

Women's Ordination, Not

Gerard V. Bradley

I am inclined to think that there are two kinds of people in the world: those who affirm the propositions spelled out in *Lumen Gentium* 25, and those who don't. There was a time when few disputed that was another way of saying that there are Catholics and non-Catholics around. No more. Cardinal Ratzinger's Response to a "Dubium on Women's Ordination," approved by the Holy Father, likely will restore some of the lost clarity and, in the process, bring many people back into full and genuine communion with the true Church of Christ.

The recent statement confirming that women may not be ordained was not itself an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. Rather, and like the formulations of *Evangelium Vitae* on the sanctity of human life, there is (in effect) a papal statement, to which religious assent is due, *that* a proposition *has been* taught infallibly by the Ordinary Magisterium. (In both cases the conditions for such infallible teaching were, I should think, satisfied a very long time ago.

Would a solemn definition that women cannot be priests have relieved the difficulties so many supporters of women's ordination now voice? Not for very many critics who think that the decisive issue is the *force* of the Pope's *arguments*. The precise form on which the authoritative proposition appears is, for these people, immaterial. But assent is due to propositions not to arguments, and the truth of any proposition is logically independent of the arguments for it. A Pope's teaching is preserved from error not by an advanced degree in rhetoric but by the Holy Spirit. Were it as critics think it is, the whole concept of teaching authority would drop out of the picture. One would either believe because convinced by argument, or one would legitimately dissent. *Lumen Gentium*, however, is about believing *because* it is taught.

The teaching is not that the Church should not ordain women, as if it were possible but simply wrong to do so. It is impossible for women to be priests; the Church lacks all authority to ordain women. That the Church might claim authority to teach definitely that it lacks authority to make women priests evidently strikes many critics as very odd, if not disingenuous. That is because they deem all authority, including the Magisterium, to be legislative in character.

(continued on page 2)

O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam profitentes circa fidem aberraverunt. Gratia vobiscum. 1 ad Timotheum 6

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

VOLUME 19, NUMBER 1 DECEMBER 1995

ISSN 1084-3035

CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S PAGE:
 Women's Ordination, Not 1

ARTICLES:
 100 Years of Philosophy by the Catholic University of America 2
 Notre Dame and Dame Philosophy 10
 Selling the Birthright:
 Esau and Leo at Georgetown 18
 A New Catholic College in Japan 20

DOCUMENTATION
 A Report from CREDO 21
 FEATURE BOOK REVIEW 26
 BOOK REVIEWS 28
 BOOKS RECEIVED 30
 BOARD OF DIRECTORS 31

Authority is for them power to choose or decide. But the Holy Father could hardly be clearer that the charism is to judge, to discern what *is* God's will for His Church, through the revelation manifest in Jesus. The underlying notion is the same with the Church's position on divorce. Divorce is impossible; marriage is indissoluble. The priesthood is intrinsically limited to men.

A central complaint of critics is that the Pope has precipitated a crisis of faith, evidently "imposing" a burden upon persons who cannot comprehend, much less accept, that only men

can be priests. If there is a crisis of faith for some, we must pray that their faith be preserved, or restored. But we cannot fault the Pope. The crisis owes not to the truth he heroically defends, but to the corrosion of essential presuppositions of Catholic faith. In any event, the Pope has not imposed any burden. He offers an opportunity for all of us to consider, and to decide, whether we stand with the successors of the Apostles. The question of women's ordination, it seems to me, is transparent for the finally decisive question: does one believe that the Pope teaches with the authority of Christ? ✠

One Hundred Years of Philosophy by the Catholic University of America

Jude P. Dougherty

Delivered on the occasion of the celebration of the centennial of the formal inauguration of the school of Philosophy, The Catholic University of America

I

Johns Hopkins University opened in 1876 to become the first institution of higher learning in the United States that could call itself a "university" in the European sense of the term. Eight years later The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore decreed the foundation of The Catholic University of America.

The inaugural ceremonies establishing The Catholic University of America took place in November 1889, one month after those establishing Clark University, making it the third graduate center to be erected in the United States.

The Catholic University was established for two different but compatible purposes.¹ The first purpose was the perceived need to make available in the United States education beyond the baccalaureate similar to that which could be found at Louvain and the German universities of the day. The second was the need on the

part of the Church to confront the intellectual challenge of the Enlightenment, seemingly reinforced in the 19th century by advances in the natural sciences. Ecclesiastical leaders were not alone in their assessment of the task. Of the same generation, the American philosopher, Josiah Royce, addressed the need for a philosophy which could serve as a rational preamble to the Christian faith and he attempted to provide one with his own version of a Hegelian inspired idealism. Leo XIII in his 1879 encyclical *Aeterni Patris* recommended, not Hegel, but the philosophy of St. Thomas.

II

By any measure, the 19th century was no less an intellectually tumultuous one for Europe than the 20th. Dominated in the intellectual order by the Enlightenment, Anglo-French and German, Europe underwent a systematic attempt on the part of its intelligentsia to replace the inherited, largely classical and Christian learning, by a purely secular ethos. The Napoleonic wars in their aftermath added materially to the destabilization of Europe eradicating many institutional structures, economic and social, as well as religious.

Startling advances in the physical sciences reinforced the Enlightenment's confidence in natural reason. The ideas which formed the secular outlook of the 19th century were the product of two major intellectual revolutions, one in biology and the other in physics. Kuhn would call them "paradigm shifts." One shift is associated with the biological investigations of the period and with the names of Spencer, Darwin, Wallace, Huxley and Haeckel. Their work employed the vocabulary of "evolution," "change," "growth" and "development" and led to the worship of progress. The effect of the new biological studies was to place man and his activity squarely in the setting of a natural environment, giving them a natural origin and a natural history. Man was transformed from a being with a spiritual component and a transcendent end, elevated above the rest of nature, into a purely material organism forced to interact within a natural environment like any other living species.

The second ideological shift resulted from advances in physics which were taken to be a reinforcement of the fundamental assumptions of a mechanistic interpretation of nature. Convinced that all natural phenomena can be explained by structural and efficient causes, the disciples of Locke and Hume discarded any explanation invoking the concept of "purpose" or of "final cause." The convergence of these trends in biology and physics made possible the resurgence of a purely materialistic concept of man and nature with no need for the hypothesis of a creative God or of a spiritual soul. The foremost symbol of the new outlook became Darwin's *Origin of the Species* (1859). For an intellectual class it codified a view which had been germinating since the preceding century. Darwin had confidently marshalled evidence and systematically formulated in a scientific vocabulary ideas already embraced. The spontaneous acceptance of his doctrine of evolutionary progress was possible only because of the philosophical groundwork laid by the Enlightenment Fathers.

On both sides of the Atlantic various philosophical idealisms were created in a defensive effort to maintain the credibility of religious witness. Challenged by purely naturalistic interpretations of faith, many found the rational support they needed as believers in a post-

**On both sides of the
Atlantic various
philosophical idealisms
were created in a
defensive effort to
maintain the
credibility of
religious witness.**

Kantian idealism. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* was founded at St. Louis, Missouri in 1867 for the dual purpose of making available the best of German philosophy and of providing the Americans with a philosophical forum. Its editor, William Torrey Harris, was also a charter member with fifty others of the society (1874) variously known as the St. Louis Philosophical Society or the Kant Club. The *Journal* and the society were devoted to the study of German philosophy, primarily German idealism. The influence of St. Louis eventually extended to New England, where Harris helped to start the Concord Summer School of Philosophy in 1880.

In the first issue of *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, Harris gave three reasons for the pursuit of speculative philosophy. In his judgment, speculative philosophy provides, first, a philosophy of religion much needed at a time when traditional religious teaching and ecclesiastical authority are losing their influence. Secondly, it provides a social philosophy compatible with a communal outlook as opposed to a socially devastating individualism. Thirdly, while taking cognizance of the startling advances in the natural sciences, it provides an alternative to empiricism as a philosophy of knowledge. Speculative philosophy for Harris is the tradition beginning with Plato, a tradition which finds its full expression in the system of Hegel.

Of American idealists, Josiah Royce (1855-1916) became the most prominent. After earning a baccalaureate degree at the University of California, Royce spent two years in Germany, where he read Schelling and Schopenhauer. He studied under Lotze at Göttingen but returned to the United States to take his doctorate in 1876 at the newly-founded Johns Hopkins University. His Gifford Lectures, 1900-1901, published as *The World and the Individual*, attempted to provide a rational basis for religion and morality. In those lectures Royce defended the possibility of truth against the skeptic and the reality of the divine against the agnostic. Royce had little respect for blind faith. The problem created by Kant's destruction of metaphysics he regarded as fundamental. In 1881, Royce wrote, "We all live, philosophically speaking, in a Kantian atmosphere." Eschewing the outright voluntarism of

Schopenhauer, Royce sought a metaphysics that would permit him to rationally embrace his Christian heritage. Whereas William James was convinced that every demonstrative rational approach to God must fail, Royce was convinced that speculative reason gives one access to God. The code words of the day, “evolution,” “progress,” “illusion,” “higher criticism,” “communism,” “socialism,” he thought, evoked a mental outlook which reduces Christianity to metaphor and Christian organizations to welfare dispensaries.

The problem for Royce was not simply a philosophical problem. The philosophers also tutored the architects of the new biblical criticism, the *Redaktionsgeschichte* movement. David Friedrich Strauss, in his *Das Leben Jesu*, under the influence of Hegel, examined the Gospels and the life of Jesus from the standpoint of the higher criticism and concluded that Christ was not God but a supremely good man whose moral imperative deserved to be followed. This Royce could not accept; there was no philosophically compelling reason to embrace a purely naturalistic interpretation of the sacred scriptures. Philosophy must be fought by philosophy.

At approximately the same time that the young Josiah Royce entered the intellectual arena, Leo XIII in an effort to combat the emerging materialisms and skepticisms then dominating Europe urged in his *Aeterni Patris* the philosophical realism of Aquinas. St. Thomas was recommended both as a philosopher and as a theologian. Leo recognized that some philosophies opened out to the faith, just as some philosophies closed it off as an intellectual option.

Immanuel Kant may have been the perfect philosopher for a fideistic form of Protestantism, but he could never become an adequate guide for the Catholic mind. With his dictum, “I have therefore found it necessary to deny knowledge in order to make room for faith,”² he reflects the tradition of Luther and Calvin, whose doctrine of original sin held that with “the fall” the human intellect was so darkened that it cannot unaided conclude to the existence of God. Catholic thought, by contrast, is essentially and historically a system of intellectualism, of objectivism grounded in a philosophical realism embraced for the most part by the Fathers of the Church. The basic principle of Catholic thought asserts the reliability of intelligence, i.e., that we are equipped with intellects that are able to ferret out the secrets of an intelligible nature, that is, we are able to achieve objective truth.

Upon our objective knowledge depends our practical decisions, our conduct. We can only do what is right on the condition that we know what is right. We can only live Catholic lives on the condition that we know what Catholic doctrine is.

III

Some members of the American hierarchy no doubt shared Leo XIII’s analysis of the current intellectual situation, but others were motivated primarily by the need for post-baccalaureate education in America. At the middle of the 19th century there were numerous colleges in the United States, two of them dating from the 17th century, a few others from the 18th. Some of them were called “universities,” but, in fact, none were. At most they were colleges with one or more professional schools attached. Harvard, Yale and others gave honorary degrees, such as the M.A., but not as a result of a program of studies until late in the 19th century. The first Harvard M.A. for work accomplished in course was awarded in 1876.

What was needed in the United States were universities in the Prussian sense, places of learning that presumed and went beyond the college. Certain leaders in higher education, Daniel Coit Gilman, president of the University of California and later the first head of the Johns Hopkins University, G. Stanley Hall of Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, and some members of the Catholic hierarchy, were advocates of the Prussian model in the post-Civil War decades. Bishop Thomas L. Grace, O.P., of St. Paul was one of the first members of the episcopate to call for a Catholic university in America. Archbishop John Ireland and Bishop John Lancaster Spalding strongly supported him. The model envisaged for emulation was clearly the Catholic University of Louvain. Louvain, it may be noted, had been ruthlessly closed by the French revolutionary forces in 1797 and was not reopened until 1834. The Belgium University was not alone in losing out to the French revolution. Twenty-two French universities, the glory of the medieval past, had existed before 1789. The Revolution swept them all away. Over the next century the very idea of institutions devoted to an inquiry into the whole of human knowledge was abandoned. Not until 1896 did France have genuine universities again.³ The precariousness of Catholic higher education in Europe made a deep

impression on the organizers of The Catholic University of America and by establishing a university under their own jurisdiction they sought to avoid complete reliance on European centers.

With ample ceremony Johns Hopkins opened in February 1876, Clark University in October 1889, The Catholic University of America a month later in November 1889. These institutions following the Germanic model were designed primarily for graduate work. The German university was a scholarly institution concerned entirely with investigation and the training of investigators. It did not prepare its students for the practice of the professions but for the advancement of the professions, both in science and the humanities. Vocationalism was beneath it; beneath it, too, was everything that the American thought of as college life. Worthy of note is that for every hundred students that affluent America was sending to American colleges, European austerity would send one to a European university.

Interestingly, the Papal Constitution for The Catholic University in America used the words “seminarium principale” to designate The Catholic University of America. A university was thought to be a place where specialized “seminaries” were conducted. An early issue of the University announcements boasted that all of the seminaries were well established with libraries and with the latest in scientific equipment. It was not until the administration of Bishop Corrigan (1936-43), just before World War II, that Catholic University had a seminary for the training of future priests in the now customary sense of the term.

In conferring its charter, Leo XIII hoped that The Catholic University of America would be an alma mater not only of a learned clergy, but also of an equally learned laity, the bulwark and hope of religion in the future. He recognized that the clergy were often regarded as representatives of a worn-out tradition, although he could point to many a priest who could be numbered among world class scientists. Leo’s aim was the creation of a body of thinkers, professional men, scientific men, men of the world in all departments of life, profoundly and thoroughly learned and, at the same time, profoundly and thoroughly Christian too.

Leo XIII had become Pope in 1878. In the second year of his pontificate, he issued his famous encyclical endorsing a fledgling Thomistic movement which was to enlist some of the best minds of the following generation. St. Thomas was recommended because of the perceived value of his philosophy in meeting “the critical state of the times in which we live.” Leo saw that the regnant philosophies of his day not only undercut the faith but were beginning to have disastrous effects on personal and communal life. Succinctly he says, “Erroneous theories respecting our duty to God and our responsibilities as men, originally propounded in philosophical schools, have gradually permeated all ranks of society and secured acceptance among the majority of men.”

