

FELLOWSHIP OF CATHOLIC SCHOLARS

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 4

SEPTEMBER 1979

Letter From President James Hitchcock

Most of us are involved in the world of publishing, professional organizations, workshops, etc. We naturally hope to reach, and influence, as wide an audience as possible. We are acutely aware of the great questions that hang over us, and we want to influence the future course of events in the Church and the world.

But in the present crisis we should never forget our primary duties to our students. Recently a young priest, teaching college philosophy, told me a familiar story. He was talking about the soul in one of his classes. A few students were aggressively resistant to the very idea. But after class a girl came up to him to express her gratitude. She wanted to believe in the soul, she said, but she had been told in a psychology class that it was impossible. She was grateful that someone offered her intellectual reasons for her belief.

Anyone sensitive to the present student generation knows that much of the anti-religious hostility of a few years has largely dissipated. However, the reasons for this are not altogether reassuring. Many students seem to lack resentment against the Church because the Church has simply never penetrated very deeply into their lives. They have been described as religiously illiterate.

The path of least resistance for the professor is to assume that most students are not interested in religion and to handle potentially difficult subjects as unobtrusively as possible. But to do this is obviously to shirk a major responsibility. Faculty, who go on year after year, often forget how short a student generation is. Often we have only a year or two, sometimes a single semester, to influence people in ways which may last the rest of their lives.

If students, while in college, are not exposed to a solid knowledge of their faith, where will they get it? For all the hopeful talk about adult education, it does not reach more than a small minority of its potential clientele. Every survey shows that even most college graduates rarely read a "serious" book. (Because of the techniques of ballyhoo, if they do pick one up it is likely to be the wrong kind.)

Only in college, for the most part, can Catholic students hope to attain any kind of solid grounding for adult faith. It is no secret that, in the past ten or fifteen years, it is debatable whether they have been getting it.

Catholic educators have been hyper-sensitive to the charge of indoctrination. The blunt truth is that all kinds of indoctrination goes on in college classrooms, even in the most prestigious schools. However, we do not have to take refuge in that argument, true though it is. Right now it is the case that most Catholic students, far from being indoctrinated with Catholic doctrine, are lucky if they even get an adequate exposure to it.

One of the most important tasks the Fellowship can accomplish is to help bring about the revitalization of Catholic undergraduate education in this country. Members who have ideas or experiences useful towards that end will find many willing listeners.

Fellowship Friend

Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., D.D.

Foundation Members

William J. Isaacson (Chicago)

Msgr. D. A. Brady (Waterlow, Iowa)

Rev. Bernard J. Rosinski, S.C.J., (Muncie)

Fellowship Appointments

Fr. Robert Levis will become co-chairman of education; Dr. Joseph Graham, Sr. M. Christopher, and Dr. Teresa Johnson will chair the committees on philosophy, religious life, and women – respectively.

Convention Remarks of Fr. Ronald Lawler

We must not for a moment fear that nothing effective can be done. Great and good things can be done. If God allows some evils of our own fashioning to fall upon us, it is that he might call us to greatness of heart and action. Surely He has given us every motive to act with confident hearts. We have tasted the grandeur and goodness of Catholic faith. We know the power of faith to heal and to give energy even in broken cultures. We see the resources that God has given us today – not

least, we know what useful scholarly resources are available to serve the faith.

But, as St. Augustine realized in his personal crisis of faith in the *Confessions*, the point is not to wish that better things may happen, but to will what must be willed, and *do* what must be done, as grace gives us power to act. My brothers, as St. Francis used to say, let us begin! This Fellowship is a call to you to do more creative work yourself.

Quotable Quotes from the Convention

● John Cardinal Carberry

What we teach, what we proclaim, must correspond to the truth. There must be, as St. Thomas put it, and “adequatio intellectus et rei”. We cannot pass something off as authentic when it is, in fact, ersatz. We cannot be faithful Catholic scholars or a community of Catholic scholars within a Catholic institution and declare that an explanation of the faith is in accord with Catholic teaching when in point of fact it blatantly contradicts the magisterium of the Church. The Second Vatican Council stresses the fact that we do not communicate our own wisdom, but the Wisdom of God as understood by the Body of Christ, the Church. Faithfulness to the magisterium is, therefore, of paramount importance in the communication of saving truth. To state otherwise is to contradict one of the basic rules of theological hermeneutics, that what we communicate must be in harmony with reality, it must give this reality a new mode of existence by our proclamation and explanation of it. By no means am I condemning creativity among Catholic scholars. After all, Pope Paul VI says that we are to penetrate, purify and express the faith in terms that are new and original. But when someone raises a trail balloon, then let him clearly say so; when someone expresses a private opinion, then let him say so; when someone dissents from the teaching of the Church, then let him admit it and not try to say that he is within the frontiers of the faith, as it is understood by the Church, “the ground and bulwark of the truth”.

● Sister Carolyn McGinty, C.S.J. (Rosary College)

The relationship of literature and faith is still evident in the power of literature to make the transcendent perceptible. Since the 1950's the world of faith and the world of literary art have been converging upon one another, bringing into sharper focus the religious significance of deeper themes of current literature – especially the

intense expression of modern man's search for a soul, for inner peace. Literature does not have to be used as propaganda for a particular moral code or as a lesson for a specific doctrine. A literature grows out of the beliefs of its age, so that as Milton's Hell differs from Dante's Inferno, today we expect a different literature about contemporary man: “a literature of metaphysical isolation, for the modern artist has experienced a great loneliness, the kind of loneliness known by the soul when, unaided by ministries either of Church or of culture, it undertakes the adventure of discovering the fundamental principles of meaning.” By vividly portraying man's awareness of good and evil, his conviction that he transcends his body, literature can arouse faith and focus man's attention on eternal truth. One has only to recall in American literature the works of William Faulkner, Flannery O'Connor, Saul Bellow, among others.

Nathan Scott, Jr. who has written much that is hopeful about the relation of literature and theology, sees literature as possibly sacramental – an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace showing what in the nature of reality can be counted on to sanctify human existence. Scott asks if it is any longer possible for the world to be encountered as sacramental, as tabernacling grace and glory, and as inviting prayers of praise and thanksgiving. That the question is being asked ever more urgently in our day, he regards as evidence of a deep yearning to find the essential structure of reality to be a sacramental pattern of our relationship to the world. We want to find ourselves amidst a world in which all created things are indwelt by grace and holiness and the life of God as they were for Gerard Manley Hopkins: “The world is charged with the grandeur of God/ . . . Because the holy Ghost over the bent/ World broods with warm breast and with ah! bright wings/”

● **Dr. Andree Emery** (*Hacker Psychiatric Clinic, Los Angeles*)

What is unique to our times is the acceleration of the rate of change and the great speed and reach of communication. We build and tear down more rapidly and on a far larger scale than did any other age. While we live in greater material comfort in most parts of the world than anyone ever did in past centuries, we are more confused, less secure, more in need to hold on to substantial and permanent truths than men ever were. Yet, to use the biblical expression, "we heap coal on our heads" by disclaiming responsibility.

To mention only one example of inexcusable passivity in face of serious challenge: We hear much criticism of the media, particularly of TV programming. Some of my colleagues and I have a greater quarrel with TV advertising. You know that a child even before he enters first grade is exposed to several thousand – some say more than ten thousand – hours of TV. Every few minutes he sees an ad, technically vastly superior to the programs and hence exceedingly effective, which gives the child to understand – regardless of the quality of the product – that any problem can be solved or ameliorated in seconds by eating something, drinking something, or buying something. This is true brainwashing: continuous repetition of the same magic in different guises. Even babies who cannot read get the message: everyone looks unhappy, upset, perplexed until they pop something into their mouth or hug something to their bosom or ride in something. A second after this magic thing appears, men, women and children on the screen are smiling, embracing, dancing, acting happy.

Can we be astonished that there is no tolerance for frustration? Success must be immediate. Who but a fool would take pains or have patience? endure and sacrifice? This thing, TV advertising may look like a fashion – because what it deals with changes rapidly – but it is not fashion. It is the vehicle of massive culture change.

● **Rev. Frederick M. Jelly, O.P.**
On The Priesthood

The predominant topic for discussion, which covered several of the above questions, was the basis for the permanence of the priestly commitment. It is interesting and encouraging for us to note now that, while it took place more than a month prior to Pope John Paul II's two letters on the priesthood, this same theme of the permanency of Orders was a primary stress in his

letters both to the Bishops and the Priests. For the sake of simplifying, the following synthesis of our discussions is narrated in the "historical present".

Although the ontological reality of the priesthood is basic to any consideration of the mystery, it is not sufficient of itself to address the problems of permanency in the presbyterate. Several other factors such as, the relative ease of granting dispensations, the collapse of faith, the indifference of brother priests to those with problems, the turning to women for understanding and consolation, the ordaining of immature men, the paradoxical contempt of both divine grace and human dignity, the general level of levity in our society, etc. must be taken into account. The very polarization of the ontological vs. the functional definitions of priesthood is symptomatic of contemporary culture's desire for changes that are opposed to the needs of the Church. Eric Mascall's excellent book, *Theology & the Gospel of Christ: An Essay in Reorientation*, contains some suggestive observations about the notion of sacramental character as *relation* (cf. pp. 211 ff.). When confronting some of the more practical questions regarding permanency, as the inadequacies of priestly formation leading to lack of maturity at time of ordination, one must be careful not to criticize "at a distance" without really trying to grasp the complex issues involved. This does harm both to the individual candidate and to the institution of the seminary. Each one involved is called to co-responsibility in forming our future priests. He/she should come to take a closer look at the seminary program, and so be better prepared to make constructive criticism.

Discussion about the central issue of permanency in the priestly commitment must concern itself with the concept of consecrated celibacy. One of the practical problems connected with this dedicated discipleship of the celibate is the mentality which seems to propagate the conviction that celibacy will inevitably become optional for diocesan priests. It also appears to tie in with the *societal* syndrome of the "second vocation or career". When problems arise in this area, and they seem to come up in the lives of most priests, too many in recent years have sought the solutions in psychological instruments *in place of* the ordinary means of grace as the sacrament of Reconciliation. Similarly, especially during the period of formation, sociology has become a *substitute* for philosophy as the "handmaid" of theology. And within the philosophy that is offered, experimental psychology frequently *replaces* rational psychology.

This has prevented our students and younger priests from conceiving the mystery of priestly life and ministry in categories more open to permanency of commitment. The theology of priesthood emphasizing a special and permanent relationship of the ordained priest with Christ (*agere sequitur esse*, and so the priest is called to act *in persona Christi*) is often looked upon as outmoded. This *must* affect the question of permanency!

Concluding Report of the Board at St. Louis Convention

Fr. Frederick Jelly, O.P., associate secretary, records the following ongoing suggestions for Fellowship action: (1) The 1980 Convention continues its study of the priesthood, especially its permanent commitment; (2) directing the attention of Bishops to the contemporary problems in Religious Life; (3) special interest be taken in philosophy and to a follow-up overview such as was contained *Aeterni Patris* in the last century; (4) Fellowship members are entitled to take political positions, even on Church matters, while such activity itself is not proper to the Fellowship as a body of scholars.

The ACCU-Identity and Purpose Committee — NCEA

The AACU (American Association of Catholic Universities — the College division of NCEA) has several sub-committees of the Board of Trustees. One of these is the Identity and Purpose Committee. This committee is preparing a draft of an Identity Statement which would eventually be distributed to all Catholic colleges across the nation for comments and discussion. The Committee itself does not know whether any identity statement is desirable at this point in history. Feedback from the colleges and universities throughout the country may decide whether any statement should be made at all.

