

UN TOURNANT DANS LA CONCEPTION DE L'HOMME
AU SEIN DE L'EGLISE CATHOLIQUE ROMAINE,
CONSIDEREE COMME INSTITUTION, ENTRE
1958 et 1970, selon trois écrits pastoraux
en vigueur en Amérique du Nord

Quelle conception de l'homme l'Eglise catholique romaine présente-t-elle dans son enseignement? Tel est l'objet de la présente dissertation, à partir d'une analyse comparative de trois écrits d'ordre pastoral, utilisés en Amérique du Nord de 1958-1970 avec l'approbation de l'autorité ecclésiastique.

La conception de l'homme sous-jacente à ces trois écrits se révèle particulièrement dans deux points: le contenu de la foi d'une part, et la relation entre Dieu et l'homme, d'autre part.

La présente recherche nous permet de déceler une nette évolution d'une conception "classique" de l'homme vers une conception "relationnelle". Ce tournant n'a pas nécessairement débuté ou atteint son terme dans les années 60. Cependant il est clair que deux approches de l'homme étaient simultanément mises en valeur durant cette période.

Nous tentons également de dégager certaines implications théologiques de cette évolution ainsi que leurs conséquences pastorales sur les plans théorique et pratique.

Présenté comme exigence partielle
en vue du grade de Ph.D.

Erin K. Malloy
Department of Religious Studies
mars 1973

A SHIFT IN THE CONCEPTION OF MAN IN THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AS INSTITUTION,
1958-1970: as manifested in three pastoral
publications used in North America

What is the conception of man in the Roman Catholic Church?
This dissertation studies the question through a comparative
analysis of three pastoral publications which were used with
hierarchical approval in North America between 1958 and 1970.

The conception of man underlying these publications manifests
itself in two areas: faith content and the God-man relationship
encouraged.

As a result of this investigation, we maintain there was a
shift from a "classical" to a "relational" conception of man.
This does not imply the shift was begun and/or completed in
the 1960s. we merely maintain that at least two understandings
of man were being promulgated simultaneously by the Church in
North America at that time.

We consider some of the theological implications of this shift
in terms of their consequences as well as some of their practical
and theoretical dimensions.

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
degree of Ph.D.

Erin K. Malloy
Department of Religious Studies
March, 1973

CONCEPTION OF MAN IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

A SHIFT IN THE CONCEPTION OF MAN IN THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AS INSTITUTION
1958-1970: as manifested in three pastoral
publications used in North America

by

Erin K. Malloy

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Religious Studies
McGill University
Montreal

March, 1973

© Erin K. Malloy 1973

Table of Contents

Preface.....	1
Introduction.....	6
Chapter	
I	<u>A Catechism of Christian Doctrine</u>
	The Baltimore Catechism No. 2..... 17
	Part I: The Creed..... 20
	Part II: The Commandments..... 32
	Part III: The Sacraments and Prayer.... 36
II	A. <u>A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults</u>
	"The Dutch Catechism"..... 48
	Part I: The Mystery of Existence..... 54
	Part II: The Way to Christ..... 57
	a) The Way of the Nations... 58
	b) The Way of Israel..... 59
	Part III: The Son of Man..... 58
	Part IV: The Way of Christ..... 70
	Part V: The Way to the End..... 113
	B. <u>The Supplement to A New Catechism</u> 118
	Part I: Creation..... 121
	Part II: Original Sin..... 122
	Part III: The Birth of Jesus from the Virgin Mary..... 123
	Part IV: The Satisfaction Offered by Jesus to the Father..... 124

Part V:	The Sacrifice of the Cross Continued in the Sacrifice of the Mass.....	124
Part VI:	The Eucharistic Presence and Change.....	124
Part VII:	Infallibility of the Church and Knowledge of Mysteries.....	125
Part VIII:	The Official Priesthood and Authority in the Church.....	126
Part IX:	Various Points of Dogmatic Theology.....	127
Part X:	Various Points of Moral Theology.....	130
III	The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.....	134
	Preface	139
	Introduction: The Situation of Man in the Modern World.....	142
	Part I: The Church and Man's Calling...	149
	Chapter 1: The Dignity of the Human Person.....	151
	Chapter 2: The Community of Mankind.....	157
	Chapter 3: Man's Activity Throughout the World.....	162
	Chapter 4: The Role of the Church in the Modern World.....	166
	Part II: Some Problems of Special Urgency.....	170
	Chapter 1: Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and Family	172
	Chapter 2: The Proper Develop- ment of Culture....	177

	Page
Chapter 3: Socio-Economic Life	182
Chapter 4: The Life of the Political Community.....	186
Chapter 5: The Fostering of Peace and the Promotion of a Community of Nations	189
Conclusions	194
IV Theological Implications of a Shift in the Conception of Man	198
New Relationships	199
New Values	203
New Horizons	209
Practical Dimensions of the Shift from a Classical to a Relational Conception of Man...	215
Theoretical Dimensions of a Shift from a Classical to a Relational Conception of Man...	218
Conclusion	233
Appendices	
I Historical Roots of the Baltimore Catechism	237
II Historical Roots of the Dutch Catechism	252
III Historical Roots of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World	279
Bibliography	299

PREFACE

The form this dissertation has taken is possible because of the background material and insights which I received from professors of the pastoral institutes of Lumen Vitae in Bruxelles, l'Institut Supérieur de Pastorale Catéchétique de l'Institut Catholique in Paris, and the Nijmegen Higher Institute of the Netherlands. The research completed at these centers broadened the conclusions of this thesis. As a result of studying the directions taken by these institutes between 1960-1970, it is possible to claim that the suggested consequences of this dissertation are more than theoretical insights coming exclusively from an emphasis of some official pastoral publications of the 1960s. These consequences have roots in the practical areas of at least three pastoral centers of thought in the Roman Catholic Church.

I wish to express my gratitude especially to the present Director of Lumen Vitae Institute, J. Bouvy, S.J. and to its founder, G. Delcuve, S.J. for their gracious welcome to the center and interest in this research. The privilege of being able to listen to the founder's original vision of the institute, and to the present Director's thoughtful concerns that the deepest of Christian perspectives of man be preserved and developed in the midst of the rapidly changing orientations of Lumen Vitae, brought the problem of this thesis into clearer focus.

Special thanks are due to six of the professors of Lumen Vitae, three of whom were my professors at the Université de Montréal, A. Godin, S.J., P. Ranwez, S.J. and M. van Caster, S.J. all of whom were forerunners in the fields of psychology and anthropology at the Institute. As a more recent member of

the faculty, J. Lombaerts, F.S.C. was in a position to appreciate the different emphasis placed on man in the last half of the 1960s. It is to him, and to P. Erdozáin, S.J., that I am most grateful for gaining access to the archival data of curriculum orientations and changes as well as to final papers and theses submitted by students over the 10 year period. I am grateful to P. Delooz, S.J., whose assistance as a sociologist helped to clarify the dimensions of the apparently changing conception of man at Lumen Vitae.

I am grateful as well to J. Audinet, Director of l'Institut Supérieur de Pastoral Catéchétique de Paris, for his time and for permission to consult the course descriptions and preparations of those on the faculty between 1960-1970.

Appreciation should be expressed also for the insightful suggestions for this dissertation given by C. Neven, C.S.Sp., Director of the Nijmegen Institute. His breadth of vision places the Church in Holland in the context of being only one, among many possible, concretely diverse manifestations of Roman Catholicism in the world today. For this reason, Father Neven encouraged the development of this research on the conceptions of man which seem to have been present already in the Church of the 1960s. I am thankful to H. Koenen, S.J. and G. Lottman for inviting me to their national weekly seminars for pastors and catechists. The team's questions and approach to problems helped to clarify the scope of this dissertation.

The question which is at the base of this dissertation began to clarify itself in Rome. Had there been a change in the conception of man in the official pastoral positions of the Church in the 1960s? An interdisciplinary committee at the Gregorian University was just beginning to study the conception of man within the Conciliar documents of Vatican II. I am grateful to P. Tofari, S.J., a sociologist on this team, for

his time, for his encouragement to continue this thesis, and especially for invaluable suggestions on how to proceed and to interpret the documents used. Another who assisted was Mgsr. Vincenzo Carbone, archivist for the Vatican Archives of Vatican Council II, who permitted me to have access to the otherwise unavailable and unpublished (sub-secreto) four drafts of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

I owe an equally important debt of gratitude to Charles Davis, Chairman of the Department of Religious Studies, Sir George Williams University, Montreal, for graciously speaking with me at the earliest stages of this research and for allowing me to use his personal copies of the drafts of the Pastoral Constitution which he had used during his participation in the Second Vatican Council. I appreciate as well the time and suggestions of Gregory Baum, O.S.A. of the Department of Religious Studies, St. Michael's College, Toronto, who was the first person, besides my director, with whom I discussed the thesis project.

To my director, Joseph C. McLelland, I express my sincere appreciation not only for agreeing to direct this dissertation but also, and most especially, for his creative insights and humor which made the research and publication the enjoyable task it was.

My gratitude is expressed to Valerie MacDevitt who typed the manuscript and, to Katherine French and Anna Marie Vadnais who proof read this work. Without their tireless assistance and encouragement this dissertation would not have been completed in the spring of 1973.

This dissertation is intended as a general contribution towards further study of the underlying conceptions of man opera-

tive in the institutions of a society, and a specific contribution to such a study of the Roman Catholic Church as an institution in North America in the 1960s. I consider my original contribution towards such a study to be in the following areas.

Firstly it is the first time that these three pastoral publications are comparatively analyzed in order to discover their underlying conception(s) of man. Secondly, based on the method of comparative analysis, I constructed my own working descriptions of the conception(s) of man which seem to underlie each of the publications used. Thirdly, I explicate the shift which occurs in the conception of man as it moves away from a classical to a relational conception. Fourthly, I attempt to develop some of the theological consequences and the implications of having at least two world-views existent simultaneously in the same institution.

Since this is the first time these three publications have been comparatively analyzed in order to construct their underlying conception(s) of man, there are no "related works" immediately relevant to this study. Neither do there seem to be any works immediately relevant regarding the process of the construction of the conception(s) of man operative within an institution.

There are, however, five works which have especially influenced the method of this dissertation: J. H. van den Berg's The Changing Nature of Man; Zevedei Barbu's Problems of Historical Psychology; Peter Berger's and Thomas Luckmann's The Social Construction of Reality; Remy Kwant's Phenomenology of Social Existence; and, William A. Luijpen and Henry J. Koren's First Introduction to Existential Phenomenology. The insights expressed in the books of van den Berg, Barbu, Kwant

and Luijpen in regard to the perspectivity of man in his world have proven basic and invaluable for the development of this thesis. Although the theories on the role of a sociology of knowledge in the construction of reality suggested by Berger and Luckmann are extraordinarily significant in any attempt to discover the world-view(s) existing within institutions, their specific method was not used in this dissertation. The methodological direction of this thesis, however, would not have been possible without an awareness of the insights of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann.

INTRODUCTION

Has there been a shift in the conception of man in the Roman Catholic Church as an institution? This question has historical roots deeper than the 1960s in North America. It was, however, in that decade and on this continent that the need to raise the question became apparent. Culturally, it was a time when the human values, which had been taken for granted as commonly shared and as fundamental for the good of North American society and the institutions within it, were no longer being taken for granted either as commonly shared or as for the common good. That was the time as well when new horizons seemed to be opening and new relationships developing.

The general purpose of this dissertation is to suggest that underlying the apparent shift in the emphasis on values in North America in the 1960s is a shift in the very understanding of man himself. Such a shift manifests itself in many places and ways in a society. One of these places is through its institutions, and one of its ways is through the kinds of relationships these institutions encourage men to have with each other.

The specific purpose of this dissertation is to discover whether or not there has been a shift in the conception of man underlying one of the institutions in North America: the Roman Catholic Church. In order to 'construct' the conception(s) of man in such an institution, this work analyzes comparatively the content of the faith and the kinds of God-man relationships encouraged by that institution in three of its hierarchically approved publications.

From such an analysis it is possible to construct a conception of man in a manner similar to one described by

Z. Barbu when he explains that if behaviour cannot be observed:

One can only infer it from, or 'construct' it out of indirect and normally incomplete evidence made available to him by historical sources. (In this way) . . . one can speak about a personality structure characteristic of the archaic or of the classical era of Greek society, . . . or modern personality structure. Similarly one can speak - as D. Riesman does - about an 'other-directed- and an -inner-directed' personality structure characteristic of the present day and of the earlier stages of American culture respectively.¹

The following pastoral publications which are the historical sources for this dissertation were chosen because they were used by the Roman Catholic Church as an institution in North America between 1958-1970: A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, revised edition of the Baltimore Catechism, #2, 1958; A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults (of the Netherlands), 1966 and with Supplement, 1969; and, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, promulgated by the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council in 1965.

Although this selection involves comparing two catechisms with a Conciliar document, it was made on the basis of what the publications have in common. First, all are pastoral publications, that is, they were written to assist man on the level of his everyday life in the Catholic Faith.² Second, all

1: Zevedei Barbu, Problems of Historical Psychology, New York, Grove Press, p. 4.

2: Although all authentic theology is pastoral, it is possible to speak of particular theological works as specifically pastoral insofar as they are written to assist man on the practical level of living his faith and in order to distinguish them from those theological works written to clarify the theoretical bases of the faith, for example, its doctrine, etc.

are addressed to Catholics in general for the purpose of furthering their education in the faith. Third, they are used with the tacit or explicit approval of the hierarchy in North America.³ Fourth, they were used in North America between 1958-1970.

The use of these particular publications is not meant to imply that these are the only, or even the most important, ones of the institutional Church during that time. They are merely three which appear representative since all were addressed to Catholics in general and all were circulated throughout North America in that decade. Nor is the study of the Church as an institution meant to imply that this dimension of its presence in society is the only, or even the most important, one. It is

3: "North America" throughout this dissertation refers to Canada and the United States. No separate study of a Canadian catechism was done because no Canadian catechism differed significantly from that of Baltimore's, neither was any one written for adults to compare with that of the Dutch. Since all of the adult catechisms up until at least 1958 shared the same common source material (which will be developed in Appendix I) the general construction of the conception of man underlying the Baltimore catechism applies as well to those of Canada.

NB: It was not until the publication of Viens vers le Père which began to be used in French sectors of Quebec in 1964 and then translated into English and used as the official Canadian catechism, that there was any serious departure from the traditional catechisms. However, this catechism, published by the Paulist Press for the United States and English speaking Canada in 1966 as Come to the Father, was written especially for the age levels of the child in the grade school and, for this reason, was not used in this dissertation which is concerned with publications originally intended for the adult Christian community.

The Dutch catechism and the Pastoral Constitution were used with at least tacit hierarchical approval in both Canada and the United States during the 1960s.

being studied because it is through the institutional dimension of its presence in the world that the Church has inserted itself into society.

A better understanding of the changes in values and human responses which manifested themselves in the RCC⁴ in North America during the period under consideration could arise from an awareness of the conception(s) of man underlying that institution's officially presented positions. There are many ways to work through the massive amount of material involved in a comparative analysis of the Baltimore and Dutch catechisms and the Pastoral Constitution. For purposes of this dissertation, there are two reasons why the analysis is narrowed to a study of the content of the faith and of the kind of God-man relationships these publications encourage. Firstly, the content area is fundamentally the same in all three pastoral works; and, secondly, a study of the kind of God-man relationship(s) encouraged in each allows for a construction of the conception of man based on the raison d'être of the Church in every age: the relationship between God and man.

The following are the working descriptions and meanings intended by the words and terms used throughout this dissertation. Shift means a change in perspectivity. A shift would manifest itself in an institution by the appearance of new relationships, new values and new horizons. Man is used to signify humanity in general and the person as an individual and social member of humanity in particular. The use of conception

4: The use of RCC throughout this dissertation stands for the Roman Catholic Church.

of man or perspective on man implies the way in which man is perceived by the institutional Church. World is used to embrace the broadest scope of man's reality and is intended therefore in the case of this study, to include God, himself, and fellowman. Although world-view is used often interchangeably with conception of man or perspective on man, it is used also to describe the broadest perspective on life apparently held by the institutional Church. The RCC as institution means that aspect of the Catholic tradition which has organized itself into specific patterns of relationships among hierarchy and laity and has concretized itself in terms of specific beliefs, laws, and ways of serving society under the coordination of the Pope of Rome and the members in affiliation with him. Unless otherwise stated, any use of the term Roman Catholic Church intends that it be considered exclusively as institution.

As a result of this study, we maintain that it is possible to construct at least two conceptions of man underlying these pastoral publications used in North America by the RCC as an institution between 1958-1970. The one will be called a classical perspective on man, the other a relational one. The shifting from a classical to a relational world-view seems to be making it possible for another perspective to emerge. We refer to this in the last chapter as a newly emerging view of man since it is not developed in the publications used, but seems to be possible because of the difference in world-views presented in these pastoral publications. We do not intend to imply that the new horizons and newly emerging view of man which seems possible is being explicitly encouraged by the institutional Church. We are suggesting only that this new perspective on man (the vague outlines of which are sketched by some contemporary theological authors) seems possible because of the

shift in the perspective on man which, we maintain, occurred in the RCC as an institution.

These conceptions of man are described briefly in this Introduction in terms of the typology used throughout this work. First, the words given and taking up are used to describe two phenomena in man's life: 1) givens- the phenomena which are considered basic realities or starting points in a person's life, for example, for a Catholic, God as Person(s). In this dissertation, "given" is used interchangeably with "content" of the faith; 2) taking up- the process by which a man chooses the way in which he will deal with the givens of his particular life, for example, will he develop a relationship with God or not? A man may question how he should take up his givens, but it is entirely possible that he may never raise such a question. He may, for example, presume that the way which is commonly accepted by others is his way as well. The way in which a man takes up the givens or content of his faith suggests the kind of relationship he is developing with God. We can say, therefore, that the perspective on man constructed from the way in which the institutional Church perceives the content of the faith, and the kind of God-man relationship it encourages, reveals how the Church as institution conceives of man at a particular time and place.

The process by which a person takes up the givens of his life, or the kinds of God-man relationships which develop as he takes up the content of his faith, is called integration. The relationship between God and man differs according to the way in which a person takes up the content of his faith. The way in which a person integrates his life reveals his perspective on life. The perspective(s) on man underlying the pastoral

publications used in this dissertation are constructed from a study of their content and of the kind of God-man relationship each encourages.

The classical perspective on man, which we maintain underlies the Baltimore catechism and is present in the Pastoral Constitution as well, can be described as one in which man sees himself in reference to himself. He conceives of himself as a spirit and a body in a dichotomous relationship. Man places himself midway in a vertical hierarchy of being which progresses upward from material to spiritual realms. As spirit-body in this echelon, spirit is considered to be essentially higher than body.

Within this scheme, therefore, man conceives of God as Pure Spirit, out of this world, and at the top of the hierarchy of being. He sees himself as an image of God with man's likeness to God thought of as mainly in the spirit. Man, therefore, is seen as coming closer to God in proportion to his ability to withdraw from the world and become more like a spirit. Classical man perceives the world as part of a universe which has an inherent order and design. This order and design is considered as external and separate from man at all times. Man's life, therefore, is to be taken up by conforming to this outside design.

In the Catholic context, failure to conform to this outside order, for example by breaking one of its laws or living as if there were no objective order and meaning in the universe, is to fail to become what from all eternity one was destined to become. This constitutes failure to do the will of God. Man therefore focuses on himself as an individual - on his individual abilities

and inabilities to conform to a pattern outside, to keep certain laws, etc. Perfect conformity is the ideal. Withdrawal from worldly concerns becomes the spiritual path to individual perfection and the way to maintain harmony in the universe.

Within a classical world-view, man questions neither his givens (for example, the order in the universe, God as Pure Spirit outside of this life), nor the way he is supposed to take them up (for example, the way in which he is to keep certain laws). The latter is very clear: conform to the design outside, the will of God, by believing certain things the Church teaches as truths, and keeping the laws in the way in which the Church teaches they must be kept. Both the givens and the ways in which they are to be dealt with are perceived as fixed realities. Creation, Incarnation, Redemption-Resurrection, for example, are considered events exclusively of the past and, therefore, as over and accomplished. Catholics individually take up the consequences or benefits of these events by conforming to the certain beliefs, keeping the specified laws and using the sacraments instituted by Christ for their individual eternal salvation outside of present time.

In this way, man posits a priori meaning to his life. He integrates his life around a universal, theoretical and abstract order outside of himself which has been accomplished already. The present, as a result, is never as significant as the past, for example, the historical events of Christ's life. Neither is it as significant as the future, for example, individual salvation at the end of time. We may see classical man, therefore, as more concerned with the eternal than with the historical, and with fixed essence rather than dynamic process.

The relational conception of man which we maintain underlies the Dutch catechism and is also present in the Pastoral

Constitution, can be described as one in which man sees himself not in reference to himself but in reference to the world. He conceives of himself as person, as one who comes into existence only through his relationship to the world. As person-in-relationship to his world, man sees himself as co-creator of the world and of the meaning it has for him.

From within a relational perspective, man sees God as Person in the world, as the one who continuously takes the initiative and invites man to cooperate in completing creation. Man is seen as an image of God, but he is most like God when he is present in the world of man, co-creating the design and meaning of life. In this Catholic context, failure to participate in this on going creation, redemption and resurrection, for example, by failing to care for one's neighbor, is to fail to deepen one's very relationship with God. Man, therefore, can be seen as describing himself in reference to the world. He sees the kind of relationship he has with God in terms of the relationships he is developing with fellowman.

Within this view of man as relational, man does not question his givens. Although creation, incarnation, resurrection are considered to be dynamic and in process rather than as fixed and ahistorical, they are taken for granted as the starting points of man's relationship to his world. Relational man, however, does question the way in which he is to take up the givens of his faith. Since he is in an on-going relationship with the God who is still creating and redeeming, man must decide continuously how he can best participate in this process. This decision-making brings about a diversity of responses - each unique and reflective of the culture and human condition of the time.

In this way, the Christian meaning of life is co-constituted by man in relationship to God and fellowman at a particular time

in his own life and in the history of the world. Man integrates his life around the more particular, practical and concrete relationships. Although he focuses more on the present, his life is continuous with the past and points towards the future. We may see relational man, therefore, as more concerned with the historical than with the eternal, with the dynamic process rather than fixed essence.

As mentioned, the new view of man which can be seen emerging from the writings of some theological authors of the 1970s is not underlying the publications used in this study. It is, nevertheless, a possible and future perspective partially because of the shift from classical to relational world-view. We describe some characteristics of this emerging perspective on man in the last chapter within the context of the theological implications arising from the shifting conception of man apparent in the institutional Church in the 1960s. An emerging view of man distinguishes itself from a relational one insofar as man describes himself in reference to himself as becoming more than human. This emphasis on the self becoming is not individualistic as in the case of a classical view, nor is it 'socialistic' (in the sense of emphasizing society first in order to consider the self), with the result of a self-society tension, as in the case of relational man. An emerging view of man emphasizes the continuity between human and divine by describing it in terms of a self becoming whole, that is, by becoming whole, man participates in the divine. This is so because man is by his human nature more than human.

Brief descriptions of the historical roots of the pastoral publications are placed as Appendices. These are to be considered simply as historical additions which broaden the contexts of the pastoral publications. The analysis is limited to the

published forms, as they appeared for general use in North America between 1958-1970. This dissertation, therefore, does not include in its analysis a comparison of the final publications with their original drafts. These latter would be beyond the scope of this study which is concerned primarily with the hierarchically approved and published position of the Roman Catholic Church as an institution in North America in the 1960s.

CHAPTER I

A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE:

Baltimore Catechism, No.2

This chapter maintains that the Baltimore catechism¹ in its content, emphasis, and the kind of God-man relationship it encourages, reveals a classical conception of man. This first chapter is an attempt to show how it is possible to arrive at this position. The following working description of classical adds to the brief one in the Introduction and is not intended to be exhaustive, merely to point up what we consider its most general characteristics.

The order and design existent outside of man obliges him to conform to what is "out there". It implies that all things essential are unchangeable and considers unchangeableness a sign of stability and truth; it sets for itself the task of "holding the whole world together" around some one point of integration; and anything that does not "fit into" this carefully patterned world-view either does not exist, or does not yet know that it belongs.

The classical account of man sees him as a part of the larger whole of the universe - a universe already full of meaning and therefore one to which man must conform. The points around which classical man integrates his life are outside himself. For the Greeks it was the gods, and behind even them, Moira, the "background of power"; for the Christian it is God. There have been times when the Law almost replaced God in the hearts of men. When this happened, law - perceived as something outside of man - became something to be kept for itself alone. To disturb the

1: A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, (1941) revised edition of the Baltimore Catechism, No. 2, Paterson, St. Anthony's Guild Press, 1958. This No. 2 revision is used because it is the one which is the result of the work of the special Commission appointed by the Catechetical section of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. These revisions were begun in 1935 and completed in 1941. The original edition bore no authorization other than the name of James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1885. Cf. Appendix I of this dissertation for further historical details.

order of the universe was to fail to be what one was supposed to be, to fail to keep the Law. For the Greeks such disobedience called down the wrath of the gods. For Christians, if serious enough, it was sure to be followed by "eternal damnation".

A classical concept of man which sees him in a hierarchy of life, tends to equate spirit with reason. Man is called a "rational animal", that is, one who operates with reason which makes him higher than the animals which operate only out of instinct and passion. This hierarchical arrangement inherited from the Greeks, perceives man as more than the animals but less than the gods. This classical world-view was carried into the Christian tradition. Since all the Fathers share a Platonic world-view, this view characterized the Christian Patristic age, and received its most powerful and influential expression in Augustine. This hierarchy of being was carried to its logical extreme. For classical Greeks, thought was higher than action, man the contemplative more human than man the worker. In fact, slaves were kept to work so man could be free to think.² Remnants of the Platonic description of man's soul as caged in his body³ found their way into Augustinian spirituality in terms of the supremacy of the soul over the body.⁴

2: Sabastian de Grazia, Of Time, Work and Leisure, New York, Doubleday, 1964, pp. 31-32; Aristotle, The Politics of Aristotle, trans. with introduction, marginal analysis, essays, notes and indices by B. Jowett, Vol. I, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1885, Book I 4, pp. 6-7.

3: Dialogues of Plato, trans. with analysis and introductions by B. Jowett, Vol. I, New York, Scribners', 1911, p. 639.

4: As one example of this, cf. Augustine of Hippo, The City of God, abridged and translated J.W.C. Ward, London, Oxford University Press, 1963, Part II, B, XVIII, # 18; XIX, #2-4.

A classical concept of man tends to see him in the abstract terms of universal man. He is described in ahistorical, a priori ways as substance (soul) and accident (body), as unchanging nature which will last eternally, as "essence" existing in the abstract, universal, and theoretical. A classical world-view attempts to cut through the accidents of time and history to arrive at the eternal, universal and unchanging. This is not dissimilar from the Platonic understanding of "the unchangeableness of essences",⁵ for example, the soul or the concept of absolutes and relatives. It simply places emphasis on the absolute as an unchanging sameness outside of man.⁶ This is why we may see classical man as more concerned with the universal than the historical, and with fixed essences rather than dynamic processes.

Part I: The Creed (Lessons 1-14)

The catechism is divided into three parts: I, Creed; II, Commandments; III, Sacraments.⁷ The content of Part I (The Creed) is drawn from the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed. It

5: Dialogues of Plato, op. cit., Vol. II, p.528.

6: Dialogues of Plato, op. cit., Vol. III, p.193.

7: This sequence is considered the most noteworthy modification of the revised edition (No.2). It was mentioned at the Historical Symposium: The Confraternity Comes of Age, 1956, (Paterson, Confraternity Publication) that, although this ordering followed that of other contemporary catechisms by John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam (Dublin: C. M. Warren, 1865), and is considered one of the major influences on the Baltimore Catechism, it differed from its own original edition and that of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, 1566. Their sequence was: Creed, Sacraments, Commandments. For further development cf. J. Hofinger, "Ordering of Catechetical Material", Lumen Vitae, 2 (1947), pp.718-746. For further examination see: The Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated into English by T. A. Buckley, London, Routledge and Company, 1852.

encourages man to relate to God as Father, as Son, and as Holy Ghost. Each person of this triune Godhead is defined and described in terms of ahistorical and universal functions and the ahistorical and universal responses man must have if he is to be saved. This emphasis on salvation is the pivotal one of this section. It focuses on the aspect of "what is to be believed" in the present in order to be saved in the future.

Man is described as creature in relationship with God his Father-Creator, as sinner in a relationship with God the Son, his Redeemer, and as member of the Church in relationship with God the Holy Spirit-Indwelling Spirit of Love. The arrangement of the content into three different areas of thought, each centering on one of the three persons, and the attention drawn to the division between man and each divine person, emphasizes more the separation than the unity between God and man.

