of his life, death and Resurrection) by a rationalist methodology of suspicion ("what is freely asserted may be freely denied") he is engaged upon just such a quest for the ideal Jesus as Zeno's paradoxes require: i.e., for a Jesus entirely dissociated from the mediation of his revelation by the historical Church, no element of whose free tradition can be relied upon as of itself intrinsically intelligible, for the intrinsic intelligibility of historical objectivity has been discarded a priori as a possibility by the method itself. If one continues nonetheless, say as a child of one's time, to be interested in "the historical Jesus," this object of interest cannot be that which is mediated by the Church's liturgical and doctrinal tradition. "Jesus" will assume that shape which the method of this clinical and inquiry may permit: it will be the resultant of a more or less arbitrary association of the fragments whose intrinsic significance has been methodologically denied, and to which an extrinsic unity, methodologically provided, may now be assigned upon a quite provisional basis.

Thereby, the Christ's sacrificial life, death and Resurrection cease to exist. Jesus then loses the free historical relationality to the past, the present and the Kingdom of God, by which alone can he be understood. His free historical unity and intelligibility, his historical objectivity, has been fragmented a priori into those rationalized infinitesimals, the Platonic *infima species*, whose spurious historical objectivity Meier's rationalized version of "critical historical scholarship" thereafter pursues in vain.

Lacking the free historical mediation of historical objectivity, that objectivity must vanish from history, to become ideal. The historicity of the Christ, mediated by the ecclesial tradition, is then marginalized, put in brackets, as by Meier, and may be relied upon to vanish along with history as such. Nothing whatever in history escapes that rationalist solvent, for history is time qualified by meaning, and only freedom mediates meaning.

Historical truth can only be free, if it is to be of historical significance: whatever is rationally necessary is, in principle, always known or capable of being known without reference to any source of information outside the reasoning mind itself, and therefore simply lacks the historical interest which could make one curious about it. Only the conviction that the truth is free, and that it continually comes to one historically and concretely from

outside oneself can account for our further inquiry about it. For only then, when the truth in its historical mediation is free a priori, can there be anything new to be learned which could be interesting, novel, unanticipated.

The necessary, the random, are alike meaningless, alike boring. Those cultures whose religions or philosophies reduced the world to either necessity or randomness have produced no tradition of experimental science. Similarly, those cosmologically-inclined physicists today, like Stephen Hawking or Sheldon Lee Glashow, who confidently seek for the all-inclusive mathematical abstraction which will sum up and comprehend all possible physical reality, accept quite blithely the prospect, implicit in their quest for a theory which would transcend the physical universe, of closing down the experimental inquiry by which physics lives. That way lies tedium, the death of all interest, all curiosity, all wonder. It represents a return to the world view of Eastern mysticism, that of theoretical Hinduism and Buddhism, as many of such dehistoricizing scientists have discovered.

Similarly, Meier's quest for the "Jesus of history" may be seen to have been deprived a priori, as a methodological necessity, of discovering in the Jesus mediated by the historical tradition of the Church, any historical unity or significance. Insofar as Meier would supply what is missing by the use of historical "reason," i.e., by the application of his rationalist historical criticism, he can discover, in the mere "data" into which the ecclesial tradition has been methodologically fragmented, only necessity or randomness.

Meier's attempt to re-integrate such data into a "historical Jesus" can operate only in terms imposing upon its multiplicity an extrinsic or statistical unity, which can only be ideal, mathematical in the final analysis. Since Meier's historical-critical methodology of suspicion has no difficulty in showing such brute empirical "data" to possess no intrinsically necessary truth, and at the same time ignores the reality of free truth, he can unify the empirical data and render them intelligible only extrinsically, by the application of the method itself. Of course, the intelligibility of such provisional integrations of data is itself conditional, provisional, conjectural. And finally, the sum of such empirical evidence or data, together with its more or less persuasive interpretation *ex aliunde*, is never complete, and any further assessment of it must in any case remain uncertain, possessed of no more

legitimacy than any other current academic consensus, similarly normed, may admit. The product of such a methodology can only be actuarial: to speak of Meier's "marginal Jesus" as equivalent to the "historical Jesus" is to confuse historical scholarship with the calculation of risks.