The suggestion favoring an Identity Statement for voluntary adoption by Catholic colleges in the United States was made by a prominent mid-west educator. His statement emphasizes, among other concepts, that in order to have a Catholic university, the university must have dedicated and committed Catholics on its staff. All efforts should be made to be sure that such Catholic scholars are hired, retained and rewarded by the Catholic university. The Catholic university cannot survive without a predominance of such scholars on its faculty.

A statement of identity would be welcomed by many Catholic colleges across the country. A college may or may not decide to adopt it for itself. Members of the Fellowship ought to be

aware of this Identity Draft Statement and prepare comments not only for NCEA, but this *Newsletter*.

The Marvel of John Paul II

Although John Paul II seems to be a smashing success with the Italian people, word from Rome suggests that there is more reserve toward the new Pope in the academic community. Part of the reason may be his direct manner of saying what is on his mind — which also runs counter to what some professors would have him say. A sample of the Pope's style and content of his mind (and faith) can be found in his June 5th paper presented to the Polish bishops' meeting in Czestochowa. Directing his remarks to the normalization of Church-State relations in his homeland, he reminded the bishops of their importance as hierarchy.

"The hierarchical order is a constitutive element of Christ's Church

"When national and state structures were lacking [in Poland], society, for the most part Catholic, found support in the hierarchical order of the Church

"When in the year 1000 there arose in Poland the fundamental structure of the hierarchical order of the Church, it arose, right from the beginning, in the unity of the hierarchy with the order of the universal Church — that is to say with the Apostolic See. In this relationship the structure of the Church has lasted uninterruptedly in our motherland until today. Thanks to this, Poland is Catholic and 'ever faithful.' The unity of the hierarchical structure, the bond between the Polish episcopate and the See of Peter constitutes the basis of this unity in its universal dimension." (*Origins*, June 21, 1979)

Fellowship's Committee on the Liturgy

The task of the Committee involves the following:

1. Determine the nature of our contribution. We need to communicate with Bishops, ICEL, and scholars to discover what role we can play.
2. Summarize and study the official directives for translation of the liturgy.
3. Elaborate principles of grammar and rhetoric with special emphasis on style.
4. Clarify the Catholic doctrine of the Mass.
5. Analyze ICEL (International Committee for English in the Liturgy) translations.
6. Produce suggested translations.

Volunteers to develop working papers on any of these should communicate with John Hittinger, Coordinator, Box N9, Benedictine College, Atchison, Ks 66002.

Editorial — Witnessing Christ's Truth

There is only one reason why anyone should listen to the Catholic Church: Recognition of the credibility of the Church's unique claim to speak the truth about man's relationship with God.

Not necessarily the whole truth at any given time, not all the truth available to humankind, not even revealed truth perfectly formulated.

But nonetheless truth which is certain about man's redemption and salvation.

In announcing this truth the Church does no more than follow Christ who first made this claim before Pontius Pilate: "I came into the world for this: to bear witness to the truth and all who are on the side of truth listen to my voice." (John 18:37)

For some strange reason, Pilate's response, more than Christ's words, dominates respectable segments of contemporary Catholicism: "Truth? What is that?"

A maddening fixation of some Catholic writers on the alleged fallibility of virtually all Church pronouncements makes it difficult for Catholics to recognize those Church teachings which ought to be accepted.

The faithful are being encouraged from within the Church to doubt the possibility of knowing Christ's truth. They are practically being urged to seek their salvation in anything but that truth — in free expression, in personality development, in sexual fulfillment, in social uplift. All these, of course, are substitutes for salvation prepared by unbelievers, who long ago decided that saving truth is unobtainable.

The secularist would have religious persons search for whatever salvation they need in human science and its applications, not in a wisdom proclaimed from on high either by a mysterious God or long ago by a problematic Jesus.

Obviously the secularist wants the Church of Christ to be a gathering place for nominal Christians only, and wants Jesus to be nonessential, even if helpful — to the salvation preached in his name.

But without truth, what is freedom or fulfillment or uplift? Is there no content to what Christ told Pilate? Have we, like the jesting Pilate, begun to walk away from Christ without waiting for his answer?

Historically, even persons who are not Catholic often have been grateful to the Church for asserting Christ's truth with Christ's vigor — even against some who have taught falsely in the name of Christ from within the Church herself. But the Church today faces a new problem. Modern dissenters seldom openly deny Catholic doctrine. More often they explain it away, minimize its importance, or raise doubts about its relevance for Christian life today. On the pretext of searching for new understandings they call the most constant and firm Catholic teachings into doubt in the minds of many faithful.

When challenged, today's scholarly dissenters use various defenses. Sometimes they hide behind a respectable facade "development of doctrine", "academic freedom", and so on, hoping thereby to gain sanctuary from discipline by the Church's divinely authorized teachers. Or they seek support for their views from peers or in public opinion, even when the Pope or bishops officially declare the opposite of these views. Banding together in cliques, dissenting scholars unilaterally declare that the Church's *magisterium* offers only a dubious interpretation of Christ's mind. They then proceed to teach contradictory doctrines as probable. Sometimes they offer their own opinion as legitimate expressions of a new magisterium, which is able to discern and proclaim what God's ongoing revelation has to say.

Modern scholarly dissenters are not above abusing Catholic terminology to misrepresent opinions more than once rejected by the Holy See. They often suppose that no teaching is infallibly proposed unless it is solemnly defined. They also distort the distinction between infallible teaching and noninfallible teaching in order to make the latter seem dubious, possible erroneous, and so subject to correction by experts. The fact of the matter is that many teachings of the Church are infallibly proposed without being defined; every truth which has been defined once was in this category. Moreover, even those teachings of the Church which are not proposed infallibly — for example, judgments by the Holy See are genuinely new questions, such as *in vitro* human fertilization — deserve religious assent (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, 25).

The successors of the apostles seldom, if ever, unconditionally assert noninfallible doctrines. When they teach day in and day out what explicitly or implicitly pertains to Revelation, when they say what they must to explain and defend God's Word, they articulate the

infallible truth received in the faith of the Church. Such day by day teachings, not only rare *solemn* pronouncements, are certainly true. The attempt to limit infallibility to defined doctrine is a device to render tolerable the assertion of opinions which contradict points of Catholic belief which have been infallibly proposed, although never defined.

The contemporary Catholic problem is compounded by friends in court of the dissenters who personally adhere to the Church's teaching but who fail to provide the scholarly criticism, which ought to be the self-correcting mechanism to keep the theological community intellectually responsible and honest. Few professional Catholic journals today publish vigorous criticism of the writings of dissenters. Such criticism is commonplace in other fields of scholarship reported in secular journals. However, journals which seldom contain sharp criticism of peer opinions often contain caustic polemics against the magisterium and its restatements of Catholic teaching.

By this failure to evaluate critically the novel opinions of peers, friends in court of dissenters seem to manifest a false belief that academic freedom and doctrinal development are higher in the Christian scale of values than assent to Church teachings and obedience to Church laws. In this belief they adopt the standards of secular humanists who explore all uncertainties by human inquiry more than they follow the way of Christ's disciples who put faith in him and who therefore have a most pious regard for his body, the Church.

In the past, doctrinal development often has come from creative thinking usually during controversies with heretics, and sometimes by an orthodox scholar who has been temporarily silenced or censured by Church authority. In such instances the new insight has added to previous understanding of divine Revelation but not contradicting any truths already witnessed in the Church's documents. Today's dissent, however, is not an advance in Catholic thought in areas previously left imprecise by the Church. There might be areas – such as the theology of war and peace – where such development is possible and needed. But, today's dissent is an amalgam of denials and confusions of essential – and sometimes fundamental, Catholic truths – the bodily resurrection of Christ, the virginity of his mother, the establishment by Christ of the Church and the priesthood, the sacrificial character of the Mass and the bodily presence of Jesus in the Eucharist, the right and duty of the Church to regulate the administration of the sacraments and religious life, and many of the moral norms Christians must try to follow if they would enjoy eternal life.

Intransigent dissent has dug itself deeper into the Church body and is more widespread today than immediately after the Second Vatican Council, when only Catholic moral standards were seriously questioned. The venerable name of Cardinal Newman is regularly invoked in justification of this activity, as if this convert and genius would be pleased with what is now going on the Catholic Church. The saintly priest in *Grammar of Assent* said that religion must be based on certainties, in *Parochial and Plain Sermons* told his hearers to "seek truth in the way of obedience", in his *Essay on the Development of Doctrine* declared the authority of Pope and bishop over the handling on of Christ's revealed religion. Newman made these assertions fully conscious of excesses to which authority figures sometimes go. Were he alive today he surely would be the rigorous intellectual foe of those dissenters within the Roman Church who deny or render unclear so many Catholic truths which he so valiantly defended during his lifetime.

John Henry Newman made great sacrifices to leave his beloved Church of England for Rome *because he came to believe that the Catholic Church offered its faith as revealed by Christ and as true and taught that faith universally to mankind from the beginning precisely as true*. No mean scholar himself – he engaged in creative meditation on that faith – he came to Rome convinced that the truth of Christ's faith is guaranteed by the authority of Pope and bishops, not by the private judgment of even the most learned or pious men.

If scholars cannot carry out their teaching or research duties with fidelity to the magisterium, they ought as a matter of personal integrity and fairness to other members of the Church to withdraw from their Catholic positions and to give up the privileges which pertain to them. Other scholars ought fearlessly to make clear the precise status of the dissenters' conclusions and the unsoundness of their arguments. Bishops just as fearlessly should criticize the reasoning of dissenters and make clear their departure from Catholic truth. As a last resort, the highest Church officers, not excluding the Pope, should with the authoritative voice of Christ define and defend the truths committed to them by Christ as they were to no others.

George A. Kelly

Items of Interest

WORKSHOP IN CATHOLIC MORAL THOUGHT WAS HELD AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA FROM JUNE 17-21, 1979.

The Workshop, sponsored by the Archdiocese of Washington and William Cardinal Baum, proved to be an interesting example of collaboration between the hierarchy and members of the Church's academic community.

Although Vatican II called for vigorous renewal in moral theology, authentic renewal has been obscured by unfortunate dissent, often highly publicized, often rejecting some of the most basic principles of the Church taught through the centuries.

Two well-known lay moralists, Professor William May, of The Catholic University of America, and Professor Germain Grisez, of Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, first offered the suggestion of this Workshop to Cardinal Baum. Together with Father Ronald Lawler, of Catholic University, and Father Lorenzo Albacete, the Archbishop's Theological Secretary, and with Bishop Thomas Lyons, they developed the theme and details of the program. Fr. William Lori of Washington acted as project coordinator.

Well-known scholars from Europe and the United States discussed the most important and pressing issues of our time. They defended the Church's morality and moral absolutes against the enervating consequentialism which has been the theoretical prop of dissent. They stressed the importance of free will, and of Catholic interpretations of any fundamental option theory. Both the sacredness of conscience and the basic duty to form conscience properly were discussed, along with Aquinas' explanation of natural law, and Vatican II's restatement of that law. The significance of Christian faith for Christian morality, and responsibilities of Christian people flowing therefrom received full treatment.

Well-known and highly publicized dissent positions were confronted in this Workshop. Recent Church documents have insisted that some dissent positions are not only wrong, but unacceptable options for Catholic theology. Church exclusion of these unacceptable positions was shown to be, not the result of theological narrowness, as a requirement of faith.

Some dissenters expressed unhappiness that dissenters were not also vigorously defended.

● WORKSHOP: CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY AND PRIESTLY FORMATION

A Workshop on "Philosophy and the Priest Today" will be held at The Catholic University of

America on the weekend of November 9-11, 1979.

The purpose of the Workshop is to explore the role of Christian philosophy in the education of future priests. Many problems that touch faith today have philosophical roots; and many have been concerned by the rather common failure to accept the vigorous renewal in Christian philosophy urged by Vatican II as an essential part of priestly formation.