Aeterni Patris fostered a widespread study of St. Thomas and led to the establishment of the Leonine Commission designed to provide critical editions of the texts of Aquinas. Some of that work has been done under the auspices of The Catholic University of America and the neighboring Dominican House of Studies.

Leo’s influence was clearly present as the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore met in November-December, 1884. In spite of the opposition of some members, the Council decreed the foundation of a national Catholic university. In 1866 there were seven Catholic institutions with “university” charters and sixty Catholic colleges. By 1875, the number had increased to seventy-four institutions of higher leaning. Most were small, some barely more than academies; none were universities in the European sense of the term.

The proposed Catholic university was to be exclusively a graduate institution, presupposing for admission a baccalaureate or other professional degree. It opened its doors under the leadership of John Joseph Keane who had spent the months of August to October 1889 at the University of Notre Dame drafting what was to become the first constitution of the Washington D.C. university. Comprised first of the faculty of the Divinity School, the fledgling institution soon added schools of philosophy and social sciences.

The School of Philosophy and the School of the Social Sciences of The Catholic University of America

In 1866 there were seven Catholic institutions with “university” charters and sixty Catholic colleges.

By 1875, the number had increased to seventy-four institutions of higher leaning.

were formally inaugurated October 1, 1895, six years after the opening of the Divinity School. On that day, in the presence of the Apostolic Delegate, who represented Leo XIII, in the presence of the Trustees and Directors of the University and of a large assemblage of bishops, James Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor of the University, solemnly dedicated the McMahan Hall of Philosophy.

With the simultaneous establishment of the two new schools the University opened its doors for the first time to lay students. What began in 1889 as a post-graduate school of religious studies was now expanded to full university status “with homes for all the sciences.”

As erected, the School of Philosophy consisted of six departments, the Department of Philosophy proper, plus the Departments of Letters, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and the Biological Sciences. In 1906 a separate school of science was created and in 1930 the several faculties were reorganized into a graduate school of arts and sciences. In 1936 the faculty of philosophy was reconstituted as a separate school.

Edward A. Pace, in his inaugural discourse as the first dean of the multidisciplinary School of Philosophy, was to say,⁴ “The School of Philosophy comprises those branches of knowledge which have had their greatest development within a century and which seems to have no limit of fruitfulness. It is here chiefly that nature gives up her secrets to man, that man penetrates the mystery of his own being, and from this deeper knowledge of the inner world and this closer scrutiny of the world without, can rise to that Being who is the author of both. It is here, more perhaps than in any other field of research, that men coming from opposite extremes of thought can labor side by side with a common object in view.”

Early members of the faculty were to share Leo’s enthusiasm for St. Thomas, but they had other interests as well. Pace, whose training included ecclesiastical studies in Rome, also studied psychology and physiology at Paris, Louvain and Leipzig, taking a Ph.D. in experimental psychology under Wilhelm Maximilien Wundt and Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig at the German university. Serving the Catholic University for 41 years, Pace was at three different periods dean of the School of Philosophy. In 1899, merely twenty years after the pioneer Wundt had opened his laboratory at Leipzig, Pace founded a psychological laboratory, the second in the United States after Hall’s laboratory at

Johns Hopkins (1884).

One of the early lecturers on the philosophy of St. Thomas was Archbishop (later, Cardinal) Francesco Satolli, then about to become in 1892 the first Apostolic Delegate to the United States. The University *Announcements* for 1895 listed Pace, Edmund T. Shanahan, William J. Kerby and Frederick Z. Rooker as members of the Department of Philosophy proper. Not all assumed their intended posts. Shanahan, a Boston priest educated in Rome and Louvain, was early appointed to teach metaphysics but became instead a professor of dogmatic theology in the School of Divinity. Rooker taught ethics. Kerby became a professor of sociology and later dean of the multi-disciplined School of Philosophy.

The *Announcements* of 1904–1905 listed two professors of philosophy, Pace and Thomas E. Shields. By 1907 the *Announcements* listed three departments of philosophy, i.e. the Department of Scholastic Philosophy, the Department of Modern Philosophy and the Department of History of Philosophy. The historian of philosophy, William Turner, had by this time been added to the faculty. His textbook on the history of philosophy was used for many years.

Two decades later in 1927 *The New Scholasticism*, now the *A C P A Quarterly*, was founded by Dean Pace in collaboration with James H. Ryan, later the 5th rector of the University and still later first Bishop and then Archbishop of Omaha. Surveying early issues of *The New Scholasticism* one finds that its articles spanned a range of systematic disciplines. In its book review section most of the books reviewed were by German or French authors, some by Italian; American publications were a minority. At the time *The New Scholasticism* was founded, a sister periodical the *Journal of Philosophy* (Columbia University) annually carried a bibliography of works published in philosophy. A 1935 issue listed forty works (books and articles) on Thomas Aquinas, eight on Albert, eleven on Augustine and another 35 on medieval philosophy.

The first dissertation accepted by the School of Philosophy was approved in 1895, the year of the School’s formal inauguration. Courses had been offered since 1891. The dissertation, written by George Lucas was entitled, “An Analysis of Spencer’s Religion of the Unknowable.” The second Ph.D. in philosophy was not conferred until eight years later. Early dissertations took as topics: “the knowableness of God,” “the status of physical dispositions,” “the problem of evil,” “sensa-

tion in St. Augustine and St. Thomas,” “the ontological basis of realism,” and “the classification of desires in St. Thomas and in modern sociology.” Most were analyses of the thought of Aquinas, but, as one might expect, there were studies of St. Augustine, Albertus Magnus, St. Bonaventure, and Dante (Scotus had to wait until 1947). In the early years there were also dissertations on Orestes Brownson, Irving Babbitt, George Santayana, Alfred North Whitehead, and Karl Marx. To date 337 dissertations have been accepted by the faculty of philosophy. They cover every major figure in the history of philosophy and treat of issues confronted in every major philosophical discipline. Today the School chooses to be known for its work in classical and medieval philosophy, for its contribution to the study of 19th century German philosophy and for its advancement of the phenomenological movement.

Prominent early graduates included Ignatius Smith, later dean of the School of Philosophy, Leo Ward, who for more than four decades, added distinction to the faculty of the University of Notre Dame, Charles A. Hart, and John K. Ryan (successor to Ignatius Smith as dean). Others such as Owen Bennett, James Collins, Allan Wolter, Vincent Smith, Rocco Porreco, Jesse Mann, Miriam Theresa Rooney and John Noonan were to join the ranks of noted scholars and educators. Many additional names could be mentioned, some prominent in religious orders, some known as able college and university administrators and some as jurists. The great majority gave their life to teaching within colleges and seminaries and did not rise to national prominence. One academic gem of the University, the Basselin Fellowship Program, a three year pre-theology program leading to the B.A. and M.A. degrees in philosophy, produced many bishops and scholars who often took their final degrees elsewhere. Priest-scholars such as Robert Sokolowski and John Wippel matriculated in that program. So did laymen like James Ross, Robert Kreyche, Frederick Ugast, Francis McQuade, and William May. The late Humberto Cardinal Medeiros and Archbishop Philip Hannan are graduates of the Basselin Program. Bishop Donald Wuerl, Bishop Raymond Burke and Bishop

Sheen left the faculty to become an Auxiliary Bishop of New York and director of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, later achieving national television fame as an engaging homilist.

Sam Jacobs are three younger members of the episcopacy who completed the Basselin program before studying theology.

Later members of the faculty, not acknowledging present members, included scholars such as Fulton J. Sheen, Rudolph Allers, Vincent Smith, Allan Wolter and William A. Wallace. Ignatius Smith's attractiveness to students was sufficient to secure for him a popular press including a laudatory article in *Time* magazine. Sheen left the faculty to become an Auxiliary Bishop of New York and director of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, later

achieving national television fame as an engaging homilist. Many living graduates remember the metaphysical depth of Charles A. Hart and Felix Alluntis, the demanding course work of John J. Rolbiecki and the remarkably wide learning of John K. Ryan. The entire Catholic philosophical community profited from their efforts as they produced textbooks, translations, original interpretations and significant speculative work.

Through the 19th century and through most of the twentieth, the value of philosophy as a component in the education of all was uncontested. European trained scholars took it for granted. Many, whether their field be physics or anthropology, could philosophize at a level comparable to their professional colleagues. Rudolph Allers's sister-in-law, Lise Meitner, no stranger to philosophy, served during his tenure as a visiting professor of physics at Catholic University. Meitner had achieved world fame for her discovery with Otto Frisch that the uranium atom indeed had been split. Karl Herzfelt, head of the department of physics at the time, enjoyed the same philosophical curiosity that led his one-time student assistant, Werner Heisenberg, to renown. As graduate education in America became more specialized in the Post World War II period, philosophy did too, perhaps diminishing its value. The tendency to specialize had its negative as well as positive aspects.

At the turn of this century William James could speak of his Harvard colleagues' "deep appreciation of one another" and of the department's cooperative effort to convey basic philosophical truths to its students.

Josiah Royce was writing books with titles such as, *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, *The World and the Individual* and *The Problem of Christianity*; and George Santayana, *The Life of Reason*, *The Realms of Being*, *The Sense of Beauty*. James' own *Varieties of Religious Experience* was what we today would call a best seller. Until the second half of this century, at least in the U.S.A., philosophy was studied in more or less a traditional manner. One was expected to know in a cursory way the major figures and movements in the history of Western philosophy. In certain programs, one was also expected to have more than an elementary knowledge of mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology.

Then modernity caught up with the curriculum. It is not merely that philosophy became so specialized that members of the same faculty sometimes find it difficult to communicate. That is one problem to be sure. Specialization, it must be acknowledged, reflects a deeper fragmentation of a once integrated discipline in which the parts were clearly understood in relation to the whole. That fragmentation has resulted in many a careful and valuable study, but it has also resulted in a kind of trivialization which permits whole careers to be spent on isolated problems or in the study of a single philosopher of little consequence, or worse still, on the youthful efforts of a philosopher whose mature work repudiated his early efforts.

Philosophy's dismemberment is also reflected in the overwhelming variety of professional associations and journals. In the United States alone there are at least 120 philosophical societies, twenty-three of which claim over 500 members each.⁵

One can subscribe to 175 journals of philosophy. In North America over 4000 books and articles are published each year in the field. Needless to say, the tendency to specialize is paid for by a loss of common vocabulary and to some extent by a loss of communal interest.

A second trend typical in Anglo-American circles is the adoption of an ahistorical attitude, often coupled with a monologism which cuts one off from primary sources both historical and continental. The converse tendency can also be noticed in a radical historicism which barely conceals a philosophical nihilism.

Perhaps most debilitating is the skepticism inherited from the early

modern period which not only casts into doubt the value of an inherited culture, but even of the intellect's ability to achieve truth. This is most pronounced in those circles which have, in effect, severed the connection between words and things, where knowledge of observation sentences replaces knowledge of being. It is also found in those quarters which reduce philosophy to a kind of evangelism on behalf of social causes, equating philosophy with "edifying discourse" or with an ongoing conversation where certainty is forever an elusive goal.

When G.E. Moore was asked, "What is the function of philosophy?" he could answer: "To give a general description of the whole of the *Universe*, mentioning all the most important kinds of things which we *know* to be in it." C.S. Peirce in his day wanted to be regarded as a laborer in the common enterprise of intellectual enquiry. Peirce is not to be faulted; the division of labor is not the fundamental problem. Given the task of *Dame Philosophy*, some labor is bound to be subservient. To shift metaphors, the master need not complete every canvass. All profit from the careful analysis and exposition of obscure texts or the production of critical editions of ancient or medieval sources. There is no substitute for taking on an issue and studying it to its greatest depth.

Yet if one made an empirical survey of the leading North American journals and major university presses, it would be difficult to determine from the texts examined the literal meaning of the term, "philosophy." Much discourse seems unrelated to the pursuit of wisdom. It is not surprising that the bulk of philosophical work will be unintelligible even to the educated laymen, but some work targets an audience no greater than that provided by a handful of university faculties. If one takes the trouble to cut through the sometimes idiosyncratic jargon, one finds that the Greeks or the

scholastics said it much more simply. Solutions presumed to be original are offered in ignorance of centuries old discussion and resolution of the same problem. How many know the difference between a "fallibilistic meliorism" and a "weak version of universal pragmatics?"

It may be that only in our day are we experiencing the full effects of a turn that took place three centuries ago. Etienne Gilson once remarked

**Philosophy's
dismemberment is also
reflected in the over-
whelming variety of
professional associations
and journals.**

that if one starts with the mind, one ends there. “History” says Gilson, “is there to remind us that no one ever regains the whole of reality after locking himself in one of its parts.” Tutored by Descartes and others, modern philosophy, in repudiating classical metaphysics, put the epistemological problem first. Of course, classical philosophy was not all that was left behind in the transition to modernity.

When in 1877 Leo recommended to the Catholic world the study of St. Thomas, he did so because of the perceived value of his philosophy in meeting “the critical state of the times in which we live.” In doing so, he won the admiration of the American philosopher, Josiah Royce. Writing in the late 19th century Royce was convinced that the neo-scholastic movement endorsed by Leo XIII was an important one, in Royce’s words, “for the general intellectual progress of our time.” The use of St. Thomas, he says, entails growth, development and change. Royce even uses the word “progress” in assessing the impact of the Thomistic movement. “Pope Leo, after all, ‘let loose a thinker’ amongst his people — a thinker to be sure, of unquestioned orthodoxy, but after all a genuine thinker whom the textbooks had long tried, as it were to keep lifeless, and who, when once revived, proves to be full of the suggestion of new problems, and of an effort towards new solutions.⁶ But Royce was also fearful that a resurgent Thomism might give way to the Kantian legions and their demand that the epistemological issue he settled first.

In *The Neo-Thomists*, (1994) Gerald McCool, S.J., has chronicled that movement in much of its complexity.⁷ The temptation which Royce feared, McCool shows, was experienced by Pierre Rousselot, S.J. and Joseph Marechal, S.J. and gave rise to the movement known as transcendental Thomism, one that was to have considerable influence in theological circles. McCool is convinced that the organized neo-Thomistic movement came to an end with the advent of the post-conciliar philosophies inspired by the Second Vatican Council. Nicholas Lobkowitz says as much in an article published in the current issue of the *A C P A Quarterly*.⁸

With respect to the future of Thomism, I am much more optimistic. While it must be acknowledged that Thomism is not the only philosophy compatible with Catholicism, it will forever remain an important intellectual option, at once compatible with pre-scientific knowledge (call it common sense, if you will), with

contemporary natural science, and with the Catholic faith.