Over the past quarter-century Catholic exegetes and church historians such as Meier have very generally succumbed to the anti-intellectualism made fashionable by Voltaire and exemplified in our time by the instant resort of neo-Darwinians to the vilification of believers in creation, and by the comparable anxiety displayed by idealist interpreters of quantum mechanics when a physicist as well equipped as Stanley Jaki to do so points out the fallacies underlying their reduction of reality to what an abstract and priori methodology will allow.

Meier's resolutely uncritical identification of history with its empirically available residue is symptomatic of the general despair of historical significance that is explicit (1) in the Buddhism to which Ernst Mach, Erwin Schrödinger, and Fritjof Capra has been led by their comparable denial of objective reality, (2) in the dogmatic materialism of Copenhagen-inspired fundamental particle physicists such as Stephen Hawking and neo-Darwinians such as Stephen Jay Gould, and (3) in the neo-Modernism of the bulk of contemporary Catholic academicians. Meier's community with that mind-set is evident in his divorce of the Catholic faith from historical concreteness, a divorce effected also in post-conciliar theologies of Bernard Lonergan, Edward Schillebeeckx and the later Karl Rahner. Hans Küng has popularized the consequences of this methodology in a major work, *On Being a Christian*. The divorce is required not by the faith but by Meier's methodology, which for his universe of discourse has the higher claim to truth.

One should not expect an exegete to delve deeply into the systematic issues his work must raise for systematic theologians; the latter tend to be comparably uninterested in the problems of exegesis. But Meier claims also a theological competence; he claims to wear also a "theological hat." Misgivings over its labeling cannot but arise when he proceeds to discuss theology as though its classic definition, "faith seeking understanding," incorporated the rationalism and historicism which specify his notion of historical consciousness. Meier has placed himself in the interest-

ing position of supposing on the one hand that the object of the faith is not the "historical Jesus" whose doubtful reality his book develops, and on the other that the Catholic faith is nonetheless historical as judged by his version of historical criticism. Wherefore Catholic theology must travel his route in either case. The link he finds between these propositions is hardly clear. Meier describes theology as a "cultural artifact" and maintains that it is necessary for anyone who today would think theologically to share his version of historical consciousness, that of modernity. As we have seen, he considers the sole alternative for the Catholic theologian to be "fundamentalism" – unless such a one be willing to adopt Bultmann's existentialist dismissal of the pertinence of historical Jesus to the Christian faith. The latter course being an unlikely route for the Catholic theologians who are the interlocutors of the author, they are left with a choice: either abandoning the historical objectivity of Jesus the Christ as the object of their historical faith, or accept that "fundamentalist" label with which Meier and his sympathizers are quite willing, even eager, to impugn the intelligence of those who continue to prefer the faith of the Church to an irrational notion of historical criticism. But, with Bultmann, Meier dismisses the relevance to the faith of the "marginal Jew," delivered up by his critical historical method. It then appears that one must either accept, with Meier, the dehistoricization project popularized fifty years ago by Bultmann and enthusiastically adopted by the Catholic academy, or be a fundamentalist. It is a hard life.

In any event, Meier's statistically reconstructed version of the "historical Jesus" has and can have no historical objectivity which could correspond to the objective historical certitude attending the free historical faith of the Church that Jesus is the Lord. Meier concedes this early on, and anticipates the obvious question, why then proceed? His answer, postponed nearly to the midpoint of his book, supposes the rationalist nexus, previously mentioned, between "faith and reason," between "nature and grace," that is the common-place of scholastic theology. We have seen that he considers the Catholic "faith" to be little concerned for the historical actions of Jesus, and so presumes the faith to bear rather on Jesus' "person" than upon doctrinal affirmations about his deeds in history. But Jesus thus dogmatically dissociated from

history is of course Jesus dehistoricized; Meier's emphatic assertion that as risen, Jesus the Lord is accessible only by faith is instinct with the denial of Eucharistic realism by which such *sola fide* theology lives. Like the Catholic theologians, particularly Schillebeeckx, who trod that path before him, Meier relies upon the Thomist theology of grace as the warrant for his historicism: on that warrant, historical objectivity becomes the realm of necessity. Governed by the innate necessity of nature, historical objectivity must conform to the immanent logical necessities of autonomous reason. One can only conclude then that faith, insofar as grace, is not nature, is not necessary, and consequently is not historical. It follows logically that the affirmations of the faith do not bear upon historical reality, and so are immune to the assault of critical rationality. In very much the same vein Schleiermacher two centuries ago defended the faith against its cultured critics; Meier takes their Enlightenment postulates for granted. It is more than anachronistic to foist them on St. Thomas, writing five centuries before the Enlightenment, and moreover with the intellectual freedom of an age of faith.