On the part of many there is anxiety about the general intellectual preparation of young men for the priesthood. The lectures and discussions will be seeking some realistic solution to such problems.

Among the speakers will be Professor Ralph McNerny, of Notre Dame University, who will give the keynote address on Friday evening. Bishop Michael J. Murphy, of Erie, Chairman of the Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation, will address the Workshop on Sunday morning.

For further information, write Rev. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap., School of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20064.

- In his syndicated column for the secular press (published July 1, 1979), Fr. Andrew Greeley, after citing some evidence for a drift back to religious practice by Catholics over 30, asks this question: "What are these Catholics discovering as they drift back to the Church?"

He answers as follows:

"In many dioceses, they encounter a church more authoritarian and legalistic than the one from which they tried to escape. Authoritarian priests and bishops have established guidelines which are even more restrictive.

"The guidelines cover nearly all church services: having your child baptized, getting your father or mother buried, first communion or confirmation for kids, even getting married. And they are tough, too. In some dioceses, children are not to be baptized unless parents promise to attend mass every week. An adolescent cannot be confirmed unless he makes a similar commitment. Two people cannot get married unless they take six instructions in the Catholic faith, undergo six months of preparation and commit themselves to regular religious practice. There is one diocese I know of that requires people who want to get married to see a psychiatrist."

- *Collegville, Minn.* — Dr. R. Kenton Craven, Fellowship member, has been appointed administrative director of the Human Life Center (HLC) at St. John's University here. Dr. Craven leaves the English department at Wartburg College in Waverly, Iowa.

Fr. Paul Marx, O.S.B. will remain as executive

director and devote more of his time to research, writing and lecturing.

At the Human Life Center, Dr. Craven will oversee the budget and staff of 17 full-time and 20 part-time employees; supervise the educational programs; conduct fundraising; and coordinate public relations. The Human Life Center, active in more than 50 countries, seeks to foster human life from conception through natural death. HLC programs include seminars, workshops and publications including "The International Review of Natural Family Planning."

- *The Catholic Standard* of the Archdiocese of Washington carried the following news report on July 5, 1979.

"Father Charles E. Curran is in the news again. He's not sure he approves of Pope John Paul II.

"The Catholic University professor spoke at a Religious Studies Institute at Baltimore's Notre Dame College. The Baltimore Sun reported on his visit. In its lead paragraph the Sun said:

'An influential Catholic theologian said yesterday he is 'fearful' that Pope John Paul II may be heading toward 'overcentralization of the papacy' and a dangerous abrogation of academic freedom in church-run universities and seminaries.'

"The news story didn't elaborate on Father Curran's fears of overcentralization of the papacy but said his fear on educational freedom referred to the Pope's recent document on pontifical education institutions. Father Curran said that is the mandate is followed literally, 'it would, in my judgment, be contrary to the notion of an American university and of academic freedom.'

"There were pickets at Notre Dame College, led by the Baltimore chapter of Catholics United for the Faith, objecting to what they called serious departures from orthodoxy in Father Curran's writings.

"The Sun reported Father Curran's response to this: 'Dressed in a gray seersucker suit, plaid shirt and blue tie, the tall priest made several lighthearted references to the demonstrations organized against him here and elsewhere by conservative Catholics. His friends and associates marvel at this notice, he said, 'because really I'm so conservative.' — D.F."

- Monsignor Reynold Hillenbrand, a pioneer in the promotion of the Christian Family Movement and other forms of Catholic Action died May 22nd at the age of 74. He was one of Chicago's most influential priests.

- A Symposium on the 100th anniversary of Leo XIII's *Aeterni Patris* "Wisdom of Catholic Philosophy" has been scheduled for Gannon Col-

lege September 13-14, 1979. Dr. Martin Larrey and Fr. Stephen Minkiel, C.M. are in charge.

- *The San Francisco Chronicle* (May 24, 1979) reports that educational psychologist Jeremy Bergman of Bowling Green State University, Ohio has a suggestion: If spouses have IQ's above 80, earn more than \$8,000 a year, have no serious emotional problems and know how to care for children, they would receive a license from the government to have a baby.

According to Bergman problems of energy and food supplies make it necessary for governments to look at such a proposal. Says Bergman: "Many scientists think licensing of parents is inevitable."

(Editor's note: Margaret Sanger proposed the same thing in *The American Weekly* under the title "American Baby Code", May 27, 1934 — long before there were problems of energy or food supplies.)

- Fr. Lawler received from the Secretariat of State in Rome a letter of thanks to the Fellowship for its greetings to John Paul II on his ascendancy to the Papacy.

- Mary Joyce has an article "Reflections on Women Priests" in *Sisters Today*. October 1976 which merits rereading.

- Daniel D. McGarry, retired professor of history at St. Louis University, is republishing *Educational Freedom*. His Winter issue — 1979 deals with "Secularism in Public Education." The contents and bibliography are valuable. For further information write him at *Educational Freedom Foundation*, 20 Parkland, Glendale, St. Louis, Missouri 63122.

- Hanna Klaus, M.D. "Natural Family Planning: The Contribution of Fertility Awareness to Body-Person Integration" in *Social Thought*, Winter 1979.

- Members who have not read, or who may have misplaced the trilogy of articles by Rev. Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J. on PAPAL MAGISTERIUM AND HUMANA VITAE: ACADEMIC DISSENT: AN ORIGINAL ECCLESIOLOGY: and PAPAL MAGISTERIUM, NATURAL LAW AND HUMANA VITAE will find these discourses included in his new work THE HISTORICAL CREDIBILITY OF HANS KUNG — Christopher Publishing House, 53 Billings Road, North Quincy, Massachusetts 02171 (\$12.95). They can be found in the Appendices beginning page 285.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Book Reviews

“Eglise de France, Prends Garde de Perdre la Foi!”
by Gaston Fessard, S.J. (Juillard. Paris, 1979,
présenté par Henri de Lubac de l’Institut Catho-
lique)

The author of the book under review was a French Jesuit belonging to the generation of “giants” produced by the Church in France all through this century. He was found dead at his desk in Trinité de Porto Vecchio, Corsica, on Sunday morning, June 18, 1978. This was just after he had sent to press the corrected proofs of his last book — “Chrétiens Marxistes et Théologie de la Libération: itinéraire de Père J. Girardi” (Lethielleux, Paris, 1978, coll. Le Sycomore — the promising successor of “Museum Lessianum” published by the French-speaking Belgian Jesuits.) On top of his desk was found the manuscript, nearly ready for publication, of the present work. It was edited by his friend Fr. Henri de Lubac who needs no further introduction.

This book is unique for our times because of its author, its content, and its editor. That all these should coalesce is quite remarkable.

My readers surely know about the two previous booklets published by Fr. Fessard in very critical periods. They bear a similar title and are constructed in the same way. As he said in his own words, “The title, the plan, and the argument are strictly parallel.”

The first of these was published anonymously as the first “Cahier clandestin de Témoignage Chrétien” (a collection begun mainly by Frs. Chaillet and de Lubac) under the title “France, prends garde de perdre ton âme!” (Juillet, 1941). This book contained a conference delivered by Fessard in the church of St. Louis at Vichy, then capital of “France” under the puppet government of Pétain. Fessard had openly denounced the moral impossibility for French Catholics of collaborating in any way with Nazism. He had already established a parallel between Nazism and Communism, both radically antichristian outgrowths of Hegel’s inverted Christianity (*Christianisme*). The author went underground because of his stand, and barely survived. It was his colleague, Fr. R. d’Ouinice, S.J., then editor of “Etudes”, an influential French Catholic review at that time, who saved him. On Feb. 29, 1944, the Gestapo came looking for Fessard in the Jesuit house at “Rue Monsieur” in Paris. Fr. d’Ouinice aided his escape from the house just in time.

After the liberation of France, when the French Communists headed by Thorez were carrying on their strategy of “la main tendue” in regard

to the Catholic Church, Fessard could finally publish in 1946, only after great difficulties, his “France, prends garde de perdre ta liberté!”. This was in the same publishing house of “Témoignage Chrétien”, and the book warned against the illusion of collaborating with an ideology that appeared to him the exact though inverted pendant of Nazism, i.e. Marxist Communism.

The small book was not an expression of fanatic anti-communism. It showed a rational and methodical conviction. We can see this by quoting Alexandre Kojève at the time of its publication, “la présentation de la métaphysique communiste. . . (témoigne) . . . une connaissance et . . . une compréhension qu’on ne trouve pour ainsi dire jamais chez les adeptes de la doctrine critiquée.” And he added, “S’il l’avait voulu l’auteur serait certainement, et de loin, le meilleur théoricien du marxisme en France.” And Kojève knew, since Fessard was one of the very few but highly selected students who, from 1933 to 1939, followed his course in “L’Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes de La Sorbonne” on the religious philosophy of Hegel. This was in the company of such others as E. Weil, R. Aron, G. Bataille, Merleau-Ponty, Lacan, and others known better in France.

Fr. Fessard had to pay a very high price because of his stand against Communism. He had to bear misunderstanding, injustice, and even contempt, even within the Church and among the Jesuits in France.

Toward the end of his life he became increasingly worried about the growing influence of Marxism inside the Catholic Church in France. After 1970 he stopped all other work and dedicated himself to the completion of his last two books already mentioned. He called the last one, the one he left unpublished, “un cri d’alarm” to warn his beloved Church not to continue on a path that ends in a perversion of the Faith. The book follows the same pattern as the two booklets that appeared in the 1940’s. It is divided into three sections that intend to uncover the critical danger to which the Church in France is submitted: seduction, engagement, and perversion (*séduire, compromettre, pervertir ou détruire*).

But what is so special about such a book? Fr. Fessard proves that such incredible “marxization” or contamination by Marxism of the Church is fostered, first of all, by the stands taken by the French bishops, especially after 1972.

So the book is published “cum permissu superiorum” but without the “imprimatur” of any bishop. The book is a fiercely critical though rationally sustained accusation against the “Com-

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

mission Episcopale de Monde Ouvrier" and of the entire French hierarchy (with the exceptions of Bishops Matagrín, Derouet, and now Cardinal Elchinger). And the man who has taken the responsibility for publishing it is the most distinguished French Jesuit alive, now 83, known to everyone for his loyal obedience to the Church, manifested with "grandeur ou éclat" — Fr. Henri de Lubac, S.J. We all remember when "Humani Generis" was published in 1951, blocking "la nouvelle théologie" of which Fr. de Lubac was the most significant exponent. Fessard's book was published by a man, furthermore, who happens to be the exclusive recipient of a personal letter from Pope Paul VI — the only one ever written by a pope to a living theologian blessing his entire theological work. (I must add that it has been passed over by most people in the Church, though Fr. de Lubac's modesty is responsible for much of that.) Indeed, Paul VI wrote a four-page autographed letter to Fr. de Lubac on Feb. 20, 1976, when the French theologian celebrated his 80th birthday.

This review is written in the middle of June, almost exactly one full year since Fessard's death. It comes from the periphery of the Western cultural sphere. By now, there surely have been notable reactions to the book. Probably this reviewer will not even have access to those critiques for several months, if ever. But I have taken the opportunity to present Fr. Fessard's posthumous book to a distinguished audience through the FCS Newsletter. I have no other way to express my concern for the Latin American Church which is being exposed to the same danger as the French Church, with this important exception: The Latin American bishops, so far, and with only a few unimportant exceptions have not fallen into the trap laid open for them from *within* the Church. I therefore take this occasion to express my own cry of anguish, and to pray that the North American bishops and theologians will help our bishops before they are seduced as the French bishops have been already.

Julio Roque de Escobar, S.J.

(Fr. Roque is assigned to Centro Bellarmino Santiago, Dominican Republic)

The Totalitarian Temptation by Jean-Francois Revell. New York: Doubleday, 1977. 311 pp. \$8.95.