The issues which confronted the late 19th century intellectual world remain. As the deep-rooted, tragic state of our culture becomes more widely acknowledged, one can detect a renewed interest in Aquinas. The materialisms confronting Leo have not gone away; if anything they have become more sophisticated and bold. They have not remained in the academy as abstract positions. In the last decade they have entered the market place (or should I say major media) as Christianity has come under attack in ways never experienced before in this country. The lesson to be learned is that faith can not simply be offered in opposition to philosophy: philosophy can be engaged only by philosophy. The philosophical works of Aquinas provide an important arsenal for those who are prepared to defend what Russell Kirk called “the permanent things.”

Allow me to bring these reflections to a close with two judgments, relevant to be sure in their own day, but surprisingly apropos our own philosophical condition. Seventy years ago George Santayana spoke appreciatively of what he called “Scholasticism.”

1. The dryness of Scholasticism, the absence from it of eloquence, passion, and personal humors, has come to seem a merit to those who would welcome an accurate, sober philosophy, and are tired of romanticism, of views which being brand new will tomorrow be obsolete, and of popular appeals to fancy or prejudice.

2. The fixity and clearness of the Scholastic vocabulary are also a relief from the Babel of figurative terms and perverse categories confusing modern philosophy and making the despair of any one who wishes to think cogently and not be misunderstood.

3. In technical philosophy, especially in England and America, there is a lively movement towards realism, both in the epistemological and in the logical sense of this term; so that the gibes about Scholastic trifling and quibbling have ceased, or have become a sign of ignorance.

4. In its association with Christian faith Scholasticism is also more welcome than it was: many have abandoned the attempt to minimize, modernize, or explain away the historical and religious dogmas of Christianity; in Scholasticism these persons hear for the first time the sound of an honest note; and they are, in more than one Church, the young, the spiritual, and the growing party.⁹

Dean Pace, in defending for his own time the necessity of a philosophical education, wrote at the turn

of the century, 1901, "...the current objections against theological truth are advanced, for the most part, in the name and in the language of philosophy. One can imagine a student who knows little or nothing of agnosticism and pantheism serenely contemplating the marvels of creation, grace and predestination; but one does not envy him. Nor is he in much better plight if he takes up the study of moral theology without a suspicion that its fundamental concepts are discussed and its principles criticized from every possible point of view. In a word, the habit of taking things for granted is one that should be cured before the treatment in philosophy ceases."¹⁰

Need I say more! The more things change, the more they remain the same. ✠

Jude P. Dougherty has been dean of the School of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America for more than a quarter of a century.

Notre Dame and Dame Philosophy

Ralph McInerny

What follows is a talk given to the the Philosophy Department Colloquium at the beginning of the 1993 academic year. It was suggested that it would complement Dean Dougherty's piece on the School of Philosophy, moon to its sun, so to speak. Ed.

A few weeks ago, the philosophy department colloquium began with a tribute to our oldest member, John Fitzgerald and went on to a paper by our youngest member, Dean Zimmerman. Fitzgerald responded with verve to the tribute given him and recalled some high and low points of his career at Notre Dame. Listening to him comment on events that I myself lived through, I was suddenly struck by how elusive objectivity is in speaking of the past.

Kierkegaard says somewhere that the historical method is a technique to put us into the position of an eye-witness of past events. But which eye-witness?

¹ For a detailed account of the University's founding and its history, see C. Joseph Nuesse *The Catholic University of America: A Centennial History*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1990. This presentation draws heavily on Nuesse's research.

² *Critique of Pure Reason*, "Preface to Second Edition," B. xxx.

³ Marvin O'Connell. *Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994, p. 16.

⁴ *Inauguration of The School of Philosophy and the Social Sciences and Dedication of McMahon Hall, Catholic University of America, October 1, 1895*. "Discourse of Dr. Pace," p. 21.

⁵ For a statistical and interpretive account of the status of American philosophy see Nicholas Rescher, "American Philosophy Today," *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. XLVI, no. 4, June 1993, pp. 717-745.

⁶ Royce, *Fugitive Essays*, "Pope Leo's Philosophical Movement and Its Relation to Modern Thought." Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925, pp. 408-429.

⁷ Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994.

⁸ Volume LXIX, Summer 1995, no. 3, pp. 397-423.

⁹ *Present Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*, ed. John S. Zybura. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo, 1927.

¹⁰ Collected papers of Edward A. Pace, The Catholic University of America Archives.

Perhaps we shouldn't think of the individual and personal stories each of us tells about the past as falling short of some complete impersonal account. There is of course the Book of Life and there is Providence, but as we read in the Book of Wisdom *incertae sunt providentiae nostrae*. The title of my talk might well be: *incertae sunt memoriae nostrae*. I present an impressionistic account of philosophy's career at Notre Dame, culled from my own memory and from the university archives — and let me thank Kevin Cawley for his generous help in that regard.

Notre Dame was founded by Father Sorin in 1842 but its earliest years were times of hardship when great institutional ambitions found expression in very modest efforts. It was soon discovered that preparation for college had to be provided an uncultivated clientele and the minim program began. There was also a school for those whose lives would be spent as laborers. But very early on, the ideal of a liberal education dominated the effort. If liberal education, then philosophy. I propose to divide the century and a half into periods:

1. Pre-1879
2. The half century after-1879
3. From the mid-thirties into the post World War II period
4. Post Vatican II

1. Early Days

In 1879 the Main Building burned down and in Rome Leo XIII issued an encyclical called *Aeterni Patris*. I do not suggest any causal connection between those two events, but then from the point of view of Providence nothing is *per accidens*. The Main Building was rebuilt during that same year, Notre Dame went on, moving into a period to be characterized by the Thomistic Revival that had been set in motion by Leo's encyclical.

What went on in philosophy at Notre Dame prior to 1879?

I will say least about this because the evidence is rather slim. In college catalogs professors are identified as offering courses in natural philosophy as well as penmanship. More typically, a man will be a professor of philosophy, theology and classics, but this by and large stops about 1870 or so, after which people are definitively instructors or professors of philosophy. The earliest recorded Professor of Natural Philosophy is one **Edmund Kilroy** who taught in the academic year 1854-55 and then apparently dissolved into myth. It is of interest that both **Alexis Granger**, successor to Father Sorin as Provincial as well as **Fr. William Corby** taught philosophy in what I am calling the first period.

Gardner Jones, LLD. presented to one Robert Healy his handwritten lectures in Logic on February 25, 1858. (In the following year he lectured on Historical Criticisms on Historians, Poets and Orators.) The emphasis is on syllogism, of which he provides Bossuet's, Gaudin's and Euler's rules and quotes approvingly Sir William Hamilton's Universal Canon of Reasoning:

What equal or inferior relation subsists between either of two terms and a common third term with which both are related, and one at least privatively so, that relation subsists between the two terms themselves.

He draws with considerable elegance the "Syllogistic Rose," a counterpart of the Square of Opposition. Absent from the discussion is Aristotle;

In 1858-59, Jones lectured on the Ontological Argument, beginning with this formulation:

God is possible. But if he did not exist he would not be possible, since he could be produced by no cause.
Therefore he exists.

Only much later in his discussion does he cite Anselm,

and then he provides the key text in the Latin. In *Ontology*, Jones refers to Gallup, Storcheman, and Descartes, Hegel (citing his defense of Anselm), and Christian Wolf.

2. After Aeterni Patris

On October 26, 1882, three years after the appearance of Leo XIII's encyclical in which he directed the faithful to the patrimony of Christian philosophy as an antidote to the intellectual and cultural evils of the day, the Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas was founded at Notre Dame. Its membership consisted of those taking classes in philosophy as well as faculty. Father Sorin was the honorary head of the organization whose meetings over the next decade are dutifully noted in *The Scholastic*.

The guiding spirit of the Academy, other of course than Aquinas himself, was one **Stanislas Fitte, CSC, (1842-1907)** a man about whom I would like to know a lot more than I presently do. In the Archives, there is a box full of his Philosophical Notebooks — only a few of which deal with philosophy — as well as his lecture notes in the history of philosophy. Fitte was an Alsatian, a graduate of the Sorbonne and priest for 14 years, ordained in 1865, before he joined the Congregation (1880) and came here. His lectures on medieval philosophy exhibit the influence of the medieval studies of Haureau and Cousin. Born the year the university was founded, coming from a Paris where interest in medieval authors had quickened among non-Catholic scholars and just after *Aeterni Patris*, it is imaginable that Fitte brought with him to Notre Dame the Thomism that found its expression in the Academy.

Professor McSweeney gave the inaugural lecture on the subject, Scholastic Philosophy, which was printed in the *Scholastic*. McSweeney makes unctuous reference to Leo XIII and it is clear that the Academy is a response to the challenge of that encyclical. Christian philosophy is called the "preamble of faith" and the names of Zigliari (misspelled) and Satolli and Liberatore are cited — all involved in the renaissance of Scholastic and more specifically Thomistic philosophy.

The format of the Academy meetings was this: a paper would be read in which a thesis was defended, and then two other speakers were assigned to raise

difficulties with the argument, after which the speaker responded. Suggestive, of course, of a medieval disputed question.

Its members have, from time to time since its organization (the *Scholastic* noted on April 26, 1884, p. 521) prepared public debates not only on the many interesting questions which are, and to the end of man's existence will be disputed, but also on those grandest principles which constitute the beauty of Philosophical studies, and which alone can bring man to anything approximating an understanding of himself as he exists, as also of the origin and cause efficient of that existence, and his future destiny; — which bring him, in short, to that highest of all ideas — the idea of God.

What were some of these perennial topics? Property, Certitude, Miracles, Spirituality of the Soul, Immortality, Law, The origin of language, Is democracy the best form of government? The existence of God. The problem of evil, etc etc.

*[Parenthetically, I note that the motto of the Scholastic in these early days was *Disce quasi semper victurus: vive quasi cras moriturus*. It has recently been re-adopted although I suspect that it now has a runic unintelligibility, much as the mottos of universities have to their present occupants.]*

In 1888, in the *Scholastic*, Fitte published a series of six articles on Matter and Form. This is an effort to show that the Aristotelian analysis of things that come to be as the result of a change into matter and form is perfectly compatible with modern physics (i.e. the physics of over a century ago), particularly chemical elements. Here is the peroration of the final instalment:

Thus it is that without repudiating the control of scientific experiment and faithfully obeying the decrees of the Church, the philosophical doctrine which we have endeavored to explain under the guidance of the Angel of the Schools, has succeeded in erecting piece by piece, that grand and sublime movement to the structure of which all the keys of creation have contributed their value. In our day, as well as in the Middle Ages, Aquinas, relying on the pedestal of his immortal genius, shows us all creatures closely united in the harmonious plan conceived from all eternity, loving one another and forming an immense concert of praise and admiration in honor of God's glory and the omniscient decrees of an infinitely good Providence.

Fitte wrote elegantly in German and French as well as English.

Present at meetings of the Academy was **John Augustine Zahm CSC** doubtless the most interesting

member of the Notre faculty during the 19th century. Born in 1851, he lived until 1921, but his career peaked before the turn of the century. His great concern was the relation between faith and science. His book on Evolution found its way into many languages — which was true of much of what he wrote: his was indeed an international reputation. A century ago he wrote a book on *Women in Science*, it his Dante collection that forms the heart of our present holdings, he traveled with Teddy Roosevelt through South America, his letters from Hawaii were published first in the Denver paper and then by the university press (Ave Maria?) His brother, a layman, taught at Notre Dame, but then moved on: he was a pioneer in aerodynamics.

Matthew Aloysius Schumacher CSC (1879 — born the year of *Aeterni Patris*) — was the first dominant 20th century teacher of philosophy, though his renown was only local. His 1904 dissertation *The Knowableness of God: Its Relation to the Theory of Knowledge in St. Thomas*, written at the Catholic University of America, was published the following year by the university press. He is on the roster through 1934, was head of the department in 1927/8 and for much of his career bears the title Professor of Scholastic Philosophy.

Charles Christopher Miltner CSC, longtime head of the department, is a dominant figure from World War I through 1950, he wrote books in Ethics, Metaphysics and Cosmology, and no adequate sense of what was happening in philosophy at Notre Dame during the second quarter of this century could ignore him. Perhaps some grasp of Miltner can be had by noting that in 1937 he wrote the foreword to and caused to have published here a little work of James A. Staunton, *Scholasticism, the Philosophy of Common Sense*. In counterpoint to that cheerful verdict must be set the *Dictionary of Terms Commonly Used in Scholastic Philosophy*, published in 1930 by the university press. As one pages through it, he cannot escape thinking that students were being encouraged to regard studying philosophy as on the order of learning a foreign language.

There were of course others, but their teaching absorbed them, and we read their names on the roster and discover little more than their names. **Charles Jean Mercier**, the nephew of Cardinal Mercier, whose *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie* at Louvain was one of the centers of the Thomistic revival, taught here from 1921/25. **Cornelius Hagerty**, **William Francis Cunningham**, **Thomas Aloysius Crumley**, **Lawrence Vincent Broughal** — who were they?

They have all gone into the dark. If they were members of the Congregation, their crosses will be found in the community cemetery. If they were laymen — who knows?

Among the names that show up during this period but whose careers stretch into the next is that of **William Roemer** (1923 ff), grandfather of the present Congressman from the 3rd district. Also **Daniel O’Grady** (1926 —), **Thomas Joseph Brennan** (1930 ff.) **Bernard Leo McAvoy** (1936 ff.) and **William Francis McMahan**. McMahan was here for a decade and ran afoul of the administration because of his outspoken opposition to Franco. His *A Catholic Looks at the World* (1945?) is worth reading. Yves Simon came in 1938 but more of him later.

3. Post-War Period

One of the most interesting phases of the history of philosophy at Notre day is that which runs from the early 1940’s through the early 1960’s.

The Medieval Institute

Philip S. Moore, CSC has been called the creator of graduate studies at Notre Dame. He joined the faculty in 1933 after study at the *Ecole de Chartes*. A man in the history department with similar background was **James Corbett**. Out of their paleographical work and the production of critical editions of medieval authors grew the Medieval Institute, officially founded after the close of World War II, but antedated by the work of Moore and Corbett. Moore was head of the philosophy department and, when **Gerald Phelan** was lured to Notre Dame from Toronto as first director of the medieval institute as well as head of the philosophy department.