But for Meier, "reason" is that methodological rationalization of reality which we have examined. "Nature" must then correspond to what "reason" knows, the dehistoricized "Jesus of history," while "grace" presumably refers to the dehistoricized "faith" whose object is "personal" but not historical, whatever that may mean. There is no news in such baroque devices, and judging from their current academic disuse, little theological interest: I have pointed out the accumulated incoherences of that brand of nominalist theology elsewhere. When driven by the same nominalist rationalism underlying the Lutheran historical pessimism and the Enlightenment atheism, "Thomism" becomes an idealism, a dehistoricizing quest for an abstract truth. On that basis, formalized by the "transcendental Thomism" of Joseph Maréchal and by Bernard Longergan's "cognitive analysis," the post-conciliar Thomist loyalists have proven their sub-Kantian theological method to be theologically sterile. This sterility is particularly evident in their neglect and even denial of the sacramental realism by which Catholicism lives.

Meier has recourse to the jargon of the recent cosmology: thus he refuses "read back anachronistically the expanded universe of Church teaching into

the big bang of Jesus' earthly ministry." The "expanded universe" of the development of doctrine concerning the Christ (which is to say, the Nicene creed, the Chalcedonian symbol) is thus contrasted to that value-free initial moment, the public life of the "historical" Jesus. Here Meier betrays his ignorance of that consuming search by physical cosmologists into the first few sub-billionths of a second of the history of the universe as the sole source of explanation of the next fifteen billion years. The exigency of this scientific quest has driven the design and funding of all that vast experimental apparatus of high energy physics still under construction here and abroad, and inspires continual feverish competition among physicists for its use. The intelligible causal relation between the past and the present of the universe is presupposed by modern physics, which is tempted, like Meier, by the doctrinaire supposition of an utterly undifferentiated initial instant - which as Stanley Jaki has shown, is simply incompatible with all the specificity which characterizes the universe we know. But the most arrant disciple of the inflationary version of the Copenhagen reading of Heisenberg's indeterminacy principle does not so cavalierly dismiss the historical significance of the inconvenient evidence provided by, e.g., the 2.7°K cosmic background radiation, as does Meier dismiss the historical significance of the Lucan and Matthean infancy narratives and of the Nicene and Chalcedonian definitions. His hermeneutics of suspicion would be ridiculous in a practitioner of a hard science, respectful *ex professo* of the data historically mediated to him. However much the experimental physicist may be the victim of some quasi-Kantian philosophical indoctrination, he knows that all he has to work with is the concrete historical evidence his instruments place before him. Were the experimental apparatus mediating this data to be held suspect a priori because of its historicity, its physical concreteness, experimental science could not proceed. It does not occur to Meier that he is in precisely the same situation of having undercut the possibility of his discipline. He has rejected the historical mediation of the data of his discipline, preferring to regard that mediation as suspect a priori, by reason of its spatio-temporality, and its consequent irreducibility to rational necessity. With the whole of the pagan speculative tradition, Meier takes for granted that history is opaque to God. Further, Meier supposes, as the physicist *qua*

experimental can not afford to suppose, that historical objectivity is not concretely given as intrinsic to the data, but is rather the unattainable goal of an unavailing quest. This supposition writes *finis* to all historical inquiry, and Meier's book details the dissolution.

Just as a nonexperimental purely mathematical physics falls victim to the final incoherence of mathematical logic and then can only oscillate between subjectivism and nihilism, so the equivalent methodological reduction of historical objectivity to rational necessity fails the exegete, for he must then choose, on the one hand, between identifying history with historiography, viz., with some arbitrary personal scenario, the product of a romanticizing construction by the historian and, on the other hand, a methodologically-forced abstention from assigning any significance whatever to the historical evidence before him other than the purely conjectural. In the end these are expressions of a single despair of history.

Meier has shown that once Jesus has been submitted to a historical criticism which denies a priori the legitimacy of the free historical mediation of the truth, he ceases to be the object of the historical faith. This does not require a book; it hardly requires a sentence. Put in the classic terms of the Augustinian sacramental theology of history, when the concrete historical reality that is the *sacramentum tantum* is dissociated from the free significance by which it is a sacramental sign, it ceases then to be capable of being understood to cause the *res et sacramentum* that is the free sacramental and historical unity of the second Adam and the second Eve. When this effect is nullified, so also is the Church and the Eucharistic sacrifice. There remains then no link whatever between the "historical Jesus" and faith in the risen Christ, the *res tantum*. All this disintegration was worked out to its last consequence, the radical isolation of the "Jesus of history" from the "Christ of faith," by similarly liberal theologians nearly two centuries ago.