Although the French social philosopher Jean-Francois Revell himself is a "socialist" (a term he

reserves for those opponents of capitalism who want to reconcile socialism and political democracy, and who are virulently anti-Stalinist), he staunchly defends capitalism (i.e., an economic system characterized by private or corporation ownership of capital goods, by investments that are determined by private decision rather than by state control, and by prices, production, and distribution of goods that are determined mainly in a free market) against what he deems to be unfair and unwarranted criticisms. In so doing, Mr. Revell demonstrates a remarkable intellectual integrity and honesty, which permeate his entire work.

According to Revell, in spite of all the evidences of capitalism's achievements, many persons continue to be seduced by totalitarian leaders and movements. Mr. Revell fears that, "The totalitarian temptation may well prove more powerful than the yearning for socialism, the hatred of capitalism violent enough to make acceptable the destruction of freedom, the fervor of nationalism so fanatical that it will engulf this earth in eternal civil war." The misguided attraction to totalitarianism, and not capitalism, is socialism's primary enemy, Mr. Revell believes, for totalitarianism destroys political democracy and liberty.

In a free society such as America, observes our author, there exists a method of choosing rules known as political democracy, along with a rough but often satisfactory approximation of Montesquieu's advice on the separation of powers. Moreover, in the United States there exist religious and cultural diversity, diversity of lifestyles, and the greatest amount of freedom that is compatible or consistent with the appropriate demands of law, order and justice.

On the other hand, in a totalitarian state like the Soviet Union, the state is fragile; it cannot satisfy the needs and desires of the society it rules, because it tries to destroy the autonomy of private life, which it fears, through constant surveillance; the state reveals its fear by following each of its members through his work, his entertainment, his travels, his friendships, the raw materials of his thought and his emotions. Precisely because it is fragile, a totalitarian state like the Soviet Union is intolerant of criticism, and refuses to make hardly any concessions in foreign policy. A totalitarian state such as the Soviet Union, moreover, politicizes all areas of life. For such a state, a work of art, for instance, has *only* a political dimension. It is either for or against the regime, and is judged accordingly.

What, then, accounts for the continuing fascination with totalitarian leaders and movements? Why are people still so willing to in effect "sell

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

their souls" to totalitarian leaders and movements? Mr. Revell offers an explanation: "The totalitarian temptation," he believes "is driven by a hatred on principle of industrial, commercial civilization, and would exist even if it were proved that people in that civilization were better fed, in better health and better (or less badly) treated than in any other." For Mr. Revell, the real issue lies in the belief that, "Money is sinful, the root of all evil; and if freedom was born of economic development, then it suffers from that original sin."

Very interesting and thought-provoking, indeed, is Mr. Revell's analysis of capitalism, socialism, and the perennial attraction to totalitarianism. In my view, however, the author's explanation for the perennial attraction to totalitarianism is inadequate and fails to go far enough. The inadequacy of his explanation emanates from the limitations and restrictions of Mr. Revell's philosophical perspective: Jean-Francois Revell is a man of the Left who apparently finds no value or validity in a religious world view or in religious explanations. Consequently, he fails to take into account the view that faith in totalitarian movements and leaders is essentially a pernicious substitute for faith in a Supreme Being and belief in the enduring values of religion: An attempt to recreate paradise here on earth purely through human endeavor, and especially through the coercive instrument of the totalitarian state: An attempt to achieve redemption not through faith in a Supreme Being but, rather, through an involvement, a total immersion, in messianic, totalitarian politics.

Haven Bradford Gow

(Mr. Gow is a law clerk and a free-lance writer in Arlington Hts., Ill.)

A READER IN NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING, Report on International Conferences, Published by the Human Life Center, St. John's University, Collegeville, MN 56321, U.S.A. 170 pages; \$4.95.

Fr. Paul Marx, O.S.B., founder and director of the Human Life Center (HLC) at Collegeville, Minnesota, and Fr. Anthony Zimmerman, S.V.D., founder and director of the Family Life Association (FLA) of Japan have jointly produced a remarkable collection of natural family planning (NFP) talks and addresses gleaned from seminars held at St. John's University over the past few years. What is nearly as remarkable as the actual compiling and editing is the fact that the Reader is now in the hands of every priest and nun in North America as well as 1,800 missionaries throughout the world! In less than eight months, Fr. Zimmerman, compiler and editor, and Fr. Marx, publisher

and disseminator, have accomplished a feat that should please the National Council of Catholic Bishops.

The Reader itself is concise, very readable, and conveniently capsulized into five parts: The Art of NFP, Teaching NFP, Wider Aspects of NFP, NFP Symposiums at HLC, and the Family Life Association.

The person, who is just becoming aware of NFP along with its phenomenal growth and methodological progress over the last decade, should start right in the middle of the book where Ingrid Trobisch begins Part III with a story about family planning in the Fiji Islands. By the time the captivated reader finishes Part III, he will sense that there is something very unique yet familiar about the NFP way of life. This is largely because the practice of NFP involves qualities which belong to the traditional Christian notion of marriage and sexuality: an openness of both spouses to cooperate and dialogue on the deepest level of their relationship, the proper placing of sexuality within the overall goals of marriage and the family, and the development through self-knowledge of a mastery of one's own fertility and sexuality, leading to an integrated view of life.

And then to Parts I and II. The book begins with the art of NFP, briefly describing the various modern methods in use (Sympto-Thermal Method, Ovulation Method, etc.). Of special interest are the results of the scientific researchers into the reliability of these methods and the growing interest in NFP by international scientific bodies such as the World Health Organization. The second part highlights various experiments in teaching NFP in different social and cultural backgrounds. Both these sections will give the reader the distinct and true impression that modern NFP is now a serious and respected area of medicine.

Perhaps the most striking testimony for the priest, doctor, or professional counselor who reads the book is the personal witness of the author-couples, who show how the practice of NFP has led them to deepen their own marriage relationship and their understanding of their living-out of the Sacrament of Matrimony.

New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 17: Supplement: Change in the Church, edited by Thomas C. O'Brien, Washington/New York: Publishers Guild/McGraw-Hill, 1979), xv plus 812 pp.

This new supplement to the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* is a substantive volume with over 500 articles, many of them quite lengthy, on a

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

wide variety of issues. Members of the Fellowship are urged to examine it. In this brief report there is opportunity only to note some of its principal positive and negative features.

There are many excellent articles in the new supplement, several of them authored by members of the Fellowship (e.g. John Harvey on "Homosexuality," Charles Dechert on "Politics, Church and," Joseph Farragher on "Moral Theology, Contemporary Trends" and "Morality," Thomas Dubay on "Holiness, Universal Call to" and "Holiness of the Church," F. Jelly on "Virgin Birth" and "Mary and the Church," etc., including three by this reporter). Among the entries, too, will be found a brief description notice by H.V. Sattler on the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*.

One of the best essays, in my judgment, is a lengthy and beautiful article on lay spirituality by Maria Adriazola. It is particularly significant in that it draws together in a comprehensive and systematic way the teaching of Vatican II on this crucially important topic. Several essays, also of substantive length, on questions of biblical theology, in particular on the nature of biblical theology itself and on the resurrection narratives of the New Testament, are provided by C. Ceroke. A Moracewski contributed a number of informative and helpful articles on questions of medical ethics and human experimentation, while the executive editor of the volume, T.C. O'Brien, has himself written several helpful essays, including a brief but informative biographical sketch of Pope John Paul II. The article on business ethics by T. V. Purcell and that on the Dead Sea Scrolls by T.J. Ryan are also both informative and stimulating. There are, in addition, many, many others in this volume that will be of great help to anyone looking for informative and sound guidance on a number of issues affecting the Church today, from African Christianity to Youth Ministry.

Several essays in this Supplement, however, cause concern, at least to this reader. Here notice shall be taken only of several of the more disturbing.

The article on Pope Paul VI by F. X. Murphy seems to be an exceptionally opinionated piece by one who is evidently disgruntled by Paul VI's teachings, particularly on contraception. According to Murphy "Paul's concern for traditional papal authority and the right to life confused his attitude toward the problem of overpopulation" and as a result he "ran the risk of having the Church accused of failing mankind at a crucial crisis" (p. 494). This is simply asserted, with no attempt to support it by reason. It is a gratuitous and insulting appraisal and ought to be considered for what it is: sheer rubbish.

J. Dedek's articles on "Circumstances, Morality of" and "Consequences, Morality of" seem quite biased. Although he notes, at the conclusion of the article on consequences, that the opinion of those theologians who reject the notion of intrinsically evil acts is "not countenanced in church pronouncements on morality" (p. 130), this seems to serve merely as a factual statement. No such qualifier is provided in the article on consequences, and in presenting the views on consequences Dedek gives readers the impression that the *only* reason for justifying abortion to save a mother's life is a calculating of consequences. This, of course, is not the case (as Dedek, one can be reasonably sure, knows). The result is that readers are terribly misled. The bibliographies for these essays are woefully arbitrary, for they call attention only to the work of Fuchs and McCormick, theologians whose positions adopt a consequentialist methodology, and ignore completely the extensive literature critical of this position.

J. Komonchak's article on "Authority, Ecclesiastical" leaves one perplexed, and needlessly so. Although Komonchak cites the *Constitution on Divine Revelation* to the effect that only the "living teaching office of the Church" has the "task of giving an authoritative interpretation of the Word of God," his article is quite fuzzy on the relationship of this living teaching office to "other bearers" of the Gospel, in particular to theologians. Readers could easily gain the impression that the "living teaching office" is simply one among many bearers of the gospel message; this impression, I submit, is not in accord with the teaching of Vatican II.

Similarly, in his essay on "Conscience, Freedom of," G. Delacourt seems to confuse the issue of religious liberty with that of the freedom of conscience, in particular the conscience of Catholics. Nowhere does he cite relevant passages from Vatican II (e.g., *Dignitatis Humanae*, 14 and *Gaudium et Spes*, 51) on the positive obligation of Catholics to form their consciences in accord with the teachings of the magisterium. Obviously these passages from Vatican II (and others as well that are not noted by Delacourt) are exceptionally pertinent to the topic he discusses.

J. Empereur's article on equality in the Church includes a demand for women's ordination as required if the Church is to image the freedom of all human beings in Christ. One might argue that this way of settling a matter is grossly oversimplistic. When Empereur's article is coupled with the many in the supplement devoted to women's issues one gains the distinct impression that all articles on the subject are one-sidedly biased toward the ordination of women.

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

J. R. Lerch's essay on "Teaching Authority of the Church" begins with a very able summary of the teaching of Vatican II on the subject. Yet as it proceeds it seems to lead, to this reader at any rate, to the conclusion that this teaching is simply historically conditioned and subject to being explained away.

Other articles of similar nature could be indicated, but this should suffice to give an initial indication of the bias of some centrally important articles. I find this bias unfortunate, for it detracts from the value of this remarkable work. It is an important reference tool and in many ways a tribute to the scholarship of American Catholics. More judicious and fair treatment of some truly substantive questions would have helped. In closing, I would like to call attention to the article (quite long) on theology by W. J. Hill, on pluralism by W. Shea, on foundational theology by F. Crowe, and on theology in seminaries by J. J. Connelly. They need careful and considered attention, for they are challengingly presented and substantive in character.

William E. May

(Dr. May is a Professor at The Catholic University of America)

Brown, Raymond E., *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*, New York etc.: Paulist Press 1979, pgs. 204, \$3.95

For the last decade or so the gospel of John has been looked at from a new perspective. It is believed to reflect the history of the Johannine community over a period of several decades rather than the ministry of Jesus.

An exegete, therefore, is called upon to reconstruct the history of that community on the evidence he finds in John's gospel according to his own reading. With this new book Fr. Brown undertakes such a task.