The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies at Toronto represents one of the achievements of Etienne Gilson, the prolific polymath from Paris. **Otto Bird** is my source for this: the aim of the Institute, according to Gilson, was to produce people who could read the *Divine Comedy* with understanding. Gilson’s major interest as an historian was medieval philosophy and theology and in the course of his career he developed a concept of Christian Philosophy — something midway between theology and secular philosophy — to cover

the achievements of the medieval authors he studied. The Pontifical Institute, during its golden years, provided a setting for this Gilsonian effort. Unsurprisingly, Phelan brought this same emphasis to Notre Dame. The all but identity of the Medieval Institute and the Philosophy Department was not destined to last, however. During much of the history of the Institute — except for a brief golden period — history has dominated, but intellectual history, with emphasis on universities and monasticism.

The Gilson Episode

While the influence of Gilson on Notre Dame philosophy continues until this day, the great man himself stopped lecturing here after what Lawrence Shook in his biography of Gilson calls *L’affaire Gilson*.¹ Gilson came to Notre Dame in the fall of 1950 to give three lectures on Duns Scotus under the auspices of the Medieval Institute and a fourth public lecture in the law school auditorium on “Historical Research and the Future of Scholasticism.” He was escorted by Phelan, given a dinner by the president, Father Cavanaugh, and dined about with friends, most notably and fatefully at the home of Professor and Mrs. James Corbett where, presumably, he spoke in an unbuttoned way on many things. The following day he left for Marquette, driven by Phelan and Father **Peter O’Reilly**. On December 15, in the *Commonweal*, there appeared “Europe and the United States: An Open Letter to Etienne Gilson,” by **Waldemar Gurian**, Notre Dame professor and editor of *The Review of Politics*. Gurian accused Gilson of spreading the sad doctrine of defeatism because of his view that as between Russia and the United States, France should choose neutrality. (These views were published in Paris in *Le monde* the previous spring.) Gilson was portrayed as someone who was scuttling out of Europe to the safety of North America, who did not understand the Communist menace — something Gurian, a Russian refugee, surely did —and who underestimated the American commitment to defend Europe.

In his article, Gurian attributed these and other things to Gilson as what he had said at Notre Dame. “You have told us that you plan not to return to France because you are not prepared to live through a new occupation.” As it happened, Gilson and Gurian had not met during Gilson’s visit, none of Gilson’s public remarks concerned the matters Gurian spoke of,

his account was clearly a secondhand hearsay account of what Gilson had said at the Corbetts.

All this was bad enough, but soon the Gurian piece appeared in Paris in the pages of *Le Figaro*, and the fat was in the fire. Gilson in December had written the College de France that he intended to retire — he was 66 — and teach exclusively in Toronto in the years left him. His colleagues met and refused to vote him honorary status; he was vilified in the French press. It was hard. Corbett wrote an eloquent letter to *Le Figaro*, disclaiming the accuracy of the Gurian piece, but it, like a letter Gilson wrote to *Commonweal* was never published.

A year later, Gurian wrote Gilson an apology and it was accepted. One of the more edifying things in Shook's life is the information that Gilson had masses offered for Gurian before and after the latter's death. The episode cast a pall over Gilson's relation with Notre Dame. He never again visited or lectured here.

The Maritain Center

Things went much better for Gilson's friend and compatriot Jacques Maritain. Maritain had made Notre Dame a regular stop on his lecture tours very early on. In 1948, the Jacques Maritain Center was founded, with **Joseph Evans** as director, assisted by **Father Leo R. Ward** and **Frank Keegan**. Maritain was here for the inauguration. It seems clear that the Center was envisaged as the eventual repository of Maritain's papers. When the Hesburgh Library was opened in the fall of 1963, the Center moved from its quarters in the old library to rooms on the 7th floor adjacent to those designed for the Medieval Institute. In the event, the bulk of Maritain's papers ended up in Kolbshiem, where Maritain and his wife are buried. The Center contains some mementos, artifacts, letters, and papers of Maritain. The papers of **Yves Simon**, a protege of Maritain, member of the philosophy department before he accepted a position at the University of Chicago, are the major archival holdings of the Center.

Joseph E. Evans took his doctorate at Notre Dame and spent his whole career here. He died in 1979 just before students returned for the fall semester and many were absolutely stunned to learn of his death. We had always known that Joe played a special role as a teacher of philosophy, but the reaction to his death brought it home anew. He was a Maritain aficionado, seldom without a volume of the master under his arm, a man slow to move and slow to speak. He taught courses in

political philosophy and in a metaphysics that was predicated on inducing a sense of the wonder of existence. Affectionate apings of Joe pointing out the classroom window at a tree, absolutely overwhelmed to find it there, and observing that it was a *be-ing* — one always sensed that those who had not been induced to have the Intuition of Being wished they had. Joe's portrait by Douglas Kinsey hangs in Morrissey Hall; the fountain bounded by the science, music, business buildings and the student center is dedicated to him. Teaching, spending hours with students each of whom he knew effortlessly by name, and translating Maritain into English — those and being saintly sum up Evans Notre Dame career.

Gery Prouvost, editor of the Gilson/Maritain letters which span a half century, includes a letter that Gilson wrote to Shook after the death of Maritain in 1973. Gilson had been reading Maritain's posthumous *Approches sans entraves* and, he told Shook, for the first time he understood the difference between himself and Maritain as Thomists. He, Gilson, had been trying to ascertain as accurately as he could what Thomas had meant whereas Maritain had been seeking to carry on what Thomas had done. The comparison shortchanges both men but it draws attention to the different contributions each man made to the Thomistic Revival. Gilson introduced a standard of historical scholarship into the study of Thomas that had hitherto been wanting; Thomas and his writings were seen to have a history, to have occurred in definite settings, occasioned by factors it is well to know if we are to understand them. The bulk of Gilson's writings on Thomas are interpretative, even paraphrastic. There is little exegetical Thomism in Maritain — the bulk of his writings are devoted to philosophical problems and if Thomas is the dominant influence, the manner is dialectical. *Aeterni Patris* was not an invitation to become an historian — but its invitation could not meaningfully be accepted apart from historical sophistication. It was the relevance of Thomas for our times that animated Leo XIII and that is the salient method of Maritain's work.

The New Scholasticism

In 1950, **Vincent Edward Smith** joined the faculty. He had just published *Physics and Philosophy* and he brought with him *The New Scholasticism*, the journal of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. The center of gravity of the ACPA had hitherto been Washington and the Catholic University. Notre Dame

was now increasingly acknowledged as the emerging leader in American Catholic philosophy. Smith went to the St. John's in 1959, but in 1965 **John Oesterle** became editor and *The New Scholasticism* returned to Notre Dame where it would remain for nearly a quarter of a century. Oesterle died in 1977 and his associate editor became editor, aided by Jean, Oesterle's widow.

Whence came the faculty that made up the department during this period of its history? The Catholic University of America — founded by the bishops of the country as a graduate school — was an obvious place where CSC's were sent for advanced studies and then returned to Notre Dame. But lay people also came from there. Louvain in Belgium was another *terminus a quo* for philosophy professors at Notre Dame. **Elie Denisoff**, **John Fitzgerald** and eventually **Ernan McMullen**. (Louvain was also a favored place for sabbaticals: Oesterle, myself, **Frederick Crosson**.) But in the 1930's. OGrady came from Ottawa. **Bernard Mullahy**, CSC with a PhD from Laval joined the faculty in 1939. **Father Herman Reith** also studied at Laval, as did several lay professors, Notably John Oesterle. In the early 1960's. **Charles DeKoninck** spent the fall semester at Notre Dame. One of the great sources of Notre Dame faculty was Father **I.M. Bochenski OP**. He himself was a visitor here in 1955/56 and due to him **Nicholas Lobkowitz**, **Guido Kung** and **Karl Ballestrem** joined the department. The symposium on universals Bochenski arranged here featuring himself, Alonzo Church and Nelson Goodman, was a harbinger of things to come. And there was **Boleslaw Sobicinski**, the founder of the *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, who made the Polish notation, rather than that of *Principia Mathematica*, de rigueur at Notre Dame. He became famous for beginning his impenetrable articles with the insouciant remark, "It is well known that..." followed by a formula of which, like Wordsworth's Lucy, it could be said that there were few to know and very few to love. How could one not mention **Ivo Thomas OP** in conjunction with logic at Notre Dame?

In 1945 **A. Robert Caponigri**, — the A was never mistaken for an indefinite article — a student of Richard McKeon's, came to Notre Dame from Iowa

**Father Ward's
shoulders are among
those on which
present day
philosophers at
Notre Dame stand.**

where he and Wilfrid Sellars were colleagues. If all other members of the philosophy department at that time could claim or be accused of being Thomists, Bob was the exception. What was he? Caponigroid, I suppose, sui generis. He brought an unequalled knowledge of Vico and Croce to the department. It can fairly be said that teaching was not his gift, nor in a way writing. A reviewer of his first book, having said good things

about it, felt that Bob had been badly served by his translator. His inspiration was drawn from Italian and Spanish philosophy and he had a great devotion to Don Luigi Sturzo.

Father Leo Ward was arguably the best known Notre Dame philosopher during the 1930's and 1940's and into the 1950's. He went everywhere, attended all the meetings, came to know his philosophical colleagues throughout the country. The range of his own writings was phenomenal but all of it is marked by practicality — he wrote on education, a book on the meaning of the Catholic university, on federal funding for all schools. He wrote on Dewey, he wrote an Ethics, he translated both Gilson and Maritain. And he wrote fictional memoirs of that Irish enclave in Iowa from which he came. In his last years, like Socrates in his death cell, Father Ward began to write poetry. It has a distinctive charm and in some cases achieves the level of art. Late in his life, at Holy Cross House, the Maritain Center sponsored a tribute to him: Tom Stritch and Jude Dougherty spoke. Father Hesburgh paid tribute to his confrere. It was valedictory but it was not sad. Father Ward's shoulders are among those on which present day philosophers at Notre Dame stand.

The 1950s saw the arrival of the now oldest generation of philosophers at Notre Dame. **Ernan McMullen** came in 1954, **Ralph McInerney** and **Joseph Bobik** in 1955. Soon **Ken Sayer**, **Harry Nielsen**, **Milton Fisk**, **David Burrell**, **Ed Manier...**

If one asked what the department saw itself as doing during the last decade of this period of its history, the 1950's, what would the answer have been? Well, it was trying to implement the suggestions of *Aeterni Patris*: Scholasticism, Thomism, was the watchword. But the Thomistic revival had been going on now for over half a century. It was clear that there were

Thomisms, and the graduate school provenance of the faculty made that inescapable. Toronto people looked askance at those from Laval and products of Louvain cast a cold eye on both. This had fruitful results on the graduate level, but on the undergraduate level a fateful step was taken.

At this time, there was a four course requirement in philosophy at Notre Dame. Miltner's books indicate that courses in ethics, cosmology and metaphysics were offered, but in the 1950's a new curricular rigor was introduced. Its theoretical foundation was the *ordo addiscendi scientias philosophiae* that Thomas Aquinas gleaned from Aristotle. According to this, one who would become a philosopher should first study logic, then mathematics, then philosophy of nature, after which moral and political philosophy might be taken up with profit, but only at the end would one presume to study metaphysics. There is much to be said for this order of learning. But did it provide the structure of a curriculum in an American college in the mid-1950's?

But there was more. Not only was the curriculum to mirror this order of learning, each discipline was organized in a scientific manner. Common syllabi for the required courses were worked out. Nor was this confined to philosophy. I have a vivid memory of Father Charles Sheedy, then dean of the college, telling me that because of the syllabisation, if that is a word, of the courses in the college, he could on any given hour of any given day say what was going on in any class.

This was more honored in the breach than in the observance, needless to say, but this period in the department's history went through its last decade in the confidence that there was an orderly way of using the 12 hours of philosophy. Since most students acquired at best a gentleman's acquaintance with the subject, it was somewhat unreal to see the curriculum as the means whereby they would scale the heights of metaphysics, being certified as philosophically wise as they were granted their degree.

Of course this conception of the curriculum amounted to the implementing of and imposition of one view — Vince Smith had been part of a commission that addressed the curriculum. The want of realism in this curriculum — was every student to be thought of as in the process of becoming a philosopher? — caused a widespread and largely unarticulated discontent that had a lot to do with what was next to happen. Sheedy was a curious mixture of benevolent despot and antinomian. Once he lectured the department on how

to do its job, basing his remarks on his success in reading Thomas's treatise on angels with a student: it was never clear what the point was, apart from the autobiographical one. One day he noticed that ethics was not among the four required courses and decreed that we were to have two additional hours for this purpose. A kind of chaos ensued.

A vignette. Once early in my career I ran into Father Hesburgh and he got onto the topic of departments always wanting more required courses without which they allegedly could not do their work. Hesburgh pooh poohed this. He gave this analogy. As a priest he was frequently called upon to give instructions in the Catholic faith. Sometimes the catechumen had a year, sometimes months or weeks, but sometimes there was just the occasion of the conversation. If the essence of Catholicism could thus expand and shrink like Alice in Wonderland, he did not see why philosophy couldn't accomplish its task in one course if it came to that. I found this heresy oddly invigorating.

4. Philosophy After Vatican II

I call the current period of the history of philosophy at Notre Dame Post Conciliar for a number of reasons. Vatican II closed in 1965 and that is as good a year as any to see the beginning of the present phase. It arose out of the preceding phase, it was a development and not a revolution, it is a period when the reputation of the department is higher and when, arguably, the department has very little clarity as to what it is doing.

The antecedents of the present period are, first, the *mauvais foi* induced by the curriculum, of which I have already spoken. Second, was the unlooked for effect of the drive for excellence. Whatever misgivings Notre Dame philosophers might have had about the required curriculum and however they might have differed from one another, there was a shared sense well into the 1950's that philosophy at Notre Dame would be distinguished as Catholic philosophy. There was no more intention departmentally than there was institutionally to secularize the academic effort at Notre Dame — in many ways that has come about inadvertently. When I joined the department in 1955, I was given to understand that in order to combine the two directions of *Aeterni Patris* — the assimilation of our intellectual patrimony *and* bringing it to bear on our own time — new members were sought who would bring compe-

tence in one or the other area of contemporary philosophy. I was hired because I had written two dissertations on Kierkegaard. During my first year, Father Ward asked me to speak to the department on existentialism. It was recognized that no one individual could accomplish the task of assimilating Thomism and addressing the present. Members were expected to be expert in some aspect of the thought of Thomas and competent in some contemporary philosophical school, issue, figure. The aim of the collective effort was a new synthesis of the old and new. By and large, hiring was done on this basis, but soon people came who were innocent of Thomas but very good in some ongoing style, problem, figure, etc. Given the large pool of Thomists of a sort, such souls could be accommodated. They would bring something needed and others could worry about how it fit in with Catholic Philosophy.