Contemporary exegetes scorn the patristic exegesis as naive, untutored, historically unsophisticated. Much of this judgement is warranted. But Meier and his colleagues deny as a matter of method and refuse to discuss as a matter of caste what the Fathers knew as a matter of faith, that history is a religious and not a secular category. Until that academic obduracy is foregone, so also is the possibility of scientific exegesis.

Pertinent Quotations from "A Marginal Jew"

- p. 4: "Objectivity in the quest for the historical Jesus is, to borrow a phrase from the theologian Karl Rahner, an "asymptotic goal." It is a goal we have to keep pressing toward, even though we never fully reach it."
- p. 5, 6: "...I never cease to be amazed at how present-day writers will first censure past critics for not being sufficiently self-critical and then proceed to engage in an uncritical projection of their own ideas and agendas upon a portrait of the historical Jesus, hardly suppressing a gasp at how relevant he turns out to be... In my own case I must candidly confess that I work out of a Catholic context. My greatest temptation, therefore, will be to read back anachronistically the expanded universe of later Church teaching into the "big bang" moment of Jesus' earthly ministry."
- p. 24: "We cannot know the "real" Jesus through historical research, whether we mean his total reality or a reasonably complete biographical portrait. We can, however, know the "historical Jesus."
- p. 26: "...The Gospels serve as the chief *sources* for our reconstruction of the historical Jesus, but to speak of the Gospel writers as presenting or intending to present the historical Jesus transplants them in an exegetical time machine to the Enlightenment."
- p. 30-31: "We abstract from Christian faith because we are involved in the hypothetical reconstruction of a past figure by purely scientific means: empirical data from ancient documents, sifted by human minds operating by inference, analogy, and certain specific criteria. Both method and goal are extremely narrow and limited: the results do not claim to provide either a substitute for or the object of faith. For the moment we are prescinding from faith, not denying it. Later on a correlation between our historical quest and the stance of faith may be possible, but that lies beyond the main and modest goal of this book. While the scholar may try to prescind from a specifically Christian or ecclesiastical commitment, a more general "existential commitment," a concern about what Jesus may mean for human life today, necessarily energizes the historical quest."
- p. 197: "...In the historical-critical framework, the "real" has been defined – and has to be defined – in terms of what exists within this world of time and space, what can be experienced in principle by any observer, and what can be reasonably deduced or inferred from such experience. Faith and Christian theology, however, affirm ultimate realities beyond what is merely empirical or provable by reason: e.g., the triune God and the risen Jesus. Thus to ask about the relation between the historical Jesus, reconstructed from modern historical research, and the risen Jesus is to pass from the realm of the purely empirical or rational into the larger framework of faith and theology, as it seeks to relate itself to the historical project."
- p. 141, n. 4: "Needless to say, our concern here is with sayings that have a good chance of coming from the historical Jesus; words ascribed to the risen Jesus do not come under the limited scope of this investigation."
- p. 201, n. 2: On this point, cf. G.G. O'Collins, "Is the Resurrection an "Historical Event?" *Hey!* 8 (1967) 381–387. O'Collins argues, rightly in my view, that although the "resurrection is a real bodily event involving the person of Jesus of Nazareth," (381) the resurrection of Jesus "is not an event *in* space and time and hence should not be called historical" (384) since "we should require an historical occurrence to be something significant that is known to have happened in our space-time continuum" (p. 384).
- p. 183: "...Common sense and the rules of logical argument seem to be on the side of critics like Willi Marxsen and Ben Meyer, who state the obvious: the burden of proof is simply upon anyone who tries to prove anything."