It is significant not only that this occurs but also that it is accentuated by references which imply a separation of spirit from body, supernatural from natural, heaven from earth, hereafter from here and now, eternal from temporal, etc. The analysis of the relationships encouraged between man and each person of the Trinity in Part I reveals a concern not only with orienting life towards a relationship with God that will save man eternally, but also with living life conscious of a division between a God out there "above" and man in here "below".

This emphasis does more than call attention to a distinction between two orders of reality. It focuses on a division between them. This is done mainly by recalling continually the gulf between God and man caused by sin.

The purpose of man's existence (Lesson 1, #1-#7) is justified wholly in terms of man's relationship with God. It is He who made man. God did this to show His goodness and share with man His

happiness in heaven. To gain this happiness, man must know, love and serve God in this world. These things he learns how to do through the teaching of the Catholic Church contained in the Apostles' Creed.

This creed becomes the framework and basis for the remaining thirteen lessons of Part I. Each article is quoted at the beginning of the lessons and the ensuing questions and answers - often as many as thirty-four (#136-#169) - elaborate on the meaning the Church gives an article of this creed.

"I believe in God, the Father Almighty". God, the Father is described as the almighty, eternal, self-existing, infinitely perfect Supreme Being above all creatures who is all-good, all-knowing, all-present, all-wise, all-holy, all-merciful, all-just and who watches over man with loving care. Man can come to know God through his natural reason and also through Divine revelation, that is, from truths found in scripture and in tradition (Lesson 2, #8-#23).

This description of God as Father is put in the context of God as Triune in Lesson 3, #24-#34. The Father is the first person of the Trinity; the Son is the second and the Holy Ghost is the third. Trinity is interpreted to mean one and the same God in three divine persons, each really distinct although all perfectly equal to one another since all have the same one divine nature. These patristic distinctions between nature and person were repeated by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century.⁸

8: Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Latin text, English translation. Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossary, by Thomas Gilby, O.P., Cambridge, Blackfriars, 1963. I, q.33, a.2; q.34, a.2; q.36, a.1 and a.4; q.39, a.2; q.42, a.1.

The catechism uses these classical distinctions between nature and person. It explains that man cannot fully understand how there could be three divine persons in one divine nature in God because it is a "supernatural mystery": a truth which man cannot fully understand but which he firmly believes because he has God's word for it (#34). This description of God succeeds in placing Him outside of and beyond the realm of any human experience. A relationship between two persons, one of whom is beyond the experience and imagination of the other, can be described in intellectual terms, definitions and descriptions. The result is knowledge about the unimaginable one, and often the construction of a "hierarchy of being" going from matter to "pure Spirit".

In assuming a position which seems hierarchically above creation, angels, and man (Lessons 4 and 5, #35-#62) God is defined as creator of heaven and earth, that is, He made all things from nothing by His almighty power. Angels and men are next and described as His chief creatures, the former being created spirits without bodies (#37), the latter being body and spirit and made to the image and likeness of God - the likeness to God being chiefly in the soul (#48, # 49).

At their creation, God bestowed on the angels great wisdom, power and holiness, understanding and free-will. Some remained faithful to God, others did not. Those who did are the good angels and entered an eternal happiness of seeing, loving and adoring God, helping man by praying for him, acting as messengers from God to man and serving as man's guardian angels. The angels who did not remain faithful were cast into hell and try to harm man by tempting him to sin (#37-#49).

This preoccupation with creation out of nothing, and the gradation from nothing through matter to pure spirit, is similar

to that of The Catechism of the Council of Trent of 1566,⁹ and The Summa Theologica by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century.¹⁰

Man's first parents were blessed with sanctifying grace which gave them a right to heaven, great knowledge, control of the passions by reason, freedom from suffering and death (#53). Adam and Eve disobeyed God's command and, as a result of this free choice on their part, they lost sanctifying grace, the right to heaven and their special gifts, became subject to death and to suffering and to the inclination to sin (#56).

In both the instances of the creation of angels and of men, the Baltimore catechism stresses the spirit as significant. Man is clearly "less than the angels" since he has a body, and his likeness to God is mainly in the soul. That man is "below" the angels is also implied by the description of how the good angels help man and the bad ones tempt him. In either case man is presented as one who is exposed to the influence of spirits, and the spirits seem to have more control over him than he has over himself.

The Church, therefore, describes man as an image of God and initiates him into knowledge about God as Father-Creator and into knowledge about himself as a creature less than the angels who, nevertheless, was created to share in God's happiness but who freely chose otherwise. Some angels chose to disobey God but their punishment was immediate and irreversible and differed from man's.

9: The Catechism of the Council of Trent, trans. with notes, T.A. Buckley, London, Routledge and Company, 1852, Part I, Chapter II, question XV.

10: Thomas Aquinas, op.cit., I, q.46, a.2; q.50-74.

Sin, and man as sinner in need of salvation, assumes a central position in the catechism from this lesson: one hundred and eighty-two of the four hundred and ninety-nine questions concern themselves with some aspect of sin. Immediately following the descriptions of the creation and fall of angels and man, and man's need of salvation, come the detailed questions and defining answers on sin (Lesson 6, #63-#76). What kinds exist other than original sin? What are the effects of sin? What is necessary to commit a mortal sin? . . . a venial one? etc. The answers given are definite and very detailed.

The emphasis on sin is on the act as if it were "out there". Sin is described as an action or omission forbidden by the law of God. Man is seen in a relationship with God's law. He can obey it or not, but there is no focus on the relationship with God Himself. The definitions of the kinds of sin as mortal and venial were mentioned in Augustine¹¹ and developed by Thomas Aquinas,¹² while The Council of Trent and The Catechism of the Council of Trent seem to presuppose these categories as if they were part of an original revelation.¹³

"I believe in Jesus Christ ..."

Since the purpose of the Incarnation is explained in terms of saving man from his sin, the relationship between Jesus and

11: Augustine of Hippo, De Diversis Quaestionibus, Chapter 83, q.26; Sermons 351. #4; #7.

12: Thomas Aquinas, op. cit., I-II; q.71, a.6; q.74, a.8-10; q.88-89.

13: The Council of Trent, Session VI, Canon 23, 25 and 27; The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Chapter V, q. XLVI and XLVII.

man is described primarily as one of redeemer-sinner. Underlying this emphasis on the redeemer-sinner relationship between God and man is the classical conception of man: he exists ahistorically, theoretically and abstractly untouched by time and place. Basically, he is in a relationship with Christ as one whose death-resurrection event happened once and for all mankind centuries ago.

The Baltimore catechism continues to focus on the dimension of human sinfulness by the kinds of questions it raises on the incarnation. God's becoming man is introduced as the fulfillment of God the Father's promise not to abandon man after Adam's original sin. He sent His own Son into the world of sin as Saviour in order to free man from his sin and reopen to him the gates of heaven (Lesson 7, #77-#89).

The details of the Incarnation re-emphasize the Church's preoccupation with the division between God and man, spirit and body, supernatural and natural. For example, Jesus is God because He is the only Son of God, having the same divine nature as His Father. He is man because He is the Son of the Virgin and has a body and soul like man's. He is only one person - that of the second person of the Trinity and has two natures, God's and man's. The Son was not always man, but became one at the Incarnation, that is, at the moment in which as Son of God He took to Himself a human nature by being conceived and made man by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Joseph was the spouse of Mary, but the foster father of Jesus.

As recently as the 1958 publication of this catechism, the Church viewed the Incarnation as a past and finished event. The emphasis is on Jesus as the one sent into the world by His Father through the power of the Spirit; there was no sense of any emergence from or uniting with the world. This focus on God as

above and outside of the world but coming down to man, continues the classical descriptions in the spirit of Trent and Augustine.¹⁴

The Redemption (Lesson 8, #90-#104) is presented in much the same way as was the Incarnation: definitions of, and information about a past event. "By the Redemption is meant that Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the whole human race offered His sufferings and death to God as a fitting sacrifice in satisfaction for the sins of men, and regained for them the right to be children of God and heirs of heaven" (#90). "The chief sufferings of Christ were His bitter agony of soul, His bloody sweat, His cruel scourging, His crowning with thorns, His crucifixion and death on the cross" (#91). Christ's passage from death to resurrection-ascension is spoken of in terms of information about facts of the past: the place and day of His death, purpose of His resurrection and ascension, the reason for His future return to judge the living and the dead. Within the context of the pastoral concern of this catechism which is to provide information and instruction about Catholicism, man's relationship with Jesus is seen exclusively in terms of the sinner pardoned and saved by Jesus. The focus is on the sufferings Jesus endured to redeem man.

¹⁴: Augustine, De Civitate Dei, Vol. I, op. cit., Lib. VII, Cap. XXXII, p. 317; Lib. IX, Cap. XV, pp. 389-391; Lib. X, Cap. XXIX, pp. 448-452; Vol. II: Lib. XVIII, Cap. XLVI, pp. 381-382.

Thomas Aquinas, op. cit., III, q.1, a.1-2; q.2, a.1-12; q.4, a.1-3; q.5, a.2-4; q.6, a.1-6.

Catechism of the Council of Trent, I, Chapter 3, question VIII and IX; Chapter 4, question I-XI.

" . . . I believe in the Holy Ghost . . . "

The section on the Holy Ghost (Lesson 9, #105-#118), continues to speak out of the same classically Greek and Christian perspective. The Holy Ghost is defined and described as the third person of the Trinity proceeding from the Father and the Son, yet equal to them because He is God.¹⁵ The Holy Ghost dwells in the Church as the source of its life and sanctifies souls through the gift of grace - a gift bestowed on man through the merits of Jesus Christ for man's salvation. A description of a God-man relationship could scarcely be more abstract. The following exemplifies this further by its use of ahistorical terms. The principal ways of obtaining grace are listed as prayer and the sacraments, especially the Eucharist; and the most ordinary actions of man merit a heavenly reward by being done for the love of God. In this way man keeps in the state of grace. Thus, grace is mentioned as something merited, heaven is something rewarded if one keeps in the state of grace. These emphases reinforce a classical concept of man in which man is described in reference to himself.

Lesson 10, #119-#135 teaches the following information regarding the consequences of grace: man's soul receives the virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost. (Lesson 10, #119-#135). The main "supernatural powers" bestowed on man's soul through grace are the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity and

15: Augustine, On the Trinity, Vol. VII, ed. M. Dods, Edinburgh, Clark, 1873, Book I, Chapter VI, 13, p. 13; Book IV, Chapter XXI, 32, p. 144.

Thomas Aquinas, op. cit., I. q.36, a.1-4; q.42, a.1.

Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part I, Chapter IX, questions IV - VI.

the gifts of the Holy Ghost: wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, piety and fear of the Lord. Some of the effects of these latter are the twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost and the beatitudes. Besides the theological virtues, there are the cardinal moral virtues: prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance.

The perfect man, the ideal Christian, is presented as one who would possess each of these virtues, gifts and fruits. In this way a perfectly harmonious relationship would exist between God and man. The ideal is clear, yet the reality is well known and is the focus of this catechism: man is a sinner and, although saved by God's Son, he is still able to choose to sin.

"I believe ... in the Holy Catholic Church ..."

This article of the Creed continues to encourage the vertical relationship between God and man. It does this by describing the Church in terms of a hierarchy of vertically exercised authority. Although the Church is initially described as a "congregation of all baptized persons united in the same faith, the same sacrifice and the same sacraments, under the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff and the bishops in communion with Him" (# 136), the remaining questions in Lessons 11 and 12 (#137-#169) are concerned more with the powers and special powers, signs and attributes of the Church as an institution founded by Christ. The four marks of the one true Church (#152) are listed as one, holy, catholic or universal, and apostolic (#155-#159), and the special attributes as ones of authority, infallibility and indefectibility (#161-#165). These four marks were more thoroughly developed in The Catechism of the Council of Trent.¹⁶

¹⁶: The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part I, Chapter X, questions X - XV.

The special power given to Peter as head was also to be passed on to his successor the Pope. "Parish priests and other priests assist the bishop in the care of souls" (#149). The laity, mentioned only twice in this catechism, come next in this hierarchical arrangement of the Church. They are defined as members of the Church who do not belong to the clerical or religious state (#150) and who help "the Church" in her care of souls by leading lives that will reflect credit on the Church and by cooperating with their bishops and priests especially through Catholic Action (#151). In this latter description, "the Church" is evidently considered to be something other than the laity since it is their job to assist "the Church" in her care of souls. "The Church" which started out being defined as a congregation of all the baptized, ends here by being equated with the Pope, bishops, priests and religious.

These particular answers about the Church are notably classical, and draw our attention to the ahistorical and universal way in which the Church evidently conceived of herself as recently as 1958. She is an organization so unchanging as to be one, holy, catholic or universal, and apostolic, so in possession of an authority and an ability to interpret faith and morals as to be infallible, and so ahistorical as to be certain of enduring beyond the end of time.

This vertical hierarchy which proceeds from God to the chosen apostles with Peter as their head, continues through his successors the bishops until our day. Such an air-tight perception of the presence of the Spirit in the world makes the last answers inevitable: "All are obliged to belong to the Catholic Church in order to be saved" (#166). "When Catholics say, 'Outside the Church there is no salvation,' they mean that those who through their own grave fault do not know that the Catholic Church is the true Church or, knowing it, refuse to join it, cannot be saved" (#167); but, "... those who remain outside ... through no grave

fault of their own and do not know it is the true Church, can be saved by making use of the graces which God gives to them" (#168). This attitude is clearly similar to, if not identical with, Trent's own, counter-Reformation logic: the whole world of truth seems to hold together only if it can be contained within the scope of the one true Church.¹⁷

"... in the communion of saints ..."

In completing this vertical hierarchical relationship between God and the "faithful on earth", account is taken of the "blessed in heaven" and the "souls in purgatory" with Christ as their head (Lesson 13, #170-#175). This reference to the "communion of saints" implies a union between the living and the dead which fills in any "gap" that might have seemed to raise questions and further reinforces the Church as an all-encompassing reality.

"... I believe ... in the forgiveness of sins"

One question (#175) is given to this particular article of the Creed. It calls attention to the special power given by Christ to the Church to forgive the sins of those who truly repent.

"... the resurrection of the body and life everlasting"

The sequence of events in history which began with God as creator of heaven and earth, angels and man, who called all to share in His glory and finally to be reunited in soul and body, is now complete. Lesson 14 (#176-#187) develops the details of this final resurrection: - who are punished in hell forever, who are punished in purgatory for a while, and who are rewarded in heaven forever.

17: The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part I, Chapter X, questions X and XI.

From this analysis of Part I: The Creed, it seems that the underlying concept of man may be viewed as "classical" in the light of our working use of that term. It holds as an ideal the vertical dimension of the God-man relationship. Man's present relationship with God is seen resting on events of salvation which are emphasized as ones accomplished in the past and promising a salvation out of time in the future. God's presence in the world is through the Church and described in the ahistorical, theoretical, universal concepts typical of a classical world-view.

Part II: The Commandments (Lessons 15-22)

God and man can be seen as in a classical relationship through an understanding of the place of law in man's life. The basis of Catholic belief is explained in terms of this vertical and individual God-man relationship. This includes an emphasis on the division between body and soul, and the primacy of spirit over body. It is not surprising, therefore, that this section of the catechism is given to a development of what specific activities are required of those who posit belief in the twelve articles of the creed. These directives can be seen as reinforcing the vertical and individual God-man type of relationship. The importance that is given to the place of laws can be appreciated from the fact that the commandments, or the keeping of the law, come as the second part of man's duty if he is to be saved.¹⁸

The commandments are presented in the questions and answers of this section in the same ahistorical, abstract and global way

18: The 1956 Historical Symposium mentions that this seems a logical division - what we must believe, what we must do, and the chief supernatural means to be able to do them. The Confraternity Comes of Age, Paterson, Confraternity Press.

as the articles of the creed were developed. The presentation of the laws in question-answer form suggest they are unchanging, for all time, and all people.

Even though the two great commandments are mentioned at the beginning as those which contain the whole law of God (#189), only six questions are raised concerning how one must live these in the world. The corporal and spiritual works of mercy are listed as obligations to be fulfilled with no attempt to develop what is involved in, for example, feeding the hungry today, giving drink to the thirsty tomorrow, etc. In fact, the separation of the corporal from the spiritual works of mercy again emphasizes two separate concerns for man: one for his body, another for his spirit.

By contrast, one hundred and ten questions and answers are given to the development of some of man's responsibilities in keeping the ten commandments and the six commandments of the Church. These latter, plus performing the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, are justified as ways in which man is to love God, his neighbor and himself (#190). However, the main concern of this part of the catechism is to develop the details involved in living each of the commandments. This becomes the central pre-occupation.¹⁹

Love of God and love of neighbor are considered as two commandments. The emphasis on the ten commandments as divided between the three regarding man's responsibility to God and seven regarding man's responsibility to his neighbor reinforces this view of how God and man are in relation. There is no attempt on

19: This amount of concentration on the decalogue is true of The Catechism of the Council of Trent, cf. Part III, Chapters I-X.

the part of the catechism of Baltimore to put this Old Testament perception into the light of the New Testament. In the development of the first three commandments, (Lesson 16-18) the focus is on God and the concerns are mainly with exactly what one is commanded to do for Him (#199, #224, #234); what is involved in fulfilling these commands (#220, #225, #235); what obligations come in addition to these laws (#201 - #214; #226-#233; #236-#240).

They are developed in the catechism in terms of obligations to God that must be fulfilled, and information about what sins are committed if these obligations are not fulfilled. In the development of the last seven commandments, (Lesson 19-20) the focus is on man. The concerns are mainly with exactly what man is commanded to do to fulfill the laws of God which command him to respect his neighbor by avoiding certain things that would be unjust. The catechism emphasizes the same things in regard to the seven commandments directed toward neighbor as it does in regard to the three commandments directed toward God. It mentions exactly what is commanded in each area (#241, #252, #254, #259, #264, #273, #277), what is involved in fulfilling each commandment (#242, #252, #260, #265, #276, #278), and what additional obligations arise from these laws (#244, #250, #253-#258, #261-#263, #266-#271, #274-#276, #278).

The vertical hierarchy which focuses on God as above and man as an individual below is reflected in the presentation of these commandments. Man's primary obligation is to God, then to his neighbor. In the detailed development of what is involved in fulfilling the first, second and third commandments, the God to be worshipped is a "supernatural" God above, the God about whom one must speak reverently is one above angels and men, and the God who must be worshipped on the Lord's day is one outside of this world of the everyday.

The focus is on man as one who must worship by acts of faith, hope and charity, adoration and prayer. He is commanded to speak reverently of God, the saints and holy things and to be truthful in taking oaths and faithful to vows. On Sunday, he must assist at Mass and is forbidden to do servile work (#198-#240). Thus man is seen basically as in a submissive and obediential relationship with God in these first three commandments. By these emphases, he is consistently encouraged to maintain a relationship with God through conformity.

Commandments four through ten are usually referred to as those directed towards "neighbor", although here, too, God and man are in a classical relationship. The way in which the obligations of these last six commandments are developed leaves the impression that this catechism is more pastorally concerned with what men are to avoid so as not to offend God than it is concerned with directing the believer in how to serve his neighbor.

The vertical relationship with God is re-emphasized and legalistic overtones become more apparent in such descriptions as the following: "A person commits a sin of calumny or slander when by lying he injures the good name of another" (#269). Neighbor seems worth man's respect because God has commanded it be done in His name. This emphasis of the Baltimore catechism is similar to that of Trent's in which the giving of alms is encouraged as part of the seventh commandment as "necessary in order to avoid idleness".²⁰

The six commandments of the Church (Lessons 21 and 22) are justified in terms of the Catholic Church's right to make laws as coming from Jesus who said to the apostles, the first bishops:

20: The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part III, Chapter VIII, q. XVIII.

"whatever you bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven" (#279).²¹ These laws oblige Catholics on different levels of their lives. For example, "to confess sins at least once a year" and "to receive the Eucharist during the Easter season", obliges man on the level of the sacramental as well as the legal; to observe the laws of the Church concerning marriage obliges him on the sacramental level as well as on the very personal one of whom he can and cannot marry; to contribute to the support of the Church obliges him on many levels, but today this has become limited to mainly the economic.

The vertical relationship between God and man is paralleled in the Church. The bishops of the Church are thought of as those receiving special rights to make laws regarding certain relationships man has with God. The details of what is commanded and forbidden by these laws, their reason for existence, their place in the life of Catholics, etc., is explained in the catechism in the usual terms of direct line of authority from God through Christ to the apostles and their successors.

The emphasis in Part II is on the negative and more legal technicalities of living the Christian life rather than on more positive and creative ones. The classical concept of man emerges from the emphasis on the commandments in the same way it emerged from the emphasis on the beliefs; there are certain teachings to be followed if one is to be saved eternally. Perfect conformity would lead to the perfect life hereafter.

Part III: The Sacraments and Prayer (Lesson 23-38)

The sacraments and prayer seem to have as ahistorical a place in the Christian's life as the creed and commandments. The sacraments are defined as "outward signs instituted by Christ to

21. Mt. 16:19.

give grace" (#304).²²

The catechism teaches that if man has the right disposition these seven²³ sacraments give sanctifying grace as well as a 'special' grace called sacramental (#309). The general purpose of the sacraments is presented as the giving or restoring of a supernatural life of grace to souls (#310, #311). It is classical in its focus on the soul as the recipient of grace as well as in its emphasis on the sacraments as "outward signs" to be received by man.

Analysis of the catechism's presentation of the sacraments reveals a pastoral preoccupation with information and instruction about them in their essence, function and effect. These questions continue to encourage an exclusively individual type of relationship with God. Each sacrament is defined as one which either gives new life to the individual's soul (baptism), or which restores/or strengthens the individual soul for a particular task (confirmation, eucharist, extreme unction, matrimony, holy orders, penance). In each case, however, the "soul's" eternal salvation is of central concern, and its relationship with God emerges as dependent on the "direct line" of grace channelled through these "outward signs" instituted by Christ to give grace (#304).

22: The definition of the sacraments in The Catechism of the Council of Trent; Part II, Chapter I, q. III, seems drawn from Augustine's The City of God, X, 5, p.162: a sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing, that is, a visible sign of an invisible grace; instituted for our justification.

23: Thomas Aquinas, op. cit., III, q. 65, a. 1 and 2.

N.B. The number was fixed at seven at the Synod of London in 1237. Cf. William R. Cannon, History of Christianity in the Middle Ages: from the Fall of Rome to the Fall of Constantinople, New York, Abingdon Press, 1960, p. 267, footnote 35.

In the catechism, both baptism and penance are described as "sacraments of the dead" since their purpose is seen to be either giving, increasing, or restoring supernatural life to the soul in sin. In both sacraments, sin is a central concern since sin blots out or interferes with man's individual relationship with God. Twelve of the fifteen questions on baptism and fifty-three of the fifty-six questions on penance explain their necessity in terms of having sin "taken away". The place and necessity of baptism and penance in the life of a Catholic focus on the functional and the negative; "having sins taken away"; being "sacraments of the dead", etc. Such emphases encourage an individualistic God-man relationship as necessary for "salvation" and encourage a relationship based on fear - fear of losing one's soul, rather than of weakening a relationship with God.

The sacraments of confirmation and holy eucharist emphasize the individual's relationship with God. Confirmation is defined as the sacrament through which the Holy Ghost comes to man in a special way and enables him to profess his faith as a strong and perfect Christian and soldier of Jesus Christ (#330). Holy eucharist is defined as a sacrament and a sacrifice in which Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine, is contained, offered and received (#343); holy communion is the receiving of Jesus Christ in this sacrament (#366).

Both sacraments focus on the individual. Confirmation does this by mentioning especially what it "does for man", for example, helps him to live his faith loyally and to profess it courageously (#337-#339). The individualistic view of man is reinforced by the emphasis on the practical details of the conferring and reception of the sacrament (#331-#336). The eucharist and communion are described in terms which are technical to the extent of trying "to explain" the mystery of what exactly happens to the bread and wine after it becomes the Body and Blood of Christ (#348-#351), and descriptive to the degree of naming the time, place, meal and persons present at the time the sacrament was instituted.

The sacrament is described as well in terms of the individual's relationship with Christ who is under the appearance of bread and wine. This is accomplished partially by the carefully detailed legal instruction on "what is necessary to receive Holy Communion worthily" (#367), what happens if he receives communion in mortal sin (#368), what fast laws are current. These strong emphases on the individual aspects of receiving communion are exemplified especially through the answers to the questions: "what should be done to prepare for communion?" (#373); and, "what are its chief effects?" (#375).

To prepare for communion one is told to think about the Divine Redeemer whom he is about to receive and to make fervent acts of faith, hope, charity and contrition. The chief effects of the sacrament are listed as four: closer union with the Lord and more fervent love of God and neighbor, increase in sanctifying grace, preservation from mortal sin and remission of venial sin, and a lessening of an inclination to evil and help to practice good works. Further, frequent, even daily, reception of the sacrament is encouraged on the grounds that such intimate union with Christ is the greatest aid to a holy life (#377). Even how one "should" show gratitude for the eucharistic presence on the altars is spelled out in terms of individualistic responses: visits to Him, reverence in Church, assisting at daily Mass, attending parish devotions, being present at Benediction (#378).

Extreme unction is the sacrament which, through the anointing with blessed oil by the priest and through his prayers, gives health to the soul and sometimes to the body when one is in danger of death from sickness, accident or old age (#443). Again, preparation for, and the effects of, the sacrament are described in terms of an individualistic type of relationship with God. One should prepare for example, to receive extreme unction worthily by a good confession, by acts of faith, hope, charity and especially resignation to the will of God (#447). The effects of

this sacrament are: an increase in sanctifying grace, comfort in sickness and strength against temptation, preparation for entrance into heaven by remission of venial sins and cleansing of the soul from remains of sin, and health of body when it is good for the soul (#445).

Holy orders focuses on the individual by describing this sacrament in the following way. It is the "sacrament through which men receive the power and grace to perform the sacred duties of bishops, priests and other ministers of the church." (#451). Requirements for its worthy reception are: that a man be in the state of grace and of excellent character, be of the prescribed age and learning, have the intention of devoting his life to the ministry, and be called to it by his bishop (#452). The effects of ordination are listed as: an increase in sanctifying grace and sacramental grace, and a lasting character imprinted on the soul which is a special sharing in the priesthood of Christ and which gives the priest special supernatural powers (#453).

These "supernatural powers" are the ability to change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ and to forgive sins (#454). The individual receives this sacrament and these supernatural powers through Christ's successors, the bishops. This sacrament emphasizes mainly the individual priest's relationship with God as having "increased in sanctifying and sacramental grace and receiving special supernatural powers" (#453). Although these special powers of changing bread and wine into Christ's Body and Blood and forgiving sins are precisely for someone other than himself, viz., the community, the emphasis is on the priest as the individual who receives these graces and powers and who is a "representative of Christ and dispenser of His mysteries" (#455).

The sacrament of matrimony is developed in terms of a binding together of two baptized persons in a lawful marriage and the reception of grace to discharge their duties (#457). Eight questions

are on the duties of the couples to each other and to their children as well as the legal directives regarding what is meant by unity in marriage, the Church's right to regulate marriages of the baptized, the state's authority regarding the marriages of the baptized, the laws of the Church regarding them, etc.

The emphasis is again on individualistic aspects. The couples' preparation is encouraged from the perspective of the individual: to pray God to direct their choices, to seek advice of their parents and confessors, to practice the virtues, especially chastity, and to receive frequently the sacraments of penance and holy eucharist. The chief effects of the sacrament on the couple are listed as: an increase in sanctifying grace, the special help of God for husband and wife to love each other faithfully, to bear with each other's faults, and to bring up their children properly (#466).

The descriptions of the seven sacraments seem to reveal a classical appreciation of man in much the same way as do the descriptions of his beliefs and commandments. In all three relationships with God (creed, commandments and sacraments) man is focused on as a soul destined for an eternal life outside time and space. His freely chosen sinfulness placed the emphasis on his need for salvation which was to be accomplished through the life-death-resurrection of the Father's Son in the Spirit of Love. The beliefs, laws and sacraments are defined and described exclusively in terms of obligations which man must fulfill in order to be saved. In this way, they maintain their identity as "things" outside man to which he must conform if he chooses to take his rightful place in the vertical order of the universe.

Sacramentals (Lesson 36, #469-#474) are "holy things or actions of which the Church makes use to obtain for man from God, through her intercession, spiritual and temporal favors" (#469). The chief sacramentals are blessings, exorcisms and blessed

objects, for example, holy water, candles, ashes, palms, crucifixes, rosaries, scapulars, images of Christ, the Virgin Mary and the saints (#473).

Sacramentals obtain favors from God through the prayers of the Church offered for those who make use of them and through the devotion they inspire (#470). Care is taken to explain this, lest anyone think that the sacramentals themselves had any power to obtain favors. Once again the traditional understanding of man in relation to God emerges - the individual benefits from the use of sacramentals by: an increase in actual graces, forgiveness of his venial sins, remission of his temporal punishment, health to his body and material blessings, protection from evil spirits.