During the early Sixties, as the Council progressed, there was a growing sense that paying attention to our patrimony in the manner urged by *Aeterni Patris* need no longer be our concern. Eventually people talked as if the Council had dismissed Thomas and recommended replacing him with _____, well, you could fill in the blank as you might. About this time, I wrote a book, *Thomism in an Age of Renewal* (1965) about what I thought was happening. If nothing else, it conveys today something of what the scene thirty years ago looked like, to me, from within.

The most important figure in the current phase of the history of philosophy at Notre Dame is Ernan McMullin. Father Reith was head of the department for 10 years; he was a reluctant administrator, and had many other virtues as well. Harry Nielsen was head for a year during which he proposed a fairly radical redefinition of our traditional task, aimed directly at difficulties with faith generated by university study. Harry was/is a Wittgensteinian Kierkegaardian, one of the best stand-up philosophers I ever knew. But as an administrator, he made Father Reith look like Henry Ford — well, maybe Lee Iacoca. Father McMullin took over at a parlous, unsettled time, when the past seemed little guide. The role he had played in earlier skirmishes in the department might not have led one to expect the success of his terms as chairman. Without any comparison, he has been the best head of the department in my

Father Reith was head of the department for 10 years; he was a reluctant administrator, and had many other virtues as well.

four decades here.

First, he was a pragmatist. And he was a natural democrat. Whatever we were going to do, would be done *tout ensemble*. During his years in office there was an ongoing plebiscite and referendum which included everyone. Gradually, the sense was lost that someone had a plan that was being implemented. Whatever plan there would be, would be everyone's, and it would be reached by everyone deciding what it would be. McMullin introduced the offices of director of graduate studies and of undergraduate studies; the philosophy major flourished. Even our quarters changed. We had been housed across the hall with what was once modestly called, before metastasis set in, the religion department. We moved several feet to the east, had our own and not a shared secretary, and offices for McMullin, John Fitzgerald and John Oesterle. The weekly colloquium was inaugurated by McMullin, the perspective series, the Carnegie Institutes. Most of the ways in which philosophy operates today is due to Ernan McMullin's innovations.

He shared the drive toward upward mobility of Father Hesburgh, he wanted Notre Dame philosophy to become known and respected across the land. This charming, even laudable, trait was also in many ways the worm in the apple so far as the specter of secularization goes. If excellence is defined as the way something is being done in certain chosen exemplar institutions, and those institutions are innocent of or hostile to a religious dimension and setting for their academic work, imitating them will cause problems. Hiring people trained in institutions where the life of the mind and religious belief are not seen as compatible and mutually influential, causes problems for the presumed institutional goals of Notre Dame.

But I have come now very close to the present and the point of this lecture is not to go on about current events and likely futures so much as to evoke the century and a half of philosophy here. That history is, I believe, relevant to what we do now and in the immediate future. Acquaintance with it can at least diminish a condescension toward the past of this place that is encouraged by the sometimes stated premise that our task is to go on *despite* what Notre Dame has been.

Let me end by singling out

something that pondering on the past is bound to press upon the mind. My title evokes *The Consolation of Philosophy*, in which Dame Philosophy address the complaint of Boethius that the innocent suffer while the ways of the wicked prosper. When one considers the many who have taught philosophy on this campus over a century and a half, most of whom are scarcely more than names, reflection on our vocation as professors of philosophy is invited. Unless they left notebooks, unless they are mentioned in the *Scholastic*, the vast majority of them have sunk into total oblivion. We chuckle over signs announcing to visitors that Notre Dame is a National Catholic Research University, but a place that could call a log cabin a university has had practice in imaginative self-description.²

The chuckling stops when one worries that the point of that sign is that the importance of our work lies in some estimate of it elsewhere, its registering on some imaginary national or international barometer. The work of some here doubtless will do that, as did the work of Father Zahm a century ago. But what about all his nameless colleagues? Were their lives wasted?

Teaching is by and large an unrecorded transaction between the old and the young. Its effects can to some degree be measured by tests but that is not the real

result. The young acquire, make their own, what the old present to them by arguing for and against, inspiring, disgusting, perhaps putting to sleep. There are intellectual as well as biological generations. Teaching has its rewards, most of them equivocal. "The best of a bad job is all the most of them make of it, except of course the saints." There are some lines attributed to Thomas More by Robert Bolt in his play, *A Man For All Seasons*. Thomas is urging Richard Rich to leave the court, abandon his political aspirations, and become a teacher. Rich is appalled. In such obscurity, who would ever know of him? Thomas's answer — call it the consolation of philosophy — can be taken as addressed to all the anonymous teachers of philosophy at Notre Dame over the last one hundred and fifty years. Who will know? You will know. Your students will know. And God will know. ✕

Ralph McInerny is the Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame.

¹ Laurence K. Shook, *Etienne Gilson, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, 1984, pp. 301-310.*

² Kierkegaard compares Hegelianism to a For Sale sign planted on a lawn before a house. When we go to the door and inquire, we find that it is the sign, not the house, that is for sale.

Selling the Birthright: Esau and Leo at Georgetown

Charles Molineaux
Georgetown University, '50

That something is quite wrong at Georgetown University has been apparent for some time. *Inter alia*, alumni and other observers will recall its surrender on the issue of funding a homosexual student group in the 80's, driven by perceived financial concerns (the funding continues), and the University's later funding of a pro-abortion group, "G.U. Choice," in the early 90's (discontinued as the result of the pres-

sure of a canon law suit by independent alumni led by The Georgetown Ignatian Society, with the help of the St. Joseph Foundation). Has there been any improvement at the University which continues to promote itself, especially in fundraising efforts, as a Catholic university?

One small but perhaps symbolic indication can be found by perusing the pages of the recent issue (Dec. 11 - Jan. 7 (8 pages + insert)) of the faculty and staff newspaper, *Blue & Gray*.

As a starter, we note that the word "Christmas" is nowhere mentioned in this end-of-the-year journal but, symbolically enough, on page 1 we read of "holiday cheer" and of giving during "this holiday season." On page 5 we learn that December 25 is a "University Holiday." Nothing more?

Perhaps the answer is to be found in the text of a recent faculty convocation address by the current

president, Leo O'Donovan, inserted with the newspaper. He cites his role as the steward of "three great endowments, or heritages, or dimensions of Georgetown": financial, academic and spiritual. In that order. This priority is reflected in the address itself which devotes major space to the financial. At the tag end, surprisingly enough for a Jesuit, comes the "spiritual": The spiritual endowment, in his view, is concerned, 1) with "service" (a demoted buzz word appearing eight times in one paragraph, the context being local community service (e.g., he notes the absence of health insurance for many in the District of Columbia)); 2) with the establishment of a day care center for faculty and staff children; and 3) with "inclusiveness," and "dialogue" as to which he asserts,

"I want Georgetown, of all the Catholic universities and colleges in the United States, least to resemble an enclave and most to encourage an intense dialogue as a virtual microcosm of the world community. Nothing less would befit a Catholic university that treasures the ancient symbols of the church as the people of God in pilgrimage through time, and the body of Christ in which every member matters (sic). Our inclusiveness is a critical element in the spiritual endowment of Georgetown. John Carroll said we should be open. We should be even more open today than he ever dreamed." (p. 4 of insert, col. 1)

Dream or nightmare — what did John Carroll have in mind at the founding of Georgetown? Concerned as he was for the early Catholic Church in then-Protestant America, and the practical need for priests, was the bishop-to-be really dreaming of a "world community" microcosm, a UN-like inclusiveness? This brand of openness is indeed more than Carroll ever dreamed: it's more than dreamy — it's absurd.

Of course we support many of the goals of the UN, as far as they go, while finding the term "world community" dubious indeed. Of course academics at a Catholic university, presumably already well grounded in their faith should be open to the perspectives of Buddhists, atheists, et al. But, even at best, the least-common-denominator result which eventuates from this secular "inclusiveness" approach can scarcely be called "a critical element in the spiritual endowment" of a Catholic university. Georgetown's spiritual endowment (and what Carroll necessarily would have had in mind) is to be found in the incredible richness of the Catholic Church — its sacraments, its learning,

its apostolicity. That apostolicity originates in His mandate, "Go . . . preach." The spiritual endowment is not found in inclusiveness, or in "getting with it" vis-a-vis the secular culture. What Georgetown needs is an injection of the counter-cultural, if you will, not this politically correct mumbo jumbo.

After all, the Vatican Council, in *Gravissimum Educationis*, said that university students were to witness to the faith in the world (No. 10). Canon law recognizes that "the entire Church is missionary by its nature" (781). More recently, Pope John Paul, in *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, also wrote of service — service to the Church. As to society, he says, "a Catholic university must have the courage to speak uncomfortable truths, which do not please public opinion, but which are necessary to safeguard the authentic good of society" (No. 32). And when *Ex corde* goes on to say that a Catholic university needs to examine the values of modern society "in a Christian perspective" and "to try to communicate TO society those ethical and religious principles which give full meaning to human life" (No. 33, emphasis added), this thrust is not another view but virtually the opposite of Leo O'Donovan's absorbing inclusiveness. "You are the salt," as He said, is not, "Let's be inclusive."

In the light of the Church's evangelizing mission, what explains the ongoing secularization of Georgetown? The current attitude is partially revealed by the fawning new plaque on its historic Old North building, which reads:

"GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY WAS IMMENSELY PROUD TO WELCOME WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON CLASS OF 1969 PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ALMA MATER WHERE HE ADDRESSED THE CHIEFS OF DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS JANUARY 18, 1993."

Georgetown University is the recipient of millions of dollars in federal contracts and grants.

Years ago, a popular history professor at Georgetown, Carroll Quigley, regularly gave a lecture in one of his courses in which he explained how instruments established to accomplish particular goals became, over time, institutions primarily motivated by self-perpetuation. Is Georgetown's president's emphasis on the financial endowment and distorted view of the spiritual endowment but confirmation that the University has simply sold its Catholic inheritance for a mess of porridge? As *Genesis* explains, "Esau cared little for his birthright" (*Gen. 25:34*). ☩

A New Catholic College in Japan

Peter Milward SJ

The Nagasaki Junshin Seibokai, or Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary of Nagasaki, is a Japanese congregation of sisters originally founded earlier in this century to assist the Bishop of Nagasaki. With its headquarters in the most Catholic district of the most Catholic city in Japan, Nagasaki, the congregation numbered many victims of the second atomic bomb to be dropped on Japan in the fatal August of 1945. But perhaps for this very reason it has come to flourish all the more vigorously in the post-war period. Now it already boasts of two four-year women's colleges in Nagasaki and Kagoshima — with high schools in both cities (and junior colleges). And now it is preparing to add a third four-year women's college, in place of its existing junior college and in addition to its high school, in Hachioji, & Western suburb of Tokyo nestling at the foot of the mountains.

This — if I may give a personal touch to this hitherto impersonal narrative — is where I come in; since after 33 years of teaching English literature at Sophia University in the heart of Tokyo I am heading for retirement at the still ripe age of 70. And so I have been invited by the sisters of Junshin to contribute to the faculty of their new four-year college, or minor university, as their first dean. This is, needless to say, by no means the first Catholic college to be founded in Japan; and so it would seem there is nothing so new about this one in particular, apart from its present freshness when the others are perhaps losing something of their original lustre. Yet in this I find something refreshingly new and original, and at the same time refreshingly old and traditional, that makes it newsworthy not only in Japan but also and especially in America.

Its originality appears in the very names of its two departments and the one faculty in which they are joined together. One is the department of “English and American Culture”, and the other the department of “Art Culture” including both painting and music; while the faculty including them is that of “Modern Culture”. Thus the emphasis of the new college — in

spite of some objections raised by officials of the Ministry of Education — is on “culture” (which has been defined by some wag as what you remember when you have forgotten everything else). As for the epithet “modern”, it is by no means restrictive in meaning, in what linguists call a “synchronic” sense; but while studying the present in England and America, in language and literature, in art and music, we look for an understanding of it all in view of the cultural tradition of the West, according to the wise saying of Confucius, “*Onko chishin*” — By investigating the past, we understand the present.

This is, of course, a basically Catholic ideal of education, akin to that proposed by John Henry Newman in his *Idea of a University*. Only what he had in mind was a university for Catholic students, both Irish and British, in Dublin; whereas in Japan every Catholic university or college has to reckon with the fact that over 90% of its student population must needs be non-Christian and non-religious, according to the post-war situation in this country. And so it must be with Tokyo Junshin Women's College: like every other such Catholic institution of higher learning in this country, it has to face the contradiction of being a Catholic college for non-Catholic students. But this is only apparently a contradiction: in reality it is a challenge that is basic to the existence of the Catholic Church in a non-Catholic, non-Christian, even non-religious, country like Japan.

In what does this challenge, as I see it, consist? I see it as consisting of two basic aspects, both inherent in the Catholic ideal: universality and inculturation. On the one hand, in our curriculum there is to be special emphasis on “internationalization”, encouraging the students to look beyond the narrow confines of their island country, in their study of English and American language and literature, art and music, while providing them with the means of actually venturing abroad in pursuit of their studies, according to the Japanese proverb, “*I no naka no kawazu, taikai wo shirazu*” — The frog in a well knows nothing of the wide ocean. Then, as they raise their eyes from Japan to the outer world and from the present to the past, especially in terms of cultural tradition, they become aware of the majesty and splendor of the Catholic Church. On the other hand, in our attention to the formation of Japanese women, we have to adapt the Catholic ideal to the needs and capacity of the students, according to the true meaning of “inculturation”, which is but a mod-

ern word for the ancient scholastic axiom, “*Quidquid recipitur, secundum modum recipientis recipitur*” or the Pauline distinction between what is given as “meat for grown men” and “milk for babes.”

Take, for example, Newman’s own *Idea*, even in Japanese translation, let alone in its English original, it can hardly be used as a textbook for the classroom even in a Catholic university — save at a post-graduate level. Its thought and sentence structure are too difficult for most Japanese students. It may perhaps be used in an abridged form; but preferably its thought has to be digested by the Catholic teacher and presented to his students in a simpler, form, adapted to the Japanese and the modern situation. So, too, with Catholic theology, on which Newman lays such emphasis as basic to the curriculum of a Catholic university. It can hardly be presented as such to non-Catholic students without fear of serious misunderstanding. Rather, it is necessary to return to the sources of Catholic theology in scripture

and tradition; and so it takes the form of an introduction to the elements of Christian faith and the history of the Catholic Church.