He reads not only the fourth gospel but also the Johannine letters (while he excludes the Apocalypse) as documents which have preserved for posterity the evolution of "an individual church in New Testament times", as the subtitle of the book reads. The Johannine gospel informs us, he says, of the growth and development of this one Christian community from the mid 50's to c. 90. The gospel itself was written about 90 A.D.

Brown contends that the first members of the Johannine community were Jews — among them, the Beloved Disciple himself an eyewitness of Jesus' ministry — who had a common Jewish messianic faith and developed a "low" christology.

At a second stage according to Brown, other Jews, this time nonconformists, joined the Johannine community. They opposed the temple cult and understood Jesus in Mosaic, rather than Davidic, terms. A third wave of adherents joined the community. These were Samaritans who, on account of their thought patterns developed the "high" christology which centered on Jesus' pre-existence and, therefore, on his divinity. The nonconformist Jews and the innovative Samaritans inevitably brought on a confrontation and in the end a rupture between the Johannine community and the Jewish establishment. The Johannine Christians are excommunicated from the synagogue and, in turn, refer thereafter to "the Jews" as the children of Satan. The main reason for the conflict was (according to Brown) the "high" christology of the Johannine community. At this point of history the Johannine gospel was written by the Beloved Disciple, who was not one of the twelve and the community may have moved away from Palestine into the Greek world.

Throughout this period, Brown speculates, the Johannine community reacted in different ways to unbelievers and halfhearted believers outside. These outsiders were "the world," "the Jews", adherents of John the Baptizer, Jewish believers in Jesus who did not dare break with the synagogue, Jewish Christians of inadequate faith (especially because they refused to accept the "high" christology), and the "apostolic churches" of Peter and the Twelve who "do not stand for all Christians", but rather "for a group of Christians distinct from the Johannine community" (p. 82).

From now on in Brown's view the history of the Johannine community is capsulated in the three Johannine letters written about 100 A.D.. Their author is said to be a "presbyteros" or elder associated with the Beloved Disciple, now disappeared, who with other elders formed a core of witnesses. It is these who supposedly constituted the Johannine "school" of thinkers and writers. As such, they were the bearers and guarantors of Johannine tradition originating with the Beloved Disciple that was already written down in John's Gospel. This is why the author of John's letters speaks as "we". The letters were prompted by a bitter division within the community, the result of different interpretations of the Beloved Disciple's views as expressed in John's gospel. The "presbyteros" tries to demonstrate from the gospel how wrong the "secessionists" are, and in the process shows the Johannine community's hatred for secessionists, calling them all sorts of names (p. 134). The notion of Christian love, in these letters, is restricted to the loyalist branch of the community. The secessionists ended up, according to

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Brown, in the gnostic movement of the second century, whereas the loyalists compromised with the "Great Church" of the Twelve. The "high" christology of the Johannine community ultimately was accepted by the Great Church and, in turn, that community accepted the authoritarian structures (bishops/presbyters) of the same Church; the teaching authority of the Johannine community, in fact, had been up to that point none but the Paraclete. It was at the time of this compromise that the Johannine community lost its identity.

Fr. Brown considers all this to be speculation admonishing the reader: "I warn the reader that my reconstruction claims at most probability; and if sixty percent of my detective work is accepted, I shall be happy indeed" (p. 7). He gives another warning at the end of his book: "my reconstruction . . . carried at most probability" (p. 171).

The reader should take these warnings seriously and realize that Brown's "reconstruction" is based on documents which for thousands of years have been read differently. The author correctly calls his effort "detective work". As a matter of fact Brown provides an impressive description of his own guess-work: "one may posit" (p. 38, 39, 98), "it is fascinating to speculate" (p. 40), "it may mean" (p. 46), "likelihood" (p. 59), "may have" (p. 69), "to suspect" (p. 69, 138), "while not probative" (it) "makes it at least feasible" (p. 70), "plausible" (p. 71), "may be" (p. 75), "problematical" (76), "it is tempting to theorize" (p. 77), "the author may be hinting" (p. 78), "perhaps" (p. 78), "with admitted uncertainty" (p. 78), "Jews might understand" (fnt 145), "May be detected" (p. 81), "it suggests" (p. 81), "it is not illogical to conclude" (p. 82), "(it) cannot be accidental" (p. 83), "(they) do not seem to embody" (p. 84), "we may make an informed guess" (p. 85), "may constitute" (fnt 161), "reasonably certain" (p. 95), "it seems best to work with the hypotheses" (p. 97), "there may have been" (p. 98), "serious possibility" (p. 98), "I shall hypothesize" (p. 99), "may have shifted," "may have been" (fnt 193), "I suspect" (p. 103, 107), "the author may be using" (p. 104), "it is a working hypothesis" (p. 104), "presumably" (p. 104, 139), "I reconstruct it" (p. 104, 110), "the hypothesis that best explains" (p. 106), "this hypothesis" (107), "my hypothesis" (p. 107), "they might have interpreted" (p. 119), "(they) may have claimed" (p. 126), "the most plausible explanation" (p. 128); "it is quite possible" (p. 130), "more likely" (p. 145), "I think" (p. 146), "christology might have stemmed" (p. 153), "may have understood" (p. 153).

Fr. Brown's effort to penetrate the enigma of the Johannine writings is legitimate, as is his formulation of hypotheses. But the reader, no less

than the author, must realize he is dealing with extensive speculation and theorizing.

In order to adopt the current fashion in Johannine studies Fr. Brown was forced to readjust his own positions on some points and occasionally to change his mind. He calls the reader's attention on p. 33 to the fact that in his Commentary to the Gospel of John in the *Anchor Bible* he identified the Beloved Disciple with John, son of Zebedee. Now, however, he says: "I am inclined to change my mind." From now on in the new Brown view the Beloved Disciple is no longer John, son of Zebedee. This readjustment was made to accommodate the new thesis that Brown now proposes in this new book.

Fr. Brown — without detailed discussion — grounds his speculations on the assumption that the gospel of John describes the history of the Johannine community. The author of that gospel stated clearly that he was describing some of the "many signs that Jesus had performed in the presence of his disciples" (Jn 20:30) and sometimes he voices concern for historical soundness (19: 35; 21:24). Without bothering to demonstrate that the author's statements are not true, Brown adhering to the Bultmann axiom asserts without proving that the gospel of John — no less than the Johannine letters — tells us, not about Jesus, but about the concerns, needs, faith and vitality of the community. He does this in complete disregard of the fact that in the Gospel there is an historical perspective that cannot be found in the letters. The Gospel unfolds within a geographical, chronological, social, religious setting which not only is missing in John's letters but is, furthermore, quite compatible with the synoptic Gospels: Same dramatic personae, same conflicts, same basic problems, same human interrelationships. All of this is completely foreign to John's three letters. The Johannine epistles, like all N.T. letters, deal with actual community situations. It may be said further that community problems colored John's presentation of the Gospel message, as they did the other gospels. However, there is a Jesus-related historical perspective to John's gospel which makes it just what it is, a gospel, different from any other form of literature. Even a New Testament letter. This is a fact always to be duly appreciated. John's gospel is filled with details having to do with Jesus, not the community: "five porticoes of the pool" (5:2), or "the abundant grass in the area" (6:10), or "the boats from Tiberians" (6:23), or the "many waters of Aenon near Salim" (3:23), or the "descent" to the lowlands around the lake (4:51), and many other details having nothing to do with community problems.

As Fr. Brown reconstructs the history of the

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Johannine community a strange picture emerges. According to him the Johannine community in its first century is in touch with every kind of Jewish and Christian religious movements (heterodox and less heterodox): Judaism in general, Qumran asceticism, nonconformist Jews, Samaritans, John the Baptizer's followers. Jewish believers in Christ committed to the synagogue, Jewish Christians of inadequate faith ("low" christology). Occasionally the Johannine community related to the Church of the Twelve, says Brown, who "do not seem to embody the fullness of Christian perception, as may be seen when the named disciples in general and Simon Peter in particular are compared with the Beloved Disciple" (p. 84). Fr. Brown makes "an informed guess that the precise aspect of christology missing in the faith of the Apostolic Christians is the perception of the pre-existence of Jesus and of his origins from above" (p. 85). It is really surprising, however, that the Johannine community never seems in Brown's view to get in touch with the Pauline churches and/or the Pauline theology, even though Paul represented the most vigorous Christian effort and the most penetrating christological perception of the mid-first century. Is that not strange? At least Brown does not explain how this could have happened. I, for one, do not think that a Christian community that started in the 50's could have been untouched by the powerful Pauline formulation of the Christian thought, even if the community originates in Palestine and moves to the Greek world, perhaps to Ephesus, as Brown is inclined to admit (p. 98, 56 F.). Still Fr. Brown may have wanted his readers to believe that the Johannine community was unaffected by Paul for a reason that is not hard to find. Brown really is arguing that it was the Samaritans, independently of Paul, who developed the pre-existence christology contained in the Johannine writings. I do not accept this explanation.

The christology that professes Christ's pre-existence and divinity was formulated by Paul in his letters towards the mid-first century: in 1 Cor 10:4 speaking of the "spiritual" rock that followed the Israelites through the wilderness, Paul clearly states that "this rock was Christ"; in 2 Cor 8: 9 the apostle also affirms that Christ "being rich led a poor life for your sake in order to make you rich through his poverty"; in Rom 1:3, Paul maintains, "the Son of God came to exist according to the flesh", and this is "the Son" whom God "sent out" of heaven to come to exist by a woman (Gal 4: 4). It is not certain that Paul's letter to the Philippians was written in the 50's (which is most likely) but it is sure that, in any event, it was not written later than 62 A.D.; and in this letter Paul states among other things that Christ, before emptying himself by taking on the form of a slave and living like a

human being, "was in the form of God and was equal to God" (2:6). Exegetes maintain that Phillipians quotes a pre-Pauline liturgical hymn. I am inclined to think that the "high" Johannine christology is more indebted to the Christian thinking in the Pauline epistles than to Samaritans who joined the Johannine community later on. And so, the christological developments in the Johannine writings (in my judgment) were inter-related with those of other Christian communities, even though the phrasing is different.

Understandably, Fr. Brown, to demonstrate that Paul did not proclaim "the same kind of pre-existence christology as John" mentions 1 Cor 8: 6; Phil 2: 6-7, and Col 1: 15-16 (all of which are discarded for various reasons), but has nothing to say about 1 Cor 10: 4 (in the wilderness "the rock was Christ"), 2 Cor 8: 9, Rom 1:3 or Gal 4:4. Brown interprets Phil 2: 6f to mean that many "doubt that 'being in the form of God' and 'accepting the form of a servant' refers to incarnation. It may mean that, unlike Adam who was also in the image of God, Jesus did not rebel at being a servant in which case the whole hymn would refer to the earthly life of Jesus" (p. 46). There are a number of things which militate against Brown's view here. In the first place he does not mention that in the Pauline hymn Jesus is also said "to be equal to God". Secondly, the "doubts" of some scholars do not disprove that the passage does refer to the incarnation. The possibility of a pre-existence christology in Paul stands. Thirdly, nowhere in the bible is it said that Adam "was" in the image of God. In Gen 1:26f Adam is said to be "created" in God's image, which is not the same as being in God's image. Fourthly, Paul does not say that Christ was in God's "image" but that he was in the "form" of God, which may today be expressed as "in the condition/status of God". Fifthly, in Pauline though there is a clear opposition between a *former* and a *latter* condition of Christ — "being in the 'form of God' he did not take advantage of his being equal to God *but (alla)* emptied himself taking on the 'form of a slave', coming to exist in the likeness of human beings". Between the former and the latter condition there is an "emptying himself" which marks a change of status. Sixthly, one of Paul's expressions is exactly the same as John's. According to Paul, Christ was *isa theo (i)* (equal to God, v. 6), according to John Christ made himself *ison to(i) theo(i)* (equal to God, JN 5: 18). Seventhly, the Pauline passage referring to the form of God etc. expresses clearly the same thought as when the Johannine Christ speaks of "the glory that he had with the Father before the world was" (Jn 17: 5, 24), or to the place "where he was before" his incarnation (Jn 6:3). Eighthly, the Pauline christology does not merely say that

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

Christ – who was equal to God – took on the form of a slave etc. It also says that he “came to exist of a woman” when God “sent him out” of heaven (Gal 4: 4). If this is not incarnational christology, it is hard to know what is. Ninthly, the fact that the Pauline Christ never said “before Abraham came to exist I am” (Jn 8:58) is not evidence of difference between John’s and Paul’s understanding of Jesus. The Pauline Christ could say that “during the events of the Exodus (long before the Bethlehem event) I was active” (See 1 Cor 10: 8). The basic understanding of Christ is the same in Paul and in John. Crediting Samaritans with the development of the “high” Johannine christology, as Brown does, while taking no account of Paul’s earlier christology calls for great imagination on the part of Brown.