Prayer (Lesson 37, #475-#489) is a lifting of the mind and heart to God (#475). The focus is again on the soul of man. The connotation of "lifting" is that God must be "up" and man "down". The classical understanding of man as body and soul is also implied: it is the mind and heart that are lifted up in prayer. There is no evidence of an understanding of man as a person who experiences himself more as a psychosomatic unity than as a body-and-soul or embodied spirit.

The pastoral concern of the Baltimore catechism for the relationship between God and man is perhaps epitomized in its answers on prayer. Prayer is an individual affair, very private for the most part. There are, as well, very minutely developed details on the procedures one should follow and observe in prayer (#477-#489). For example, the specific ways in which one should pray (#477), those for whom one should pray (#478), how one knows that God always hears prayers (#479), why one does not always receive what is prayed for (#480), and the kinds of prayers (#482-#487).

The instruction reinforces the vertical, exclusively individual-God relationship, and couples this with legal overtones on

proper procedures. It also re-emphasizes a division between God and man. This focus on prayer is clearly from the point of view of man. He is the one who "lifts his mind and heart"; decides whom he will pray for, which prayer he will say, how and why he will say them. This emphasis on the individual and legal is not balanced by any other. Therefore, the lines of classical man are drawn: his prayer is characteristically ahistorical, universally the same, and with the a priori confidence that he always will receive what is best. Even prayer is an obligation with specific requirements, and the submissiveness and obedience to a God "out there" is its characteristic relationship.

The Our Father (Lesson 38, #490-#499) is considered "the best of all prayers because it is the Lord's." Taught by Jesus Himself, it is a prayer of perfect and unselfish love (#490). The explanations given for each of the phrases in the Our Father (#491-#499) focus on informing one about the meaning they should have for the person praying. These interpretations imply that there are no other interpretations possible.

Even though there is casual mention of "neighbor" (#491) and "all men" (#493, #494, #497), the emphasis on the individual is not broken in this last lesson. The Lord's prayer is defined as one of "perfect and unselfish love" because in saying it we offer ourselves entirely to God and ask from Him the best things, not only for ourselves but also for our neighbor (#491). The references to "all men" allude to a group besides the "we" praying. For example when we say "Thy kingdom come", we pray ... that all men may come to know and to enter the true Church" (#494).²⁴ When we say "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven", we pray that all men may obey God on earth as willingly as the saints

24: N.B. The strong implication that Church and kingdom are identical.

and angels obey Him in heaven (#495). When we say, "but deliver us from evil," we pray that God will always protect us from harm, and especially from harm to our souls (#499).

The implication is that the "we" have the true view of things and, therefore, pray for "all men". There is classical certitude in such authoritative teaching as well as emphasis on being on the inside of the "in" group. The "soul" is singularly mentioned. In #496, the usual equation of the body with materiality and the soul with spirituality occurs as well as the division between bodily and spiritual: in "give us ... material life of our bodies and the spiritual life of our souls."

This analysis of the 1958 edition of the Baltimore catechism followed the content divisions and interpreted what seemed to be the primary emphasis of the God-man relationship. As a result it can be appreciated that the Roman Catholic as a member of the institutional Church would question neither the givens, that is, the content (Part I) nor the ways in which these givens of the faith are to be taken up (Part II). The beliefs are drawn from the Apostles' Creed and the rules and laws to be kept are based on the ten commandments of God, Christ's invitations to be Christian and the six commandments of the Church.

The pivotal issue throughout the catechism is the way in which man is to take up those givens of his Catholic life. This is encouraged in terms of a relationship between man as sinner and God as his saviour. It is possible to believe what man must believe and to keep those laws one is commanded through the use of the seven sacraments and prayers (Part III). The predominant overtone is not man as one who now sins and God who now saves, but man as one who sinned in the past, was saved and although he still sins, will be saved eternally at some future point outside of time and space.

From this study of the content and emphases of four hundred and ninety-nine questions and answers, we construct a classical concept of man from the following. Part I (The Creed) develops according to the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed. Man is encouraged to assume the following postures before God: creature, sinner, member of the Church, that is, man is portrayed as creature in relationship with God as Father-Creator, as sinner in relation to God as Son-Redeemer, and as member of the Church in relation with God as the Spirit-Indwelling Love in the Church until the end of time. Although these relationships overlap, the catechism's way of comprehending God as Triune is to conceive of Him as Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and of man therefore in a relationship with each of these persons according to the above situations in which man became conscious of himself.

The main emphases of these relationships seem to be the individual and his place in the vertical hierarchy between God and man. Emphasis is also placed on the way in which man is perceived: as a body and soul dichotomy whose likeness to God is mainly in his soul. From within this perspective, man is seen as half-way in an echelon coming from pure Spirit down to the materiality of the heavens and the earth. This particular hierarchy of being is reinforced by the interplay between God as "up there" and man as "down here". For example God the Father, who is above heaven, earth, angels and men sent His Son into the world to save man from sin, and Father and Son both sent their Spirit to dwell in the Church until the end of time.

These same characteristics are reflected in Part II (The Commandments). In this part the individual and the vertically oriented God-man relationship is emphasized by stressing man's obligation to God in terms of laws to be kept. The importance of fulfilling every detail of the laws is highly developed and as a result man, in order to be saved, is encouraged to maintain a relationship with God based on obedience.

The main point around which the entire catechism pivots is man's salvation after death, his "heavenly reward". It is in this section that sin and redemption assume their central position by the analysis of the kinds of sin, their definitions and descriptions. The emphasis is on sin as something to be avoided at all cost because through serious sin one runs the risk of "eternal" damnation.

Part III (The Sacraments and Prayer) carries through the basic emphasis of Parts I-II by presenting means of receiving grace, that is, sharing in God's life if certain specific requirements are met. More than in any other terms, the seven sacraments are presented as necessary for man's salvation. The division between God and man, spirit and body, supernatural and natural, heaven and earth, are reinforced throughout this part as each of the sacraments is defined in terms of its special graces and special function in the life of man. The individual-vertical type relationship between man and God is highlighted as the preparations for and effects of each of the sacraments are seen as very "spiritual" and "individual" ones.

The primary pastoral preoccupation of the Church expressed in this catechism is to help man to come to salvation. The creed is presented with a view of informing about his human condition. Belief, plus keeping the commandments, will give him an eternal reward. This is possible through man's choice but only because he has already been saved by Jesus and can receive these salvific graces through the divinely instituted channels of grace, the sacraments.

In light of the working use of the term classical in this dissertation, it is possible to see that underlying this catechism there is a consistently classical conception of man. It is a conception in which man is seen in reference to himself. He is encouraged to focus on his individual abilities and inabilities,

and to conform to God's designs for him in order that he, the sinner, may be saved.

His presence in the world is described in ahistorical, theoretical, often abstract and universal terms. In this way man posits a priori meaning to his life and the present is never as significant as the past or the future. This presupposes the classical split between body and spirit, presuming the "higher" of the two to be the "spirit" and thereby setting up a vertical hierarchy between man and the gods which graduates upwards in proportion to its loss of the "bodily". Such a Greek concept of man found its way into the Christian tradition as early as the Patristic age and remains even as late as the 1958 revision of the Baltimore catechism.

CHAPTER II

A NEW CATECHISM, CATHOLIC FAITH FOR ADULTS

A. "The Dutch Catechism"

Even a cursory comparison of the Dutch¹ with the Baltimore catechism shows that the RCC as an institution has in each a very different view of the world and the role of the Christian in it. The question naturally arises from Catholics with a classical world-view: what is happening? How can there be such differences, even apparent contradictions, in the Church's position in the world and in its directives for Christian living? How can we account for such rapid changes as are occurring in the Church that even those with the best of intentions are profoundly confused?

How could a catechism such as Baltimore's be reprinted in 1958 for the general instruction of United States Catholics and, only eight years later, a catechism such as Holland's be published in the United States? By 1969 it had received the "imprimatur" of an American bishop - giving it enough of an official sanction to circulate freely throughout the United States and to have as much authority in the Church as Baltimore's ever received.²

It is my view that, underlying any change in directives and attitudes which are as profound and controversial as have occurred in the last decade, there is a change in the very conception of man; that is, in this case, a change in the very way in which the RCC as institution conceives of man in relation to God and to his world.

Therefore, in order to continue the development of this thesis, let us compare what seem to be the relationships between God and man encouraged in the Dutch catechism with those which seem to be

1: A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults, new authorized edition with Imprimatur and Supplement, New York, Herder and Herder, Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1969.

2: cf. Appendix I to this dissertation for the kind of approbation given to the Baltimore catechism.

encouraged in Baltimore's. After completing this comparative analysis, it should be evident that the former reveals a basically relational conception of man in his world. The difference between what is considered, in this dissertation, as a classical view of man and a relational one can be appreciated by the following working descriptions. The emphasis in a relational view of man is placed not on order and design as if these existed outside of man, but rather on man's power to integrate his world as he experiences it as 'outside' of himself and yet as something he knows he can freely control.

Relational man, like classical man, does not question his givens. Relational man, however, does question the way in which he is to take up his givens in relation to God, man and his world. He, unlike classical man, can choose the way in which he is to take them up. Thus we see relational man defining himself not in reference to himself but in reference to the world. He sees himself as person-in-relation-to-the-world, one who becomes aware of himself as he chooses how to take up the givens of his faith. From within this perspective, man sees himself so intrinsically in relation to his world that he does not see himself existing without the world, nor the world existing without him.

In a relational world-view, stability is not so much synonymous with unchangeable sameness, as with continuous change. Change flows from the interrelationship between man and his world. The most constant experience of man's life is movement and change. Stability is born from man's ability to base the continuity of his life upon this change. This relational concept of man does not posit all meaning and order outside of man and, as a result, challenge him to conform to it, but rather encourages man to co-create meaning as he integrates what is given with his modes of assimilation and use. In this mental structure man does not conceive of himself as "fitting into" the already existing patterns of the world so much as co-creating new ones in response to the new insights of his relationship with the world.

The Dutch catechism assumes that the sacraments, laws and beliefs are the givens of life within the Roman Catholic Church as an institution. Within this relational view man is encouraged to take up each of these dimensions of the faith according to his personal and cultural uniqueness. It is from these confrontations with givens that diversity arises in the relational view of man.

In this world-view, man is not conscious of himself in a vertical-individual hierarchical relationship with God. He conceives of himself as being in personal relationships with others in which authority, responsibility and love come from within these relationships rather than from outside.

Spirit and body are not described in terms which connote a dichotomy, as in a classical conception of man. Instead, man is described as person in process of becoming more human as he integrates his spirit and body in his responses to life. Man is made whole in an alternating process such as differentiation-integration. This means that man questions the way in which he is to take up his givens, that is, the way he is to integrate them into his life. He is aware that he does so in a very unique and personal way, limited by his particular perspective and conditioned by the historical circumstances at the particular time in which he lives. It is in this sense that we can speak of man as being social by nature: "man depends upon society with respect to the subject matter on which he exercises his activities. . .but man is independent in the way in which he takes up these materials."³ In the case of the Dutch catechism, the subject matter is the given, that is, the content of the faith; the way man takes them up is according to his personal relationship with God in the world of men. Thus man can be seen as social by nature insofar as he

3: Remy C. Kwant, Phenomenology of Social Existence, Pittsburgh, Duquesne, 1965, p.65.

defines himself in reference to the world both in respect to the subject matter and in respect to the way he takes it up.

Divisions of the Catechism

The Dutch catechism includes a Foreword, signed by the Bishops of the Netherlands, which expresses the hope "to present anew to adults the message which Jesus of Nazareth brought into the world, to make it sound as new as it is."⁴ The text is in five parts: I. The Mystery of Existence; II. The Way to Christ, a) The Way of Nations and b) The Way of Israel; III. The Son of Man; IV. The Way of Christ; V. The Way to the End. In the 1969 edition a Supplement was added at the request of "the Commission of Cardinals appointed to examine (the 1966 edition of) A New Catechism".

Throughout the Dutch catechism there are numbers in the margins giving cross-references to the subject as well as to the Supplement. It is within this context that we find "the themes . . . chosen to provide matter of reflection for mature believers."⁵ There is also the suggestion that "for a summary of the message of faith in shorter form . . . the reader refer himself first and foremost to the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed, the Creed used at Mass, and ancient confessions in which the Church proclaimed its faith."⁶

There is, therefore no attempt to begin by questioning the formulation of these classically stated doctrines or paradigms of the Catholic community, nor is there an implication that they no

4: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.5.

5: Ibid., p.vii.

6: Ibid., p.vii.

longer are the data of Catholic belief. In fact the Bishops write:

'new' does not mean that some aspects of the faith have been changed while all the rest remains as before. Had that been our object, we could simply have changed a few pages of the old catechism. But this is not the case. The whole message, the whole of the faith remains the same, but the approach, the light in which the faith is seen, is new.⁷

By addressing the people of Holland in this way the Bishops of the Netherlands call attention to an important fact. The catechism is an "attempt to render faithfully the renewal which found expression in the Second Vatican Council."⁸ This catechism, then, is to Vatican II what the Catechism of Trent is to Trent's Council: a pastoral effort to put the 'spirit of a council' into the hands of the believing community. Both catechisms, being addressed to particular locales, reflect a mentality which is no doubt more than that of the local area, and yet less than that of the council.

Today we can appreciate how a catechism reflects the mentality of a particular culture at a particular time. For example, today we appreciate that Trent's catechism reflects a need for "defense of the faith" as well as the Church's need of reforms. The only way we can begin to understand the Catechism of Trent is to see it as a pastoral expression of a classical concept of man. Today we have the distinct advantage of being able to see it as one expression of the Church: one reflecting that day and those problems.

It is in the spirit of reflecting on today and contemporary problems that the Dutch catechism takes its unique shape and makes its unique contribution to the long line of catechisms published within the Roman Catholic Church.

7: Ibid., p.v.

8: Ibid., p.v.

Part I: The Mystery of Existence

The Dutch catechism begins with the mystery of existence: man the questioner is face to face with life as a question. Out of the questions emerging from what the catechism considers four of life's essential elements, man is seen to be in a position to discover God. From the four elements of existence - life in common, life as on this earth, man as part of the earth in its materiality, and man as more than his body (spiritual quality, freedom) - come man's understanding of the grandeur and misery contained in living each of these. Man's beginnings, vaguely etched in his evolutionary process and his destiny, and pointed to in terms of the progress of man from barbarian to "mass murderer", leave man with no earthly answer to his question.⁹

The catechism suggests that even though these experiences, as well as the deep longings within man for happiness and goodness, could bring him to "surmise an infinite Origin, the misery of the world challenges pure reason at this point". The catechism continues, "therefore, the gift of faith in Jesus indicates the direction in which truth is to be found."¹⁰ Jesus is not presented as the answer that makes the ultimate why and wherefore clear, but rather as an answer in the sense of the one who shows man now how God Himself fights with sin and suffering.¹¹

The way in which the Dutch catechism presents the mystery of man's existence differs from Baltimore's in content division and emphasis. In the former, man is seen as always in process of

9: Ibid., p.12.

10: Ibid., p.20.

11: Ibid., P.20.

maturing and therefore questioning life as he experiences it: in its grandeur and misery. Man is presented as one who can come to the threshold of insight into God's existence through his own reasoning and view of life, but who cannot hurdle the challenge put to these by the misery in the world except through the gift of faith. In the Dutch catechism existence is a mystery - but a mystery which is dealt with more as something inexhaustibly knowable than as ".... a truth which we cannot fully understand, but which we firmly believe because we have God's word for it."¹²

The Dutch catechism emphasizes that man is one who searches out answers to questions arising from his life experiences and who, with the gift of faith, discovers Jesus as the fulfillment of his longings. Man is presented as existing in a relationship with God commensurate with human experience and faith, whereas in the Baltimore catechism his relationship emerges from knowledge about God based on fixed truths as enumerated by the authority of the Church in the Apostles' Creed.

In the Dutch catechism, the relationship between God and man is a Christocentric one. Jesus is the focal point, the one who calls man now and who is the way by which the living God comes to man. "No one has ever seen God. The only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known (Jn. 1:18)." In the Baltimore catechism attention is focused on definitions of how God is Triune. The approach is then one of logically and chronologically considering each person in turn, according to his function. This encourages a relationship with a God who worked past events - Creation, Redemption, Resurrection - and invites man into a relationship today based on fidelity to a belief in these truths

12: A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine, revised edition of the Baltimore Catechism, No. 2., Paterson, St. Anthony's Press, question 34.

of yesterday in order to be saved tomorrow. In both cases, focus on the present is avoided.

The catechism of Holland encourages man to see Jesus his brother standing in the midst of men saying "Come and see" (Jn.1:39). "The whole aim of the book is to be an answer to this invitation."¹³ This is intended as more than a book of information, truths and laws. Through this catechism the reader is initiated into a personal relationship with the risen Jesus who lives in the world of today. Then, in retrospect, man is given the information surrounding God's becoming, as well as man's. This makes the difference between being invited to hear Jesus' call to share in His life today, that is, "to become with Him", and being told that there are definite truths which must be believed about God, and definite laws which must be followed, if one wants to be saved in the future.

Although both catechisms begin their first chapters by focusing on man's existence, they differ in their emphasis on man. In the Baltimore catechism man is presented in the context of presentations on God, heaven, and the Church. The Dutch catechism puts man in the context of one who questions existence, and is able to find God through experience and the gift of faith.¹⁴ Both catechisms are concerned with the same thing: man's relationship with God. They differ in how they encourage man to discover God as well as in "where" He might be found. In the final analysis, could this not result in the Church's encouraging a different kind of God-man relationship, one based on a different kind of understanding of who man is?

13: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.22.

14: Ibid., pp.3-32.

Man's relationship with God is seen by the Dutch as one which can grow and become more genuinely human as man questions his existence. In the Baltimore catechism this relationship is seen as one which can grow in proportion to man's fidelity to the answers the RCC gives to questions about God's teachings. From this emphasis of resting on assured answers the Baltimore catechism perceives man as static. The Dutch catechism's presentation of man as questioner is more dynamic.

Part II: The Way to Christ

Within the Christian perspective of the Dutch catechism, it is apparent that the way to Christ is interpreted to be the way of nations from their primitive relations, through Hinduism, Buddhism, Chinese universalism, Islam, Humanism and Marxism to the way of Israel. The outstanding paradigm is that, whether they know it or not, all religions and philosophies of life point to Christ. Christianity emerges as the culmination of the nations', especially Israel's search for an answer to life.

Emphasis is placed on the historical and spiritual development of the Jewish people. Their awareness of their identity came as a triple process. They gradually realized they were called first of all to live more than in a common loyalty and for the welfare of their nation; secondly, to live more than an individually conscientious life; and thirdly, to open their hearts to all human beings recognizing their responsibility to share what had been given to them in Jesus. This three-fold consciousness is seen by the Dutch catechism as similar to later Christianity's own steps in development as well as that of humanity's as a whole.

The Baltimore and Dutch catechisms differ in content and in emphasis when they focus on the place of other national and religious beliefs in man's way to Christ. The Baltimore catechism never raises the question and, by this omission, focuses exclusively on the Catholic Church as the only means of salvation, although

mention is made that those "who through no grave fault of their own do not know the Catholic Church to be the true Church, can be saved by making use of the graces which God gives them."¹⁵

In the Dutch catechism the attempt to place all other religions in the context of being enroute to Christ borders on mere tokenism. It interprets all history as preparing for Christ since of all religious groups "it was through the Jewish people that God chose to reveal himself and his fidelity."¹⁶ Such an understanding of other religions raises the question of how Catholicism respects them. Is it a respect based on the assumption that whether they know it or not they are moving towards Christianity? If this is the case, then evidently Catholicism sees Christianity as the only true or real religion. This is the given: Christianity is the only full culmination of religious belief. This suggests a relational conception of man because there is a very definite given, and because there are various possibilities of how this given can be taken up.

Part III: Son of Man

In comparing the Jesus of the Baltimore catechism with the Jesus of the Dutch catechism, it is possible to notice similarities in catechism content, but the difference in emphasis is so great that one might wonder if it is the same person. The essential information remains: Jesus, Son of God, second person of the Trinity, becomes man of the Virgin Mary, suffers, dies on a cross, rises from the dead to redeem man from his sin, ascends to the Father, leaves the little community of followers to await the coming of the Spirit.

15: The Baltimore Catechism, op. cit., question 168.

16: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.37.

The emphasis however, is different from Baltimore. There the emphasis is placed on Jesus as a very ethereal person about whom there are many facts based on the authority of the Church He founded. In the Dutch catechism, the focus is on the person who performed these acts of love rather than on the fact that He performed them. It also emphasizes the fact that the actions He did then, He does now as a sign of His love. Jesus is, therefore, more than a figure in history, His activity, more than events of a past.

The difference in emphasis on the relationship between Jesus and man can also be seen by looking at the differing contexts in which Jesus is placed in each catechism. The Baltimore catechism places Jesus in the context of "The Incarnation" and of "The Redemption". It calls attention to what He did for man and how He did it. The Dutch catechism places Jesus in the context of who He is - Son of Man - and, in light of this, reflects on how His life reveals His unique love and His presence among men.

After situating man within the context of his own personal existence, and then within the context of the historical background to the coming of Jesus, the Dutch catechism concentrates specifically on the presence of a Jesus in the midst of man today. This is the context out of which Jesus emerges as "Son of Man". This emphasis on Jesus emerging from the midst of men is accomplished not only by developing the scriptural perspective (in which the emphasis was on this aspect of His presence in the community) but also by developing the way in which the presence of Jesus is celebrated liturgically today. In both these ways the catechism educates in the faith by dispelling ignorance in regard to the scriptures and the liturgy, as well as by encouraging the reader to respond to the person of Jesus who lives today and invites each person to share in His perspective of life. Jesus is seen as calling men to follow Him and "construct eternity now."¹⁷

17: Ibid., p.104.

The Baltimore catechism situates man more in terms of where and how he figures in God's plan: somewhere between the beginning and the end of the world, God created man, and Jesus came to save him from his sin. The Jesus-events are past, today men must come to Jesus by believing these things about Him and by receiving the merits of Jesus through the Church's channels of grace.

Although the purpose of both catechisms is to educate Catholics in their faith, the differing ways in which they do this can be appreciated by noticing where each places its emphasis in the God-man relationship. The Baltimore catechism is concerned that all errors be avoided and detailed answers given to the specifics of everything one knows about Jesus through the Church's authority. In this way, man can be certain that his relationship with Jesus is based on absolute truth with no danger of error.

The pastoral concern of the Dutch catechism, however, is that man enter into a personal relationship with Jesus. Paradoxically, there is mention of even more doctrinal details but always with an eye to unveiling the presence of Jesus in the fullness of His truth as one who lives now.¹⁸ It considers these very important for the development of man's understanding of his own dignity as a person.¹⁹ With pastoral intent, the catechism writes: "They (doctrinal details) help us see how closely God's becoming man is connected with man's becoming man - in the way that God meant him to be....Dogmas are values - ... which enlarge our horizons They reject nothing... but human negations and ... unfold the mystery which is disclosed in the gospels."²⁰ By placing the emphasis here, rather than

18: Ibid., pp.72-73; 104-105; 146-147; 149-342.

19: Ibid., p.81.

20: Ibid., p.82.

exclusively on the definitions, the Dutch catechism implies that the development of a relationship between God and man calls man to more than a knowledge about Jesus.

In the reflections on Jesus, Son of Man, there is a deliberate attempt "... to be faithful to the attitude of the gospels."²¹ In neither the content nor the sequence of events do the authors try to reconstruct a biography from the data as if looking for information about someone who is dead. "They try instead to allow the gospels to speak for themselves with their clear message about one who lives."²²

This contrasts with the Baltimore catechism's emphasis on doctrinal information clarifying, for example, what are the chief teachings of the Catholic Church about Jesus (# 79); is He more than one Person? (# 82); how many natures has Jesus? (# 83); what is meant by the Incarnation? (# 85); the Redemption? (# 90); what were the chief sufferings of Christ? (# 91), etc. All these questions reflect the classical preoccupation with definitions, the classical approach based on deductive reasoning.

In contrast to the definitions of the Baltimore catechism, the person of Jesus emerges from the pages of the Dutch publication somewhat as follows: in the concrete, historical and personal terms of the gospels' "beloved Son" (Mk. 1:11);²³ suffering servant (Is. 42:1);²⁴ friend at Cana's wedding feast who, at Mary's request

21: Ibid., p.73.

22: Ibid., p.73.

23: Ibid., p.91.

24: Ibid., p.91.

changed water into wine (Jn. 19:26);²⁵ teacher,²⁶ prophet, healer, miracle-worker.²⁷ The emphasis is on a contemporary Christ; teaching, healing, prophesying, reflected visibly in the life of men.²⁸

By introducing Jesus in Part III, the catechism places Him as the culmination of man's personal longings (Part I) as well as of the longings of nations and religions for centuries (Part II). The focus on Jesus as an answer to this life emphasizes the Jesus-events not only in light of their historical past but also as presently leading to fulfillment now and in the future.

The teaching on the Trinity is expressed in terms of the community of the three persons. This community is understood as one arising from the relationships of Jesus with the Father and the Spirit.²⁹ Through man's relationship with Jesus, he becomes aware of God as his own Father-creator and Spirit of Love. In the Dutch catechism, Jesus as Son of Man implies that His kingship has already begun - "The kingdom is . . . in Jesus' own work and preaching."³⁰ Man participates in this community of God by recognizing the presence of the kingdom on earth.

25: Ibid., p.92.

26: Ibid., pp.97-105; 112-122.

27: Ibid., pp.106-122.

28: Ibid., p.193.

29: Ibid., pp.91-92.

30: Ibid., p.96.

The parables of Jesus are placed within the context of the presence of the kingdom. Instead of being stories which illustrate a point, they are themselves the message.³¹ The beatitudes are presented as attitudes which throw all "worldly" rules into confusion. Those who live them are in "an ideal position to await the kingdom of God, to receive it already here on earth as a deep joy in an existence which often seems far from attractive."³²

They are presented as hard sayings for that time. In the days of Jesus, Israel had a distinct group of good people, namely, the Pharisees, who thought of themselves as "the remnant" mainly because of their fidelity to the law and the faith. Yet Jesus did not identify with them. Instead, emphasizes the catechism, He gathered another type, a different class; He gathered the "lost sheep of Israel", the poor, the sick, the sinners, the misfits of society. These were his special people for whom His kingdom comes.

The Dutch catechism places the foundation of the Church in the context of the coming of the kingdom. It not only avoids the Baltimore catechism's implication that they are identical,³³ but also explains their relationship. "... To make His kingdom live in the world, He formed for Himself a people. The people is called by Him 'His Church'. The Church is not yet the kingdom, but 'it forms the embryonic and initial stage of the kingdom on earth'.... (Constitution on the Church, #5)."³⁴

31: Ibid., p.97.

32: Ibid., p.99.

33: The Baltimore Catechism, question 494.

34: The Dutch Catechism, p.104.

This catechism focuses on the Jesus-man relationship as paradoxical: the kingdom is here, yet not here, in the Church. Jesus and those who choose to respond to His invitation to join His community are seen together, in a process of making the kingdom come, yet knowing that somehow Jesus is Himself the kingdom and therefore the kingdom is here.³⁵ In this context, we become aware of the social dimension of man that pervades the Dutch catechism. Man is in a deeply personal relationship with God in the person of Jesus, but one which situates him in his community. Man is an individual, but this individuality rather than causing him to withdraw and become totally absorbed in a relationship with Jesus to the exclusion of others, makes him more conscious of his social dimensions.

We recall that the Baltimore catechism focuses on the foundation of the Church as a past event. The foundation of the Church serves as a solid basis of authority the result of which is that man has the certitude of being able to establish a positive relationship with God. This certitude is possible if man believes what the Church teaches and follows its laws. In this way, man is on his way to his individual, eternal salvation. There is no further challenge than perfect conformity to a perfect law.

The Dutch catechism, on the other hand, lays its stress on the Church as the Messiah's community, a new people, the 'sacrament' of the kingdom of God - "not in possession of the kingdom, but struggling for it."³⁶ However, our attention is called to the fact that this community did not happen accidentally. Both the Dutch and the Baltimore catechisms see the authority of the Church as based on authority Jesus gave His disciples. Jesus called His apostles and sent them out on their mission of announcing "the good news"

35: Ibid., p.105.

36: Ibid., p.144.

with the authority to "cast out devils" (Mt. 10:1), forgive sins (Jn. 20:23), and "to bind and to loose" (Mt. 18: 12-18).