In effect this means that the critic must a galling but realistic third column for a vote of "not clear" (*non liquet*). There will always be some difficult cases in which no criterion applies or in which different criteria apply but point in opposite directions. Such conundrums cannot be resolved by the *deus ex machina* of the criterion of historical presumption. In the convoluted case of the historical Gospels, such a criterion simply does not exist."

p. 198: "Moreover, and more importantly, the proper object of Christian faith is not and cannot be an idea or scholarly reconstruction, however reliable. For the believer, the object of the Christian faith is a living person, Jesus Christ, who entered into a true human existence on earth in the first century A.D., but who now lives, risen and glorified, forever in the Father's presence. Primarily, Christian faith affirms and adheres to this person – indeed, incarnate, crucified, risen – and only secondarily to ideas and affirmations about him. In the realm of faith and theology, the "real Jesus," the only Jesus existing and living now, is this risen Lord, to whom access is given only through faith."

p. 196: "It is rather the staunch believer who often feels the quest is at best a waste of time and at worst a threat to faith. In this camp one finds strange bedfellows: strict followers of Rudolph Bultmann and dyed-in-the-wool fundamentalists. For opposite reasons they come to the same conclusion: the quest for the historical Jesus is irrelevant or even harmful to true Christian faith. For the strict disciple of Bultmann, the quest is both theologically illegitimate and historically impossible. Theologically, the quest tempts the

Christians to prove their faith by human scholarship, a new form of justification by works. Historically, the [begin p. 197]> sources are simply too meager, fragmentary, and theologically-colored to allow any full portrait. Fundamentalists object to the quest for the exact opposite reason: the historical Jesus is naively equated with the Jesus presented in all Four Gospels. All tensions and contradictions are harmonized by hilarious mental acrobatics.

p. 198: "The theology of the patristic and medieval periods was blissfully ignorant of the problem of the historical Jesus, since it operated in a cultural context bereft of the historical-critical understanding that marks the modern Western mind. Theology is a cultural artifact; therefore, once a culture becomes permeated with a historical-critical approach, as has Western culture from the Enlightenment onward, theology can operate in and speak to that culture with credibility only if it absorbs into its methodology a historical approach.

For contemporary Christology, this means that faith in Christ today must be able to reflect on itself systematically in a way that will allow an appropriation of the quest for the historical Jesus into theology. The historical Jesus, while not the object or essence of *faith*, must be an [here begins p. 199]> integral part of modern *theology*.

p. 201: "Hence the lineage of Joseph is what determines the lineage of Jesus – a point that is stressed not only in the Infancy Narratives in general but more importantly in the very passages that *inculcate* the idea of Mary's virginal conception." [emphasis added].

MONSIGNOR FABIAN BRUSKEWITZ BISHOP-ELECT OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Monsignor Bruskewitz, pastor of St. Bernard's Church, in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin (Milwaukee Archdiocese) holds an S.T.D. in dogma from the Gregorian University. During the 70's, he served as a staff member of the Congregation for Catholic Education in Rome. He is the tenth priest member of the Fellowship to be made a bishop.

A British View of "A Marginal Jew"

J. B. Orchard O.S.B.

Father Orchard is a Monk of Ealing Abbey, London and a member of the Board of Trustees, Catholic Biblical Association of Great Britain.

This weighty volume is soon to be followed by a second one which will deal with the Public Ministry and Passion of the Lord, but omitting the Resurrection. The publisher's announcement ranks it as equal in importance with Renan's *Vie de Jesus* and with Romano Guardini's *The Lord*. However, despite this recommendation, it has not got the popular appeal of the above-mentioned authors, though its great learning is bound to have a considerable influence on those clergy and laity who take the trouble to wade through it.

Father Meier has taken the unusual step of putting himself from the start into the shoes of a non-believer in order to demonstrate to all and sundry how far one can proceed towards discovering the truth about the 'historical Jesus' without invoking either faith or the Holy Spirit. Undoubtedly an apologist for the Catholic faith can profit a great deal from such an exercise, but it is a negative one from the point of view of a Catholic exegete whose main function is surely to interpret the Bible both Old and New Testament, as Faith documents under the guidance of the Church in the light of the Holy Spirit, who with the human authors has jointly and individually begotten the whole text. Father Meier has given us an interesting academic exercise and no more, since he has deliberately ignored the whole basis on which the believing Christian interprets the Sacred Writings. The tentative conclusions that he reaches at the end of this volume (see pp. 350-352) are so meager, uninspiring and unhelpful that they prove beyond cavil the aridity of such an approach, except as a propaedeutic to the proper treatment of the Gospels as inspired documents, in which the Holy Spirit and the evangelist have jointly enshrined the faith which the Church has later formulated in her dogmatic pronouncements.