Another problem with Brown’s reconstruction of the Johannine community’s history is his rejection of the Apocalypse as a document that might help in such a reconstruction. The fact that the book of the Apocalypse was not written by the same author of either the fourth gospel or the Johannine letters is not what really matters. What does matter is that the contacts of the Apc with the Johannine thought are obvious, and this book certainly derives from the Johannine circles. So Brown’s reason (given in a footnote, 5) to discard the Apc is far from convincing: “the relationship of Revelation to the Johannine corpus remains puzzling”. The relationship is not easy to explain (and in this sense it is puzzling), but there is a relationship among all the Johannine books. Brown argues in another place (p. 65) that the relationship between John’s gospel and the Apc is to be rejected because “the attitude toward the emperor and Pilate in the Gospel does not have the bitter tone toward Rome found in the Apocalypse”. But why should a narrative centering on Christ’s trial reflect the situation of some 70 years later? The letters of the “seven” churches in Apc 2-3 seem to reflect well the same basic situation that emerges in the Johannine letters and in Jn 15-17. Particularly the perspective of persecution is not foreign to 1 Jn: “This is the victory that overcomes the world – our faith. Who is he who overcomes the world except he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he who came through water and blood, Jesus Christ: not in the water *only but* in the water *and* in the blood” (5: 4ff) – which warns that being a good Christian is not just a matter of baptism but also of martyrdom (if need be; see in Apc 3: 21 the “victory” of Christ as a model for the victory of the believer; see Jn 16: 33). The problem for Brown is that if the Apc were included among the Johannine writings, the letters to the churches would prove his reconstruction ground-

less. The church of John is in the same trouble as the “seven” churches, i.e., it is a segment of the Christians universal church that is now going through rough times.

This leads us into another aspect of Brown’s book. The history of the Johannine community does not seem to be any different from the history of all other churches in the New Testament. There were pressures from outside, divisions inside, doctrinal error, doubtful moral attitudes, tensions and conflicts because of personalities in just about all churches represented in the New Testament. The clearest case are the Pauline communities, even while the apostle was still alive (see 1 and 2 Cor). Another question comes to mind about Brown’s interpretation: Why should the errors rejected in the Johannine epistles constitute the “faith” of a well established antagonistic *group* instead of several doctrinal and/or moral deviations of individual teachers? Brown has not demonstrated that the latter alternative is untenable. Neither does Brown prove that whenever the author of 1 Jn emphasizes a doctrinal point or rejects a given error he is referring to the “secessionist”. In regard to 1 Jn 2: 15-17 Brown himself notes (p. 128): “It is very difficult to be sure that this passage is directed against the opponents, since it may be simply a general pastoral warning to his own followers”. But most other instances cited by Brown are hardly any different.

At the end of his book Brown appends an article (published elsewhere a few years ago) on *Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel* (p. 183-198). He writes there that “In the Johannine community a woman could be described as exercising a function which in other churches was the function of an ‘ordained’ person” (p. 187). Brown argues this point from the fact that in Jn 12: 2 when Martha is serving at the table she is said by the Evangelist to *diakonein* and from the other supposed fact that “the office of *diakonos* already existed (in the 90’s) in the post-Pauline churches (see Pastorals)”. However, the reader should be alert to the fact that the office of *diakonos* (just as that of *episkopos*) already existed in Philippi when Paul wrote his letter to that community (Phil 1:1), and so before the post-Pauline era as Brown avers. Furthermore, how else could the evangelist describe the function of a nonordained person who served at table except by the common term *diakonein*? If Brown is laying biblical groundwork for ordained women, he has chosen the wrong argument.

Advancing his thoughts about this possibility one step further, Brown notes a few pages later (p. 198): “John has left us with one curious note of incompleteness: the disciples, surprised at Jesus’

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

openness with a woman, still did not ask him "What do you want of a woman?" (Jn 4:27)". To which Brown attached this final comment: "That may well be a question whose time has come in the church of Jesus Christ." Whether or not we are faced with a note of incompleteness may be a matter of opinion. It is not, however, a matter of opinion that, in the words of the evangelist, the actual question raised by the disciples differed from Brown's rendition. The disciples, the evangelist writes, "did not ask 'what do you want' or 'what do you speak with her?' ". Their clear concern was only whether Jesus needed or was looking for something. Since the gospel itself did not ask "What do you want of a woman?", Brown's final comment may have relevance to him but certainly not to the gospel text he cites.

Manuel Miguens, O.F.M.

(Fr. Miguens is a professor of Scripture at St. John's University, N.Y.C.)

Sharing the Light of Faith — Special Issue. *The Living Light*. Vol. 16, No. 2, Summer 1979

The Living Light is the official publication of the Department of Education of the United States Catholic Conference. Its masthead describes this periodical as providing a "Forum for catechists and professional educators, designed to present developments and trends, to identify problems and issues, to report on research, to encourage critical thinking and to contribute to decision making in the field of religious education and pastoral action." It is further stated that the Department of Education of the United States Catholic Conference has sole responsibility for the editorial content of *The Living Light* in collaboration with members of the Department of Religious Education at the Catholic University of America. Thus, the Reverend Berard Marthaler, O.F.M. Conv., Director of the Department of Religious Education of the Catholic University of America, and author of the soon to be published official commentary on the National Catechetical Directory, is the Executive Director of the periodical, whose editor is traditionally the representative for Religious Education — CCD in the Department of Education of the United States Catholic Conference. This special issue, however, has Father Thomas F. Sullivan of the Religious Education Department of the Catholic University of America, serving as Acting Editor. It is important to indicate that this special issue, which was released this summer and is devoted *in toto* to the National Catechetical Directory, follows quickly upon the publication of

the *Discussion Guide To the National Catechetical Directory*. The *Discussion Guide*, written by Rev. Thomas F. Sullivan, was commissioned by the National Conference of Diocesan Directors — CCD, and distributed, as a vehicle for implementing the *N.C.D.*, by the Department of Education of the United States Catholic Conference.

The analysis, which follows, will endeavor to demonstrate that just as the *Discussion Guide* sought to raise once again and legitimate a number of questions which were considered to have been settled by the *N.C.D.* consultation process itself, the amendments of the Bishops' meeting, November, 1977 and the October, 1978 Letter of the Congregation for the Clergy, this number of *The Living Light* seeks to explain away, for its readers, a number of substantive areas on which the final published version of the Directory was both clear and unambiguous.

Although this issue of *The Living Light* may not enjoy as widespread a circulation as the *Discussion Guide*, it is worth noting that this journal, because of its official character, exercises significant institutional impact, not only among catechists, in school and CCD programs, but also in graduate schools of religious education throughout this country, as well as diocesan offices of religious education.

The present analysis will allow for only a review of several major articles contained in this issue, which, in fact, could be said to constitute, in its own right, a sort of "commentary" on *Sharing the Light of Faith*. The purpose of this analysis is to show that such a "commentary" has grave implications both for the implementation of the *N.C.D.* and for the future of the catechetical enterprise in the United States.

After reading these articles, it is not too difficult to conclude that this issue of *The Living Light* might well be serving as yet an additional vehicle for communicating views which could not be expressed, for obvious reasons, in the soon to be published officially commissioned commentary mentioned above.

Writing in the Foreword, Rev. Thomas Sullivan introduces the articles which follow by observing, among other things, that: "The Church in our day is not, however, of one mind in all things, and the directory understandably reflects some of the ambiguity of the current scene." (p. 133).

Sister Ann Marie Mongovan, O.P. observes in her article, "The Directory: A Word For the Present," that "The Directory reflects our diversity and unity. Every reader can look at it and find whatever he or she wants to see. Every reader can also look at it and find what he or she does not want to see. *It is both liberal and conservative in what it says, because we are both liberal and*

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

conservative.” (p. 136, italics added).

One wonders if the Bishops of this country who approved the Document at a four-day meeting in November, 1977, as well as the Congregation for the Clergy which issued a letter both approving and correcting certain details of the final version, would have believed that this document, when finally printed, was intended to appeal *equally* to every variety of opinion which now exists among Catholics in the United States.

It is worth noting that the same author of this article is quoted as having said, at the close of the Fall, 1977 Bishops' meeting, that the Bishops, in their amendments to the final draft of the document “almost ravaged” the *N.C.D.* (National Catholic Reporter, 11/25/77 p. 3).

In “Revelation: Dimensions and Issues” (p. 155), William P. Loewe, Ph.D. of C.U.A. presents a study of the notion of continuing revelations as it emerged in the religious education enterprise during recent years and found its way into successive drafts of the *N.C.D.* The author quotes from the letter of the Congregation for the Clergy of 10/30/78 which sought to correct the compromise position of employing a capital “R” and lower case “r” for revelation in the final version – which the Directory Committee had pleaded with the Bishops to retain.

The Vatican letter stated:

“The employment of capital and small letters (Revelation, revelation) to distinguish various meanings of the notion of revelation tends to engender confusion. It would seem to be less open to misunderstanding, if the word ‘revelation’ standing alone, without modifiers, quotation marks, or italics, were to signify public divine revelation in the strict sense, and that other expressions be chosen to indicate other modes by which God manifests Himself to men.” (p. 163).

In spite of this correction, Loewe employs his own hermeneutic to reassure readers of *Living Light* that all has not been lost in reconciling the poles of tension between the notion of continuing revelation and the affirmation of a public revelation complete with the apostles. Thus he observes:

“The American bishops, at least, were satisfied that this recommendation (Large “R”, small “r”) was effected in their amended version of Chapter three. The Roman authorities apparently disagreed, and their reluctance had some justification. Surely the stylistic device of employing capital or small letters for various meanings of revelation would appear contrived, and this difficulty would be heightened by the confusion introduced with the wording of the distinction which controlled that device. *The final version of Chapter three contains the substance, if not the language, of continuing revelation. A compromise document, it reproduces the tensions inherent in the theological pluralism*

which characterizes the Church today.” (p. 167, italics added).

It is worth noting, at this point, that readers of this issue of *Living Light* were instructed by the commentaries mentioned earlier about how the *N.C.D.* reflects the ambiguity of the current scene; *is* a conservative and liberal document because we are conservative and liberal. Now we are told by CUA's Loewe that *Sharing the Light of Faith* is a compromise document and that this statement of his is made under the rubric of what appears to be an unnuanced concept of theological pluralism.

What emerges here is a steady whittling away of a number of the solid positions taken by the Bishops. The methodology employed is subtle, consistent and, interestingly enough, comes at the conclusion of several key articles in this issue. We will soon see how contrived this procedure is and, in one instance, even logically absurd. Please recall once again that this issue of *Living Light* is virtually a commentary on the *N.C.D.* itself.