Finally, it has to be emphasized that such a Catholic college or university consists not just in the ideal it offers in its teaching, but rather in the reality that is enshrined in its buildings, its campus and above all its church or chapel, where the life and liturgy of the Catholic Church is there for all, even or especially non-Catholic students, to see and appreciate and even participate in, to the best of their ability. Thus they may pass from the “notional assent” of mere knowledge to the higher “real assent” of understanding and wisdom, which is for Newman the fine fruit of a university education. ✠

[Peter Milward is the author of *My Idea of a University in Japan* (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1996)].

DOCUMENTATION

A Report from CREDO

The Goal of CREDO

The mission of CREDO cannot be stated more eloquently than this statement by the Pope: “When so many people are thirsting for the living God (Ps 42:2) — whose majesty and mercy are at the heart of liturgical prayer — the Church must respond with a language of praise and worship which fosters respect and gratitude for God’s greatness, compassion and power. When the faithful gather to celebrate the work of our redemption, the language of their prayer — free from doctrinal ambiguity and ideological influence — should foster the dignity and

beauty of the celebration itself, while faithfully expressing the Church’s faith and unity” (Pope John Paul II’s address to American Bishops, *Ad limina Apostolorum*, L’Osservatore Romano, December 1993).

Bishops Approve Segment 4

In CREDO’s October news letter, we predicted that the November meeting of bishops might bring “flashes of drama” as the bishops debate Segment 4 of ICEL’s revised translation of the Mass (Roman Missal). But the meeting was singularly without drama. The body of bishops was clearly impatient and approved the texts with a vote of 182 to 39 with 37 bishops abstaining or absent.

In quantity, Segment 4 repre-

sents the midpoint of the eight segments ICEL will submit for the bishops’ consideration. But in terms of the path set, it probably represents victory for the entrenched liturgical establishment for the near future. The debate was limited. ICEL texts approved in the past by slim margins of votes can now be expected to be routine. The margin of victory this time was 10 votes over the required two-thirds majority. Even if a significant minority of the bishops object to the texts and episcopal fatigue continues in the conference, the remaining texts should be approved by November, 1996.

So long as the principles of translation remain unsettled, the bishops do not have much to work with. There is a possibility that the upcoming Forum on the Vernacular might be successful in initiating

a scholarly and non-polemical dialogue among various points of view. We hope the Forum (comprised of bishops and scholars) will reinstate the sacral vocabulary of the liturgical texts and make them more accurate and beautiful.

Episcopal Impatience

At the November plenary meeting of bishops, Francis X. DiLorenzo, Bishop of Honolulu and a former rector of St. Charles Seminary in Philadelphia, perhaps correctly summed up the confusion, frustration and impatience of most of the American bishops. His mention of a “learned or quasi-learned society” probably refers to the work of CREDO:

“The general assumption is that a quasi-learned society or learned societies have strong feelings about these particular translations. And my sense is there is a general understanding by such persons as myself that the quasi-learned society or learned society gets in through the back door through the recommendations by some of the bishops. I’m wondering, is it possible for the future when a quasi-learned or learned society has serious problems about our situation can go directly to the committee. Because what we wind up doing here is, people who are inexperienced in the area of translation are asked to comment on their work. And this clogs up our system tremendously...”

Bishop Donald W. Trautman, chairman of the liturgy committee, responded that the committee “would be open to dialogue directly with the learned or quasi-learned society.” Bishop DiLorenzo continued: “...I’m not questioning the validity or lack of validity of what they are observing,

but most of us here are going to sit here for hours watching this debate like we have done time and again and we’re kind of left here. You’re basically coming to us to ask us and we should be honest enough to say it’s beyond us, I’m sorry, we can’t really answer you. But to keep going through this entire thing..., many here who are honest would say, this is not in my ballpark. And in a sense another drama plays out on the stage here and we are all here observers as opposed to being actors in the drama as we should all be.”

The Liturgy Committee’s Tactics

The liturgy committee’s strategy seems to have been to withdraw proposals when it was necessary to avoid direct confrontation with the bishops, but to block modifications to the texts with little or no explanation, even if suggested changes were reasonable.

The committee could not afford the appearance of unraveling support in the conference. Any negative vote would seriously damage the credibility of the liturgical establishment. This almost happened at the June meeting of bishops. At that meeting, the liturgy committee withdrew its proposal to allow standing during the Eucharistic Prayer when a number of bishops, led by Cardinal Bernard Law, strenuously objected.

At news conferences after the votes, Bishop Donald Trautman, chairman of the liturgy committee, would boast that the bishops failed to vote down a single proposal by the liturgy committee. This ob-

scures the fact that a number of controversial proposals— but only the most daring proposals such as using “inclusive language” to translate *Homo factus est* in the Nicene Creed—were withdrawn before a vote. Bishop Trautman, capitalizing on the impatience of most of the bishops, deflected or obscured most of the substantive criticism of the texts.

A Case Study

When Bishop William Keith Weigand of Sacramento objected to the use of the word “baskets” in the Pastoral Introductions prepared by ICEL, he pointed out that the General Instruction on the Roman Missal forbids the use of “baskets” as a sacred vessel in the celebration of Mass. Bishop Trautman responded that the General Instruction does not disallow baskets, which have been employed at papal Masses. In any case, Bishop Trautman argued, the committee uses the term simply to designate a “low container.”

Later in the week, Bishop Weigand, corrected himself. The 1980 document *Inaestimabile donum*, issued by the Congregation for Divine Worship, not the General Instruction, prohibits the use of simple baskets as sacred vessels. Bishop Trautman responded the bishops should not be unduly concerned by the word “baskets,” because the Holy See was only warning against “SIMPLE baskets” which would not show proper reverence.

Directing Attention to “Inclusive Language”

Bishop Trautman also succeeded in convincing the bishops (and, notably, Cardinal William H. Keeler, outgoing chairman of the NCCB, see below) that the primary objections to the liturgical texts had to do with “moderate, horizontal inclusive language.” Few would object to using “brothers and sisters” in place of “brethren,” for example. Bishop Trautman also cited—interestingly—various documents from other committees of the NCCB where “inclusive language” was insisted upon.

A simple glance at the history of the bishops’ interventions would show many more serious theological concerns than those listed under “horizontal inclusive language.”

Liturgical Agenda Set at Los Angeles Meeting

Bishop Trautman’s approach appears to be a derivative of the themes set at the October, 1995 Los Angeles Archdiocesan Liturgy Conference. Bishop Trautman was one of the conference’s two keynote speakers, along with Sr. Mary Collins, professor of religious studies at Catholic University, who advocated women’s ordination and was on the editorial committee for the ICEL Psalter project.

In Los Angeles, Bishop Trautman painted a picture of the Mass and old translations of the Bible as unintelligible to young people in America because all the language they hear, from TV news

to school books, is presented in inclusive language. He called for “a balanced use of horizontal inclusive language” (as opposed to vertical inclusive language, which bans masculine metaphors for God).

Bishop Trautman stated that, after the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith rescinded approval for the gender-neutral New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, Cardinal Ratzinger provided the U.S. Bishops with [the presumably secret] norms for translation of future texts. The Bishop said the bishops have been following these principles with the retranslation of the Sacramentary.

Ignorance of these interim principles of translation is a disadvantage which the CREDO scholars must endure.

An Expanding Definition of “Inclusive Language”?

At the Los Angeles meeting, Bishop Trautman also advocated expanding “inclusive language,” claiming, “Women are not the only special interest group that has taken offense to the wording of the Scriptures.” He noted that changes were being made to avoid offending people with disabilities and Jewish people who protested “the portrayal of themselves as killing Christ in the passion accounts of the Gospels.”

Bishop Trautman criticized people who “seek a translation word for word...they do not accept what we call dynamic equivalency.” He said ICEL’s “most striking feature is repeated insistence

upon freedom for translating liturgical texts and its opposition to mechanical, slavishly-literal translation from Latin.”

Formal Equivalent Translations

Bishop Trautman’s complaint that organizations like CREDO promote “slavishly-literal” translations sidesteps the issue. In October CREDO, in a letter to all of the bishops, pointed to the revision to the New American Bible (NAB), which was approved by the Administrative Committee/Board of the NCCB and received an imprimatur from Cardinal James Hickey in 1986.

“The primary aim of the revision [of the New American Bible] is to produce a version as accurate and faithful to the meaning of the Greek original as is possible for a translation. The editors have consequently moved in the direction of a formal-equivalence approach to translation, matching the vocabulary, structure, and even word order of the original as closely as possible in the receptor language. Some other contemporary biblical versions have adopted, in varying degrees, a dynamic-equivalence approach... [This approach] has the disadvantages of more or less radically abandoning traditional biblical and liturgical terminology and phraseology, of expanding the text to include what more properly belongs in notes, commentaries, or preaching, and of tending toward paraphrase. A more formal approach seems better suited to the specific purposes intended for this translation.”

Why not give the bishops a chance to review formal equivalent alternative translations?

Cardinal Keeler Seconds Bishop Trautman

Cardinal Keeler, outgoing chairman of the NCCB, in an extraordinary departure as he closed the plenary meeting in November, concluded with remarks apparently drawn from Bishop Trautman's Los Angeles speech. He also pointed to the Holy Father's use of "inclusive language" during his recent visit to the United States as validating its use in solemn liturgical translations: "...I think we can make mention of the Holy Father's use of what we would call moderate inclusive language on the horizontal level in his speech. I think it is an exemplary thing for us in the talks that he made when he visited us here in the United States. ...what we want to speak is the language that will keep our trust with the young people who responded so beautifully to the Holy Father in Denver young people who in their schools, in their books, in their songs are using this kind of what we would call horizontal inclusive language. It's the culture they are growing up in. If we are going to keep faith with them—while we want to do absolutely everything that will keep us in touch with the riches of our tradition—we also have to be sensitive to the way they speak and what they hear in our use of liturgy and our preaching to the extent that it is possible in fidelity to the tradition."

In the Holy Father's address to the United Nations this year, he used "man" generically 10 times along with the pronouns "he" and "his".

ICEL's "Inclusive Language"

It's difficult to see how it is possible for ICEL to censor words such as "man" "man kind", "brethren"; etc. without doing violence to the texts and the Church's tradition.

For example, in one of the prayers, in an effort to avoid "man," ICEL translates *Deum et hominem* as "truly God and truly human" when the Latin text refers to Christ as "true God and true man." In a number of instances, ICEL censors male pronouns with respect to God. Possessives such as "His" as in "His name" are replaced with "God's" as in "God's name." Aside from being linguistically "intrusive," it is incorrect to refer to these changes as "horizontal inclusive language."

Several bishops made the point that there are sound theological reasons to use the word "man" in liturgical texts. Bishop John R. Sheets' intervention provides an example:

"[In one of the prayers translated by ICEL] we find the expression: 'The Lord Jesus Christ...has conquered sin and death...He is the mediator between God and humankind...' 'Humankind' as such does not exist, just as 'animal-kind' does not exist except as found in individual lions, tigers, etc. The whole force of the preface is lost by the introduction of the word 'humankind.' The word 'mediator' in the Preface means that there is dialogue going on between two subjects, God and man. There is no dialogue possible between Christ and an abstraction, such as 'human-kind'..."

Bishop Sheets' thoughtful intervention (only partly reported here) was voted down in a voice vote.

Other Concerns Obscured by the Liturgy Committee

Contrary to perceptions, the vast majority of the interventions made by the bishops had to do with concerns other than inclusive language. In CREDO's October newsletter, we pointed out ICEL's tendency to censor the Church's sacral vocabulary such as "soul", "merit", "beg", "only-begotten Son", and "saint" or "holy" or "blessed". ICEL also has suppressed the hierarchy of angels in the translation of the prefaces and has virtually excluded words and phrases of humble supplication. These concerns were rejected by the liturgy committee with explanations such as "the proposals are stylistic" or "the translation is adequate according to the principles prescribed by the Apostolic See in *Comme le prévoit*."

Forum for the Vernacular

The long-awaited "Forum on the Vernacular" where principles of translation are expected to be discussed by a team of bishops and scholars has been funded by the bishops. Cardinal Keeler made this comment at the concluding press conference:

"...the Forum that is going to take place will offer an opportunity for a more measured reflection on the principles that are part of the translation process. An understanding too—it's not just a question of principles—of the art of doing the translation...there will be opportunities for those who

have some very special concerns about how do we keep alive the full rich complexity of the traditions of the Church. They will have an opportunity to be heard..."

In matters as grave as the translation of sacred texts, professional exchanges among competent scholars cannot but produce good.

Analysis

The liturgy committee has succeeded in deflecting the attention of the bishops away from the substantive issues behind ICEL's proposed revisions. As a consequence, the body of bishops was left confused and impatient. The errors identified by a small number of bishops, if left uncorrected in the main, will only fester over the years. Contrary to the liturgy committee's dismissal of substantive concerns as merely being "stylistic in nature" or contrary to the "principles prescribed by the Apostolic See in *Comme le prévoit*," the pattern of mistranslation to accommodate contemporary language or feminist concerns establishes a dangerous precedent.

Invoking precedents buried in texts approved by bishops is a tactic already used by the liturgy committee. For example, in explaining why "only Son" was an acceptable translation for the word in the preface of Christ the King, the liturgy committee argued that the "previous segments have established [that] 'Unigenitus' does not always have to be translated as 'only-begotten'." The committee now treats the mistranslation of *Unigenitus* as normative.

Bishops in the future will find

it increasingly difficult to maintain the traditional hieratic language of the liturgy and to resist the demand for conformity to cultural and ideological trends. The censorship of the sacral vocabulary and words of humble supplication, the subtle introduction of "vertical inclusive language," the amputation of Latin phrases, and the whole array of mistranslation bodes ill for the English-speaking Church. A sure way to guarantee obsolescence is to follow today's fashion.

Prognosis

Will the Mass be valid should these translations be confirmed by the Holy See? Of course. But it should be clear after 30 years that inadequate translations of liturgical texts have contributed to the loss of the sense of the sacred. The fullness of doctrinal content of the original Latin prayers will have been lost to another generation of Catholics. Unless the texts are adjusted behind the scenes before confirmation by the Holy See, the distortions in the revisions approved by the bishops will contribute to a growing crisis of Eucharistic faith.