As a result of adopting this approach, Father Meier can offer no help to the intelligent Catholic student or inquirer towards the resolution of the undoubted difficulties that can be raised against the acceptance of such fundamental doctrines as the virginity of Mary and the divine sonship of Jesus. Of course, he duly explains that he is throughout prescind from the Catholic Church's teaching and guidance on the use of the Bible and is confining himself exclusively to the exercise of historical criticism in the light of human reason alone. It is indeed hard to fathom what he expects to gain by publishing what is, from a Catholic angle, such a lopsided presentation; for after all, the Bible, and *a fortiori* the New Testament, is the Church's book and remains always in her custody.

One further word. The very title of this book is really next door to a blasphemy. Jesus never was and never could be a 'marginal' Jew. A Christian might tolerate some such title as 'the *marginalised* Jesus,' for his enemies did succeed in marginalising him during his lifetime. But this was solely because for his own good reason, viz., the salvation of the world, he allowed himself to be so treated in order that he might rise again from the dead to prove himself to be our pioneer and leader into eternal life. The attitude of mind betrayed by this title, and by the author's express decision not to include the Resurrection in his second volume, demonstrates that, whatever his real intention may have been, he has committed a colossal error of judgement, so that the best possible fate for this volume (and its sequel) would be for it to be effectively marginalised by all sincere Christians.

Book Reviews

The Consuming Fire: A Christian Introduction to the Old Testament, by Michael Duggan, Ignatius Press: San Francisco, 1991, pp. 670, \$29.95.

Father Michael Duggan, a priest of the Diocese of Calgary, Alberta, with a Licentiate in Sacred Scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, has written an excellent *Christian* introduction to the Old Testament. This book embraces the rare, but necessary, virtues of critical scholarship, a readable and engaging style, and, most importantly, faith. Thus it is both theologically sound and thoroughly contemporary. Moreover, since Father Duggan possesses a great deal of pastoral and teaching experience, his book brings to life the practical, personal and communal implications of God's revelation in the Old Testament.

There are introductory chapters on the history, geography, and development of the Old Testament as well as introductions to the various forms of biblical literature (Pentateuchal, Prophetic, Wisdom, etc.). There are chapters that cover all forty-six books of the Old Testament. Moreover, there is an excellent assortment of charts and maps. One of the outstanding features of the book, which must have taken many hours to compose, is its comprehensive index of biblical themes. Any student of the Old Testament will find this index indispensable.

Each chapter is relatively short, usually between ten and fifteen pages. Thus the student will not get bogged down in unnecessary detail nor become bored. Each chapter is clearly and creatively composed of six parts. Firstly, there is a description of the historical situation that provides the setting for the events related in the individual books. Secondly, Father Duggan considers the historical situation of the author and his audience, since often this situation is quite distinct from the historical events narrated. The Deuteronomists, for example, worked four hundred years after the events they deal with. Thirdly, Father Duggan examines the major themes of the particular book and their relationship to other biblical texts. Here he not only identifies the importance of each book, but also shows its relevance for the life of the contemporary reader.

Fourthly, Father Duggan admirably confirms the truth of St. Augustine's dictum: "All Scripture serves

to give notice of the coming of the Lord ... The New Testament is hidden in the Old: the Old Testament is brought to light in the New" (*De Cat. Rud.* 7.9). Thus, Father Duggan illustrates how the contents of a particular biblical book foreshadow the coming of Christ. He explains how the New Testament uses the various texts and sees their fulfillment in Jesus. I know of no other introduction to the Old Testament which so consistently and insightfully presents the Old Testament revelation in light of its fulfillment in Jesus Christ. This is a major benefit of this book. For the Christian reader this feature of Father Duggan's book will not only give him or her a better understanding of God's revelation in the Old Testament, but will also give him or her a greater appreciation of the New Testament revelation.

Fifthly, each chapter contains a list of study questions. These questions are designed both for personal comprehension and for group discussion. Sixthly, at the end of each chapter there is an outline of the complete biblical book.

I hope that Duggan's book finds its way into every college and parish library, and into the hands of every teacher of religious education as well as of every priest, religious and lay person who is interested in furthering their understanding of Sacred Scripture. Most of all, I hope that it will become the standard text for college and seminary introduction courses to the Old Testament.

Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M. Cap.
Oxford, England

How My Mind Has Changed, Edited by James M. Wall and David Heim. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991. Pg. viii + 184. Paperback, \$8.95.