Reverend Michael D. Place, S.T.D., of Mundelein, Illinois, in his article: “Reflections of a Moral Theologian” lays out the four basic elements of contemporary Catholic ethical thought that have significance for a review of the directory. He informs his readers that he will have to present the understandings and commitments with which he approaches this consideration of the directory because: “although these understandings and commitments are common to many of those doing Roman Catholic ethical reflection in the United States, they are not yet universally known” (p. 179). After Place “orients his readers to his “Understandings”, he indicates then that he will proceed to ask “whether the directory takes these ideas into account, and whether it is consistent in its ethical applications” (p. 179). Thus, he examines the methodology or framework in which his ethical reflections takes place. The historicist perspective of the concrete, individual, and the changing is contrasted with the older approach in ethics and theology in general which began with the abstract, the ethical, the essential and the unchanging. Change is to be taken seriously and “obviously change in areas such as family life or sexuality or the state would have significant import for ethical thought and would suggest the possibility of modification of earlier ethical conclusions.” (p. 180). He next considers the context in which ethical reflection takes place especially in the light of “the reforming works of Fuchs and Haring,” and the *Image of the Human Person* recently proposed in the latter's new work, *Free and Faithful in Christ*. In speaking of the many conflict situations which people face in their seeking to be responsible and relational, the author states:

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

"They are faced with the question of how they are to make decisions about the appropriateness of specific actions when some conflict arises. In the older tradition such conflict was recognized and addressed by the ethical principle of double effect. While still of value, that principle is today found by many moralists to be too limited in its application. Thus they have developed what is known as the principle of proportionality as a guide for making ethical decisions in conflict situations. Summarized the principle says that the responsible person must in all situations seek to maximize the good and true values present and to minimize the bad and the disvalues present. Or, as my colleague Father Timothy O'Connell says, one ought to do as much good as possible and as little evil as necessary!" (p. 183).

Father Place continues

"So, too, personal sin then is not as easily identified with the doing of a particular 'bad act'. Personal sin comes about when one refuses to live the creation destiny of being a responsible and relational person . . . *ultimately, a human action has the personal significance of selfishness as it is expressive of this fundamental perspective.*" (p. 184) (*italics added*).

According to Place, another key element for appreciating the work of contemporary moral theologians is an *Understanding of Church* where a conflict between the new and older, more static, more juridical, more legalistic understanding of Church "is acutely present in recent debates about the role of the ordinary but noninfallible magisterium of the Pope and bishops in matters of morality." (p. 184).

In these comments on controverted issues in moral theology, Father Place does not mention that many respected moralists strenuously oppose the moral approach he so glowingly describes; this approach has been criticized as a form of consequentialism which requires the abandonment of moral absolutes and implies that the end justifies the means. Not surprisingly the American bishops do not endorse such an approach. Nor does Father Place mention that the Sacred Congregation for the Faith has criticized the theory of fundamental option which he seems to endorse (See *Persona Humana*, No. 10); nor that the issue of the moral teaching of the Church often appears to be a matter of the infallible exercise of the ordinary Magisterium (see L.G. 25) and not simply a matter of noninfallible teaching.

In part II of the article the author evaluates extensively the *Directory's Methodology, Context, Image of Human Person, and Understanding of Church*, the very same structure used for his outline of contemporary principles of moral theology in Section one. Place alleges that the Directory has absorbed:

"much of what my colleagues are discussing. It is more attuned to the world of experience; it contextualizes morality within the fullness of the Christian mysteries; it understands the human person as a responsible and relational being; and it understands the Church in a communal and spiritual fashion. But it has also chosen to ignore or even to reject other insights. Change does not seem possible in certain areas of the moral life; the reality of sin is not clearly presented; the possibility of conflict between goods or values and the ethical principal (sic) of proportionality are absent; and complexity of the contemporary ecclesial experience is not visible. *Considering the present realities, perhaps this is the best a moralist could expect from such an official document.*" (p. 190 – *italics added*).

Given his reservations about what might be expected from an official Church document, it is not surprising that Father Place should appeal to his audience – religious educators – for support. His *ad populum* argument reveals a mistaken notion of the teaching authority of the Church and amounts to an unfortunate manipulation of his audience. Thus he says: "*Hopefully, the wisdom gained from the next years of its use by those who are on the front line of communicating the Christian life, the catechists, will provide the necessary concepts and knowledge for future revisions.*" (p. 190 – *italics added*).

A strategy seems to be clearly suggested in this instance. If a document like the *N.C.D.*, approved and promulgated by the bishops, is not acceptable to certain segments of the theological community in the United States, a partnership between theologians and religious educators should be established to make the difference in the future. In this view, it's all a matter of time; to this end, clearly delineated, albeit speculative and magisterially unjustified, guidelines for non-acceptance of the Church's teaching on a particular issue are made available, even before the *N.C.D.* is in the full swing of implementation.

In the "Directory and First Confession" (p. 192), Rev. Thomas F. Sullivan reviews the literature on this question up to the time of the publication of the *General Catechetical Directory* and after. He presents his own interpretation of *Sanctus Pontifex*, (1973) which stated that all experiments allowing First Communion before First Confession were to cease and that "*Quam Singulari* is to be obeyed everywhere and by all." (p. 202). Sullivan states that despite the forcefulness of its language *Sanctus Pontifex* did not end all discussion of the order of the sacraments. He reminds his readers that this subject was on the agenda for the American bishops at their November 1973 meeting and that "at this time the

Selected Notes on Contemporary Books and Articles

bishops took the position that this declaration should be given a "pastoral interpretation which is rather broad, so that the impression of obligation to confess before first Communion would not be insisted upon." His footnote, No. 42, justifying the alleged position taken by the bishops, refers merely to a report submitted by Archbishop Borders, Chairman of the Committee on Education, entitled "First Sacraments: A Pastoral Interpretation." (*Origins* Vol. 3, (December 6, 1973), pp. 277-279). Sullivan further contends "that at no subsequent meeting did the bishops change their position." (p. 203). In footnote 43 which follows this sentence, Sullivan states "*This fact is important to keep in mind in interpreting the final wording of number 126 of the National Catechetical Directory.*" (p. 203).

We will shortly see how Sullivan uses this argument to deflate the import of the Letter of the Congregation of the Clergy for those whom he alleges provided the final wording of number 126 of *Sharing the Light of Faith*. But before we do, it is important to indicate that although some bishops, *in open discussion*, indicated support of a broad interpretation of *Sanctus Pontifex*, the bishops, as a body, took no formal position by vote on this question. In fact, the bishops decided not to protest the Congregation's decision to deny their request to continue the experimental practice, but agreed to send a letter to the Holy See expressing concern over the way the decision was made — purely a procedural matter. (*National Catholic Reporter* 11/23/73).

It should be pointed out further that on the very same page of *Origins*, which Sullivan cites in reference to the report rendered by Archbishop Borders, the right-hand marginal commentary reads as follows:

"Although the U.S. bishops indicated at their annual meeting that they were having no problem implementing last summer's Vatican decree on first confession and first communion, many did express concern over the manner in which the Vatican treated the U.S. church in releasing the decree." (*Origins* Vol. 3, (December 6, 1973) p. 277 right-hand margin commentary).

As we shall see, Sullivan's attempt to explain away paragraph 126 betrays a kind of legalistic argumentation which in other situations he himself would most soundly and forcefully criticize.

The Letter of the Congregation for the Clergy of October 30, 1978 which both approved and corrected the N.C.D. had this to say on first Confession-first Communion:

"Not only should the *Catechesis* for the Sacrament of Reconciliation precede First Holy Communion, but youngsters should normally receive the Sacra-

ment of Penance before their First Communion (cf. Joint Declaration of the Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship and for the Clergy (24-V-1973, 20-V-1977) and also the address of Pope Paul VI to the Bishops of the New York Province, (May 20, 1978).

Before we let Sullivan speak for himself, it might be worthwhile to quote from Pope Paul VI's address to the Bishops of the Dioceses of New York on the occasion of their *Ad Limina* visit to Rome. One is hard put to understand that in an article that footnotes everyone from St. Alphonsus Liguori to Noldin and Jone no mention is made of this papal statement which reads: "Another important aspect of the penitential discipline of the Church is the practice of first Confession before first Communion. *Our appeal here is that the norms of the Apostolic See not be emptied of their meaning by contrary practice. In this regard we repeat words we spoke last year to a group of bishops during their ad limina visit. The faithful would be rightly shocked that obvious abuses are tolerated by those who have received the charge of the episcopate which stands for, since the earliest days of the Church, vigilance and unity.*" (AAS, 1977 p. 473; *Origins* 5/4/78 p. 724).

Father Sullivan is undoubtedly aware of the fact that even as far back as *Quam Singulari*, children were never to be forced to the reception of the first sacraments nor were they to be refused access to them. Rather, they were to be gradually led to an encounter with Christ in these sacraments. Yet he concludes this article by stating:

"Rather, it might be described as a compromise of a compromise. Unlike the congregation's statement, the bishops' wording omits any mention of the *reception of the sacrament of penance by the children*. Their finely honed sentence preserves continuity with the Roman suggestion, but it significantly reduces the practical requirements for observing the law in this matter. It says that penance should be celebrated before first communion. It does not say that any or all children must receive the sacrament of penance before first communion (p. 207).

Sullivan seizes on a purely verbal difference between the language of paragraph 126 of the N.C.D. and the language of the October 30, 1978 letter, and alleges that it reveals that the bishops who inserted the final changes compromised the clarifications contained in this Letter of the Congregation for the Clergy, which he also claims to have been itself a compromise. What type of curious reasoning could arrive at such a conclusion especially when the Letter in question refers explicitly to the Joint Declarations of the Congregations for the Sacraments and Divine Wor-

ship and for the Clergy (24-V-1973), 20-V-1977) and also to the above quoted address of Pope Paul VI to the Bishops of the New York Province May, 1978.

What is most troubling about Father Sullivan's position is not that it contains bad arguments – or even misinformation. The difficulty is that the bishops have settled the issue of the order of the sacraments as a practical proposition; but Father Sullivan will not accept this resolution and uses as the forum for expressing his non-acceptance a publication which (1) is an official publication of the U.S.C.C. Education Office and (2) is directed to religious educators – the very people who must implement the N.C.D. His refusal to accept the

bishops' resolution – like that of some of the other authors of this "commentary" – thus has institutional status and profound implications for the teaching of the Faith in the years ahead.

If the Faith is to be taught in accord with the N.C.D. and the Magisterial teaching on which it is based, catechists must be instructed by those who accept the N.C.D. and this will not happen unless the institutions charged by the bishops with implementing their teaching get about their proper job – a task not even begun but seemingly refused in this special issue of the *Living Light*.

Michael J. Wrenn

(Fr. Wrenn is the Director of the Archdiocesan Catechetical Institute in New York)

Publications of Interest

- Jaroslav Pelikan's third volume of the history of development of doctrine (*The Growth of Medieval Theology, 600-1300* recently published by the University of Chicago Press) opens (p. VIII) with this sentence:

"The word 'theology' is used in the title (as it was often used in the Middle Ages) in a sense different from that in which we generally use it. To us, the word tends to mean what individual theologians do and how they develop their systems, but I am employing it almost as a synonym for 'church doctrine'."

Or in another place (p. 4)

"For our purposes here, 'age of faith' refers primarily to faith in the sense of 'that which is believed'. A synonym for 'faith' would be 'doctrine'."

- Fr. Harold A. Bueton, professor of education at CUA provides a good summary of the effect of secularism on American schools in *Columbia* (July 1979). The following remarks apply to some Catholic schools as well:

"As the 20th century moved on, the United States looked less to Europe for its ideas on schooling, and gave birth to a native pedagogy. Fathered by Francis W. Parker and nurtured by John Dewey, it matured in the form of "progressive" education. The aims of schooling became more consistently secularist – Dewey's social efficiency, for example, and social insight. Parker asserted the primacy of method over content and faith in the inevitability of progress. William Torrey Harris, then the nation's commissioner of education, held the belief that secular studies could not be pursued under the same roof as religious doctrines; his public school had to be a purely secular institution.