The Goal of CREDO

The mission of CREDO cannot be stated more eloquently than this statement by the Pope: "When so many people are thirsting for the living God (Ps 42:2)—whose majesty and mercy are at the heart of liturgical prayer—the Church must respond with a language of praise and wor-

ship which fosters respect and gratitude for God's greatness, compassion and power. When the faithful gather to celebrate the work of our redemption, the language of their prayer—free from doctrinal ambiguity and ideological influence—should foster the dignity and beauty of the celebration itself, while faithfully expressing the Church's faith and unity" (Pope John Paul II's address to American Bishops, December 1993).

Membership Requirements

CREDO is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit corporation. All contributions are tax deductible. CREDO has been established as a society of priests. We also accommodates lay associates.

CREDO
c/o Fr. Cornelius O'Brien
P.O. Box 7004
Arlington, Virginia 22207



The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars regrets to announce the death of the Most Reverend G. P. Flavin, Bishop of Lincoln. May his soul, and the souls of the faithfully departed, rest in peace.

***Flawed Expectations:
The Reception of the
Catechism***

by Msgr. Michael Wrenn and
Mr. Kenneth D. Whitehead,
Ignatius Press, 1996

Let us begin this review with the contemporary Catholic problem which Msgr. Wrenn and Mr. Whitehead address in this book, one that developed at the turn of the 20th century under the aegis of Alfred Loisy and company. A significant body of Catholic opinion has held ever since that the historical origins of revealed religion, including Christianity, are shrouded in mystery (or mythology) and can no longer be presented as it has been, that is credibly, to upper educated scientific moderns. If, therefore, Catholicity is to continue being relevant to Modernity, then layers of this mythology must be stripped away by competent scholars. Their work, when it is completed, will enable pope and bishops to preach a more enlightened gospel, and still be within the Christian tradition.

By its openness to the modern world, the Second Vatican Council is alleged to have quietly reversed Pius X's condemnation of Modernism, granting "freedom," if belatedly, to the Church's "knowledge class" to proceed with the updating of the Church's creed, code, and cult. For this reason, the idea of a Universal Catechism was rejected during the Council period, viz., because "reformers" considered a "textbook" of Catholicity premature, if not any longer necessary.

The Wrenn-Whitehead *opus* is really a one volume account of what has happened to Catholic

catechesis once bishops, after Vatican II, delegated to "religious educators" and their publishers, the task of renewing the way the "Catholic Catechism" was to be taught to the young. This time, however, the Catholic faith would be taught without the benefit of specific answers to specific questions. Msgr. Wrenn, special consultant to Cardinal O'Connor on such matters, and Mr. Whitehead, formerly of the U.S. Department of Education but with long experience in Catholic catechetics, are amply qualified for the task they undertook.

Their account of catechesis from the Council's close in 1965 is traced in nine chapters, and includes the story of how the first guidelines (in the form of the *General Catechetical Directory*) came to be, of the 1977 Synod, out of which came *Catechesi Tradendae*, and of the Extraordinary Synod of 1985, during which Bernard Cardinal Law suggested a Universal Catechism. How that Catechism was composed, its initial reception by various publics, the controversy over its translation, and the reaction of theologians and religious educators to the final product, are all related there. Three final chapters describe the efforts to reinterpret the new Catechism in what had become a typical post-Vatican II mode. Three appendices dissect "the translation" process, a valuable record of how bureaucracies work, when lightly supervised.

Flawed Expectations also contains many human interest components, not the least of which is the relationship between the NCCB to the USCC, and the latter's tie-in to the *Catholic University of America*. I will leave readers to discover for themselves the details of this kin-

ship. (*Living Light*, an official USCC publication dealing with religious education, is no longer published by *Our Sunday Visitor* because of its freakish attitude toward *magisterium*.) In any event, readers of Wrenn-Whitehead might keep three things in mind as they move from chapter to chapter: (1) Catechists, including college teachers of the faith at the highest levels of education, are critically vital to the Church's faith and unity because they deal directly with the young, and with underformed and doubting Catholic adults; (2) Revisionist catechizers, on the other hand, in their quest for a "provable" core Catholicity, would neglect teaching persuasive doctrines, which "scientific theologians" consider "unprovable" or "unecumenical," those, too, which are taught firmly, even definitively, by the *magisterium* of the Church; (3) The last word, therefore, on what is to be taught must now be determined by experts through the force of their arguments, not by the witness of the Successors of the Apostles to Christ and to the Church's developed sense of the original deposit of faith.

Msgr. Wrenn and Mr. Whitehead list on one page all the teachings which catechetical experts have managed to render moot — all of which are found, and taught as true, in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: original sin, Satan, angels, purgatory, the Four Last Things, Mary's perpetual virginity, the Church's teaching authority, the obligation to profess the faith and accept Church authority, "the end never justifies the means," Transubstantiation, the seven Sacraments instituted by Christ, the male priesthood, priests

are not delegates of the people, marital indissolubility, the evil of contraception, the disorder of homosexual acts, and so on.

Many readers will be fascinated by Chapter 4 which describes the birth of the English translation, the one finalized by Archbishop Eric D’Arey of Hobart (Tasmania), after much heat over “inclusive language.” During this debate “the experience” of the radical feminists ran into the Church’s experience with Christian truth formulated in creeds from Nicea to Paul VI’s *Credo*.

When the reader digs into the chapters on the various Commentaries, written almost overnight, to explain away the new Catechism, things become a little scary. Fortunately, the authors provide a list also of authentic interpreters of the Church’s new syllabus, chief among whom are Alfred McBride, O. Praem, Fr. James Tolhurst, Aidan Nichols, O.P., Msgr. Francis D. Kelly, Fr. Robert J. Haters, Sr. Mary Ann Johnson, and John Cardinal O’Connor’s *Moment of Grace*. However, the Revisionist Commentaries are likely to be advertised better, and to be more prominently displayed in book stores and at conventions. An early negative review of the new Catechism, after the French edition appeared in 1992, came from the pen of Jesuit Francis Buckley, whose put-down for the *National Pastoral Life Conference* (in *Church*, Summer 1993), asked “What to do with the new Catechism?” and answered: “[It] could have been written before Vatican II.”

Two Xavier University faculty members (Cincinnati) issued *The Catechism: Highlights and Commentary* (Twenty Third Publications, 1994), and received generous pub-

licity from the standard religious education journals. Authors Brendan Hill and William Madges believe that the new Catechism needs more dialogue with other trends in contemporary theology. As an aside, they tell their readers that confession is not integral to the Sacrament of Penance, nor are children obliged to receive Penance prior to First Communion. The Liturgical Press of Collegeville, MN, one of the Catechism’s approved Roman publishers, has two Commentaries on the market, the first one edited by Michael Walsh, an ex-Jesuit. According to the publishers, this book’s scholars also wish to enter “critical dialogue” with the official text. The contemporary reader is warned in one place against “culture shock,” i.e. by seeming, in the reading of the text, to be translated backward into the 13th century. Contributor Monica Hellwig does not think the Catechism should be used in preparing children for First Penance. Another contributor looks upon it as a poor guide on morality, unless the content is somehow nuanced. Collegeville’s second Commentary, Jane E. Regan’s *Exploring the Catechism*, is not happy with the heavy catechesis stress on instruction. Writing mainly for religious educators, she describes the text as “only one catechetical source.” “What does the text mean for me?” she asks.

The People’s Catechism: Catholic Faith for Adults was assembled for Crossroads by a panel of specialists, led by a bishop. The usual convention of authoritative teaching begins with phrases like “only one faith, but many theologies,” “no group has a corner on the truth,” “the text must be inculcated

locally.” Wrenn-Whitehead describe this book as a caricature of everything that was bad in modern religious education. This Commentary speaks of “rock-bottom, non-negotiable doctrines,” but from the reading it is hard to decide what they might be.

Flawed Expectations is more than an account of doings. It is a critical analysis of ideas, weighing them in balance against what has been taught by the Councils of the Church, and by modern Popes.

Vatican II was hardly over when a bishop asked me to study and evaluate his educational machinery. Without very intensive investigation, it did not take long to notice that among the leading intellectual lights guiding the Post-Vatican II reform of religious education in that diocese were Sr. Marie Augusta Neale, Bro. Gabriel Moran, FSC, and Fr. Bernard Cooke, S.J., the nun hostile to any obedience save to God, the brother opposed to the very existence of the religious order and the parish, the Jesuit who thought the entire Church succeeded the Apostles, not just bishops, and publishers of textbooks who lapped up every word these gurus uttered, as if it was pure oracle from on high. It is amazing that we have survived as well as we did.

Because the Wrenn-Whitehead *opus* is a weighty book which will catch the attention of those who study such things, a truncated version of its “hard core” content ought to be issued, and under a title such as Post-Vatican II Catechesis: What It Means to Go Modern.

Msgr. George A. Kelly is the Founder of the Fellowship.

***Truth on Trial:
Liberal Education Be Hanged***

by Robert K. Carlson.
Forward by Alice Von Hildebrand.
Notre Dame, Indiana: Crisis
Books, 1995, \$13.95, 201 pages.

Given the crisis in secular and Catholic University education, many of us find ourselves daydreaming about ideal programs. Some few of us, such as myself, actually teach at Universities where the ideal of a true liberal arts education is promoted with splendid results. Most of us are trying to present the riches of the tradition in circumstances less than satisfying. And so if you think “what if . . . ?”

In his lively, delightful and pointed expose, Dr. Robert K. Carlson of Casper College, describes a program most of us wish we were teaching and details how it ran afoul of the powers of suppression so rampant on most campuses “dedicated to academic freedom.”

Truth On Trial is about the Integrated Humanities Program at the University of Kansas in the ‘70’s. The project was organized and taught by a team of 3 professors, John Senior, Dennis Quinn, and Franklyn Nelick for undergraduates. When the course of studies became popular, actually leading students to truth, a university committee investigated it and decided to eliminate it.

Carlson’s account of the history of the persecution of the Integrated Humanities Program is not an embittered diatribe but instead a portrait of an experiment that may well stimulate others to emulation.

We get to see how the program was created. We “listen in” on typical dialogues. We get to see the good effects on the minds and lives of participating students — especially students who found their way from truth, to Truth, to religious vocations within the Catholic Church.

The chapter heads will give you

a sense of what to expect from *Truth On Trial*:

- The Loss of Center
- The Creation of an Integrated Humanities Program
- The Restoration of a Philosophical Educational Center
- The Siege Begins.
- Death by Administration

The inclusion of the Brochure describing the Integrated Program may well be the seed of future institutes based on a similar philosophy of liberal education.

Get it. Read it. Give it to friends.

Truth On Trial can be ordered by calling: 1-800-852-9962 — Crisis Books.

Dr. Ronda Chervin is a visiting Professor of Theology and Philosophy at Franciscan University of Steubenville.

Mary

by Edward Schillebeeckx and Catharian Halkes
Crossroad; 1993; 88 pages; paperback \$9.95

This book by two retired Dutch theologians deals with the role of the Blessed Virgin in the life of the Catholic Church today. Their essays are separate.

Schillebeeckx wants to praise Mary “but not too much,” since devotion to her must be founded on truth. In particular he claims that she must not be called the Mother of the Church; this title, he says, belongs to the Holy Spirit; Mary should be called our sister. In this however he overlooks the Gospel’s “Son, behold thy mother,” and also several centuries of Catholic piety. And he also says that Mary is the mother of all believers; so the point he is trying to make seems to be a rather elusive one.

As well, he teaches that “we have to work out a mariology which keeps to biblical criteria.” Yet he

does not mention where the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption fit in.

Halkes is a feminist theologian who lost her devotion to Mary but has gotten back some of it. She is a sincere but not an enthusiastic devotee. Her essay is a good source for the problems Catholic feminists have in their relationship to the Blessed Virgin. Unfortunately she draws rather heavily on the discredited Eugen Drewermann.

One of her arguments is that, since Mary always points to Christ, she is not a good model for women because she emphasizes the subordination of women to men. But Mary is subordinate to Christ not because he is a man but because he is God.

Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.

Carnets Spirituel

Jean Daniélou, SJ
Paris: Cerf, 1993

This must first of all be a correction. In 1978 I was the translator for the article “Jean Daniélou” by M.-J. Rondeau which later appeared in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia/Supplement: Change in the Church*.¹ Unfortunately, we were not able to stop the press, and the announcement of the *Carnets Spirituels* went out by means of this encyclopedia entry, among others, when at the last minute a legal concern by the family of the late Jesuit cardinal prevented their publication. The galleys circulated privately among a small circle, but the efforts to get the book published were only successful, finally, in late 1993.

Since then Cardinal Paul Poupard reviewed it in “*L’Osservatore Romano*”² and at least some attention has been given the book in France itself. But 1994 is the twentieth anniversary of the death of Daniélou.

A Mass was held in Paris in the Church of St. Ignatius on March 25, 1994. Attending were Cardinal Jean-Marie Lustiger and Father Jacques Orgebin, SJ, the provincial of France. It seems time to look back and reconsider the life of this superb patristics scholar who was a faithful religious and priest, despite the unjust rumors which circulated at the time of his death. It is a happy event to see the *Carnets Spirituels* at last.

The *Carnets Spirituels* are basically notes taken during spiritual retreats between 1936 and 1957, with the bulk represented by his tertianship period in 1940. How much things have changed since then. In 1940 Europe was plunged into war, and the French Jesuits making their tertianship were plagued by anxieties. But Daniélou had an unshakable faith in God, and a thirst for His grace. He is hard on himself, and reproaches himself often for his failures and self-centeredness, for being distracted, for not being wholly centered on the Lord. The notes are filled with references to scripture, the Fathers, poetry, and theology. But especially the liturgy — he loved the rich liturgy of the Church, and was steeped in its prayers.

Though the world around him may have been disturbed, there is a serenity found in this kind of spiritual writing, something perhaps rarely seen today, perhaps no longer possible. If someone once accused him of having a monastic dimension, it may be because of this contemplative's serenity.³

Daniélou was ordained a priest in 1938, and made a cardinal as well as bishop in 1969, probably over his initial protest. But his defense of the honor of Paul VI in the remaining five years of his life is rooted in the notes he would have remembered from tertianship when he pleaded for

the grace of apostolic zeal.⁴ One of the causes of his death was surely the exhausting procession celebrated in Tréguier in the outdoors the day before his death. Ever the Breton, the cardinal wanted to be close to the simple folk who were the Church.

One can criticize the academic career of Daniélou by saying that in his latter years his work was done in haste and at the expense of his popularizing interests. Be that as it may, his motivation was still the same—love of the cross, love of the Catholic Church, love of Divine Love incarnate in Jesus.