Each decade for the past 50 years, *The Christian Century* (which is edited by Wall and Heim) has asked prominent writers to reflect on developments in their thought. Fifteen persons responded this time, all white, all from Christian denominations, and nearly all from the United States. As regards common themes, the

summing-up concludes that no one theology is dominant, that the importance of community is stressed, and that the dangers of feminism are frequently pointed out.

Let us mention three essays in particular. Elizabeth Achtemaier of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, says that she has "come to a new appreciation of the wisdom and mercy embodied in the divine instruction given us in the Scriptures." Disregard of God's laws, she says, has resulted "in a drug war that we are not winning, in burgeoning crime that has made city neighborhoods uninhabitable, in teenage pregnancies and 'children having children,' in rampant abortions, swelling welfare roles, sexually transmitted diseases, self-indulgent neglect of community good, and countless ruined lives. We chose our own way and . . . brought on ourselves the way of death."

She also notes other consequences of the decline of religion: ecclesiastical bureaucracies in inverse proportion to church membership, feminists substituting themselves for the divinity, "kooky cults," Christian training "occupied more with relevance, social issues, and entertainment, than . . . the content of the biblical message," and clergy who "hand over educational matters to associates and religious educators, while they themselves dispense therapy, psychology, and the latest religious or social opinions."

Richard McCormick, S.J., of Notre Dame, tells how he became a dissenter from Catholic teaching on moral issues. He claims that "John Paul II is least effective as a teacher when he explicitly sets out to teach," and agrees that "the Church is never further from Christlikeness and the Gospel than when it exercises its magisterium." And he complains that Rome appoints as bishops only those who have never publicly questioned *Humanae Vitae*.

Peter Berger, of Boston University, says that, though he is still a Christian, he cannot identify with any existing Christian denomination. He finds that many of these denominations have identified with the "American way of life," or have adapted their mores to fit the world, or have embraced feminism.

In general, he thinks, they have legitimated middle-class culture; and the new middle class now includes a "large number of people occupied with education, the media of mass communication, therapy in all its forms, the advocacy and administration of

well-being, social justice, and personal lifestyles." This class has "a cultural clout enormously larger" than its mere numbers warrant. It is on the left and draws its income from social programs which benefit it as much as those for whom they are intended.

According to Berger, the clergy and officials of the mainline churches belong to this class, which is highly secular in outlook. "The mainline churches will thus contribute in a double way to the secularization of America – by legitimating a set of highly secularized values and by contributing to the unchurched population through its emigrants [those leaving it]." Some of its secular activities are "the mindless endorsement of faraway tyrannies," "the equally mindless endorsement of all types of domestic radicalisms," and "the insouciant acceptance of millions of abortions."

Berger thus finds himself without a church: "I consider myself theologically liberal, at least in the sense that I would find it quite impossible to move into any branch of evangelicalism and almost as impossible to move toward Rome. At the same time, I cannot give assent to the left-liberal-liberationist politics that has become monopolistically established in nonevangelical Protestantism.

The whole book is interesting.

Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.
St. Peter's Seminary
London, Canada

O'Collins, Gerald, S.J., and Farrugia, Edward, S.J., *A Concise Dictionary of Theology*, Paulist Press, 1991, 268 pages, \$11.95.

We have here a handy, easy-to-use reference work of theological words, ideas, history etc., containing over a thousand entries. As would be expected, the entries are short, often just whetting the appetite for more information. They are, nonetheless, given the size of the work, remarkably comprehensive and informative.

The work is not without faults. The section on Original Sin, for example, is doctrinally inadequate and contains no information on the decrees of Trent (just as the article on Trent contains no reference to Original Sin). Also inadequate, in my estimation, are

the articles on Fundamental Option, Fundamentalism, Efficacious Grace, and Modernism. There is no entry for *Humanae Vitae*, surely an oversight from an historical and doctrinal point of view. The article on the Pope describes him as "head of the Catholic Church" where "visible head" would surely be better. And the entry for Scripture and Tradition claims, erroneously, that Vatican II's *Dei Verbum* only speaks of Scripture as the "word of God" (in fact it speaks of the revelation which comes to us in Scripture and Traditions as that word).

Others will probably discover additional oversights and inaccuracies, but it is well to remember that works such as this are notoriously difficult to prepare. The mistakes or inadequacies in this dictionary are more than outweighed by its many strengths. The articles are by and large clear, accurate, concise, and informative. Indeed this volume must, I think, be judged very favorably, far better than most of its kind, and, given its size and price, an excellent buy.