"The 20th century added as a subspecies of secularism the philosophy of positivism, which holds that, to be valid, all intellectual investigation and religious belief must have as their base the empirical methodology. This produced a mind closed to transcendent values. Logical positivism, analytical philosophy, the pragmatism of William James, and the instrumentalism of John Dewey became the dominant philosophical influences in schooling. Because of his many years of training teachers at Chicago and Columbia universities at a time when higher degrees were becoming popular in education, Dewey was especially effective in spreading these ideas to schools throughout the country."

"Although the deists had not denied truths about the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, secularists like Dewey reduced these truths to meaninglessness. As Edward L. Thorndike, an important figure in the development of the tests and measurements movement in education, said: 'Whatever exists, exists in quantity, and can be measured.' As for religion, the emphasis is more on 'feeling,' and the purpose is a 'social' goal, but definitely away from institutionalized religion. Because religious institutions are divisive, to their mind, they seek absolute separation of church and state. Their frequent charges that denominational schools are 'divisive' suggest, of course, that there exists in the government school an orthodoxy from which non-government schools deviate. That orthodoxy is secular humanism."

- The concept "revelation" caused controversy during the writing of the *National Catechetical Directory*. Commenting on the final product Bro-

ther Gabriel Moran manifests disappointment that the final version of NCD leaves revelation with "official Christian sources." He thinks "the language of natural and supernatural (or general/special) revelation had become inadequate by the 19th century" and hopes that "someone saves earlier NCD drafts for 50 years from now when the Churches are trying to restate a Christian position in a religiously diverse world". (*National Catholic Reporter*, June 1, 1979) Professor Eugene Fontinell — confining himself to revelation about moral law — has difficulty with a "God who knows exactly what should be done in every instance" and with our task "to find out what God knows." In reviewing Philip Keane's book *Sexual Morality* he sees "human morality not as a slavish carrying-out of the eternal unchangeable orders of a divine potentate, but as the sharing in the creative life of a loving creator who invites us to struggle with him to bring forth a new world richer in realization and possibility." (*Commonweal* June 8, 1979)

- Dr. James Hitchcock's new book (Seabury Press) entitled *Catholicism and Modernity: Confrontation or Capitulation?* has a chapter six which describes "the triumph of bureaucracy" in the Church, the opening paragraphs read as follows:

"Common sense would suggest that, were modern Christianity suffering a crisis of belief, there would develop a tension between those who can be broadly designated 'religious professionals' — priests, educators, church bureaucrats — and lay people with the former group struggling valiantly to maintain the Church's official doctrines, from within their institutional ghetto, against a spirit of scepticism growing among lay people forced to live their lives amidst the secularity of the world. Some commentators have in fact described such a division despite little empirical evidence to support it."

"Here common sense is in error, and the above division, to the degree that it exists, is almost the reverse of what might be expected — on virtually every question it has been the religious professionals who have espoused avant-garde and iconoclastic positions, the laity in the pews who have resisted or remained passive and bewildered towards change. Thus a 1977 survey of sexual beliefs by a Jesuit sociologist reported that 'The groups the least in agreement with the pope's authority are the parish staffs' and 'The parish councils, generally composed of the most active, are the most orthodox in agreeing with the official Catholic stance on sexual mores.' Even on issues like contraception, where there has been an obviously massive defection of the laity from official doctrine, it is questionable how strong that defection

would have been if many religious professionals had not prepared the way for it either by attacking the official teaching or by predicting its modification, and if these same professionals had made any serious effort to uphold *Humanae Vitae* once it was issued."

"The expectation that religious professionals represent the 'establishment' and thus are forced to uphold an official "line" misunderstands both the historical character of the Church and the nature of modern bureaucracy. Innumerable studies have revealed that bureaucracies are at best only tenuously responsive to commands issued by their nominal superiors. They operate, usually, under their own momentum, in accordance with their own priorities, sometimes in direct contravention of official policy decreed from on high."

- *Our Sunday Visitor Press* of Huntington, Indiana, will release in the fall SPIRITUAL THEOLOGY, by Jordan Aumann, O.P. This will be the first manual of spiritual theology to appear in English since Vatican Council II. It is directed to seminarians, professors of spiritual theology, retreat masters and spiritual directors in particular.

Father Aumann has an STD from Salamanca, Spain. Former editor of THE PRIEST, he presently is Director of the Institute of Spirituality at Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas in Rome and Consultor to Sacred Congregation for the Clergy. He is a member of the Dominican Province with headquarters in Chicago.

Father Aumann is also translating for Our Sunday Visitor Press the doctoral thesis written by Pope John Paul II at the Angelicum from 1946 to 1948 under the direction of Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. The thesis is entitled "THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH IN ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS." Translations are likewise being prepared in Spanish, Italian and French. It should be released by OSV in the fall.

- St. Louis University professor John Jay Hughes accused Msgr. George A. Kelly's book *The Battle for the American Church* of saying (page 51) that the Eucharist is "a repetition of the sacrifice of the cross." Actually Msgr. Kelly is summarizing on page 51 (and clearly says so) "Hans Kung on the Eucharist". In Kung's *On Being a Christian* (p. 427) the Swiss theologian writes: "[the Eucharistic meal] is itself not a repetition of the 'sacrifice' of the cross. It is a commemorative (anamnesis, memoria) and thanksgiving celebration." (Incidentally, this language of Kung was rejected in 1562 by the Council of Trent).

- Thomas Joseph Casey has a valuable note on "Institutional Apostolates and Community Life" in the Summer 1979 issue of *Communio*. Priests and religious particularly will find the analysis clear and to the point.

- An article by Richard Stith (School of Law, Valparaiso University) entitled "Toward Freedom from Value" appeared in *The Jurist* (Winter and Spring 1978) which analyzes the problems associated with a moral or legal system based upon values, even intrinsic ones.

- Eamon R. Carroll, O. Carm., *Understanding the Mother of Jesus* (Wilmington, Delaware, Michael Glazer, Inc. 1979)

This little book of 159 pages takes advantage of the new ecumenical interest in the Blessed Virgin to capsule not only the significant new developments in the study of Our Lady (the result of research) but seeks to answer the questions raised by Protestants about Mary. The booklet contains almost 40 pages of recommended readings about Mariology. It is available at \$2.95.

- Rev. Allan J. Placa, *Contemplative Prayer* (Living Flame Press, Locust Valley, New York 11560)

- Fr. M. Raymond, O.C.S.O., *Forty Years Behind the Wall*, (Huntington, Indiana, Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1979)

Those who are old enough to remember *The Man Who Got Even With God* will remember Fr. Raymond, a Trappist monk of the time and fame of Thomas Merton.

Here is a book on the interior life by a man who has been an athlete, a Jesuit, a professor, retreat master and monk for now forty years at Gethsemani in Kentucky. It is very personal even while commenting on the writings of the great saints and philosophers.

- Michael Davies, *The Order of Melchisedech: A Defense of the Catholic Priesthood* (Devon, England, Augustine Publishing Co., 1979)

This is a "sock it to them" paperback study, more than 200 pages in length, which criticizes (negatively for the most part) the recent concessions made by Rome in its ordination rites. The issues in contest: the Catholic versus Protestant concept of the sacrificial priesthood. Nijmegen theologian J.P.M. Van der Ploeg, O.P. in an introduction calls it "a rich and scholarly book which should be in the hands of all who study post-counciliar develop-

ments in the official Roman Catholic Church." The source documents cited in the text and appendices are especially valuable.

- The *Clergy Review* (June 1979) calls Professor William May's *Human Existence, Medicine and Ethics* (Franciscan Herald Press 1977) "a clear, concise, scholarly and well-argued contribution to current debate in Catholic Medical Ethics."

- Fr. Walter Kern's *New Liturgy and Old Devotions*, (Alba Books, \$3.50) looks at the enduring value of devotional prayer and its usefulness in a Vatican II liturgical piety. The chapters are: (1) Liturgical Piety, (2) Principles for Renewing Popular Devotions, (3) Sacred Heart Devotions, (4) The Eucharist Outside of Mass, (5) The Morning/Daily Offering, (6) Devotions to the Blessed Virgin Mary, (7) The Rosary, (8) Devotions to the Saints, (9) Newer Forms of Devotional/Paraliturgical Prayer, (10) Prayers for Various Occasions.

- William J. Whalen *Separated Brethren* (Huntington, Indiana, *Our Sunday Visitor, Inc.* 1979)

This is the third revision and updated revision of a book first published in 1958. It is a survey of Protestant, Anglican, Eastern Orthodox and other denominations in the United States. Not only are the well-known traditional religious bodies covered for their origins and theology but the latter-day Cultists, the Muslims, the Bahais and Buddhists also. Professor Whalen is a director of publications at Purdue. This is a handy manual for those involved in Ecumenical work at the parish or Diocesan level.

- Henry Paolucci, who calls himself a convinced Hegelian, has published two new volumes on his favorite research subject: *A Brief History of Political Thought and Statecraft* (Griffon House Publications) and *Hegel On the Arts: Milestones of Thought* (Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.)

- Henry Regnery, *Memoirs of a Dissident Publisher*, New York, Harcourt & Brace Co. \$12.95.

This is the story of a man with an apostolate – to publish books likely to be scorned by the reigning secularist establishment, mostly secular books to be sure. But one book *Marriage and the Family* by Carle C. Zimmerman and Lucius F. Cervantes, S.J. published in 1956 remains an important compendium of data for Catholics concerning the place in family life of monogamy, children, differential sexual roles, and of Christianity itself.

Employment Opportunities

Priests of St. Charles Borromeo, P.O. Box 2545, Port Charlotte, Florida, 33952, seeking two or three religious or lay catechists to take over religious education in parochial school and CCD classes. A house and car are available for use. Call 813-625-4906.

1979 Dues and Biographies

Those who have not so far returned their 1979 dues or returned their *Curriculum Vitae on the Form sent to them in the mail* are requested to do so as soon as possible. Mail the completed form to the executive secretary (preferably typed).

St. John's University
Jamaica, N.Y. 11439

Francis Bacon on *Unity in Religion*

"When atheists, and profane persons, do hear of so many discordant, and contrary opinions in religion it doth avert them from the Church and maketh them to sit down in the chair of scorers."

The Board of Directors of
the Fellowship meet in Chicago
on September 8th at the
Ramada-Ohare Inn

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Jamaica, N.Y.
Permit No. 451

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars

The National Congress on Church Related Colleges and Universities

From June 21st to June 23rd 1979 approximately 800 educators from church related colleges of twenty-three denominations met at the University of Notre Dame, in order to prepare for the critical years ahead for all religious oriented institutions — years of drastically declining enrollments. The meetings marked the midpoint in a two year program of the National Congress. The final report of the National Congress will be made at the February meeting in Washington, D.C.

The preliminary reports of the delegates' assigned study commission were mailed approximately one month before the June meeting in order that we would be given the opportunity to familiarize ourselves with their contents. There were six study commissions: Educational Purposes and Programs, Issues of Society, Relationships Between Church and College, Legal Issues, Public

policy, and Financial Issues.

The Education Purposes Commission is trying to answer the question — why is the Church engaged in higher education? The statement on Church Related Colleges and Universities: Identity and Integrity, must be broad enough to fit all church related colleges and universities whether they be Catholic, Methodist, Southern Baptist, Lutheran, etc. Because of the large number of delegates and comparatively short time given for interaction the Congress was not as profitable to many. The papers which were prepared by the study commissions will be revised in light of any strong feeling that evolved during the three day Notre Dame Congress. Fellowship members seeking further information on the workshop materials and study commission papers may contact the *Newsletter*