In this catechism the point of emphasis on the authority invested in Peter, and intended for his successors as well, is not that man need never fear error since the Church was "infallible in matters of faith and morals." The point of emphasis is much more on the frailty of that original community as epitomized in Peter.³⁷ But although it has authority and signifies the kingdom "... there is also the misery of sin and obstinacy. There the kingdom of heaven is often found like someone who casts good seeds upon the ground with the strange result that sometimes weeds grow.... Yet, in this struggle for the kingdom there is the promise that the gates of hell will not prevail against it."³⁸

The sections on the miracles of the Son of Man place them in the service of His word.³⁹ They emphasize a relationship brought about by the message of Jesus the miracle worker and the man's (or the crowd's) inner attitude, for example, the healing of the cripple (Mt. 9: 6-7) is an outward sign of his inner attitude of faith. The catechism focuses on miracles as signs of Jesus' understanding of man's inner desire for deliverance. "The miracle is a work of God which points to a deeper deliverance: the acceptance of God's reign."⁴⁰

In the sections on the Our Father, the Dutch catechism concerns itself with Jesus as a man who prays to his Father. This contrasts

37: Ibid., pp.143-144.

38: Ibid., p.144.

39: Ibid., p.110.

40: Ibid., p.111.

with the Baltimore catechism's details on the meaning of each of the prayer's phrases. The sections on prayer in each catechism differ along these same lines of emphasis. The Dutch focuses on the relationship between God and man in terms of man's confidence and simplicity and God's comprehension of man's ordinary needs. Jesus teaches man that he may come as he is to God in sincerity, and in the spirit of watchfulness, and hopeful expectancy that "the kingdom comes." Man as person-in-relation-with-others-in-God is the facticity. This contrasts with Baltimore's concentration on man as an individual, concerned about what he should pray for, how he should pray, for whom he should pray, etc.

In the Dutch catechism, Jesus is seen as the way to the Father. He calls man to live a life of obedience by doing the Father's will. Man is, therefore, in a relationship with Jesus as his brother and with God as his Father in a Spirit of Love. But there is a paradox about the fidelity of Jesus to the Father through law. He came to free men from it, yet he died under it. The changes Jesus put forward were attempts to make internal something that was being wrongly considered as purely external, without in any way abandoning the external in the process.⁴¹ In this way, law emerges as a given in the Dutch catechism. Man is in constant relationship with the law. He may decide how to take-it-up, that is, how to live it in his today, but, always, law is a given. It is even seen as such by Jesus who responded to the law by taking it up within its Judaic context.

The Baltimore catechism's emphasis on law is different. Neither catechism changes the essential teaching on love of God and neighbor as basic to Christian living, but the contexts within which this teaching is placed suggest a difference in the Church's conception of man. In the Baltimore catechism law is placed in the

41: Ibid., p.129.

context of "The Commandments", Part II, that is, between belief and sacraments. By dealing with law from within this perspective, the Church implies that its pastoral duty is to give all the details of law: which bind the most, the least, how seriously they bind, etc. In this way, emphasis is placed on man's obligation to conform to these laws, as if they were exclusively outside of him, and he most Christian when in unthinking obedience to them.

The Dutch catechism, on the other hand, places law in the context of the person of Jesus who is in the midst of men today. The emphasis shifts from law as something outside man which comes from God but remains 'out there', to law as no impersonal code, but the law of the living God. The Sermon on the Mount sums up Christ's call to man and, through it, man faces "God's authentic and unmitigated will."⁴²

This latter emphasis does not imply that there is no judgment of man by God. In fact, it seems to insist on a judgment more severe than any that mere standards of law could apply.⁴³ Nor should we conclude that there is no reward - "... your reward is great in heaven" (Mt. 5:12). This reward, however, is not seen as a carefully calculated payment in proportion to one's good works. Rewards are not payments, but a sharing in His love.

Nor is "neighbor" to be seen as "just an insubstantial spectre in Jesus' doctrine. He (neighbor) is not just a useful means through which to exercise the love of God...."⁴⁴ "Neighbor" in the Baltimore catechism was never defined as a pragmatic route to God.

42: Ibid., p.130.

43: Ibid., p.131.

44: Ibid., p.133.

However, from the listings of what man must do to love God, neighbor and self (#190), as well as from the emphasis on love of neighbor as an obligation (#193), one can readily conclude that this was the point.

The Beatitudes are not even included in this section on the two great commandments. The Baltimore catechism instead places the Beatitudes in the section on the "Virtues and Gifts of the Holy Ghost". As a result of this context, they appear as attitudes which are the fruition of a life of sanctity rather than as a basis of living the Christian life.

In both catechisms, there is an attitude toward the "self". In the New Law man is to love his neighbor "as himself" for the love of God. In the Baltimore catechism it is simply mentioned as part of the "two greatest commandments" (#189), in the Dutch it is singled out as an ingenious emphasis because man can never wiggle out of his responsibility to love his neighbor on the grounds of not knowing how. "As you love yourself" clarifies any question that might arise as to how this could be done today. The Christian does for another what he does for himself, for example, if he goes on vacation, he gives money to his neighbor to do the same.

It is not surprising that the section "Who is this Man?" in the Dutch catechism has no counterpart in Baltimore's. Such an emphasis would be foreign to a catechism given more to information about Jesus than to reflection on His presence in man's life. The Dutch catechism approaches Jesus through questions. Jesus emerges as one "fully a part of the real world of his day, while . . . completely distinct from it."⁴⁵ The gospel accounts are central and from them we see how everyone He meets is "brought up sharply

45: Ibid., p.147.

against the fact of God's today. He brings God's today along with him. This gives His person an incomparable and tranquil authority."⁴⁶

The Easter story is the pivotal one of the chapter. It is indeed paramount to the whole catechism. The Dutch present the risen Jesus as primarily living now in man's midst, and only secondarily as one who lived in history. Carefully following scriptural sequence, the catechism highlights how the prophecies of the Old Testament could be interpreted in light of the Easter event.⁴⁷

The basic relationship encouraged throughout the catechism emerges in this section: contemporary man shares in the life of the risen Jesus. Man is presented as most human when he can perceive the reality of Christ's resurrection.⁴⁸ Since this perception is not possible outside a Christian perspective, faith becomes of central importance. From within this Christian perspective, a man of faith is a whole man. By referring to "the whole man"⁴⁹ in this way the catechism's appreciation of Jesus as man, and of man as a participator in God's life, can be seen. Man is not focused on exclusively as sinner-redeemed and on his way to a salvation hereafter, but as one who is tending toward God, becoming "a whole man" capable of perceiving "the new creation" of Christ's and his own resurrection.

46: Ibid., p.149.

47: Ibid., pp. 158; 159; 161; 163; 164; 166; 172; 174; 175.

48: Ibid., p.185.

49: Ibid., p.185.

Christ's ascension and the Spirit's pentecostal arrival occur within the context of the abiding presence of the risen Christ. Mention is made of the ordinary and special gifts of the Spirit with an eye to awakening a realization in men today that the Spirit is present in the most ordinary of all things: charity.⁵⁰

Part IV: The Way of Christ

Over half the questions of this catechism are given to an integrated development of the Church in time - from its first days to its present straining towards the coming of the kingdom. Care is taken to situate the early Church in relation to the modern. "We can recognize the Church of today in the description given by the Acts: the crowds; baptism; doctrine; the breaking of bread; awe; apostolic leadership; . . . community of goods now realized in various ways from collections to the vows of poverty...."⁵¹

From these basic reference points, the Dutch catechism gives an historical account of the Church through the centuries, always portraying it in its strengths and weaknesses as part of a larger world history. This history is not presented as cyclic, but as moving towards an encounter in love.⁵² The Baltimore catechism makes no attempt to place its questions and answers in historical contexts, and therefore indicates that it sees its answers as universally and ahistorically applicable.

This omission on the part of Baltimore is significant. First, since the Baltimore catechism aims to give information, and does so with no attempt to place the facts given in historical perspective.

50: Ibid., p.196.

51: Ibid., p.203.

52: Ibid., p.213.

we surmise that as recently as 1958 the Church had not become pastorally concerned with such a dimension of truth. It simply repeated the world-view of the 16th century in which no understanding of the place of history, historical psychology, etc. had even begun. The Church had evidently not changed its concept of man or world since then.

Second, this omission reinforces how truly classical was the Church's conception of man. Truth was seen as never changing, the relationship between God and man as unchanging - an endless, constant and undifferentiated love on His part - and an endless conformity to His teachings on man's.

Third, it reveals an attitude toward truth endemic to Counter-Reformation Catholicism: teachings never change. No distinction is made between truth and the expression of truth. Therefore, since the catechism of Baltimore had not substantially changed its concept of man from the one held at least as far back as Trent's, there is no attempt to develop doctrine in the 1958 edition.

The Dutch catechism's analysis of historical details manifests some evidence of a shift in the Church's perception of man. Man is appreciated as historical. The catechism tries to respect each age of the Church for what it was, what attitudes were operative, what it contributed negatively and positively towards the coming of the kingdom.⁵³ There is no attempt to justify more questionable contributions nor to highlight those more reflective of the Gospel. Both are there like the weeds and grain of the gospel parable, growing side by side until the end.

Unlike the Baltimore catechism in which the emphasis on the consequences of sin is mainly on the individual, the Dutch emphasizes

53: Ibid., pp.213-236.

the social consequences. The section on "The deepest level of history,"⁵⁴ discusses the inmost kernel of Church history. It is not to be thought of by recalling the acts of kindness, love and patience but rather something deep beneath the goodness: each man's history of sin and grace. What lies deepest is "the treachery (apostasy, schism), the harshness (war, inquisition, feuds), the scandal, the indifference, the unbelief, the despair, the hatred, to which God responds again and again with grace."⁵⁵

Faith is emphasized as that which comes by hearing. Faith presents difficulties today rooted in factors common to all men: desire to be master of everything, no room for admiration or reverence, no time to wonder at the mystery of life.⁵⁶ The gospel forces man to revise his thinking, turns him into something new. This is "conversion". The Dutch catechism is very understanding of the pastoral problems involved. Parents are encouraged not to become down-hearted if a child does not appear to be living in the faith: "Faith can be urged but not imposed"⁵⁷ Parents, therefore, must respect what the child sincerely believes. This same attitude is seen later in regard to the missionary attitude of our day.⁵⁸ There are no legalistic or judgmental statements on the "degree" of sin committed by parents or child, instead there is an attitude of respect for truth as it is known by both. How different this is in tone from the Baltimore catechism in which faith is defined as one of the theological virtues, and two other answers explain

54: Ibid., p.235.

55: Ibid., pp.235-236.

56: Ibid., pp.236-238.

57: Ibid., p.241.

58: Ibid., p.241.

how faith can be safeguarded (#204) and sinned against (#205). In this section of the Dutch, man is seen as in a relationship with God through the Church as an historical event.

In the following section, man is perceived as in a relationship with God through the Church as "sacrament". The Church as "sacrament" of the kingdom assumes a central position from this point on in the Dutch catechism. The implications of each sacrament are developed within the contexts of their manner of signifying the presence of Jesus. Unlike the Baltimore catechism, in which the emphasis is on man's individual relationship with God through each sacrament and the specific function sacraments have in the individual's salvation, the Dutch catechism places the emphasis on the social and present importance of each sacrament not only for the individual but also for the entire Christian community.

The sacrament of baptism, for example, is considered within its liturgical context. The Easter Vigil is the most appropriate time for the person to be baptized.⁵⁹ Not only is it the night when Jesus arose, but it is the night when, today, the Christian community gathers to celebrate its deliverance. What better time for one to be received into the community since "baptism is not a purely individual contact with the Lord"?⁶⁰

The catechisms differ in their attitudes towards the non-baptized, too. The Baltimore catechism emphasizes that one must be baptized in order to be saved. Its consideration of how this is to be done is typically classical in approach. It follows the process of deductive reasoning which posits the answer first, and then reasons backwards, eliminating all possible objections to its

59: Ibid., p.244.

60: Ibid., p.247.

logic. The Baltimore catechism concludes, therefore, that all who through no fault of their own have not received the sacrament can be saved through baptism of blood or desire (#321).

The Dutch catechism, however, operates with a more historical view of life, and a person-oriented method of reasoning. It approaches the question of baptism from where man is. All men make contact with Jesus simply because they have been born. He is their fellow-man.⁶¹ This does not make baptism a formality. Rather it makes baptism "part of the great whole make up of the Christian preaching, choice of life and the intensity of Christ's forgiveness . . . , it brings about a reality; it places a heaven in this world What would otherwise remain vague and full of error takes on shape and intensity" ⁶²

A baptism which makes new Christians as individuals also reveals God's ways with the Christian. Christians are baptized into this community as well as into an individual relationship with God.⁶³ Clearly, this emphasis on the communal does not shift the essential content of the Church's position regarding the necessity of baptism. All still must be/are baptized in order to share in God's life. Thus, baptism can be seen as a given in the life of a Christian. Man's view of the sacrament affects how he takes it up, that is, how he integrates the sacrament into his life.

One difference in the Church's understanding of man is seen in the explanations given concerning how and why everyone is to be baptized. In the Baltimore catechism, the emphasis is on man's

61: Ibid., p.249.

62: Ibid., p.249.

63: Ibid., p.249.

salvation as an individual and as eternal, on the soul as the recipient of grace. Children must be baptized as soon after birth as possible lest they die and not go to heaven; parents sin mortally, therefore, if they neglect this duty.

By placing the emphasis on man as part of the Christian community by birth, the Dutch catechism reveals a social or relational conception of man. His baptism, seen as baptism into a community of believers, focuses on man as sharing the life of God in the solidarity of men. This spirit of solidarity is reinforced by a spirit of service, humility, obedience and the Christian attitude toward death. By these ways of being with men the Christian builds up the body of Christ here and now.

Infant baptism is discussed in the Dutch catechism not in the context of sin, but in terms of the community, most especially the desire of the baby's parents to have their child share in their own circle of faith. The catechism emphasizes that parents must remain mindful of their child's growth to independence. This growth entails, in the long run, the conversion of the child to the person of Jesus. The infant baptism is simply the child's initiation into the life of his parents' community and a reflection of his human dependency at this time. He must someday choose or deny Christ.

The question of the destiny of infants who die unbaptized has been a constant issue throughout the Church's history. The Dutch catechism attributes this uncertainty in the Church to the interpretation of theologians "who considered the necessity of the baptism of water too exclusively in terms of its importance for the individual."⁶⁴

64: Ibid., p.251.

The Dutch catechism underlines its stress on baptism as part of a totality by concluding the section:

. . . it is important not to isolate baptism and envisage it only as something individual and momentary which takes place between God and the soul. As soon as the baptism of water is taken out of the whole great context, strange problems arise, as history of the Church has shown. Just as the hand is only really a hand in the totality of the body, so too baptism is only a genuine sign of Christ in the totality in which he gives it to us: the totality of our life and death, the totality of Christian upbringing, of the fellowship of the Church and of mankind.⁶⁵

This perception of man as social, and part of a larger whole, is carried throughout the Dutch catechism's development of each sacrament. Each sacrament is seen as a sign of the totality of life. As such, "the Church has preserved these signs faithfully since they are gifts to be handed on, but also flexibly, since they are signs to be presented meaningfully."⁶⁶ We can therefore suggest that it is mainly a relational conception of man that seems to underlie the Dutch catechism's teaching on baptism. This sacrament is a given, but the way in which the Catholic is encouraged to take it up differs from that of the classical view. The change in emphasis from man as an individual to man as social, as well as the encouragement of parents to realize that the child is not automatically Catholic simply because he is baptized, shifts the institution's conception of man from a classical to a relational one.

Confirmation is considered in the context of the eucharistic liturgy. Emphasis is placed on its social rather than its individual dimensions. Confirmation is seen first of all as the

65: Ibid., p.252.

66: Ibid., p.255.

sacrament which in some ways perfects baptism.⁶⁷ It is a gift of the Spirit, seen within the context of His presence within the community at Pentecost.⁶⁸ It is a gift which should not be viewed as an isolated magical action, but one which presupposes education and preaching before it can have any significance for the recipient and/or the community; and, once received, it grows through life in the Spirit.⁶⁹

A relational conception of man, therefore, seems to underlie this development of confirmation insofar as the sacrament itself is unquestioned, and the way a person receives it is as diverse as his education and individual growth in a particular community.

It is not until this section that the Dutch catechism focuses on the power of sin and the meaning of salvation.⁷⁰ The catechism places its discussion on sin and redemption after its development of confirmation, and before its consideration of the Eucharist as the third and greatest sacrament of initiation. This sequence places sin in a different context from the Baltimore catechism which emphasizes it as part of man's beginning; every belief, commandment and sacrament is here described within the context of man's sinful "state" and need of salvation.

The Dutch catechism, on the other hand, never sees sin in terms of a pure state.⁷¹ Instead, it views humanity as existing only as a race into which Jesus was to come or has come. Man is always fellowman of Jesus. For example, a child is born into a

67: Ibid., pp.256-257.

68: Ibid., p.258.

69: Ibid., pp.258-259.

70: Ibid., p.259.

71: Ibid., p.259.

world where redemption is already at work.⁷² However, the universal guilt, concomitant with being human, is not minimized, it is simply put into the perspective of the child's own experiences of his incapacity to love.

Sin is seen not as "something that happened in the garden" millennia ago. It is not seen as something for which man is not responsible, neither is he merely the victim of the mistake or malice of his first parents. Sin is not dismissed as "just part of the retarded development of mankind - not sin, but immaturity."⁷³ Instead, in light of man's present experiences, sin is: "his tremendous, universal, inevitable and yet inexhaustible incapacity to love."⁷⁴ The Fall (Gen. 1-11) is a message about man, not about his beginnings.

The catechism is able to have such a dynamic concept of man as sinner because it is aware that its world-view is different from those held in earlier times:

In earlier times, indeed, until recently, our picture of the world was primarily static, or stable. Things persisted the way they first existed. If one wanted to say something about the basic elements of existence, one showed how things were at the beginning. The explanation lay there . . . : God created them. He was spoken of like a carpenter who had made something and left it there
The existence of sin was explained primarily by the fact that man had sinned.⁷⁵

72: Ibid., p.259.

73: Ibid., p.260.

74: Ibid., p.260.

75: Ibid., p.263.

It is within this context of a consciousness of this new world-view that the Dutch catechism discusses sin. Since our thesis is that the RCC as an institution is shifting its conception of man, a change in the Church's view of man as sinner would be a basic area in which the shift would be most significant.

Instead of focusing on the individual and legal details of sin - original and actual - mortal and venial, as does the Baltimore catechism, the Dutch focuses on the common aspect of evil. The people as a whole are sinful. Mindful that later parts of the Old Testament stress the individual's responsibility, the catechism sees sin as a matter of collective responsibility.⁷⁶ Jesus points up this collectivity. The catechism sees the collective character of evil in terms of the degrees of its contagiousness, and painful consequences, for example, one can injure another, infect him with evil, deliberately pervert him, undermine his sense of values.⁷⁷

The Dutch catechism interprets this general sinfulness, which we read about in scripture and which Augustine labeled peccatum originale, as "the sin of mankind as a whole (including myself) insofar as it affects every man. In every personal sin, the original sin of man is basically presented and active and contributory."⁷⁸ But even here, the emphasis is not on sin, the emphasis is on the greater power of grace. This is why the authors of the catechism were encouraged to write the catechism. "Though they (the authors) knew that some of their heritage of sin and aversion from God might be reflected in the text, they were still more confident that the forces of truth and grace which flow to them through

76: Ibid., p.265.

77: Ibid., p.265.

78: Ibid., pp.266-267.

mankind and the Church, would work super-abundantly in these pages...."⁷⁹

The catechism's teaching on sin therefore places itself within a contemporary world-view and, although it sees man as in process of growth and in collective evolution, sin is still more than "immaturity", it is his incapacity to love. Sin, as man's "tremendous, universal, inevitable and yet inexhaustible incapacity to love" today, is seen as original sin still present, active and contributory. Sin is a given. The way man copes with this condition is variable. The pastoral concern of the Church in this catechism is that the divine message about sin be passed on: 1) mankind is created by God; 2) mankind is called to participate in a special way in His life; 3) man collectively or culpably fails to respond to God's purpose; and 4) God wills to free and heal man. Salvation is to be made whole by God.⁸⁰

The Redemption of man by Jesus is seen as this redemption of the whole man. The other religions that have attempted to redeem man from the experiences of his failures are seen as inadequate attempts, each of which touched only one or two dimensions of man but never redeemed the whole person.

The catechism's conception of man continues to become more apparent as it stresses the failure of the other religions to redeem the whole man. Hinduism and Buddhism fail because they start with the basic experience of life as pain and seek liberation through contemplation and asceticism or the eight-fold way. In fact, they bow to fate in the end, accepting misery of the world (others) and their own non-development of personality as necessary.⁸¹

79: Ibid., p.268.

80: Ibid., p.268.

81: Ibid., p.271.

Islam fails according to the catechism, because there is no sense of sin or grace, since everything depends on God in a fatalistic way. Although a joyful religion compared with Buddhism and Hinduism, there is little room for progress given this strong element of fatalism. Humanism fails in a way unlike these other religions which stress the "spirit" and individual at the expense of the bodily and worldly. Humanism fails because it asserts that man is only man. Eternity, perfect love, the All, are supposedly baseless.

Marxism's failure, according to the catechism's view of man, rests in Marx's principle that deliverance is a very definite material process, that is, in the return to the original relationship of man to the work of his hands. However, "there is a message in which one 'believes', a party which is a sort of 'holy people', a 'now' which is viewed as the 'fullness of time', and a 'suffering saviour', the proletariat. But all these themes are given a sociological content. They do not point to an answer to the ultimate question."⁸²

By noting the dimensions of man which the catechism sees as unredeemed by other religions, it is no surprise to see that the catechism places its emphasis on man and redemption. It is in the light of God's revelation of Himself that man is disclosed as he really is. Jesus' holiness and love of the Father show man how dominated he is by egoism.⁸³ But man's fate is rooted in himself: there is no fatal force outside man forcing him, "no decree of Allah outside him, no iron law of Karma, no law of human nature or historical dialectic."⁸⁴ Man's destiny is foreshadowed by sin which

82: Ibid., p.277.

83: Ibid., p.277.

84: Ibid., p.277.

is understood by the catechism as part of his common but free responsibility. Man "stands in the space of freedom along with his own deeds, which can make him happy or unhappy now and for eternity. This is man seen fully as he is."⁸⁵ The catechism's view of "other religions" as salvific for only certain dimensions of man, not for the whole person, suggests that diversity would be allowed in a relational world-view only to the extent that it could finally be contained within the "given" - in this case, Christianity.

The catechism holds a balance between man as one responsible for his destiny and man as completely unable to effect his own deliverance. Through Jesus man is saved as he becomes more human. With the gift of His Spirit, man conquers sin, has a life with God, and a salvation out of death.⁸⁶

Such consequences of God's intervention free man to overcome sin, misery and evil in the world by love and kindness. He is, therefore, no less involved in the concerns of this life than the humanists and Marxists. The Christian simply sees this earthly involvement as part of a larger whole. There is therefore a distinction made between "this life" and "the next", but no division is implied.

The catechism mentions how true it may be that at times Christianity encouraged a sort of fatalism: the idea of heaven made people feel that their primary responsibility on earth was to conquer individual sin rather than human misery.⁸⁷ Today, the

85: Ibid., p.277.

86: Ibid., p.277.

87: Ibid., p.278.

Dutch authors continue, in light of a broader historical view which now includes evolution, the Christian should understand how the teaching on sin, love, and responsibility should urge man to "subdue the earth", making it a more human place.

This response to life bases itself on Jesus risen. In his resurrection, sin and death were conquered. It is interesting to note that the Dutch catechism realizes the emphasis was not always placed here. Significantly, the sentence "... So many of us have grown up with the wrong ideas on this subject", is followed by the one

"... In the Middle Ages and for long after, even in present day preaching, stress was laid on the aspect:

'The Father had been offended, the order of justice disturbed, and a penalty had to be extracted. The Son was the victim who paid the debt in full. Thus the right order was re-established.'⁸⁸

These sentences state what, up to this point, had been implied: the Church had not changed its basic emphasis on the God-man relationship since the Middle Ages. The Church is changing its emphasis from sin as an offense upsetting the right order of things which can be corrected by punishment and pain, to a focus on the human being who is injured and offended. In this latter view sin can be corrected by love, work and regret.⁸⁹

This change in emphasis reflects a shift in the concept of man away from one which saw him as the one who through his own free will committed the sinful acts which upset the order of the universe outside himself. With this understanding of sin, it was easy

88: Ibid., p.280.

89: Ibid., pp.280-281.

for man to have the impression that "to do the will of God" meant to conform carefully to the network of authoritative teachings and laws in order to be saved for the next life.

By placing a different emphasis on sin, the Dutch catechism implies a different concept of man. Man is still capable of sin, but the focus is on him as he now is: redeemed by Jesus and in process of becoming more fully in Jesus as he assumes his responsibility for developing the earth. The emphasis is on the whole man, the whole person's response to this life, rather than on the soul's primacy over the body and on the "spiritual" as being intrinsically "higher" than the "material", and sin "something that happens" to the soul.

The Dutch catechism sees the whole person responsible for involving himself in the human tasks of alleviating personal suffering and global miseries. Yet it is always aware of the larger whole of which he is now a part: God's life is shared with man here and now and hereafter. In this way, man is seen as becoming. Man has one life - in two parts. One part of his life is the one of which he is now aware, this "earthly" life; the other is the yet-to-be-experienced part of life after death. Life is eternal. Yet the awareness of the continuation of life is no excuse for avoiding the responsibility towards what has already begun.

In one way, we might conclude that such a shift in emphasis on sin is insignificant because the basic understanding of man, that is, that he is a sinful creature does not change. However, this is an oversimplification of the situation, given our working description of a concept of man as one in which the mental structure is dependent upon the historical circumstances or world-view of the community. In light of this, we would say that beliefs never exist "out there" but only exist in the lives of those who structure and interpret them from within the historical perspective of their age. The continuity, the stability of Christianity rest therefore

on the risen Jesus who lives only in a present and calls men of every age and culture to share in His life. It would seem an oversimplification to dismiss the first definite shift in perspective on the God-man relationship in at least 700 years by saying it is "more of the same."

Exactly what is involved in and implied by this change of perspective will be developed in Chapter IV of this dissertation. For the moment, we simply call attention to the fact that the change becomes apparent, in the Dutch catechism, especially in the context of "sin".

This catechism next concerns itself with teachings which seem to have developed and even changed in some other religions. It suggests that these changes happen in the light of Christ's teachings, thus implying that Christ's teachings are, in fact, having tangible effects on the paradigms of religions and philosophies. For example, Hinduism's originally vague notion of God became a concept of the One God; Buddhism's emphasis on redeeming man by suppressing all desires changed to one of recognizing the value of serving others as a way to Nirvana. The latter attitude seems to have no source in the Buddha and therefore its emergence is, perhaps, the message of Jesus "Love between God and man, between man and man."⁹⁰

Although Islam's Quran has one verse which speaks of love between God and man, it is a love based on obedience not fellowship. That God is inaccessible is basic to the Muslim. Yet, even though a mysticism of love appeared through Al Hallāj who was tortured to death in 922 for his doctrine on this point, it has remained with the Muslims ever since. The Dutch catechism suggests that, since there is no basis for such love in their doctrine, the message of Jesus could explain its presence there.

90: Ibid., p.285.

There are as well Christian values in humanism and in Marxism, but humanism and Marxism of themselves cannot explain the deepest reasons for these values. Perhaps it is the Spirit of the Lord. Such interpretations on the part of the Dutch catechism develop its original attitude: all of humanity is part of a larger history en route to an encounter with Love Himself. Just how this is occurring is never totally clear, but the catechism suggests that developments in these religions are signs along the way.

The Dutch catechism's effort to change its emphasis on God-man relationship becomes more evident in its explanations of grace, faith, hope, charity, prayer, etc. It begins its teaching on grace with a caution regarding the usual distinction made between sanctifying grace as a "state of grace" and actual grace as that "given for each particular act". With these distinctions, one must remember that there is only one grace, that is, the presence of the one living Spirit.

Although there have been many meanings attached to grace through the centuries, this catechism focuses on this gift of God's presence with man not only as something "individual" and internal, but also as in the realities of life and external. God can come to us through people and events. In fact, "The most important way of the Spirit is through other men."⁹¹ Indeed, this emphasis is insisted upon "... this must be affirmed even more clearly, by saying that the Spirit is always given to us together. It would be false individualism to think that the Spirit is given to each one independently of others."⁹²

The catechism's development of faith, hope and charity suggests that the Church sees man in a dynamic relationship with God and

91: Ibid., p.288.