Even though the *Notes* do not include his retreats during and after the Council, we get a view of the fresh idealism that was Daniélou's as a young Jesuit. These writings are not academic or polemical. They are the type of spiritual diary known to be kept by saints, the journal of the soul, the record of success and failure in following Christ, the search for grace — and the joy of the Holy Spirit. Though they appeared in book form so many years later than first anticipated, no reader will be disappointed in going through these meditations. For those too young to have known the old formation, or for those unacquainted with his dense literary references, Professor Rondeau has provided hundreds of explanatory footnotes.

Rev. Brian Van Hove, SJ, resides at Les Fontaines, Communauté des Pères, B.P. 219, 60631 Chantilly Cedex, France. November, 1995

¹ Vol. XVII (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1979), pp. 172-173 / 5 cols.

² Wednesday, February 23, 1994, p. 16, under the title: "Il grande oceano tranquillo della preghiera"

³ He says himself: "Spiritualité de la Compagnie: non le dénouement effectif de Jean de la Croix, mais la désappropriation entière et Dieu trouvé dans toutes les créatures; l'entière, délicate docilité à l'Esprit." (p. 359)

⁴ *Carnets Spirituels*, p. 241.

Infallible: An Unresolved Inquiry

by Hans Küng

Continuum; 1994; 289 pages; paperback \$19.95

In 1970 Küng wrote his well-known book denying the infallibility of the Church in general and of the pope in particular. This present book is a reprint of the original, with the addition of a preface by Herbert Haag and of two articles published by Küng in 1979, immediately preceding his being denied the right to call himself a Catholic theologian.

Many persons are unaware that the necessary and sufficient cause of Küng's book was the publication of *Humanae Vitae* in 1968. They are likewise unaware that the reason for his denial of infallibility, as he explains in his book and as Haag explains well in the preface of its reprinting, is that he saw that Pope Paul VI had no choice but to write what he did if the Church is infallible.

Küng faults the Majority Report of the Papal Commission on Birth Control for not realizing this. He saw that Paul VI could not change an infallible teaching, and that the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* is infallible if, indeed, the Church is infallible. Most opponents of *Humanae Vitae* claim that it is not infallible. But Küng, probably its leading opponent, thought otherwise, that is, if one grants the infallibility of the Church. That is why, in order to oppose *Humanae Vitae*, he denied the infallibility of the Church.

His reasoning is: (1) If the Church is infallible, the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* is infallible; (2) The teaching of *Humanae Vitae* is erroneous; (3) Therefore the Church is not infallible.

Küng does, of course, search history for other examples of what he considers to be grave errors made by the Church, but he makes it clear

that *Humanae Vitae* is his chief target.

He ends by claiming that the Catholic Church is “indefectible in truth” though it is fallible and in fact teaches many errors. This word-juggling baffles me, and it has not fooled the Vatican authorities. That Christ’s Church can be “the pillar and ground of truth” while proclaiming dogmatic and moral errors, even on extremely important points, is incomprehensible. That the Church has kept its unity of doctrine so far is due to its infallibility, not to its indefectibility à la Küng.

Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.

Life Scientist: Their Convictions, Their Activities, and Their Values

by Gerard M. Verschuuren
Genesis Pub. Co.; 1995; 273 pages,; hardcover \$34.50

This is a good introductory philosophy of science, particularly philosophy of the life sciences. It is very clearly written, and, in the points it makes, abounds with examples from the history of science. It distinguishes science from ordinary knowledge in virtues of its objectivity and intersubjectivity. Of course these are often not adequately obtained, and the book points out many reasons why this is so.

The author shows that the life sciences, being empirical, cannot deal with ethics. Ethics is another science, which judges empirical sciences from outside them. Some scientists, he says, are determinists, but determinism, in human affairs, is false.

Of particular interest for all scholars is the analysis of “disinterestedness in research and publications,” an analysis which shows that personal or social interests can adversely affect the results reported.

Verschuuren explains also a

growing interest among scientists in a “citation index,” which judges the value of a scientific article exclusively by the number of references to it in later scientific literature. He reports that 50% of scientific articles are not referred to at all, and most of the rest are referred to only once. And scientists are judged by the sum of the references to their articles.

The book also shows the importance of following a code of ethics in dealing with human subjects, and another code in dealing with animal subjects. Knowledge is not the only good, and it must on occasion be limited by personal or social welfare.

Leonard A. Kennedy, C.S.B.
Castries, Saint Lucia

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALBA HOUSE, 2187 Victory Boulevard, Staten Island, NY 10314-6603

Building on Solid Ground: Authentic Values and How to Attain Them, Thomas D. Williams, L.C. xii + 197 pages. \$5.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0749-5.

God Still Speaks: Listen!: Homily Reflections for Sundays and Holy Days — Cycle A, Harold A. Buetow, Ph.D., JD. xliii + 257 pages. \$14.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0727-4.

His Words Shall Guide Us, Terence Cardinal Cooke. 48 pages. \$2.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0757-6.

Hooked on Philosophy: Thomas Aquinas Made Easy, Robert A. O’Donnell, CSP. xii + 110 pages. \$7.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0740-1.

If There is a God, Why Do I Need Braces?, James Penrice. x + 85 pages. \$4.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0735-5.

In the Silence of Solitude: Contemporary Witnesses of the Desert, ed. Eugene L. Romano, HBHJ. xxviii + 112 pages. \$7.50 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0754-1.

Mourning: The Journey from Grief to Healing, Patrick M. Del Zoppo. xxvi + 46 pages. \$3.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0737-1.

Opus Dei: Who? How? Why?, Giuseppe Romano. x + 197 pages. \$9.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0739-8.

They Called Her the Baroness: The Life of Catherine de Hueck Doherty, Lorene Hanley Duquin. xxii + 314 pages. \$19.95 hardback. ISBN: 0-8189-0753-3.

Virginity: A Positive Approach to Celibacy for the Sake of the Kingdom of Heaven, Raniero Cantalamessa, OFM Cap. xvi + 96 pages. \$5.50 paperback. ISBN: 0-8189-0745-2.

BETHANY HOUSE PUBLISHERS, 11300 Hampshire Ave. S, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55438

Daybreak!, Harold Fickett. 288 pages. \$14.95 hardback. ISBN: 1-55661-180-3.

THE CROSSROAD PUBLISHING COMPANY, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10017

An American Emmaus: Faith and Sacrament in the American Culture, Regis A. Duffy. 184 pages. \$15.95 paperback. ISBN: 08245-1540-4.

FOREST OF PEACE PUBLISHING, 251 Muncie Rd, Leavenworth, KS 66048-4946

Feathers on the Wind: Reflections for the Lighthearted Soul, Edward Hays. 128 pages. \$10.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-939516-29-2.

GENESIS PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 1547 Great Pond Road, North Andover, MA 01845-1216

The Road to Understanding: More Than Dreamt of in Your Philosophy, Joseph M. Bochenksi. 137 pages. \$13.95 paperback. ISBN: 1-886670-06-4.

IGNATIUS PRESS, 2515 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94118

A Crisis of Saints, Fr. George Rutler. \$11.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-556-8.

A Moment of Grace: John Cardinal O’Connor on the Catechism of the Catholic Church, John Cardinal O’Connor. 354 pages. \$16.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-554-1.

Angels (and Demons): What Do We Really Know About Them?, Peter Kreeft. \$9.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-550-9.

Arise from Darkness: What to Do When Life Doesn’t Make Sense, Benedict J. Groeschel, C.F.R. 184 pages. \$11.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-525-8.

**Board of Directors
of the Fellowship of
Catholic Scholars
1993-1995**

PRESIDENT

Prof. Gerard V. Bradley
219 Law School
Notre Dame, IN 46556
(O) (219) 631-8385

PRESIDENT EMERITUS

Rev. Msgr. George A. Kelly
107-10 Shore Front Parkway
Rockaway Beach, NY 11694
(H) (718) 945-4856

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY/
TREASURER

Dr. Jude Dougherty
Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064
(O) (202) 319-5259
(H) (301) 299-7886

DIRECTORS

Dr. Carl Anderson
John Paul II Institute
2900 N. Dinwiddie St.
Arlington, VA 22207
(O) (202) 526-3799
(H) (703) 534-9144

Rev. Kenneth Baker, S.J.
Homiletic and Pastoral Review
86 Riverside Dr.
New York, NY 10024
(O) (212) 799-2600

Rev. Cornelius Buckley, S.J.
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117
(O) (415) 666-0123

Sister Timothea Elliot, RSM
St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie
Yonkers, NY 10704
(O) (914) 968-6200

Sister Joan Gormley
Mount St. Mary's Seminary
Emmitsburg, MD 21727-7799
(O) (301) 933-1279
(H) (301) 447-5295

Dr. Michael J. Healy
Franciscan University of Steubenville
Steubenville, OH 43952
(O) (614) 283-6228
(H) (614) 282-2146

Dr. James Hitchcock
University of Saint Louis
St. Louis, MO 63103
(O) (314) 658-2910
(H) (314) 863-1654

Rev. Ronald Lawler, OFM. CAP.
Holy Apostles Seminary
33 Prospect Hill Road
Cromwell, CT 06416
(O) (203) 632-3010
Fax 203-632-0176

Dr. Joyce Little
St. Thomas University
Houston, TX 77006
(O) (713) 522-7911
(H) (301) 956-1936

Dr. William May
John Paul II Institute
487 Michigan Ave. NE
Washington, DC 20017
(O) (202) 526-3799
(H) (301) 946-1037

Dr. Joseph P. Scottino
Gannon University
Erie, PA 16541
(O) (814) 871-7272
(H) (814) 459-6258

Dr. Janet E. Smith
University of Dallas
1845 Northgate Dr.
Irving, TX 75062
(O) (214) 721-5258
(H) (214) 650-0785

Msgr. William B. Smith
St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie
Yonkers, NY 10704
(O) (914) 968-6200 Ext. 8248

Rev. Earl A. Weis, S.J.
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60626
(O) (321) 274-3000

Dr. Kenneth Whitehead
809 Ridge Place
Falls Church, VA 22046
(H) (703) 538-5085

PRESIDENT EMERITUS and
EDITOR OF FCS NEWSLETTER

Prof. Ralph McInerny
Jacques Maritain Center
714 Hesburgh Library
Notre Dame, IN 46556
(O) (219) 631-5825
(H) (219) 232-2960

*"Divine Madness": Plato's Case against
Secular Humanism*, Joseph Pieper
(tr. Lothar Krauth). 59 pages. Paperback.
ISBN: 0-89870-557-6.

*God or Goddess? Femist Theology: What Is
It? Where Does It Lead?*, Manfred Hauke.
\$17.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-559-
2.

*Living the Catechism of the Catholic Church,
Vol. I: The Creed*, Christoph Schönborn.
\$9.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-560-6.

*Marriage: The Rock on which the Family is
Built*, William E. May. 143 pages. \$9.95
paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-537-1.

*Recovery of the Sacred: Reforming the
Reformed Liturgy*, James Hitchcock. 186
pages. \$11.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-
89870-544-4.

*The Church and the Culture War: Secular
Anarchy or Sacred Order*, Joyce Little. 207
pages. \$12.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-
89870-547-9.

The Drama of Atheist Humanism, Henri de
Lubac, S.J. \$24.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-
89870-443-X.

*What Catholics Really Believe: 52 Answers
to Common Misconceptions About the
Catholic Faith*, Karl Keating. 155 pages.
\$8.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89870-553-3.

**PAULIST PRESS, 997 Macarthur
Boulevard, Mahwah, New Jersey
07430**

*Holiness: A Classic Introduction to the
Spiritual Life*, Donald Nicholl. xiv + 158
pages. \$11.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8091-
3113-7.

**PRENTICE HALL,
Upper Saddle River, NJ 07458**

*Moral Issues: Philosophical and Religious
Perspectives*, Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez
(ed.). xvi + 527 pages. Paperback.
ISBN: 0-13-819145-X.

(continued on page 32)

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC., 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, Maryland 20706

Catholicism, Liberalism, and Communitarianism: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition and the Moral Foundations of Democracy, eds. K.L. Grasso, G.V. Bradley, and R.P. Hunt. 360 pages. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 0-8476-7994-2.

SHERWOOD SUGDEN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS, 315 5th Street, Peru, Illinois 61354

Personal Existence after Death: Reductionist Circularities and the Evidence, Robert J. Geis. iii + 136 pages. \$9.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89385-044-6.

The Quantum Enigma: Finding the Hidden Key, Wolfgang Smith. iii + 140 pages. \$14.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-89385-042-X.

SOPHIA INSTITUTE PRESS, Box 5284 Manchester, NH 03108.

O Holy Night: Masterworks of Christmas Poetry, ed. Johann M. Moser. 142 pages. \$20.00 hardback. ISBN: 0-918477-24-7.

Wood of the Cradle, Wood of the Cross: the little way of the infant Jesus, Caryll Houselander. 166 pages. \$14.95 hardback. ISBN: 0-918477-32-8.

ST. PAUL BOOKS & MEDIA, 50 St. Paul's Avenue, Boston, MA 02130

Saint Anthony: Words of Fire, Life of Light, Madeline Pecora Nugent, SFO. 408 pages. \$10.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-8198-8.

SOPHIA INSTITUTE PRESS, Box 5284, Manchester, NH 03108

Creed or Chaos?, Dorothy L. Sayers. ix + 116 pages. \$14.95 hardback. ISBN: 0-918477-27-1.

The Ways of God, attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas. viii + 82 pages. \$7.95 paperback. ISBN: 0-918477-30-1.

TAN BOOKS AND PUBLISHERS, INC., P.O. Box 424, Rockford, Illinois 61105

Ven. Jacinta Marto of Fatima, Msgr. Joseph A. Cirrincione. 69 pages. \$1.50 paperback. ISBN: 0-89555-480-1.

TOUCHSTONE BOOKS, 1230 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020

The Sorrow, the Sacrifice, and the Triumph: The Apparitions, Visions, and Prophecies of Christina Gallagher, Thomas W. Petrisko. 300 pages. \$12.00 paperback. ISBN: 0-684-80388-7.

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, 3211 Fourth Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017-1194

Faithful for Life: A Moral Reflection, A Statement from the U.S. Bishops (Publication No. 5-019). 30 pages. Paperback. ISBN: 1-57455-019-5.

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

Box 495

Notre Dame, IN 46556

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Notre Dame, Indiana
Permit No. 10

Fellowship
of Catholic
Scholars
Newsletter