Msgr. James O'Connor

Joseph Nicolosi, *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality: A New Clinical Approach*, Jason Aronson, Inc., Northvale, New Jersey, 355 pp., \$40.00.

This book is intended for the "non-gay" homosexuals, unhappy with their sexual orientation, who

are willing to cope with their problem, develop non-erotic relationships with men and, once secure in their gender identity, to enjoy heterosexual relationships.

There are twenty well-worth-reading chapters here from an initial analysis of the "non-gay homosexual" to a discussion of the failure of the mental health profession, through the problems of childhood, the refusal to acknowledge the pathological elements, and seven chapters on treatment.

Following is a typical paragraph:

"In reviewing recent studies of gay relationships, a reader cannot help but be struck by the persistent absence of reflective comment. Gay researchers remain tenaciously descriptive, but rarely evaluative. While the sexual behavior within the relationship is quantified and discussed in the greatest detail, there is a void of qualitative comment on psychological or emotional issues. These studies are typically approached sociologically and, consequently, any pathology is assumed to be socially caused."

One would think sociologists would provide qualitative comment on the social implications of "gay activism," but they usually reserve those judgments for the politically correct views dominant in their discipline or department.

Dr. Nicolosi is a breath of fresh air. Pastors, including bishops, will profit from this book. Its price is high but discount houses may reduce the burden.

George A. Kelly

The John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and the Family has published a new, highly attractive brochure announcing its 1992-1993 doctoral program, starring David Schindler in Systematic Theology, William May in Moral, Francis Martin in Scripture, and John Finnis in Philosophy. The program is under the general supervision of Kenneth Smith. For further information call Dean Carl Anderson at (202) 526-3799.

In case you missed it: *The National Catholic Reporter* (March 6, 1992) has discovered the Catholic rightists who are damaging the Church. Its list, prepared under one-time editor Arthur Jones, includes in part, Cardinal O'Connor, Frank Shakespeare, and Cardinal Law, Al Haig, Ralph Martin, and the University of Steubenville, Christendom College, Thomas Melady, William Casey and, of course, OPUS DEI, the CIA, and many others.

Books in Brief

IGNATIUS PRESS

Rev. Michael Duggan, *The Consuming Fire: A Christian Introduction to the New Testament*, (\$29.95).

Chapters on history, geography, and development of the Bible.

Jean Laplace, S.J., *Prayer According to the Scriptures*, (85 pp., \$7.95).

Father Peyton's *Rosary Prayer Book*, (145 pp., \$6.95).

Charles Donovan and Bob Marshall, *Blessed are the Barren: Social Policy of Planned Parenthood*, (368 pp., \$19.95).

A monumental and definitive study of the politics of birth control in the U.S., with forewords by Dr. Nathanson and Cardinal O'Connor.

Otto Bird, *Seeking a Center*, (145 pp., \$11.95).

This autobiography touches on the Great Books movement in this country, the reforms of Adler and Hutchins, and his own involvement as a pioneer who found "the center" in Thomas Aquinas and the Church.

AVE MARIA PRESS

Stan Parmisano, O.P. *Testament: Belief in Age of Unbelief; Faith in an Era of Skepticism*, (184 pp., \$6.95).

Biblical reflections on our religious heritage.

Friends of the Fellowship

Bishop Lawrence P. Graves

Bishop Charles G. Maloney

Dr. Patrick Guinan

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

ALBA HOUSE

Karl A. Schultz, *Where Is God When You Need Him?* (184 pp., \$9.95).

Sharing stories of suffering with Job and Jesus: from easy answers to hard questions.

Frederick J. Murphy, *Bilingual Homilies for Feast Days and Other Occasions*, (82 pp., \$4.95).

The Rector of the Boston Cathedral has produced valuable homilies in Spanish and English for major feasts and events.

Father Robert Wild, *Journey in the Risen Christ*, (132

pp., \$7.50).

The story of Catherine DeHueck Doherty.

James McKarns, *Give Us This Day*, (150 pp., \$7.95).

Two-minute homilies for weekdays by an Ohio pastor. Alba House has homilies by him for Sundays and Saints' Days, too.

Herbert F. Smith, S.J. *Sunday Homilies, Cycle C* (194 pp., \$9.95).

The author of ten books of homilies has another good source book for preachers.