92: Ibid., p.289.

therefore conceives of him as in process of becoming. Faith is developed as the Spirit's gift which enables man to give himself entirely to him.⁹³ This is no once and for all decision based on either reason or feeling. Faith is a constant leap out of self into the dark which must be made again and again and it always affects man's present moment.⁹⁴

Hope grounds itself on God's eternity and goodness and the resurrection of Jesus.⁹⁵ It is borne in the fragile vase of a conviction that humanity is moving towards God, who is God not of the dead but of the living.⁹⁶

Prior to all efforts to love, Christians must realize the fact that they do love, not because of their own merit exclusively, but through the gift of God. Love is, as well, a duty and the whole catechism is given to discussing Christian love.⁹⁷

Perhaps one of the most significant shifts in the conception of man can be seen in the development of prayer.⁹⁸ The Dutch catechism places different emphases on prayer from the Baltimore. The latter places its lesson on prayer last, and emphasizes it in terms of its definitions and man's obligations - for whom he is to pray, why he is to pray, how he is to pray, etc. (#475-489). The

93: Ibid., p.289.

94: Ibid., p.292.

95: Ibid., p.298.

96: Ibid., p.299.

97: Ibid., p.300.

98: Ibid., pp.304-320

Dutch catechism places prayer within the context of man's way to Christ and specifically states that the details of posture, thoughts, etc., are ways of becoming aware of God's presence, but to remain in these details, or to equate the saying of prayers with praying, is never to pray.⁹⁹ To remain preoccupied with these details also means that man would remain within the bounds of a human religion. Prayer, according to the catechism, is above all listening to God.¹⁰⁰

Man, in the Dutch catechism, is conceived of as open to God's initiative, open to His mystery in a spirit of faith that He is now speaking. Therefore, man is in a posture of listening-response, in a dialogue which is initiated by God. This conception of man praying differs from the one in the Baltimore catechism. There, man is described as most "perfect" if he conforms perfectly to the rules of prayer.

Man emerges, therefore, from the Baltimore catechism as the one who takes the initiative in prayer and prays "successfully" if he "does it right". Inevitably, prayer is thought of as a monologue. What else would be possible, given a static world-view in which everything "important" has been done, and God has said everything there is to say, and man is biding his time between the days when creation happened and Jesus saved and the end of time when He will come again? If God is "up there", waiting for man to die so he can share fully in His life, and man knows that he will share in this eternal life in proportion of how well he kept the laws and believed the teachings in this life, there is really nowhere to "go" in a God-man relationship, except up the levels of perfection within a well known territory carefully delineated by authoritative teachings.

99: Ibid., pp.305-306.

100: Ibid., p.306.

God is not saying anything different to man from what He said before, so why listen? Man knows it all, has heard it all before.

The Dutch catechism, on the other hand, sees the center of Christian prayer as the Eucharist and therefore not exclusively a private, isolated, one-way conversation with God but a public, common celebration of man's solidarity in His presence. This does not cancel the validity of private prayer; in fact it heightens it as necessary for the development of man's relationship with God as part of a community. Instead of encouraging the split between spirit and body (the Greek tendency to equate contemplation with the "spiritual" and action with the "bodily") the Dutch catechism stresses the fact that in Christian prayer, contemplation is the basis of real work. Prayer cannot be detached from daily life. "There is no religious world apart from our genuine existence."¹⁰¹ The different shape and form prayers may take are portrayed as responses to God's word, not man's effort to make it to the "seventh heaven."

The Dutch catechism reflects on Sunday as the day of the Eucharist - not as the day of obligation to worship, and avoid servile work. It encourages a day of rest in the profoundly human sense of Sunday being a day in which one can go more deeply into the meaning of life, become aware of being more than a worker.

The Bible is considered as a household book bringing to that household the words of eternal life.¹⁰² The Christians of the Reformation kept sight of this during the dark days of the Catholics' Counter-Reformation which tended to ignore the place of scripture in its attempt to place emphasis on the Church's own authority.

101: Ibid., p.312.

102: Ibid., p.322.

Attention is drawn to the Eucharist as one sacrament with many meanings. Certain meanings are emphasized more than others at different times in history. Each, of course, reflects the atmosphere and world-view of its day. Convinced that the Spirit will not allow error regarding any official teaching on the Eucharist, various Councils have made pronouncements about the special form of Jesus' presence in the world. No council ever aimed to determine exhaustively or for all time all of the meanings of the Eucharistic mystery. In order to understand the teachings of these Councils, the Dutch catechism urges that one ask, for example, what Christian and evangelical values were at stake at the time in question.¹⁰³

The whole celebration is considered as a meal, a thanksgiving, and a sacrifice of Jesus' presence in man's life. It is no isolated element in his life but one which calls man to celebrate the fact that He lives in the midst of mankind.¹⁰⁴ This focuses on Christ's followers as the "priestly people" who were formed for the earthly task of service.

The distinction between a priestly people and a pastoral priesthood is made on the basis that all the baptized share in the former, whereas only those holding office in the Church as a result of their ordination to the priesthood through Orders share the responsibilities of the latter. In this light, Holy Orders is seen as a sacrament of degrees: bishops, priests, and deacons.

The emphasis on one priesthood stresses "the faithful as a whole, who have received the anointing of the Holy One (cf. Jn. 2:20) (and therefore) cannot err in belief" (Second Vatican Council On the Church, #12). As a result, infallibility is interpreted more

103: Ibid., p.334.

104: Ibid., p.344

in terms of a collective insight of the community than as the individual insight of the Pope.¹⁰⁵

Given the "static" world-view of the Baltimore catechism, truth was "the unchangeable" rock. If it moved it could not be faithful. Today, however, we realize that truth was never dealt with, only its expressions. With a deepened awareness of how the dynamism can be a stabilizing force of life, we are able to interpret the authoritative teaching of the magisterium as a living voice rather than a static system.¹⁰⁶

Up to this section, the Dutch catechism has focused mainly on man's relationship with God. Man was portrayed as full of love and reverence for the mystery of his origin. The subsequent sections consider man's relationship with the earth as one full of love and reverence.¹⁰⁷ This division follows that of the ten commandments: the first three being directed specifically towards man's relationship with God and the last seven being directed towards man's relationship with his neighbor "for the love of God."

The Baltimore catechism respected this same division, with no attempt to interpret the division in light of Christ's teachings. The Dutch catechism places the emphasis not on the division but rather on the meaning of these commandments for man today. For example, the sense of values they express must be adapted to society of every stage of culture and expanse of time. The Church's task is to interpret and adapt accordingly, always mindful that every such effort reflects a certain type of society at a certain time.¹⁰⁸

105: Ibid., p.365.

106: Ibid., p.366.

107: Ibid., p.371.

108: Ibid., p.372.

Such caution on the part of the Dutch catechism reveals its underlying conception of man/world as in-process; and its underlying conception of truth, though absolute, is in its expression, relative to the perspectives of a particular time and culture. Although the Dutch catechism does not develop any new teaching on the "changing nature of truth," it opens the door to this by dealing with its relation to time and place in its formulation and expressions. Man is in-relation-with his world, in process of integrating the givens (commandments) with their various possible meanings for today. Relational man is challenged to co-create the contemporary meaning of the basically human values of the decalogue.

This appreciation of norms as relative is developed further in the consideration of conscience as the "organ of perception". The individual's conscience is seen as an essential contribution to the over-all adaptation. Man has within himself "a living sense of what he ought to do."¹⁰⁹ Emphasis is placed on the personal conscience which does not exist in isolation from the conscience of the community.

Such an emphasis is different from the one in the Baltimore catechism where the laws are given a whole section by themselves and stress is laid on man's obligations to keep them. In the Dutch catechism the discussion lays bare what the Dutch consider the primordial and profound unity of conscience and commandments: the conflict/tension they cause each other. The laws cannot foresee all circumstances, conscience cannot let itself be guided exclusively by the letter of the law.¹¹⁰

In this section it becomes clear that one pastoral concern of the Church of Holland is that the faithful be educated to follow

109: Ibid., p.373.

110: Ibid., p.374.

their conscience. Even if these are in error they bind man in his relationship with God. "Fidelity to conscience is the bond which links Christians with all mankind in the search for truth" (The Church in the World, #16.)¹¹¹

It is not surprising that the Dutch Church in our day, coming as it does from an age filled with a growing sense of man's personal responsibility, stresses the importance of a personal decision of conscience. This underlines a difference between the Dutch and Baltimore catechisms. The former does not imply a solitary process, but one made in the community - based on advice, discussion, awareness of the laws, etc. This process is to be put into the context of the love process: "The whole source and purpose of the law is love."¹¹² Love of God and man cannot be separated.

In this way the Dutch avoid the split between God and man implied in the Baltimore catechism. Insistence on the impossibility of separating them reveals love of neighbor as a mystery of faith: God is our neighbor. In this way the Dutch emphasize the social dimension of a personal conscience decision. Man is person-in-community-of-men and, as such, draws from traditions and cultures and is responsible for his fellow men. Therefore there is no such thing as a personal decision of conscience which has no roots in, or consequences for, the community. But there does seem to be the suggestion here of the possibility that a personal conscience decision might not "fit into" the classical interpretation of the law.

It is in light of these remarks that the catechism recalls The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. This

111: Ibid., p.375.

112: Ibid., p.376.

constitution sees the task of Christians in the world to be one not only of coping with the world of ideals but also of committing oneself to the everyday issues in which God is to be found.¹¹³ These are listed in both the constitution and the catechism in similar terms: marriage and the family, religious life of the evangelical counsels, political life, reverence for life, work, property, altruism, culture, leisure and the quest for truth.

The way in which the Dutch catechism addresses itself to these areas of concern suggests a relational conception of man. The first area with which the catechism is concerned is marriage and the family. It begins by placing it within a socio-psychological context: a person's identity begins in his family as a cell of love. Father and Mother are the first to be known as "others." God is known through the parents. The catechism does not begin its discussion of marital love on an agape level but develops the importance of an erotic love and the human desire to belong to each other totally.

A brief history of marriage and a consideration of marriage in the Old and New Testament emphasize its gradual evolution towards a more human development. It is in this context that the sacramental dimension of marriage today is considered. In the sacrament, marriage becomes a sign through which Christ gives us His Spirit of Love.

The sacrament consists in the couple's mutual promise to live their lives together. The insistence that this promise be made in public has varied through the ages. The catechism continues to place all things in their historical perspective by explaining that, after the Council Trent, the legal forms for marriage were instituted in canon law. In the 16th century this was seen as a necessary and

113: Ibid., p.380.

welcome protection from the prevalent "clandestine marriages" of that age.¹¹⁴ There is, therefore, no implication that these laws of the Church concerning marriage are unchangeable.

These carefully detailed protective laws are not to be considered the "last word" by the Christian community.¹¹⁵ "The matters raised in these pages simply mean that it is not granted to men - even where legislation is at its most subtle . . . - to decide in every instance whether this or that marriage is really contracted in Christ There will never be a total identification between law and conscience."¹¹⁶ Therefore, from within a relational world-view, man is called to more than conformity to law. No such allusion was ever made in the Baltimore catechism's carefully worked through section on marriage as a sacrament (#457-#468) nor in the Church's commandment on marriage (#298-#303).

The more relational than classical conception of man is again revealed by the way in which the Dutch catechism discusses "mixed marriages." The catechism emphasizes the person's freedom to **choose** a marriage partner; the Baltimore catechism was more preoccupied with all the possible impediments. (#299-#300). Both catechisms are concerned that each person's relationship with God not be jeopardized.¹¹⁷ The Baltimore maintains that this can be facilitated by carefully made and kept laws regulating who should and should not marry whom. In this way, a certain right order of things is maintained.

114: Ibid., p.393. N.B. The state did not register marriages at the time.

115: Ibid., pp.394-398.

116: Ibid., p.397.

117: Ibid., p.400.

The other catechism places the emphasis on the couple in the mystery of their love. It is concerned that the deepest human values be shared in common, since it is upon these values that the marriage nourishes itself. Therefore, even though the same encouragement is given in both catechisms, namely to marry a Catholic, the reasons given shift the emphasis from doing the "right thing" because the Church says so (in this way defending and preserving one's faith) to doing it because it may make a difference in the growth in depth of the marriage.

Family planning was an unheard of possibility for Catholics not only in the 16th century but even in the early 20th. No reference to such a thing is made in the 1958 catechism of Baltimore. However, the Dutch catechism sees this modern phenomenon as a responsibility for Christians. Throughout this section of the catechism family planning is placed in the context of a Christian responsibility. The uniqueness of each marriage requires that the couple decide how they are to plan their family. "No outsiders can really tell (them)." ¹¹⁸

There are several methods of regulating birth. The catechism implies that since the Vatican Council II did not speak of any of these methods as such in the Pastoral Constitution, there is a difference of standpoint from the one expressed by Pius XI and maintained by his successor. It continues, "we can sense here a clear development in the Church, a development which is also going on outside of the Church." ¹¹⁹ The catechism raises the question: "Are all methods of regulation of birth of equal value to the Christian conscience?" The Council gave no answer. ¹²⁰ It does

118: Ibid., p.402.

119: Ibid., p.402.

120: Ibid., p.403.

suggest that couples ask themselves conscientiously whether the practices in question do, or fail to do, full justice to the great personal values which should be expressed in sexual intercourse and in the whole of married life. It refers them back to The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, (#51), and further advises that the last word lies with the conscience, not with a doctor or a confessor. But "reverence for life undoubtedly demands that no practices be chosen which could be harmful to health or to the affective life of the couple."¹²¹

Within this context of birth and man's dawning awareness of how dependent he is on others for life, the catechism begins its development of the fourth commandment: Honour your father and your mother.¹²² The child's relationship with his parents initiates him into obedience. In some form obedience will always be a part of his life. Man should recognize that obedience is a liberating phenomenon. The catechism's emphasis on this fourth commandment is positive. It sees the commandment in the light of the human values of authority and obedience. This tension can be creative if lived in the atmosphere of Christian love.

Pastoral concern is expressed in regard to education to love,¹²³ for manhood and womanhood,¹²⁴ for independence.¹²⁵ The emphasis on

121: Ibid., p.403. N.B. This was written before "Humanae Vitae" was published, July, 1968.

122: Ibid., p.403.

123: Ibid., p.406.

124: Ibid., p.408.

125: Ibid., p.410.

each is on the education to love. Children should be educated to the art of being happy with the joy of others. Education for manhood and womanhood is an education in love - sexual education in its broadest sense. Education for independence involves parental respect for the child's growth/decision of faith and for his personality development.

We notice, therefore, that there is a difference between the Dutch and Baltimore catechisms in their respective emphases on marriage. In the former the persons are considered as in a love process. Marriage is a being with each other, assuming the responsibility of building a family life together which is based on love and reflected in the education of the children to a life of love and personal independence.

Although the Baltimore catechism would not deny any of these attitudes, it certainly focuses on marriage more in terms of its duties and finality. The Dutch would not minimize these in the least but, by placing marriage in the context of love and personal development, it reveals a different understanding of man from the Baltimore. The latter would have seen him as a better Christian the more he kept the laws of marriage and abided by the Church's directives.

This shift in emphasis opens the question of the traditional interpretation of fidelity in the Church.¹²⁶ Within a classical world-view, fidelity was commonly accepted as synonymous with keeping the law. To remain legally married to the same person until death was to remain "faithful." Within a relational world-view fidelity is discussed more in terms of how truly each helps the other to grow in love and in personal development.

126: This question will be discussed in Chapter IV of this dissertation.

This same appreciation of man as one who is called to love is carried through the catechism's discussion of the evangelical counsels. Although man is ordained for marriage according to the structure of his mind and body, there are some who freely choose to remain unmarried "for the sake of the kingdom" (Mt. 19:12). Instead of focusing on this way of life as one "especially recommended by Christ but not strictly commanded by God's law" (#197, Baltimore Catechism), the Dutch places the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience in the context of the three deepest areas of human response: man's desire for love, need for possessions, and need for power. The vows do not serve to "deny" man these basic values. This emphasis would be more the interpretation of the classical conception of man: the closer to God the further away he is from man.

The more relational conception of man emphasizes celibacy for the kingdom as a means of developing in love and service of man, and in this way reflecting one's love of God. The second counsel, to live without personal property, mentions that this does not imply that the link with earthly things is to be given up because they are evil.¹²⁷ It places the emphasis on "possessing all things in common," seeing in this reality a way of being more free to be present to others. In this way the religious can love and serve the earth "possessing nothing, yet possessing all things."

The counsel of obedience arises from earthly Christian interpretation of Christ's obedience to the Father. All Christians try to live this obedience. The religious began to see the will of God especially in the superior and then began living according to the Superior's directives as a sign of God's will. This does not mean that the religious renounces his own initiative or conscience, merely his "plans" for the day or the year!

127. Ibid., p.411.

If lived in the spirit of love, the counsels encourage an "undivided" heart, one which leads to the simplicity and freedom of Christ and to a deep relationship with fellowman. The Dutch catechism mentions explicitly that this does not imply that there is something wrong or "lesser" in marriage, property ownership, or being the master of one's own life. It merely sees the three evangelical counsels as reminders that man is sinful: 1) he often lacks something in his love, that is, it frequently remains somewhat egocentric; 2) he often fails to share his possessions generously; and 3) he often has his will run counter to God's.

A second motive for living these counsels is to free man for the new creation. Paul (1 Cor. 7:31) thought this "form of the world was passing away," and that the new one was at hand. Religious life is seen, therefore, as a way of living which in some way, abides forever.¹²⁸

The catechism mentions Christ as the third motive for a religious life. His life was simple and free and, for the religious, the way to these attitudes is through a life of the counsels.

The Dutch catechism's development of the religious life reveals a more relational than classical understanding of man. Each of the vows is discussed in the context of a person's responsible decision to take up his own life religiously - by the use of these counsels. It avoids the classical mentality by not stressing this traditionally Christian life-style as one of being a "state" of life, with counsels "to be kept" and rules to be obeyed. The celibate priest tradition seems linked in the Dutch catechism with his function: ". . . the task of the leaders in the Church is to a very special service"¹²⁹ Although this is a justification for its presence

128: Ibid., p.414.

129: Ibid., p.416.

in the Church today as a "given", it is evidently not to be considered unchangeable, for the Dutch catechism continues, "This does not mean that it could not be otherwise."¹³⁰

The discussion on celibacy reveals that "classical" and "Christian" were used synonymously. The complete spirit/body reoccurs. Spirit is equated with contemplation; body with action. The former is considered "higher" than the latter. The Dutch catechism reveals a relational conception of man on this subject because it does not question the basic world-view upon which the validity of a life of celibacy rests. It only reworks and "updates" some of the interpretations for today.

Stress is not laid however, on the aspect of "separate rôles" in the Church, some "higher" some "lower", some pointing to "heaven", others to "earth". The emphasis is expressed clearly as: together before God.¹³¹ The People of God wait for the Lord together - as married, religious, priests.

As people of God, Christians are in the world but not of the world ("world", it is explained, is used in the biblical sense of mankind insofar as it is estranged from God, insofar as man comes in for God's criticism). This emphasis opens the way for a very different conception of man as he is religious, one which has implications affecting the Church's usual understanding of the "states" of life: married, religious and single.

There is another biblical interpretation of "world" - one more in keeping with today's parlance: world insofar as it is called to be gathered in the Lord, "the world which God so loved".¹³²

130. Ibid., p.416.

131. Ibid., p.417.

132. Ibid., p.417.

In this sense, the people of God belong to the world and must be as much a part of it as possible.

The sections on political living, reverence for life, etc., which follow, try to see life in the world in light of the gospel and the Christian's responsibility. Church and state are societies in which the Christian lives. Men live together in loyalty, co-operation, obedience to society's laws.

Church and state have different tasks, different spheres of operation; but they are in harmony when things go well and neither tries to "buy off" the other. The Church's task is to maintain this tension and speak out only if the State threatens the possibility of living a Christian life.¹³³

"Reverence for life" is developed as an attitude man should have for everything alive; "You shall not kill" involves responsibility for mental and physical health. Christians are encouraged to care for all that lives. A concern for adequate housing, food, clothing, an awareness of the sorrows of too much drinking, noise, pollution, etc., are problems awaiting solutions from those who really love life. How are Christians to respond to the complexities of capital punishment and war? Christ did not tell man how. He gave him a spirit which would cause him to bring about solutions appropriate to the different ages of man.¹³⁴

Work is something to be done together and on the world, that is, on God's Creation. God is in the act of creating the world and He does so also through man. A second aspect of work emphasized by the Dutch catechism is that it unites men according to their callings

133: Ibid., p.420.

134: Ibid., pp.421-426.

because it is done for others. (Even if it is done for self, at least there are benefits for others). Society is a system of service in which all men take part, some more consciously than others, but all have some form of unity in the background. Thirdly, work is affirmed in the Christian message as a means for men to love and to become more themselves. The consequences of work are seen as eternal and therefore man's work on this world builds the new creation.¹³⁵

These positive dimensions of work are off-set by more negative ones: its difficulty, boredom, slavery, stupidity, shortcomings, etc. Work, like all human values, needs to be redeemed.¹³⁶ Although this has been accomplished the Christian message tells of three elements through which the Creator and Redeemer is acting: growing mastery of resources, growing unity, and the resurrection.

The first reality creates greater humanization of the world as its energy makes life more possible and more human. The next element, redemption of work by love, makes unity a possibility. In Christian faith, all mankind is important. The Christian insists on the value of each person - no one can be neglected, nor should anyone feel devoid of hope even if one fails, for the resurrection is accomplished even in the midst of apparent human failure.¹³⁷

The catechism's view of the Christian at work reveals a relational conception of man as one in process of becoming valuable as an individual as he becomes responsible for the social dimensions of living in the world. This awareness of man as person-in-

135: Ibid., p.428.

136: Ibid., p.428.

137: Ibid., p.430.

community implies that the attitude of love bears with it a specific kind of responsibility: sharing the goods of the earth. Ownership must be redeemed. Today men are more conscious of the existing imbalance and therefore more responsible for doing something about it. But what? How?

The Christian tries to live the tension between struggling to acquire personal and collective rights and to live in the spirit of poverty called for in Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Service becomes a Christian way of living this tension creatively - society is redeemed by human service.

By placing the emphasis on man as respecter of life, the catechism works through the positive implications of the fifth commandment: you shall not kill. In light of contemporary attitudes towards life, the Dutch catechism stresses how Christians must respect it: with the attitude of the Beatitudes.

This is followed by a development of the seventh commandment. "You shall not steal." This is interpreted as forbidding as well, receiving stolen goods, fraud, damaging another's property, not paying debts, not returning borrowed things, wasting time for which one is paid, plagiarizing ideas, etc.¹³⁸ The basic suggestion is for man to restrain his covetousness. Yet since the earth is the common property of all, one does have the right to as much of it as is necessary for continued existence (cf. Church in the World, #69.)¹³⁹

The section on helping the needy underlines how much love has been the central emphasis. "Love discovers what will later be a

138: Ibid., p.433.

139: Ibid., p.433.

matter of justice."¹⁴⁰ Rights of man are only partially included in the codes of law. Therefore, in contrast to the Baltimore catechism where the emphasis is on keeping the law and man is conceived of in terms of his individualistic relationship with God and his own afterlife, the Dutch catechism insists on the authenticity of Christianity in terms of love.

This love must be expressed in giving to others. How much? No fixed rules are attempted by the catechism - only the remark that the gospel never says that this love is not to interfere with man's standard of living.¹⁴¹ In fact, the catechism considers it a blessing if Christians give so much for the "health, holidays and development of others ... that they themselves have a cheaper car, or none at all, less exclusive clothes, cheaper toys for their children, etc."¹⁴² This is an endless process and therefore this is the Christian atmosphere in which the most fortunate children are raised. In this focus on the "other", emphasis is also placed on the personal aspect of giving - the giver denies himself something(s) and therefore feels what he is about. In this way collection plates and fund raising are not excluded as impersonal. The gift of self becomes the most important because Christians must be men for others.

In this section, the catechism's personal, historical concept of man re-emphasizes that he is most human when loving the other as he loves himself. The added explanation of what this invitation suggests is that the love one has for self is to be extended to another even at the expense of the giver himself. This clarifies

140: Ibid., p.434.

141: Ibid., p.435.

142: Ibid., p.435.

the catechism's conception of how essentially social man is by nature and the extent to which Christian love goes beyond a vague attitude of love "for everyone" with the hope of eternal life as a reward for such good-will.

Leisure is considered the time of love. The catechism is concerned that man not forget to develop other dimensions of his personality. This age tends to emphasize the values of work, efficiency, technological know-how, etc., often at the expense of the person's own rhythm of development, therefore the Church encourages man to develop personally - at leisure.

Perhaps it is within the context of leisure as necessary for human living that the shifting emphasis of the Church on man's relationship with God can be seen. The more classical conception of man stresses the individual to the exclusion of the social. The more personal, historical, relational conception of man stresses the need for personal growth. It avoids the individualistic type of emphasis in which the social was unheard of and the soul soared so far above the body that heaven alone became the motivation for living now. The growth of a person to a wholeness which makes him more conscious of others and of his own identity as a social being is the emphasis of a relational world-view.

The catechism's development of man's need for leisure reveals its appreciation of man as a social being. Leisure does not become a "project" one must do "to obey some Church directive." Nor is it defined as the "free time spent for others." It is more profound. Leisure is the time one needs for oneself in order to become more fully human. To become more fully oneself requires time and distance away from everyday work and thought-patterns.

The paradox is that in stressing the "person", encouraging him to center himself, operate with integrity, move from an order within himself, more, not less, emphasis is placed upon his social responsi-

bility for others and on his relationship with God as "the Other." It was in stressing the "individual" and encouraging him to look outside himself for the "design of life", the "order of the universe," etc., that more emphasis was placed upon man's own individualistic preoccupations - his own salvation, his own perfection, his own sins, etc.

Within the context of "quest for truth", events of man's everyday are discussed: conversation, sincerity, lying, "fortune-telling." Conversation is a basic structure of existence, it forms the background of all speech. To speak, to listen, brings happiness and builds confidences. It allows people to know themselves and the other better. Sincerity, that is, to speak the truth so as to show one is trustworthy and not to lessen one's trust in another, means "giving reality a chance in our thinking,"¹⁴³ screening out emotional prejudices, egoistic self-delusions, bigotry, etc. Lying distorts reality and causes a disintegration of personal trust and confidence.

"Fortune telling" comes under the large umbrella of presentiments, second sight, telepathy, astrology, etc. A quest for truth should not deny the validity of these phenomena without further study and investigation. However, the catechism mentions Christ as the greatest revelation of the mysterious and knows that the responsibility to which man is called in freedom by his Creator gives him his truest contact with reality.¹⁴⁴ Jesus is no magician, the sacraments no mysterious glimpse into another world - but rather encounters with Jesus in faith, summoning the whole man to "mystery, not riddles."¹⁴⁵ "Mysteries of faith are expressions given us to

143: Ibid., p.442.

144: Ibid., p.444.

145: Ibid., p.445.

name the inexpressible which is revealed in all things and in all men."¹⁴⁶ The believer may therefore recognize that the mystery of existence is a mystery of friendliness and security, of life and light ... the mystery of the Father, Son and the Spirit.¹⁴⁷

The difference between the two catechisms can be seen by a look at the over-all attitude each seems to encourage in regard to life. The Dutch catechism explicitly states that only those who welcome the mystery into their lives can learn to admire and to let themselves be gripped, to give themselves to believe, to give and to serve. The Baltimore catechism repeatedly tends to imply that there are "solutions" to all of life's problems if only people would put things in their rightful position in the hierarchy of values, beliefs and commandments. The only time "mystery" is even mentioned is to define it as supernatural and then as something men believe in because they have God's word for it (#34). Even mystery fits into the "order of the universe" outside man, even mystery has its own "place."

Sin is not discussed at length until the end of the fourth part: "The Way to Christ." Unlike the focus on sin in the Baltimore catechism, where it assumed almost immediate and central importance, the Dutch not only place it last in the chapter, but also place emphasis on it as the negative side of man's positive capacities. Redeemed man is capable of love and service because he shares God's love. The nature of sin is discussed as man's will freely set on evil. Evil is, therefore, not just the imperfection of a free creature which can be corrected by intelligence and energy (as Buddhism implies) but it is man's turning from God, which cannot be rectified by man alone. The catechism sees sin not as a trans-

146: Ibid., p.447.

147: Ibid., p.447.

gression of a law (as Islam holds) but as an offense against personal love, and sin is not against man only (as humanism claims) but also against God as creator and redeemer.¹⁴⁸

These emphases on sin as a weakening in the relationship between man and God call to mind what may have been eclipsed in the Baltimore catechism in its attempt to clarify and explicitly define its teachings on beliefs and law.

There is a mystery about iniquity. Why would one do something against love, against developing a living relationship? Man never does seek pure evil. He seeks the good but it is misplaced. For example, as Augustine described it, man seeks the good of his own independence but turns away from the good of the universal whole.¹⁴⁹ This is the subtlety of the corruption of sin, man can sin with what is good. It is living in false security to think sin is conquered simply by keeping laws.

There are degrees in the failures to love. The Dutch catechism prefers to refer to these degrees with the word "gravity" or "seriousness" rather than "mortal".¹⁵⁰ The reason is that "mortal" implies fatal and this is neither the case nor the emphasis intended by the Dutch. The point stressed in this catechism is that the seriousness of sin varies - it does not rest exclusively in the act itself, as implied by the way in which the Baltimore catechism dwells on the details of how one knows if a sin is mortal or venial. Emphasis in the former is placed on the fact that the amount of knowledge and personal freedom varies not only from person to person

148: Ibid., n.448.

149: Ibid., p.449.

150: Ibid., p.454.

but from time to time in a person's life. Man changes, he grows, he is a different person at forty than he was at twenty. He is still Peter, but not the same Peter, age twenty. In this sense, he can be considered to have the same identity and yet to be a different person.

In its development of the subject of sin, the Dutch catechism states:

. . . too precise juridical definition of the difference has also its disadvantages. . . it can be so preoccupied with it that attention becomes exclusively fixed on the action while little heed is taken of the attitude of the heart, which remains, as Jesus said, the real source of all evil (Mk. 7:14-23).¹⁵¹

Another drawback to precise definitions is that they concern themselves mostly with acts seen in isolation - acts readily seen and easily recounted with little attention given to the attitude of life that gave rise to these acts. It is not easy to say what is grave sin and what is not. Man can generally agree that certain things would always be bad: murder, adultery, leaving a dying person, etc., but even in these it depends on the person's inner attitude.¹⁵²

In grave sin ("mortal"), one's attitude is the will to break with God as He is encountered in fellowman and in man's conscience.¹⁵³ This is further explained as more than "hatred" of God, it is also the refusal of something essential for faithfulness and love, for example, a husband offends his wife not by hating her but also by

151: Ibid., p.452.

152: Ibid., p.452.

153: Ibid., p.453.

infidelity in what is essential to their love. Will man be damned if he dies in such sin? "Yes, if he perseveres in a wilful estrangement in total indifference, he is at enmity with God,"¹⁵⁴ and death, being merely a passage, is a transition from this temporal attitude to an eternal hardening in it. This is hell.

Forgiveness is an attitude which so permeates the lives of Christians and non-Christians alike that it is easy not to realize that it is a gift of the Spirit. But God's forgiveness does not mean that men stay in their sin, and God just does not pay attention anymore. Man is new. However, the consequences remain, the damage done by man is - therefore must be repaired as much as possible. For example, return stolen goods, rectify lies said about another.

In this latter case, if reparation is not fully possible, the penitent does some other good act. In the early Church, penance was often replaced by good works, for example, instead of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the penitent built a bridge for travellers.¹⁵⁵ This good work which replaced "penance" later replaced "the temporal punishment due to sin." The Church sees itself as having been given full authority to forgive men; it is the channel of pardon for all.¹⁵⁶

The sacrament of Penance is the climax of reconciliation and other acts of forgiveness in the Church. It is a sign of Christ's real presence. This is one reason for confessing sin to the priest - authority has been given to him. It is also reasonable

154: Ibid., p.453.

155: Ibid., p.455.

156: Ibid., p.456.

since reconciliation with God should be expressed. Man also is in a position of acknowledging his impotence to set right his relationship with God and fellow men. Were man left to his own initiatives, it would risk his final feeling that out of his own humanity alone he re-established a relationship with God and neighbor.

The catechism's historical development of the sacrament from its beginning reveals a growing understanding of the nature of man as an individual and social being as well as a growth in an understanding of how he is sinful. The Dutch catechism mentions that, in early centuries, the sacrament was given only once in a lifetime and then only for murder, idolatry, (or apostasy) and adultery if they were known publicly and therefore a source of scandal. Other sins were forgiven through mutual reconciliation, prayer, private penance, good works, etc.¹⁵⁷

Later, the custom grew of confessing private sins and the penance became private as well. This seventh century custom, which came from the influence of the east and of Irish monasticism, gave rise to the various forms of confession today. The three liturgical elements remain: contrite confession, absolution and penance imposed.

This approach of the Dutch catechism to penance, historical details and emphasis on the personal attitude and responsibility to society, differs clearly from the approach of the Baltimore catechism in which stress is placed on the details of how to confess sins, which sins to confess and the punishments for a bad confession, etc. The personal, relational, historical conception of man which underpins the Dutch catechism is revealed through the emphasis it places on sin as an attitude of the whole person which refuses to encounter love in someone.¹⁵⁸

157: Ibid., p.451.

158: Ibid., pp.449-454.

Part V: The Way to the End

This last part of the catechism directs itself to the ultimate and to God. Man's insatiable hope is a mark of his humanity and a sign that "there is more." Death happens quietly through life - illness, loss of friends are each in their way a preparation. Usually imperceptible these preparations are nonetheless present in every life.

The sacrament of the anointing of the sick (or Extreme Unction) brings the presence of Jesus to the mind of the sick person and his community. Death is the profound mystery of life: it ends the existence of the whole man as he is known. Christian tradition gives man hope - he is more than he was known to be here. His resurrection has always been a part of the Church's teaching. It has been interpreted differently in the past than today, and this is an indication of how deeply the shift in the Church's conception of man has affected the Christian world-view.

The classical conception of man as body and soul would logically interpret the "resurrection of the body" to mean something that would happen when Jesus comes again: the "soul" of man having departed at the moment of death. The relational understanding of person as an inseparable bodily-spiritual being-in-the-world makes this classical image less satisfying and therefore less significant.

The Dutch catechism discusses man's resurrection in what it considers more biblical terms. "Soul" in the New Testament, for example, Matthew 10:28, does not mean a human spirit floating free, detached from the body; it means, as it does elsewhere in the Bible, "life."¹⁵⁹ The catechism suggests Christ means that the something

159: Ibid., p.473.

in man which is most properly himself can be saved at death. He does not say that this "something" is entirely dissociated from a new body. It is therefore not biblical to speak of the soul as disembodied.

How is one to understand scriptural references to man's resurrection? In light of biblical usage and contemporary insights into the meaning of person, one could think of this resurrection as "existence after death (which) is already something like the resurrection of the new body."¹⁶⁰ The body is not thought of as molecules scattered and buried all gathered together on the last of days.

The communion of saints is discussed as the fellowship of the human race and the Church. This fellowship comprises everyone who is humanly fulfilled through a life of love and dedication. What can be done for the dead? The Church prays for them. In light of this, the catechism explains its liturgy of the dead.¹⁶¹ Death is no private affair, the earthly community loses a personal presence of Christ in the world, and the communion of saints receives him. Perhaps he is recognizable to them because he is risen.

The resurrection on the last day is discussed in light of the Bible's expression of God's concern for man since the beginning. Man will rise, as did Jesus, and his new birth will be completed.¹⁶² The judgment is still seen in the rather literal terms of an event to happen, an awareness that is to come, which will reveal union with/or aversion from Christ.

160: Ibid., p.474.

161: Ibid., pp.476-477.

162: Ibid., pp.478-479.

The Dutch catechism interprets the "new creation" of 1 Cor. 2:9 as primarily concerned with faith on earth. "Something of eternal joy begins already amid the distress and fears of this life."¹⁶³ Emphasis once again is on this life. Faith in God, and a belief that there is more to life than what man now experiences of it, should never turn man's attention away from this life.

The final sections integrate the various dimensions of man-in-relation-to-his-world, by placing him within the context of his broadest development. Man's growing consciousness of evolution is seen as giving him a new vision of God's majesty. As the "becoming" of the universe unfolds, sharper contours of truth - always before proclaimed but not attended to - emerge: creation of the world is not so much something God did, but something He does; creation is not making something as men do, it is creating all things to depend on Him - He is now working towards their perfection.¹⁶⁴ He invites man to participate in this creation of life - an emphasis which causes man to pause and one which focuses on the God-man relationship as one of creative love.

Next these emphases focus on God as not part of this world - He "transcends" it, yet, is at the same time present in it.¹⁶⁵ God's immanence, so thoroughly felt in scriptural passages, is emphasized today as a presence through natural causes. Earlier this presence was understood in terms of His appearance when there was no natural explanation for it. In the Dutch catechism the more a creature is itself, the more God is present within it. "God's

163: Ibid., p.481.

164: Ibid., p.489.

165: Ibid., pp.490-491.

action does not consist of his pushing aside what he has created, but of his bringing it to be itself as fully as possible, and man most of all."¹⁶⁶

Unlike the Baltimore catechism, which focuses on God as "supernatural" spirit in heaven, etc., focus in the Dutch catechism is on the tension between a God free of the world but still at its depths; independent of man, yet bound up with man; transcendent but immanent.¹⁶⁷ Within this context, various scriptural passages are discussed - Job's predicament, Christ's promise that whatever man asks of the Father in His name will be given, etc. Finally, and most important comes the revelation of God as love. "The mystery of God is not a mystery of isolation but of fellowship, creativity, knowledge, love, outpouring and receiving, and that is why we are what we are. Human life is the possibility of cooperating with what God is: love."¹⁶⁸

From this comparative analysis of the two catechisms, it is possible to suggest that they differ in their underlying conceptions of man. Unlike the classical conception of man constructed from the Baltimore catechism where man is described in reference to himself and sees his task in the world as one of conforming to the order and design in the universe outside of him, we construct a relational view of man from the Dutch catechism. In this latter pastoral work, man is described in reference to the world, and God is described as a person in the world who continues to invite man to cooperate in the creation and redemption of the world. Man is

166: Ibid., p.491.

167: Ibid., p.492.

168: Ibid., p.501.

seen as an image of God, but he is most God when he is present in the world of man, co-creating a design and meaning to his life.

Although in a relational view of man, the givens or content of the faith are considered as dynamic and on going, historical mysteries, they are not questioned; they are taken for granted as the starting point of the Christian life. What relational man questions however, is the way in which these givens are to be taken up, that is, integrated into his life. The Christian meaning to life is co-constituted by man in his relationship with God and fellowman as he takes up the givens of his faith in the historical, concrete and particular circumstances of his life. A relational conception of man emphasizes the communitarian rather than the individualistic type of relationships between God and man. It encourages a diversity of relationships by the way it suggests that man integrate his life around the person of Jesus according to the situation, time and place.

The divisions of the Dutch catechism into themes for reflection, and the consideration of these five themes within the context of man's response to Christ involving a responsibility for the co-creation of the earth, effectively remove the centuries old black-and-white categories of the question-answer formats. With the loss of this latter comes a different structuring of reality. By removing the classicists' monopoly on a "Catholic" world-view, the Dutch catechism opens the door to the possibility of several world-views. More important than any particular one it might suggest is the fact that because it encourages another world-view, the classical one can no longer be considered synonymous with the RCC as an institution.

CHAPTER II

A NEW CATECHISM, CATHOLIC FAITH FOR ADULTS
B. The Supplement

A Supplement to A New Catechism, by Edouard Dhanis, S.J. and Jan Visser, C.S.S.R., was written on behalf of the Commission of Cardinals appointed to examine A New Catechism. Even though it was the Commission's intention that "the modifications ... be inserted into the (original) text ...,"¹ the modifications were presented finally as a separate supplement to the original catechism. For this reason, the Supplement is being analyzed separately in this dissertation.

The purpose for studying this later insert into the catechism is three-fold. First, a knowledge of the supplementary additions and subtractions is essential to an over all analysis of the edition of the Dutch catechism which was authorized for distribution to Roman Catholics in North America in 1969.²

Second, it reinforces the thesis that a shift in paradigms in the conception of man was taking place within the Church as an institution and manifested itself in three pastoral publications used in North America between 1958-1970. Had there not been question of such a change in the Church's understanding of man, it seems unlikely that the appointment of a Commission of Cardinals would have taken place. Why appoint a separate commission in Rome to reaffirm, clarify and modify the original text of a pastoral publication which had been written during a four year period by the hierarchy, theologians and laymen of another nation - particularly

1: A Supplement to a New Catechism, Edouard Dhanis, S.J. and Jan Visser, C.S.S.R. on behalf of the Commission of Cardinals, November 30, 1968, p.515.

2: In fact, Bishop Robert F. Joyce of Burlington, who had been willing to put his name as Imprimatur of the original 1966 edition, hastily withdrew his signature a few days before it went to the presses of Herder and Herder when he heard rumors of a Roman Commission being set up to make points of clarification. He did not put his Imprimatur in the catechism until the Supplement was inserted.

since this publication had received the unanimous approval of that hierarchy?

Third, study of the Supplement becomes even more necessary for purposes of this dissertation when we realize that the Commission of Cardinals signed it exactly ten years after the revised edition of the Baltimore catechism appeared for general circulation. Between those dates occurred the Second Council of the Vatican. The Church's shift in its perspective on man seems even more apparent when we read that the theologians writing the Supplement did not see their suggestions as fundamental but merely as points of clarification.³ The givens of either world-view therefore remain unquestioned, but the ways in which the Dutch suggested these givens could be taken up evidently were thought to be different enough to warrant a supplement of clarifications.

It is not possible to analyze comparatively the content and the kind of God-man relationships encouraged in the Supplement with those encouraged in the original because the former deals with the content by topics and takes no notice of their original context. For example, the Supplement discusses original sin in terms of a fixed doctrine held by the Church rather than as a present reality which can be appreciated only within the context of Christ's presently redeeming ways with men. It is not possible, therefore, to compare these texts since the Supplement takes no notice of the context of the original. We can note, however, the particular areas of content which the Commission of Cardinals singled out as in need of modification and clarification.

3: The theologians who worked on the Supplement were quoted as saying that the changes they suggest "(are) minor modifications of terminology and clarifications rather than substantive (ones)." They admitted, however, these assessments were important - "for one thing the Curia insisted upon them." Cf. National Catholic Reporter (November 29, 1967), Kansas City, National Catholic Publishing Company, p.1.

No separate construction of the conception of man underlying the Supplement is possible since the Supplement simply inserts the Church's traditional teachings on a subject with no attempt to situate or discuss the point in question within the context of the Christian life presented by the Dutch original. The following will be a brief noting of the content of the additions and subtractions. We maintain, therefore, that the theologians who wrote for the Commission of Cardinals attempt to reaffirm the givens or content of faith in the ahistorical and universal terms reflective of a classical perspective on man. This is done vis-à-vis the historical and concrete terms used in the relational world-view of the Dutch catechism.

I. CREATION: The existence of pure spirits: - angels and devils. The original text refers to scriptural passages regarding angels as messengers of God and, in the fact of the "horrificing wickedness which we see at work",⁴ raises the question: is it purely human? The supplementary text quotes the Fourth Lateran Council on the existence of angels. By putting this question in parentheses, this text reveals a certain classical concern with information and answers in the face of questions.⁵

The section on the direct creation of the human soul⁶ is in contradiction with the original's title: the creation of man.⁷ It is evidently a deliberate contradiction since it follows the Dutch catechism's careful explanation:

4: A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults, new authorized edition with imprimatur and Supplement, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969, p.482.

5: The Supplement, p.517-518.

6: Ibid., p.518.

7: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.382.

It was once usual to say that God created the world and preserves it in being, but creates each soul directly But this manner of speaking failed to do justice to two things, one, the Creation itself is a reality which strives upwards, and two, that body and soul are not to be divided.⁸

By ignoring this explanation, and replacing the word "man" with that of "soul", the Supplement seems to reinforce a classical conception of man.

II. ORIGINAL SIN: This is the longest section of the Supplement. Its length reinforces the central emphasis which the classical tradition places on sin. This section which begins with excerpts from the (then) latest documents issued by Rome on the subject, puts forward the classical interpretation which controls the questions raised by giving directives according to an already established order outside.

The Supplement's selection of certain points for clarification suggests not only its concern that traditional teachings be known (cf. listings of Councils on pp.519, 525, 526, 533) but also that they be interpreted in the traditional way. Curiously, these Supplementary additions seem merely to be making explicit what the Dutch clearly presupposes as traditional teaching. As a result we can appreciate that, to those within a classical world-view, the perception of the givens of Catholicism as dynamic would appear as a 'betrayal' of doctrine. Most significantly, a misunderstanding of a relational world-view by those from within a classical one (in this case, the Commission of Cardinals), would cause the 'reinforcing' process or defensive tone to become predominant. A dynamic conception of man (in this case, the one expressed in the Dutch catechism), easily appears in need of modifications and clarifications to those with a static conception.

8: Ibid., p.382.

The same attitude is seen in III. THE BIRTH OF JESUS FROM THE VIRGIN MARY: 1) The mystery of the virginal conception. Although this section repeats much of the development in the original text, it omits the part suggesting that the deepest meaning of the article of faith, "born of a Virgin Mary," is that the evangelists proclaim Jesus' birth was not due to the will of a man, nor did it depend on what men can do for themselves.⁹

By this omission, plus the insertion of the sentence: "...under the guidance of the magisterium we all confess that Jesus 'was conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary',"¹⁰ the Supplement gives the traditionally classical interpretation. Further, in the section 2) the perpetual virginity of Mary, the explicit directive is given: "add: the perpetual virginity of Mary is confirmed by the tradition of the Church, and presented by the magisterium to our belief,"¹¹ This was to follow the original text which reads: "Jn. 19:27 makes it highly improbable that Mary had other sons."¹²

The original text states Mary did not understand who she was bringing into the world until the resurrection.¹³ The Supplement reads "she had an initial intimation of it."¹⁴ The former bases

9: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.75.

10: The Supplement, op. cit., p.539.

11: Ibid., p.540.

12: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.77.

13: Ibid., p.77.

14: The Supplement, op. cit., p.540.

its position on the historical fact that hymns in the Church after the resurrection were the first signs the later generations had that the early community realized the "invisible God."¹⁵ The Supplement gives no reason for its position. We can surmise that it was repeating the popular traditional belief that, from the time of the Annunciation, Mary knew her son was God.

Both sections, IV. THE SATISFACTION OFFERED BY JESUS TO HIS FATHER and V. THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS IN THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS,¹⁶ develop certain traditional aspects of the Church's teaching. No significant additions are made, only scriptural excerpts and traditional teachings are reaffirmed.¹⁷ The Supplement does not focus, as does the original text, on the multiple emphases possible regarding the mystery of the Eucharistic presence.

... It is all a matter of personal preference, of the form of the celebration, of one's education, and even of the age in which one lives.¹⁸

VI. THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE AND CHANGE. 1) The eucharistic presence. This insertion reiterates the Church's traditional teachings, for example, those of the Council of Trent on the presence of Jesus in the sacrament. 2) The eucharistic change, is not discussed. Teaching on it is repeated in terms of the classical tradition from the Middle Ages, the Council of Trent and Paul VI's Mysterium Fidei.¹⁹ Both the original and the insertion

15: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., pp.77-78.

16: Ibid., pp.282-283; The Supplement, op. cit., pp.541-545.

17: Ibid., p.547.

18: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.341.

19: The Supplement, op. cit., pp.550-551.

are expressing the same concern: that the presence of Jesus in and through signs be understood as the bread of eternal life.²⁰

3) The duration of the Eucharistic presence is considered in both the Supplement and the original text in non-scientific terms. They both agree that the Eucharistic presence of Jesus ceases when the form of bread is no longer there.²¹ The 'reservation of the Eucharist' is discussed in the original text within the context of the Mass as a celebration. The value of private adoration, Benediction, etc. is acknowledged but the point of these prayerful responses is to awaken man's desire to celebrate the Eucharist to his fullest capacity. The Supplement stresses only the aspect of private devotion. In this way the emphasis is placed on the private-individual type of spirituality characteristic of the classical world-view.

VII. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH AND KNOWLEDGE OF MYSTERIES.

The Commission inserts four aspects of the people's progress toward the fullness of truth: the revealed message has aspects to it which Christ willed to make known to the Church gradually; the people attain revealed truths through instruments of human expression, (these can change to a certain degree); images and conception are also used in this process and therefore the distinction is made between truth and the expression of it; revealed truth must always be presented so hearers can approach it in light of their own mentality, knowledge and problems.²³

20: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., pp.342-343.

21: Ibid., p.345; The Supplement, op. cit., p.551.

22: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., pp.346-347.

23: The Supplement, op. cit., p.553.

24: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.365.

These points make more explicit what the original text discussed in terms of infallibility as an expression of a many-coloured and dynamic reality. It is not static and "smoothly rounded off."²⁴ "A fixed point need not be immovable.... A fixed point for a calf is not the hedge ... but its mother, which moves and runs ..., for the child the same - a fixed point is his mother "²⁵ In this sense infallibility is not a rigid system but a fixed point that interprets the gospel for each new age.

Both the Supplement and the original text are concerned with the same phenomenon: change in the phrasing of beliefs. The Supplement inserts explanations in regard to the phrasing of beliefs and then uses the very example of the original text: "the fixed point." But by placing this example in the context of its explanations, the Commission changes the original meaning and reveals a classical world-view: it becomes necessary to justify motion as something which can be calculated, bear specific distinctions, and come in logical steps. It is in this way that the Supplement makes legitimate the "supernatural sense of the faith which characterizes the people as a whole."²⁶

VIII. THE OFFICIAL PRIESTHOOD AND AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH.

1) The priesthood of believers and the official priesthood, are seen as belonging to the whole community in both Supplement and original. Phrases such as "hierarchical priesthood is 'higher',"²⁷ etc., however, are used in the Supplement, whereas the original text speaks in terms of general priesthood being the central and

24: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.365

25: Ibid., p.366.

26: The Supplement, op. cit., p.553.

27: Ibid., p.555.

and important thing.²⁸ There are two different points made in regard to priesthood. This original text discusses priesthood as central to the community, the Supplement discusses it in terms of being hierarchically 'higher'. The two texts, therefore, are not strictly comparable. 2) The official or hierarchical priesthood explanations do not differ essentially. Points of rubric are added in the Supplement: for example, the newly ordained priest concelebrates the eucharist with the bishops.²⁹ 3) The authority to govern and to instruct. This section carefully develops the traditional teaching on Peter as head of the Church and the gradual realization of this in terms of the power of infallibility (especially between Vatican Councils I and II). The Supplement does not make essential changes in the emphasis of the original text, it merely clarifies by development.³⁰

IX. VARIOUS POINTS OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. The emphasis on

- 1) Our knowledge of the mystery of the Holy Trinity is different in this section from in the original text. The Supplement clarifies and explains points of information about it whereas the original reflects more on the mystery of the Father, Son and Spirit.³¹
- 2) Our knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ. The original reads "... we only know who God is through Jesus. It is not through (our ideas of) God that we learn to know Jesus. But it is through Jesus that we learn to know God."³² The Supplement replaces this with: "... Jesus ... brings us a higher knowledge which is fully true and

28: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.363.

29: The Supplement, op. cit., p.556.

30: Ibid., p.557.

31: Ibid., pp.560-562.

32: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.79.

certain, in connection with our sonship."³³ And, again, the original writes: "Away ... with our elaborate human explanations. How God is, we can find in Jesus, who was born, died and rose again, and lives on through His Spirit in His Church."³⁴ The Supplement inserts a longer explanation.³⁵

In 3) The consciousness of Jesus, the original text is concerned with the fact that "In Jesus' truly human knowledge ..., something of his likeness to God radiates."³⁶ The Supplement's explanation deals with the 'levels' of Jesus' consciousness.³⁷ In 4) The sacrament of Baptism, and in 5) The sacrament of Penance, there is no basic difference in the concern of the Supplement and that of the original.³⁸

This is true as well of 6) The nature of miracles. The original and supplemental texts have two concerns in common. One is that men realize that what is considered "miraculous" may change with one's place and education. The other is that men experience God at work in His creation. There are exceptions to the laws of nature. These exceptions must teach man that he does not know what can happen within himself and in the world.³⁹

33: The Supplement, op. cit., p.562.

34: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.81.

35: The Supplement, op. cit., p.562.

36: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.91.

37: The Supplement, op. cit., p.563.

38: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., pp. 246; 249; 250; 252; The Supplement, op. cit., pp.563-564.

39: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.107; The Supplement, op. cit., p.565.

7) The Mystery of life after death, is treated differently in the original than in the Supplement. The former carefully directs itself to what used to be the explanation based on a distinction between 'body' and 'soul', and mentions that a new effort at expression is not a change of faith, but a different way of interpreting the same faith. "The Bible never thinks of the soul as entirely divested of all corporality."⁴⁰ In this context there is a discussion of the "existence after death (as) already something like the resurrection of the body."⁴¹ The Supplement inserts scriptural and Church council quotations on life after death.⁴²

This section, like the ones before it, seems to suggest that the classical world-view was synonymous with "the Church". In this view any re-structuring of relationships appears to be a tampering with the fundamental phenomena.

8) Judgment and final purification. The Supplement has a more literal understanding of the judgment than has the original. The former places it at the end of time,⁴³ whereas the latter suggests we do not know when, that it is not important to place it in time, merely to realize that the verdict is pronounced by the Judge.⁴⁴ The teachings on purification after death are the same: "there is still ingrained egoism to be converted..., and it (the conversion) begins to take place with death."⁴⁵ 9) The mystery of the vision of God, is discussed with no significant additions or subtractions, or even shifts in emphasis.⁴⁶

40: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.473.

41: Ibid., p.474.

42: The Supplement, op. cit., pp.566-567.

43: Ibid., p.568.

44: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.480

45: Ibid., p.477; The Supplement, op. cit., p.568.

46: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.483; The Supplement, op. cit., p.569.

X. VARIOUS POINTS OF MORAL THEOLOGY. 1) The universal moral laws, a phrase used in the Supplement, is not used in the original.⁴⁷ The latter speaks instead in terms of eternal values. These two interpretations are clearly a question of two different world-views expressing the ways in which morality bears the stamp of each age but somehow is affected by elements which are perpetually valid.

2) The indissolubility of marriage. The Supplement requests that the original text's examples of 'two marriage cases' be dropped since in the cases used, the final decision is left to the conscience of the couple.⁴⁸ The original mentions these cases, however, by explicitly placing them as examples that "... it is not granted to men - even where legislation is at its most subtle, and most strongly orientated to practical life - to decide in every instance whether this or that marriage is really contracted in Christ."⁴⁹

On the question 3) Serious and less serious sin, inner dispositions and acts, the Supplement repeats the original text. Both agree that the inward attitude is the determining aspect of sin.⁵⁰

4) The married state. Both texts agree on the givens of marriage: The Genesis account emphasizes fertility, love, similarity between man and woman, and implies monogamy.⁵¹ The texts differ,

47: The Supplement, op. cit., p.569.

48: Ibid., pp.570-571.

49: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.397.

50: Ibid., pp.452; 453; The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., pp.571-572.

51: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.389; The Supplement, op. cit., pp.572-573.

however, in regard to the ways in which they suggest that the couple is to take up their love in marriage. On the subject of family planning, for example, the Supplement makes it clear that, just because the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World did not pronounce on concrete methods of birth control, and therefore did not explicitly repeat the teaching of Pius XI, "... this still may not be seen as a fundamental modification or change of standpoint as regards Church teaching."⁵² The original text suggests that "reverence for life undoubtedly demands that no practices be chosen which could be harmful to health or the affective life."⁵³ The Supplement urges the very thing the Dutch avoided: "consult with a prudent priest, ... a doctor, ... who can decide what is medically best...(for you)"⁵⁴

From this comparison we maintain that the aims of the two works differ. The authors of the Dutch catechism described their intention as one of bringing about "a new type of catechism (one which) tries to present the faith of (the)fathers in a form suitable to the present day."⁵⁵ And, although the theologians of the Commission of Cardinals "considered (their) changes minor modifications of terminology and clarifications rather than substantive",⁵⁶ they did seem to find it necessary to reinterpret the teachings and suggest substitute ones for some of those written by teams of theologians, bishops and laymen of another culture and country. By

52: The Supplement, op. cit., p.573; N.B. This was written before the publication of Humanae Vitae, July, 1968 (cf. p.574); it was published afterwards, however, on November 30, 1968.

53: Ibid., p.403.

54: Ibid., p.574.

55: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.5.

56: The National Catholic Reporter, (November 29, 1967), Kansas City, National Catholic Publishing Company, p.1.

doing this, the Commission reveals a classical world-view since, evidently, their teachings are to be considered ahistorical and universal. It is not only the gesture of changing the historical and particular teachings of the hierarchy of a particular country which brings us to this conclusion, but it is also that the Commission of Cardinals questioned neither the givens of the creation, incarnation, resurrection, etc., nor the ways in which these givens were to be taken up. They concerned themselves simply with "clarifying sections of the original so that no shadow might obscure the teaching of the Church."⁵⁷

Since the theologians commissioned by the Cardinals did not consider their changes substantive ones, it is understandable that the authors of the Dutch catechism neither changed their own original text nor inserted into it the additions of the Commission. The purpose of the original Dutch catechism was not to give final answers or to define the Church's positions, but rather to put today's questions in light of the Gospel.⁵⁸ The purpose of the writers of the Supplement, however, was to make finalizing statements to clarify any new issues and to end any possibility of confusion.⁵⁹

57: The Supplement, op. cit., p.574. "Though the preceding comments are not negligible, either in number or in seriousness, they nonetheless leave by far the greatest part of the New Catechism untouched, with its admirable pastoral, liturgical and biblical character. So too they support the praiseworthy intentions of the authors of the Catechism, which was to present the eternal good news of Christ in a way which is adapted to the mentality of the people of our times. It is precisely the high qualities with which the work is enhanced which make it desirable that the teachings of the Church should always be given without any shadows which might obscure it." (Cf. Acta. Apostolicae Sedis, 60, 1968, p.69.)

58: The Dutch catechism, op. cit., p.v; The National Catholic Reporter (May 24, 1967), p.9; Rev. William Bless, Director of the Nijmegen Higher Institute at the time of the 1966 publication of the catechism says: "... the new catechism does not pretend to have the last word. That word simply does not exist ... (not now, nor (will it) for years to come...). There will always be further thought about the faith... we hope our catechism will awaken thought in other countries (and) each will prepare their own catechism for adults."

59: The National Catholic Reporter, op. cit., p.1.

We maintain, therefore, that the setting up of a special Commission in Rome "to clarify" and supplement a catechism emerging from the theologians, people, and bishops of another country, reveals the classical preoccupation with 'preserving' truth, restating doctrines and traditional interpretations of beliefs as 'universal' and ahistorical.

An analysis of the Supplement suggests that a classical conception of man underlies these additions. The way in which each of the topics is clarified reinforces man in a classical relationship with his world, a relationship based on the presupposition that there is a universal, ahistorical body of theories and directives which are the Church's teachings to which man must conform. In fact, it is conceivable that the Supplement would never have been written if a classical world-view had not prevailed in the Church at that time (1968). Yet the Commission, unaware that it was operating from out of another world-view, was also unaware that its 'clarifications' could be considered substantive.

This phenomenon of unawareness, that there was another conception of man underlying the catechism, accounts for the simultaneous publishing of the two different world-views side-by-side. The publication of the Supplement exemplifies how these differing views of man in his world were operative in the institutional Church during this period.

CHAPTER III

THE PASTORAL CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH IN THE MODERN WORLD

Since this Pastoral Constitution is an official document, written in committees and sub-committees of an Ecumenical Council by many bishops and theologians from all over the world for the universal Church, it may at first seem that it cannot by its nature be compared with two catechisms. Yet it can be compared to the catechism in purpose and concern.

The Constitution is explicitly pastoral. Its purpose is clearly stated: it addresses itself "not only to the sons of the Church and all who invoke the name of Christ, but to the whole of humanity ... (in order to) explain to everyone how it conceives of the presence and activity of the Church in the world of today...."¹ Its concern is the community of mankind, linked as the Church is with this community by sharing in its "joys and hopes, griefs and anxieties of men of this age,"² and bringing to this human community light kindled from the gospel and putting at its disposal the saving resources which the Church receives from its Founder.³

This particular pastoral publication and the two catechisms are analyzed precisely because all three were widely circulated to Catholics in North America during the period of renewal and fomentation of the 1960s. The Constitution stands in relation to the other documents of Vatican II in the unique position of being the one through which the Church officially expressed its pastoral positions and raised questions regarding its own identity and aspirations in the modern world.

1: Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, (Gaudium et Spes), The Documents of Vatican II, with notes, et. al, edited by Walter M. Abbott, S.J., trans. J. Gallagher, New York, Guild Press, 1966, p.200.

2: Ibid., p.199.

3: Ibid., p.201.

It is the document from which the Dutch catechism frequently quotes and upon which it patterned its discussions of the problems facing Catholics today in regard to marriage and the family, work and leisure,⁴ etc. The use of this constitution does not imply that it is the only one in which it is possible to see outlines of the shift away from classical concept of man. It is being used merely because by the comparative analysis of these texts it is possible to see a concrete reflection of multiple world-views in the Church.

The analysis is limited to the published version of the Constitution. It excludes therefore, the four preliminary stages or drafts of the Pastoral Constitution because they were not available to members of the general reading public who are the concern of this dissertation.⁵ This study, therefore, limits the material used in the comparative analysis to pastoral works in their published form as circulated for the general education in the faith of Roman Catholics in North America in the 1960s. As a result of the analysis, which is not intended to be exhaustive, we maintain that underlying this document there are at least classical and a relational conceptions of man.

4: A New Catechism: Catholic Faith for Adults, new authorized edition with imprimatur and supplement, New York, Herder and Herder, (Montreal, Palm Publishers), 1969, p.381-466. Pastoral Constitution, Part II, #46-72.

5: Sincere gratitude is expressed to Rev. Msgr. Vincenzo Carbone of the Archives of Vatican Council II, Rome, Vatican City, for his assistance and generosity in permitting complete access to these original Latin documents. These documents are considered as secreto and sub-secreto and ordinarily available only to those who were invited to participate in the Council sessions at least as periti. Equal appreciation is expressed to Prof. Charles Davis Chairman of the Department of Religion, Sir George Williams University, Montreal, who shared his personal copies of the third and fourth drafts.

We recall that in a classical conception of man, man defines himself in reference to himself and in terms of being a spirit-body dichotomy in relation to God and to the world. The institutional Church's perspective on man, therefore, is one in which man does not question either the givens of his faith or the way in which he is to take up these givens. Both are known - or should be known - hence the long line of catechisms. Man is seen as spending his earthly life meriting the reward of his heavenly life by trying in a uniform way to conform perfectly to the will of God. God is known through the teachings on the beliefs, laws and sacraments and is considered by man as part of the design and order of the universe which in turn is perceived as something objective, separate and outside of man.

According to our working description of a relational conception of man, man defines himself in reference to the world and in terms of being a body-soul unity, a person in relation to the world and to a personal God. The institutional Church's perspective on man, therefore, is one in which even though man does not question the givens of his faith, he does question the way in which he is to take them up. This "way" is not known in any ahistorical or universal manner but requires awareness of God as historically and particularly present in the world of today. Man spends his life responding to God's initial invitation to co-create the world and to continue the salvation-events of Jesus. Unity emerges through the particular personal diversities as well as through the historical diversities of culture and time.

The Council also seems aware that modern man is in a "new age in history", one in which he is beginning to question even the givens of his life. Such an acknowledgement on the part of the institution suggests that it is able to perceive man in other than classical and/or relational terms. Since, however, the implications of this kind of questioning were never concretized in the Pastoral Constitution, we cannot construct the conception of man as one under-

lying the constitution. We only can suggest that in 1965 the institutional Church seemed aware that man was at another 'first' in the development of the human race - one in which he was in crisis largely because he was questioning what before were the unquestioned starting points of his life.

The Pastoral Constitution can be appreciated as an example of the struggle of the Council Fathers, operating out of their well-tried classical perspectives of the world and man, to move into other perspectives. It also calls attention to a phenomenon familiar to institutions, in this case, to the Church of Rome: conceptions often change not by conscious design so much as by the accidental combination of struggles, shared insights, surprises, reaffirmation of the familiar and nihilation of the truly diverse.

That the phenomena of two different conceptions of man existing side by side, often within the same paragraph, presented no apparent difficulty to Council Fathers suggests that the Fathers must not have been aware of the way in which these underlying conceptions of man differed.⁶ This reflects the phenomenon of change: in any change from one perspective to another the initial steps or insights are perceived from within the already held perspective. In this instance this means that any new perception of the way in which man is in a relationship with his world was seen from within the classical world-view.

6: It is understandable that the Council Fathers would not have been aware of the conceptions of man which seem to underlie this document since the parts are written by many commissions and sub-commissions. However, to the best of my knowledge, there is no indication in any of the published and unpublished documents on this Schema that the question of underlying conceptions of man was ever even raised as a problem or basic question.

Division of the Pastoral Constitution

This analysis of the Pastoral Constitution proceeds in the same way as did those of the Baltimore and Dutch catechisms. It moves chronologically and critically through the content and emphases placed on the relationship between God and man. The two-part division of the Pastoral Constitution reveals its anthropocentric focus: Part I. The Church and Man's Calling; Part II. Some Problems of Special Urgency. The first part addresses itself directly to man himself in society, and the Church in relation to the whole person. The second part considers the consequences and implications of this relationship especially in regard to some issues considered as urgent between 1960-1965.

PREFACE

Both content and emphasis of the Preface situate man in relation to his world. The initial concern the Council expresses is one of speaking of the intimacy of the Church's link with humanity, and of the role of the Church as servant in the modern world.

The Preface focuses on Christians as those who, "united in Christ, led by the Spirit in their journey to the kingdom of their Father"⁷ have welcomed the news of salvation for all mankind. The constitution portrays the Christian community as so intimately in union with mankind and with its history that it considers the "joys and hopes, griefs and anxieties" of all men as its own (#1).

7: Pastoral Constitution, op. cit., p.200.

The suggested Christian stance is clearly not the classical one of the Baltimore catechism: standing above or outside of the human condition in anticipation of an after-life. It is, rather, one of realizing from within the human situation the way in which Christians are linked intimately with humanity because they have received the news of salvation for all mankind. A distinction therefore emerges: Christians are not synonymous with "mankind"; yet Christians are intimately related with their fellowman from within their Christian perspective. Christians are a part of mankind. This emphasis is not dissimilar from that of the Dutch catechism in which man is considered in the human condition of his grandeur and misery, and Jesus is seen from within a perspective of faith as the answer to life's paradox of grief and joy.⁸

The way in which Vatican II addresses itself not only to the sons of the Church and to all who invoke the name of Christ, but also to the whole of humanity, draws attention to the relational dimension of the Church and the world. Up until this point in history the institutional Church had not addressed itself pastorally to all humanity, nor had it felt it necessary to explain its presence and activity in the world. It was presumed that everyone understood the Church's role in the world: to bring all men to a salvation in Christ outside of time. The Church saw its responsibility to the baptized as one of helping them focus on an after-life. It saw its responsibility to the unbaptized as one of bringing them Christ's message and His baptism of salvation. As a result, the emphasis was placed on the Church's separation from the world. The constitution is a shift away from this emphasis.

8: The Dutch Catechism, op. cit., p.19.

The focal point of the Constitution is the world. In this instance, world is considered as the whole human family along with the sum of those realities in the midst of which that family lives. In stating that Christians see this world as "one created and sustained by its Maker's love . . .,"⁹ the Council stresses that, from within a Christian perspective of Christ's death-resurrection, Christians can see the world as 'fashioned anew.'

By focusing on the world, the Council in no way intends to lessen its emphasis on God. The Council instead places the emphasis on the total context of this God-man relationship. Within this context the Church serves humanity as "witness to the faith of a whole people of God gathered together by Christ."¹⁰ The Constitution does not give classical responses and age old answers to man's questions about his place in the universe, the meanings of his own and the collective striving of humanity, etc. The Church instead, in solidarity with and in love and respect for the human family, expresses a desire to be in relationship with man by engaging in conversation with this family about contemporary problems.¹¹

Through this desire to be with man in his searching and questioning, the Constitution suggests that it conceives of man in reference to his relation to the world. The Council sees the Church as able to contribute something more than merely further questions. It can put these questions in the light of the gospel

9: Pastoral Constitution, op. cit., p.200.

10: Ibid., p.201.

11: Ibid., p.201.

and the saving resources which the Church receives. Within this relational world-view man is described as one fundamentally open to God:

For each human person deserves to be preserved; human society deserves to be renewed The pivotal point of our total presentation will be man himself, whole and entire, body and soul, heart and conscience, mind and will This Synod proclaims the highest destiny of man and champions a godlike seed which has been sown in him Inspired by no earthly ambition, the Church seeks but a solitary goal: to carry forward the work of Christ's Family who came 'to serve and not to be served' (Jn.18:37; Mt.20:28; Mk.10:45.)¹²

In this way, the Church situates itself as servant in the modern world and reveals its perception of mankind as essentially in relationship with God.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Although throughout this introduction the Council expresses concern that the Church situate itself in the human condition, and raise its questions from within this perspective in the light of the gospel, the emphasis of this section is however, ambiguous. It reveals a dual conception of man. On the one hand, it concentrates on the kind of relationship the Church encourages man to have with God through the world. On the other hand, by never calling into question whether or not such relationships could in fact develop normally within the classically structured world as known by the Christian, the Council implies that no serious threat is posed to the classical world-view.

12: Ibid., p.201.

The Constitution initially perceives the Church in relational terms as a presence in the world of man, as an interpreter of the salvation events. In order to serve humanity the Council suggests that the Church for example carry out its "duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times."¹³ It is not sufficient for the Church merely to describe the world situation. It must interpret this situation in light of the gospel.

The Church therefore is not perceived by the Council as having "answers" to present from outside the situation. It is seen as having a perspective (that of the gospel) out of which it can engage in dialogue. The Church, the Council fathers suggest, must understand the world in which it lives - its expectations, longings, and often dramatic characteristics (#4).

The following description of the impact of change on man suggests that the Church perceives man in the relational terms of one who is questioning the way in which he is to take up his givens. The Council in these passages seems aware that modern man may be heading towards questioning his givens for the first time since he no longer has yesterday's phenomenon as his starting point. For example, man today is aware that he must deal with the discrepancy between wealth and poverty on international levels. This preoccupation suggests a social view of man which is beyond that of the relational, yet not developed enough in this Constitution to be considered as a separate perspective on man. We note it now merely as a view of man which may emerge in the post-Vatican II era. Initially, it is being presented by the Church of the 1960s as a view of man more

13: Ibid., pp.201-202.

familiar to those who are not within a Christian perspective.

The Constitution describes modern man as passing through a new stage in history, one in which profound and rapid changes are erupting. These changes are seen as coming from man's intelligence and creative energies, but they "recoil upon him, upon his decisions and desires, both individual and collective, and upon his manner of thinking and acting with respect to things and to people."¹⁴ The Council sees this as a "crisis of growth" in which man, while extending himself in every direction, does not always succeed in subjecting things to his own welfare. It is typical of a relational view of man that he be described as one who can "lay bare the laws of society, only to be paralyzed by uncertainty about the direction to give it."¹⁵

It is understandable that these uncertainties regarding direction would extend themselves even to man's givens. Man is aware of a new kind of responsibility face-to-face with the overwhelming discrepancy between abundance of wealth, resources and economic power, and dire poverty of hunger, suffering and total illiteracy. Man is experiencing the contradiction of having a vivid sense of unity while being torn apart in conflict. Pressing one another with questions in regard to the present events, and burdened with the uneasiness of no answers, man finds himself questioning what he had previously taken for granted. Insofar as man finds himself almost forced into questioning even his starting points, he is in a position to move beyond a relational conception of himself. This Constitution however, does

14: Ibid., p.202.

15: Ibid., p.202.

not suggest that man do this. Instead it re-states the givens of the faith and encourages man to reconsider only the diverse ways in which he could take up these givens.

These profoundly changed conditions (#5) are part of a broader and deeper revolution. Man, who is mastering time and space, finds that his destiny in the human community has become "all of a piece," whereas before various groups of men had had a private history of their own. Within this context, the Council suggests a relational perception of the human race. It sees humanity as having "passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one."¹⁶ In terms of this dissertation we maintain therefore that the Constitution's view of man has passed from a more classical to a more relational conception of reality.

The next section on changes in the social order (#6), implies the opposite. This section exemplifies how the insights of the Constitution which seem to appreciate man as being in relation to the world, are nullified by being placed within a more classical world view. In certain societies modern urbanisation and technology have replaced the old traditions. "These people, especially those among them who are attached to older traditions, are simultaneously undergoing a movement toward more mature and personal exercise of liberty."¹⁷ This suggestion that it is possible to substitute one world-view for another, yet to hold onto one uniform world-view (in this case, one of urbanization) is classical. Endemic to the classical view is that everyone belong and everything "fit into" it. In this case

16: Ibid., p.204.

17: Ibid., pp.204-205.

technology and urbanization become the "new" (but nonetheless one and only) world, and man is judged as "more mature" the more he moves towards it. This classical view, places the ideal outside of man and considers such global things as urbanization and technology in the ahistorical, acultural and universal terms of "progress".

The description of the psychological, moral and religious changes in attitudes and in human structures (#7) however, suggests a view of modern man which is neither relational nor classical, for frequently even man's accepted values are called into question.¹⁸ This calling into question of accepted values is not suggested as being necessary for Christians. However the Council, by acknowledging that it is a typical question for modern man in general, opens the door to this kind of questioning within Christianity. "The young" receive special mention, as do institutions, laws, and modes of thinking and feeling handed down from previous generations. The Council describes the "previous generations" as not always well-adapted to the contemporary state of affairs - "hence arise the upheaval in the manner and even the norms of behavior."¹⁹ The implication is classical: if institutions, laws and modes of thinking were adapted - then no upheaval would occur. These new conditions have an impact on religion as well. Through them, some people achieve a more vivid sense of God, stripped of any magical mentality of yesterday, while others abandon the practice of religion.

18: Ibid., p.205.

19: Ibid., p.205.

There are at once relational and classical perceptions of man in the sections on imbalances in the world (#8) and man's broader desires (#9). On the one hand, man is seen as one so in relation to his world that he is the cause and the victim of the imbalances. As one responsible to and for his world, man must work to establish a political, social and economic order which will serve him better and help him develop his individual and collective dignity.

On the other hand, these passages imply a classical world-view insofar as they encourage man to develop a system that will be balanced enough to answer the basic needs of all. The implication is that man should arrive at a universal and common denominator which would answer everyone's needs. Such efforts would tend to conceal diversity by putting it on a level of a common denominator. By doing this it would encourage man to make uniform, general, and ahistorical responses to man's needs.

These same paragraphs exemplify a relational view of the union between God and man: the given is comprised of unquestioned teachings on man, but the way in which man is encouraged to take up these givens varies.²⁰

A relational conception of man in his world is suggested subsequently by the way in which the Constitution speaks of man's "becoming aware that it is his responsibility to guide aright the forces he has unleashed...." (#9). Man is

20: Ibid., p. 206.

encouraged to assume personal responsibility for the imbalances under which the modern world labours - for these imbalances are rooted in the heart of man himself (#10).

However, although man is told that everyone should assume his personal responsibility, it is suggested that he do it in such a specific way that the whole human race would arrive, as if in one lock-step, at the same insight at the same time. For example, with "proper" education, everyone would finally agree on what would be involved in responsible government, etc. This implies a classical world-view, one which implies that if only we could educate "everyone" to hold the same values - Christian, historical and universal though they may be - "the world" would be better because it would be operating on identical principles of justice, love, peace, etc.

Even though there are these emphases which imply two different world-views or conceptions of man within the Church, the Constitution states its perspective of the truth and places its suggestions in the context of Christ as the focal point of all human history. The Council continues in classical and relational terms to emphasize that beneath all changes there are many realities, that is, givens, which do not change and which have their ultimate foundation in Christ who is the same yesterday and today ... and forever.²¹ In light of Christ, the Council wishes to speak to all men to illuminate the mystery of man and cooperate in finding the solution to the outstanding problems of our time. The Council is, too, in search of answers to today's questions. However, since the givens of the

21: Ibid., pp.208-209.

Christian tradition are not being questioned, the search goes on from within classical and relational world-views.

Part I: The Church and Man's Calling

The global view of the four chapters of this first part reflects the Constitution's emphasis on man as relational, that is, as person in relation to his world who co-creates his individual and collective life in light of the given of Christ and the gospel. These interdependent chapters on: the dignity of the human person; the community of mankind; man's activity throughout the world; and the role of the Church in the modern world, presuppose a dynamic view of the Church as the People of God who are led by the Spirit of the Lord, who fills the earth. (#11).

The Council expresses its desire to assess, in the light of its faith, the contemporary values of man in order to relate them to their divine source. By giving answers to the questions raised by modern man, the People of God and the human race serve each other and "the Church will show its religious, and by that very fact, its supremely human character." Although the Constitution focuses on the relational aspect of the Christian's vocation in the world, this part suggests as well a classical type of relationship between God and man.

The image of a human race putting questions to the Church, and the Church furnishing the answers is quite classical and foreign to the consequences one would expect to come from living out the encouragement of the Preface: to engage in conversation with man. A Church "giving answers" suggests an institution so uniformly united that it would have identical answers for all questions raised by men despite their varied life-situations. Although the answers are given from within

a Christian perspective, and do emphasize the relational aspect, there is still a classical attitude of "giving answers." This gives a security in the classical sense of "having uniform answers to give" rather than a context into which to put the questions. To have a context into which to put the questions not only allows for but encourages a unity arising from a diversity of responses.

In the Constitution there is no serious attempt to insist that in a relational world-view the Church can only provide the gospel and, at best, be the context within which Christians can sort out their own questions and answers according to their time and place in history. This perspective is never worked through in this part of the Constitution with the result that it is impossible to know what the Church really desires her position to be in the modern world. The Church's position is one of genuine insight and concern for the human condition - an emphasis suggesting a conception of man as in-relation with the world, but one which seems to presuppose the security of a classical conception of man by suggesting that it can give the answer to how all men should be in relation to one another.

There is, however, a significant difference between this particular 1965 view of the Church regarding man and former ones, for example, of The Council of Trent, Vatican I, and in the Baltimore catechism. From the beginning, this Pastoral Constitution conceives of man as a social being, a person who is therefore an individual-in-society. Man is a person-in-relation-to-his-world. The individualistic emphasis is non-existent. Absent as well is exclusive focus on the after-life.

Throughout this Pastoral Constitution man is always at least considered as a social being. He is at best usually discussed as being in relation to the world (others) and to God by the very nature of his social being. Even when this relationship is encouraged in more classical than relational terms, it is always, in intent, social.

CHAPTER I: The Dignity of the Human Person

The Council states that all men - believers and unbelievers - agree that all things should be related to man as their center and crown. (#12) But "who is man?" man asks himself today. From within its Christian perspective, the Church answers. Man is one who is in-relation-to-God: in fact made to His image.²² The authors, in giving their variations on this scripturally familiar theme, reveal a relational conception of man in his world.

Firstly, "to be created to His image" involves more than being able to know and love God. It implies being "appointed by Him as master of all earthly creatures" in order to subdue them and incorporate them into "man's glorification of God." This responsibility for the earth is a consequence of man's likeness to God.

Secondly, the description of man's innermost nature as being social is within the context of Gen. 1:17 "it is not good for man to be alone" "male and female He created them." By stressing that the companionship this produces is

22: Ibid., p.210.

the primary form of interpersonal communion, the Council offsets the familiar classical emphasis on the "soul" in union with God as the "highest" form of life. These scriptural roots tend to help man situate himself at his beginning rather than in the classical way of stopping with the authoritative teaching of the Church. Whatever teaching was intended by the allusion to the relationship between man and woman, it is finally placed in the perspective of moving outside of, beyond the personal relationship itself: "Unless he relates himself to others he can neither live nor develop his potential."²³

This conception of man as being in relation with others overlaps, however, with a classical one. The creation to God's image is followed by accounts of the fall, incarnation-redemption, resurrection, which reveal these salvation-events as ones of the past. God not only does not create now but He evidently saved man from sin and was raised from the dead long ago. Man is therefore not in a relationship with God who now creates and saves out of the same event. Man is united in a relationship with a God who did these things for him and who now brings man into touch with them. Since sin is described in the neo-scholastic terms of a static event of the past, it is, to that extent, a quite classical understanding. Man was "made by God in a state of holiness", and at the dawn of history, set himself against God and at that time put himself out of harmony with himself, others and all creation. Man sought fulfillment apart from God and now, split within himself, is inclined to evil.

23: Ibid., p.211.

Man's call to grandeur, and yet to depths of his misery have their ultimate explanation in God's revelation. This section on sin implies an understanding of man as relational to the extent that it discusses man within his present condition. It implies, however, a classical understanding of his relationship with God, to the extent that man is presented as having sinned. As a result, man is seen as still inclined to evil, as having been redeemed and, consequently, to be saved at some future point outside of time. Focus is on the "design outside", that is, on the events of a past or of a future to which man can conform.²⁴

This section on the make-up of man (#14): mind, conscience, and in need of freedom, seems to reveal the two underlying world-views of the classical and the relational man. On the one hand, there is an emphasis on the relational; the given is man as one, though body and soul: the way he takes up his world is through his body and soul. "Through his bodily composition he gathers to himself the elements of the material world. Thus they reach their crown ... and raise their voice in praise of the Creator."²⁵ Through his soul he meets God who "awaits him there", and through his mind shares in the divine mind. Man is encouraged to follow his conscience since it reveals the law which is written by God in his heart and joins man to the rest of mankind in search of truth. Man therefore becomes man through his relationship with his world.

24: Ibid., p.211.

25: Ibid., p.212.

On the other hand, there is a classical emphasis on man's relationship to God through his body, mind and conscience. It is classical especially in the sense of calling attention to God's activities as coming from outside of man. For example he is obliged to regard his body as good since God has created it. This same view is carried into the areas of his mind as perfected by wisdom, while through faith, a gift of the Spirit, man can appreciate the divine plan (#15). Likewise, the more correct man's conscience, the more he is guided by "objective norms of morality." (#16)²⁶

The Constitution's handling of freedom (#17) reveals its lack of any profound conception of man as relational. It neither defines nor describes freedom, an omission which reveals an apparent lack of awareness that any conception of man rests on the understanding of freedom. Freedom is, however, at least included in the description of man as a person.

Although it speaks of "authentic freedom as an exceptional sign of the divine image within man,"²⁷ it only considers freedom in terms of "free-choice." God willed that man be left "in the hands of his own counsel" (Eccles. (Sir.) 15:14) in order to seek God spontaneously. By mentioning that choice does not happen from "blind internal impulse nor from more external pressure," the Constitution seems to presuppose that man is relational: he is in relation to; in tension between the internal and external, he must choose the way in which he

26: Ibid., pp.212-214.

27: Ibid., p.214.

will take up his givens. Man does not operate as a person who is driven exclusively by either "impulse" or "pressure."

The mystery of death (#18) is more of the same mystery of life. Man's rebellion against death is interpreted as a sign that he bears within him an eternal seed of life. "God has called man and still calls him so that with his entire being he might be joined to Him."²⁸ Man's anxious questions about his future have an answer in Christ who won this victory when He rose to life, and by His death freed man from death. Within this context of faith, hope is aroused.

This consideration of death focuses on the relational aspect of man. From within a human perspective, death is a riddle, a puzzle to be solved; from within the Christian, it is a mystery of the continuation of life. Clearly, the distinction between life and death is acknowledged, but noticeably absent is any classical emphasis on a division between them.

The fact that atheism is even considered in this document testifies to the Council's view that man is in-relation with his world as one who must cope responsibly with contemporary threats to human fulfillment. And, according to the Council, atheism is such a contemporary threat to the Christian. "An outstanding cause of human dignity lies in man's call to communion with God" (#19). If man has been called to converse with God from his origins, then "atheism must be accounted among the most serious problems of this age." It therefore requires examination.

28: Ibid., p.215.

Although "atheism" is used in many senses, the Council sees its roots going back to a misunderstanding of who God is.²⁹ To the extent that believers neglect training in their faith, or teach erroneous doctrine, or are deficient in their religious, moral or social life, they conceal rather than reveal the authentic face of God and religion (#19).

Two forms of modern atheism are singled out: the form that sees man's need for independence inherently in conflict with any dependency on God, and the form which seeks human liberation through economic and social emancipation (#20). The Church's attitude towards atheism is not classical in the sense of presenting the truth and "requiring" belief under pain of mortal sin. It is, instead, an attitude motivated by love of and concern for all men which listens attentively to questions raised by various forms of atheism today.

In this spirit of dialogue the Church considers the questions which are raised. It concludes that the remedy for atheism can be found not just in the Church's teachings but also in the Church's integral life and that of her members (#21). To the extent that a remedy is found, a classical world-view is suggested.

Since the discussion of atheism takes place within the context of the description of man, emphasis is placed on him as in relation to his world. The fact that atheism is even considered in this section suggests the Council's humanistic desire to be with man in his questions. A classical

29: Ibid., p.216.

world-view emerges, however, insofar as atheism is held up as worth being considered by the Church, but is finally "liquidated" by some form of incorporation into the Church. A classical view copes with other world-views either by liquidation, for example, declaring it to be "heresy", or by incorporation into its own classical view.³⁰

The consideration of Christ as the New Man (Adam) lists the Christ-events as of the past. It considers not only Christians but all men of good will in grace as "conformed to that likeness of Christ" (Rom. 8:23) and associated in the paschal mystery. "Such is the mystery of man" (#22).

By rooting the mystery of man in the mystery of the incarnation, this article calls attention not only to the relationship between God and man but also to the intimacy of that relationship. Out of the fullness of Christ's life, Christians and all men are able to live out of His law of Love. "Such is the mystery of man ... as seen by believers in the light of Christian revelation. Through Christ and in Christ, the riddles of sorrow and death grow meaningful"³¹

CHAPTER II: The Community of Mankind

In this chapter, the council intends to call to man's attention the more basic truths of the Christian doctrine

30: Recall the previous reference to this process described by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, New York, Doubleday Anchor, 1967, pp.159-160.

31: Pastoral Constitution, op. cit., p.222.

on human society. It intends to dwell at some length on some of their implications which have significance for today. The Constitution conceives of man in the world in the relational terms of growth in interdependency. It suggests that the perfection of brotherly dialogue is not reached on the level of technical progress but on the deeper level of interpersonal relationships since this demands respect for the person's spiritual dignity (#23). By seeing man as capable of establishing more than "external" relationships, the Council suggests that man is profoundly, totally relational. Christian revelation can lead man to an understanding of "the laws of social life which the Creator has written into man's spiritual and moral nature."³²

The nature of man is rooted in the community of man and in the process of man giving himself to others (#24). He is with all men as brother because of his membership of the one family of man created to share in God's own communion of Father, Son and Spirit. This emphasis on man in relation with God is further developed by the scriptural reference to the law of love: love of God cannot be separated from the love of neighbor. (Rom. 13:9-10, 1 Jn. 4:20).³³

Since the Church appreciates the social nature of man as intrinsic to him, and not as something extra, it follows that it would be concerned with the difficulties man faces in fraternal dialogue. The many organizations and institutions

32: Ibid., p.222.

33: Ibid., p.223.

springing into existence today are seen as a source of conflict as well as of dialogue. The Church suggests that disturbances arising from socialization come not only from the natural tensions of economy and politics, but also from the deeper level of man's pride and selfishness (#25).

How the Council sees the concrete form of the relationship between God and man is reflected in the description of God's Spirit as "not absent from the development of the common good" (#26).³⁴ An awareness of both man's human family and his personal dignity are developing simultaneously in our day and must therefore be humanly balanced. The social order, in constant need of improvement, must be "founded on truth, built on justice, and animated by love." The human person must have the necessities for leading a truly human life.

By placing the emphasis on the person in society, and situating God's Spirit within human development, the relational world-view becomes evident: the Christian is not to "feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty," etc., in the classical spirit of "meriting his salvation hereafter," but in the spirit of caring for, that is, loving, his brother with whom he will move in communion towards a common goal - God.³⁵ This shift from being motivated by merits to being motivated by care is also a shift from a focus on the individual and the future to the community in the present.

34: Ibid., p.226.

35: Ibid., p.225.

A relational conception of man seems as well to underlie the section on love. Reverence for fellow man must be so thorough that everyone consider his every neighbor, without exception, another self (#27); so too, his enemy (#28). Whatever is "opposed" to life itself, violates the integrity of the person, or insults human dignity, is considered infamy.³⁶ "The enemy" is described as "those who do not think and act as we do" and, therefore, require dialogue so that their ways of thinking may be understood. This perception is considered basic since Christ requires not only that men forgive each other, but that they love each other.³⁷

A relational conception of man seems to underlie the understanding that the essential equality of all men is seen as based on their creation to God's likeness and on their common origin and destiny (#29). For example, the given of man's relationship with his neighbor is his responsibility for his brother. The way he takes up this responsibility varies according to his time and place - in this case, he is to work to eradicate every kind of prejudice.³⁸

More than an individualistic ethic, therefore, is required today (#30). Contrary to the classical emphasis on keeping the law and individual salvation, man is told not to be drugged by laziness nor to content himself with a merely individualistic morality.³⁹ He is told it is his sacred obligation to take

36: Ibid., p.226.

37: Ibid., p.227.

38: Ibid., pp.227-228.

39: Ibid., p.228.

care of society's need, for the more unified the world becomes the more men will abandon their individual offices and groups. The Church stresses that this is possible only if men cultivate in themselves the moral and social virtues. The Constitution says divine grace is necessary for these, thereby describing man in terms of the way in which he is in relationship with God.

Even though it is possible to construct a relational conception of man from these emphases on man's responsibility for society and the need for more than an individualistic ethic, there is an indication of a classical world-view as well. This latter underlies the idea that a more unified world will come from men extending their offices from a particular area to embracing the whole world. Seemingly, the presupposition is: an ideally unified world would be one in which the moral and social virtues worked out in a local area would be "spread to", extended throughout the world. The inherent uniformity required for working from within this classical view is exactly the opposite from the inherent diversity which is essential to a relational view of man. Thus we see the ambiguity of the existing views on man. The rise of diversity on a local level is nihilated by attempting to universalize it on a global level.

A new social awareness in the Church is acknowledged implicitly through the emphasis placed on man's need to be educated to the obligations of conscience. It focuses on man's obligation to participate responsibly in developing this world, rather than in "acquiring merits for a next-world." For man is seen as part of "a single people, a people which acknowledges Him in truth and serves Him in holiness." (#32)⁴⁰ This rela-

40: Ibid., p.230; cross-reference to Lumen Gentium, Chapter II, art.9, The Documents of Vatican II., p.25.

tional view of man underlies the following section as well.

Christ, the incarnate Word, exemplifies how intimately men are bound with God and each other. He revealed the Father's love through living the most common social realities. For this, Christ founded a brotherly community composed of those who receive Him in faith and love. This solidarity is to increase until all men will offer glory to God (#32). The Church here focuses on a solidarity built on brotherly love in God's love, not on the solidarity based on classical conformity to certain laws as has happened, for example, in the interpretation of even the beatitudes as laws to be followed.

CHAPTER III: Man's Activity Throughout the World

The Church appreciates that man is obtaining for himself many of the benefits of life he had previously believed came from heavenly powers (#33). With the accomplishments of science and technology, the Church notices that man is raising questions regarding the meaning and value of such activity. How should things be used? What are the goals of individuals and societies in light of these strivings? For the first time in its "official" history, the Church situates herself with man in his questions. Offering to place them in the context of Christ's word, the Church desires to add the light of revelation to man's experience "without always having at hand the solution to particular problems"⁴¹ By placing itself in such a relationship with the world, the Church reveals Christ's word as the given and the questions and answers raised as part of the

41: Pastoral Constitution, op. cit., p.232.

process of taking up this given: Christ. In this way, the Church dispels any suggestion that it is a problem-solver.

In the next section, the Church at the same time as it encourages the Christian towards a concern for the world, also encourages a classical relationship between God and man by emphasizing God in static terms and His actions as past:

To believers, this point is settled: considered in itself, such human activity accords with God's will. For man, created to God's image, received a mandate to subject to himself the earth and all that it contains, and to govern the world with justice and holiness; a mandate to relate himself and the totality of things to Him.... Creator of all (#34).⁴²

This description of the God-man relationship portrays very little more than the Baltimore catechism's descriptions of God's saving-events of the past and their "distribution" or application to man today.

Without the slightest difficulty and apparently oblivious of the conflicting conceptions of man that are present, the Constitution switches from the classical to a relational perspective: . . . men and women can consider that by their labor they are unfolding the Creator's work and are contributing, by their personal industry, to the realization in history of the divine plan.⁴³ Christians see the triumphs of the human race as signs of God's greatness and the flowering of His mysterious design. Man is, therefore, according to this

42: Ibid., p.232.

43: Ibid., p.232.

conception, participating in mystery not in the classical way expressed in the Baltimore catechism as: "something he cannot fully understand but which he must believe on God's word," (#34) but rather as co-operator in the mysterious development of the earth.

By placing emphasis on the value of human activity (#34), the Constitution seems to want to cancel out two prevalent attitudes: that man is in competition with God because of the success of his talents and energy, and that men are deterred by the Christian message from building up the world and are impelled to neglect the welfare of their fellows. The Council insists that the Christian is convinced that the triumphs of the human race are signs of God's greatness and of the presence of His mysterious design, and that the Christian is bound to care for the welfare of his neighbor.⁴⁴

The double-thread of relational and classical perceptions appears again in the description of human activity (#35). By his activity, man not only develops society but also himself because "when in accord with the divine plan and will, (this should) harmonize with the genuine good of the human race and allow men to pursue their total vocation"⁴⁵ However, since God is still an entity with plans and a will that seem fixed (off in the distance - and outside of man), it suggests a classical view of the God-man relationship. The development of man as an individual and social being moves within the confines and securities of the classical world-view, hence the ambiguity of the co-existing views is once again revealed.

⁴⁴: Ibid., p.233.

⁴⁵: Ibid., p.233.

Another pastoral concern of the Constitution is the rightful independence of earthly affairs, that is, the autonomy of created things and societies which enjoy their own laws and values but are to be regulated by man (#36). The Church expresses a concern that man not interpret "independence of earthly affairs" as meaning no reference to their Creator, because, from within a Christian perspective, this is impossible. Man is encouraged, instead, to develop a relationship with "earthly affairs" on the basis that this is not only required by modern man but also harmonizes with the will of the Creator. "Earthly matters and the concerns of faith derive from the same God."⁴⁶ Although these references to the unity between temporal affairs and God reverse the more familiar classical emphasis on their inherent division, the primary conception of man underlying this section still seems classical insofar as the Church presents itself as knowing the "will of the Creator."

The Constitution repeats the traditional teaching on the way in which sin came into the world, and will remain until its end (#37). It offers the Church's insight into why men find themselves in an unhappy situation: man's pride and deranged self-love need to be purified by Christ's death-resurrection. In Christ's power, man can love the world and assist in the human progress. The only "world" man is not to be conformed to is the one connoted in Paul (Rom. 12:2) which was one of "the spirit of vanity and malice which transforms into an instrument of sin those human energies intended for the service of God."⁴⁷

46: Ibid., p.234.

47: Ibid., p.235.

All human activity is finally perfected in the paschal mystery (#38). Although this saving-act is considered in static terms as one of the past, Christ is described in dynamic terms as "now at work in the hearts of men through the energy of His Spirit!"⁴⁸ He animates and strengthens the longings of man for a more human life on earth.

By distinguishing, but not separating, earthly progress from the growth of Christ's Kingdom (#39), the Constitution implies a relational world-view. After obeying Christ, "and in His Spirit having nurtured on earth the values of human dignity, brotherhood and freedom, and indeed all good fruits of our nature and enterprise, we will find them again, but freed of stain ... and transfigured. On this earth that Kingdom is already present in mystery."⁴⁹ This chapter posits one end of the relationship beyond the limits of time and space since it emphasizes that all will be perfected when the Lord returns.

CHAPTER IV: The Role of the Church in the Modern World

The Constitution focuses on the Church and the world as in mutual relationship (#40). This focus is, however, still in classical terms of "earthly" and "heavenly." By placing the basis of the dialogue on the development of the dignity of the person, the human community and the meaning of human activity, the Pastoral Constitution reveals its view that the human dimensions of the Church emerge from the world of man's relationships.

48: Ibid., p.236.

49: Ibid., pp.237-238.

The Church has a saving and eschatological purpose as well. Although this is seen to be attained fully only in the future world, it is already present in this world⁵⁰ "Heavenly" values unite the human family in a "spiritual" community. Men of faith see the interpenetration of the earthly and heavenly cities. The Council intends to set forth general principles for the proper fostering of a mutual exchange in matters common to the Church and the world.

Through its members, the Church strives to bring help to (#41-43), and receive help from (#44) the modern world: its individuals, society, human activity. The Church conceives of herself as assisting individuals by offering them a broader context for the meaning of their lives. It does this not by suggesting exclusively a "hereafter" but rather, in light of the gospel, by encouraging respect for conscience and freedom of choice now. This emphasizes all human talent as something to be used in the service of God and man as men love each other today. From within this Christian perspective, the Church proclaims the rights of man by suggesting that human dignity is fully maintained by divine law.⁵¹

The Church conceives of itself as assisting in the growth of society (#42) in terms of a religious, not an economic or political function.⁵² This does not exclude, however, the possibility of a human community economically and politically viable arising from the accomplishment of this religious

50: Ibid., p.238.

51: Ibid., pp.240-241.

52: Ibid., p.241.

mission. In this way, a true unity among man can be encouraged - not one imposed by external dominion, but one fostered by an internal Spirit of love and faith.

Perhaps this article is the most significant one for encouraging a relationship between the Christian man and his world which would achieve genuine diversity among men. This diversity would be according to culture, nation, community and institution. This suggestion is one which moves towards a deeper conception of the way in which man can relate to his world. Once the emphasis on unity is based on a respect for diversity, a fluid conception of unity arises.

Such a view not only cracks the tightly sealed classical universe of fixed and uniform unity but it also suggests that a relational view must be fluid. It does this by emphasizing man's responsibility to build his world from within a Christian perspective in which even the givens are fluid though constant. From within a Christian perspective, this unity would be rooted in a faith in God as Father; and the unique diversities created through love and respect of man as brother.

The Church conceives of her contribution to human activity (#43) as one in which Christians discharge their earthly duties in response to the gospel's Spirit. Yet this article stands in stark contrast to the previous one. It is almost the epitome of a classical world-view. Everyone in the Church is in his carefully defined role: laymen are charged with "secular" duties; priests are to give the laymen "spiritual nourishment"; bishops, as rulers of the Church should, with "their" priests, preach the message of Christ that all earthly activities of the faithful (as if a separate species from bishops altogether) will be bathed in the light of the gospel; pastors should be mindful they are "revealing the face of the Church to the world."

The Constitution never implies that these roles will have to be reconsidered if the relational dimensions of man are allowed to follow their natural evolution. By presuming that these roles are the only structures out of which Christians are to operate, the two conceptions of man stand in conflict. From within a classical framework, the Constitution stresses a relational perception of man. It focuses on the fallacy of ignoring this earthly city and seeking only the one to come. It focuses as well on the fallacy of dividing faith from daily living. This latter is considered one of the more serious errors of our age.

Mankind is told very definitely that a Christian "who neglects his temporal duties neglects his duties toward his neighbor and even God, and jeopardizes his eternal salvation."⁵³ Although this more relational world-view emerges, the constitution seems to try and contain it within the classical. As a result, this article is primarily classical.

The Church conceives of receiving help from the modern world (#44) in rather classical terms. In this article, the Church and world seem more in separation than dialogue. For example, the progress of science, treasures of cultures, etc., which reveal the nature of man more clearly, are considered as ". . . benefits (which) profit the Church."⁵⁴ The Church "must rely on those who live in the world, are versed in different institutions, etc."⁵⁵ A dialogical emphasis is given.

53: Ibid., p.243.

54: Ibid., p.246.

55: Ibid., p.246.

however, in regard to evangelization: the Church should accommodate her preaching of the revealed Word, for each nation develops the ability to express Christ's message in its own way. At the same time, the Church should foster a living exchange with diverse cultures.

Christ as the Alpha and Omega (#45) is seen from within a relational world-view as the focal point of all of man's history and longings. The Church is a people of God - whose single intention is that God's Kingdom may come and the salvation of all people may come to pass. It offers to all men "the universal sacrament of salvation" and simultaneously manifests and exercises the mystery of God's love for man.⁵⁶

PART II: Some Problems of Special Urgency

The Council hopes to consider some of the present and urgent problems in light of the gospel and of human experience. It does this with the desire that all men may be enlightened by ideals proclaimed by Christ as they search for answers to these complex questions. Part II follows from Part I of the Constitution in which the dignity of the person is developed as the work he is to accomplish in the world as an individual and as a member of society.

At least two conceptions of man seem to be present in the Council's attempt to address itself to the concrete implications of its theories on how man should be in relationship

56: Ibid., p.247.

with the world. The fact that the Church would consider contemporary problems at all is in contrast with her former position. Previously the Church suggested universal, ahistorical principles for Christian living. From these contrasting views one could easily conclude that the Church had changed from well-integrated classical conceptions to more relational ones. One can hold this position since the Church is giving signs of a different conception of man. Evidently more than one way of looking at man is possible.

When the 19th century beginnings of a different world-view occurred, however, it solidified into neoscholasticism. The present shifting may end in a "neo-classicism" of a sort but, until there are signs of this, it seems safe to suggest that the existence of apparently conflicting world-views, such as the two discovered underlying this constitution, are signs of the process of letting one world-view disintegrate and then another re-integrate around the same person(s)/and ideal(s).

Man and communities of men are always at some stage of this process - either integrating their beliefs or living through their own personal disintegration and re-integration process. They are usually unaware of this process. Since the time of early Greco-Roman influence, the faith-content of Western Christianity has been integrated into a classical conception of man and the world. It is, therefore, understandable how remnants of this classical integration remain in the midst of its own process of disintegration.

Man always operates from out of a perspective even if he is not aware of it. This is true of communities and institutions as well - they have a working conception of man whether or not they are conscious of what it is. This conception

conditions their theoretical and practical positions in relation to the world. It is exactly this latter point that has seemingly escaped the RCC as an institution. The Council Fathers are a contemporary example of being oblivious to the fact that a conception of man underlies every position on the relationship between God and man.

CHAPTER I: Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and the Family

The Constitution presumes from the beginning that the family unit is a given which is at the core of a healthy society and of a person's well-being (#47). Although the Church never questions the traditional structures of marriage and, in fact, therefore, inherently reinforces them as valid, it does appreciate the difficulties of fostering this community of love in our day. Today an atmosphere of free-love, divorce, worship of pleasure and economic, social, and psychological unrest contribute to helping ideals of a Christian marriage fade into the background.

The Council therefore wishes to offer guidance and support to those Christians and others who are trying to foster the natural dignity of the married state, that is, trying to take it up as sacred.⁵⁷ By addressing itself to the challenges facing the Christian marriage today, the Constitution implies a conception of man as relational. If the Pastoral Constitution had an exclusively classical conception of man, this entire second part would have been judged by the Fathers as unnecessary. Although the Council sees all of married life and love as

57: Ibid., p.250.

constituted by the Creator and rooted in an irrevocable personal consent (#48), the Constitution reveals a quite classical perspective of the relationship that is established by conjugal act: "for the good of the spouses and their offspring as well as of society, the existence of this sacred bond no longer depends on human decisions alone."⁵⁸

By placing fidelity somewhere beyond human decisions, the Church implies that a certain stability comes not from the ongoing development of personal relationship so much as from a previous promise and act. As a result, marriage is thought of in static terms and the reality of it is posited exclusively in a "state" of being married because the couple gave themselves to each other once upon a time.

The Constitution seems to be operating from out of a classical world-view in two other situations as well. By describing the ideal family as one "gathered around the hearth fire", the Council betrays an unawareness of the real situation in cultures other than, perhaps Italy and, until the last decade, the Province of Quebec. By voicing this as an ideal, the reality of the Constitution's guidance and support can be easily questioned and dismissed as out of touch with the problems of Christian couples in for example, downtown slums or upper middle class suburbia because there is no attempt to reconsider the marriage relationship in terms of the givens of a particular society, culture or even sub-culture.

The second situation cited by the Council which suggests a classical understanding of man, is the frequent reference to

58: Ibid., p.250.

the witness value of a Christian marriage. This attitude implies that a Christian marriage can "manifest to all men the Savior's living presence in the world and the genuine nature of the Church."⁵⁹ Such a conception of man presupposes the classical medieval world in which "everyone" would (1) know Christ and (2) be capable of making a connection between a cultural phenomenon such as marriage and Christ and His Church.

The emphasis of these sections on "conjugal love" (#49) and "fruitfulness of marriage" (#50) are certainly different from "Casti Connubii"⁶⁰ - but despite the differences they still encourage a classical view of the relationship between God and man. There is however an underlying encouragement towards a relational view also. For example, it states: "authentic conjugal love will be more highly prized, and whole-some public opinion created regarding it, if Christian couples give outstanding witness to faithfulness and harmony. . . ." ⁶¹ Yet, on the other hand, the Constitution does emphasize that while marriage and conjugal love are naturally ordained towards begetting and educating children, marriage is not instituted solely for procreation. Parents are encouraged to make responsible decisions regarding the transmission of life to and the education of their children.⁶² They are to take into

59: Ibid., p.252.

60: Casti Connubii, encyclical of Pius XI, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 1930.

61: Pastoral Constitution, op. cit., p.253.

62: Ibid., p.254.

account their own welfare, that of their children, material and spiritual conditions of the times, and their state in life - consulting if they wish society and the Church.

The Council states clearly that no true contradiction can exist between divine laws pertaining to the transmission of life and those pertaining to the fostering of authentic conjugal love.⁶³ However, it states in quite classical terms how questions regarding this harmony are to be determined: by objective standards. Such standards, based on the nature of the human person and his acts, preserve the full sense of marital self-giving and human procreation in the context of true love.⁶⁴

The Constitution states in classical terms as well how the family is to accomplish its purpose. The family achieves its fulfillment in a communion of minds and a spirit of cooperation: the father's "active presence is beneficial", the children need the mother's care at home, her domestic role must be safely preserved. Children are to be educated so that, as adults, they can assume a responsible position in society (#52). Since the family is considered the foundation of society, all communities, public authority, etc., should regard it as their obligation to protect and foster it.

63: Ibid., p.255.

64: Ibid., p.257; This document was published before either of the Vatican Commission on Birth Control was set-up and before Humanae Vitae of Paul VI appeared, July, 1968.

The kind of encouragement given Christians, however, reveals a more relational view of the family. Christians are to promote the values of marriage and the family by "distinguishing eternal realities from their changing expressions" and in this way redeem the present.⁶⁵ In this way, the Church sees Christians able to contribute "helps which are suitably modern."⁶⁶ All men, according to their skills and vocations are encouraged to pool their efforts towards arriving at suitable birth control measures. Priests are urged to preach God's word and celebrate the liturgy in such a way that married couples will be strengthened in their love.

In this section on marriage and the family, the classical conception of man is not profoundly disturbed. However, relational concerns are expressed and these unknowingly shift the relationships of man so that from them emerges a new conception.

The following chapter on cultural development suggests more strongly than any other in Part II that there is present another view of man — the relational. As mentioned, this view of man sees him as one who would be able to raise questions regarding the givens — which up to this time in history — he had taken for granted as his starting points. Since this apparent shift carried no word of explanation from the Council of Fathers, one can only assume that, as was the case throughout this Constitution, they were not aware of it, and therefore were not concerned with its implications.

65: Pastoral Constitution.. op. cit., p.257.

66: Ibid., p.258.

It is understandable that the emphasis placed on man in the chapter on marriage would be different from that in the one on culture. The former is surrounded by centuries of traditional teachings of the Church, the latter was considered a "new" phenomenon.⁶⁷ Also partially accounting for the difference is the fact, to be discussed in the Appendix to this Chapter, that these chapters were written by different commissions and sub-commissions.

CHAPTER II: The Proper Development of Culture

This chapter, perhaps more than any one, emphasizes the relational aspect of the union between man and God, between man and his world, and suggests as well that another view of man could be emerging within the Church. The Constitution conceives of man as so intrinsically related to his world that he can come to his true and full humanity only through culture (#53). It appreciates the fact that the conditions in which men live "have been changed so profoundly in their social and cultural dimensions that (one) can speak of a new age in human history" (#54).

Man as an individual, therefore, becomes fully human through culture, and, as a social being, because of changes in cultural dimensions, he is part of a "new age." Both his individual and social development, included in the section on

67: Ibid., p.259: footnote 179 mentions that "the concept of 'culture' as it is understood by sociologists and anthropologists is a relatively new one. It is not surprising then that Vatican II should find it necessary to spell out several definitions of the term."

the circumstances of culture in the world today, reveal a world-view based on changes. For the first time in history the Church has officially and pastorally expressed itself from within such a perspective. None of these changes are considered as "external" to the process or nature of man's becoming more fully human. Within a classical world-view this would have been the case.

What is of unparalleled significance for purposes of this dissertation is the way in which the Constitution describes the interrelationship between the influences of man's cultural environment and the new ways of thinking, acting and making use of leisure which arises from them. The Constitution acknowledges that the seeds of man's conception of himself and his world, that is his mental structures, arise from the relationship, the ways of thinking and acting in a particular culture. Such an understanding of man deepens the appreciation of how one can speak of a relational conception of man and opens the door to a newly emerging perspective on man. In both cases the givens of man's becoming are seen as intimately bound up with his particular culture and time.

By becoming conscious of how they are artisans of the culture of their community (#55), men and women experience a sense of independence and responsibility. This, the Council recognizes, is a sign of the spiritual and moral growth of the human race as well as of how the world is becoming unified. In light of this, the Constitution makes its most definite statement on how it conceives of man today: he is witness to "the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first of all by his responsibility toward his brothers and toward history."⁶⁸

68: Ibid., p.261.

Man is not defined first of all by his relationship to God but by his relationship towards his brothers and history! From within a Christian perspective, this anthropocentric emphasis bears within it the understanding that God is man's origin and destiny. However, the statement is clear: man has no accidental relationship to this world; he is not here in the style of the Baltimore catechism awaiting an after-life.

The Constitution suggests that Christians as artisans of culture ought to raise certain questions. This reinforces the fact that, in this section, the Council expresses its awakening to a new conception of man, yet identifies with a relational conception of him. The questions reveal a sensitivity to the negative and positive consequences of culture diversity (#56). How, for example, can intercultural exchanges encourage dialogue and not disturb the life of the communities, not destroy ancestral wisdom, nor jeopardize the uniqueness of each people? How can men foster new cultures without destroying the heritage of tradition? How can men synthesize the many new borders of knowledge and preserve the ability to contemplate, to wonder? How can all men share in cultural values when those of some cultures are becoming refined and sophisticated? How can any conflict between humanism and religion be avoided?⁶⁹

The Pastoral Constitution singles out certain principles of cultural development which emphasize how the God-man relationship is to be expressed. Christians, on pilgrimage to their "heavenly city," are to seek the things "above" (Col. 3:1-2)

69: Ibid., pp.261-262.

by working with all men to construct a human world. The understanding of how this fulfills the "divine plan" suggests, however, more a classical than a relational world-view. The "design of God" manifested at the beginning of time is seen as something outside of man and therefore the reason man is to "subdue the earth" (Gen. 1:28).

The Constitution suggests another principle for cultural development in the Spirit of Christ: study philosophy, history, mathematics, natural science, etc. By these man can bring the human family to a greater understanding of universal values, for example, truth, goodness and beauty, and therefore be better disposed to be enlightened by God's wisdom. Even the conclusion of these suggested principles, to the extent that the emphasis is placed on the division between world and gospel, is curiously classical. "All these values can provide some preparation for the acceptance of the message...."⁷⁰ (#57)

The links between culture and gospel (#58) are listed as many because, by His incarnation, Christ has spoken according to cultures proper to the different ages. The Church has tried to do likewise, and, at least in theory, has traditionally embraced such cultural adaptation. In all forms of culture the Church emphasizes that the human spirit should be freed in order to wonder, to understand, to contemplate, to make personal judgments, and to develop a religious, moral and social sense (#59). Within this context the teaching of Vatican I on the "two orders of knowledge", faith and reason is reaffirmed. Here it is applied to the autonomy of cultures.⁷¹

70: Ibid., p.264.

71: Ibid., p.265.

A relational conception of man seems to underlie the following section on: some especially urgent duties of Christians with regard to culture. Christians are encouraged to take up their given Christian heritage by working on a national and international level for decisions in the economic and political fields which affect the rights of man (#60). They are encouraged as well to see that men capable of higher studies are able to pursue them and to develop themselves personally (# 61).

The Constitution acknowledges that the ideal of the "universal man" is disappearing. Yet each man must preserve the view of the whole human person, "a view in which values of intellect, will, conscience and fraternity are pre-eminent. These values are all rooted in God the Creator...."⁷² All the benefits coming from this cannot educate man to a full self-development unless deep thought is given to what culture and science mean in terms of the human person.

The emphasis on the harmony that should exist between culture and Christian formation (#62), reveals that this experience has shown itself to be a difficult one. It is however, the Council's view that this kind of difficulty does not harm the life of faith; it can stimulate it. Such seems the case today. Recent studies and findings of history, science, philosophy raise new questions and demand new theological investigation.⁷³

72: Ibid., p.267.

73: Ibid., p.268.

It is understandable and significant that this section on culture would be the one to open the door towards a conception of man which would be an outgrowth of a relational view. The appreciation of culture as it is used here is a relatively new phenomenon in the Church - one which would not slip easily into well tried categories. The fact that today we can appreciate that man's perception of his givens is from within his cultural perspective, makes it not only possible, but a responsibility, to question his givens.

CHAPTER III: Socio-Economic Life

The Constitution repeats the traditional concern of the Church that the dignity of the person and welfare of society be advanced in the socio-economic realm. "Man is the source, the center and the purpose of all socio-economic life."⁷⁴ The Constitution stresses that although there are indications that man is increasing his dominion over nature and developing closer relationships with other citizens, groups and countries, there are, as well, reasons for anxiety. In many economically advanced areas, for example, many men have let economics become central to their lives. As a result, they are insensitive to the enormous imbalances between those who live sumptuously and those lacking the bare necessities of life (#63).

The purpose of productivity must not be merely to produce, to make profit, or to dominate (#64). It must be to serve man, that is every man and the whole man - in his material needs and in the demands of his intellectual, moral, spiritual,

74: Ibid., p.271.

and religious life. Mankind is to control economy; it must not be allowed to follow an automatic course. Men, therefore, are responsible for the economy, they have not only the right but the duty to contribute to the progress of their community in whatever way(s) they can.

In the midst of these situations, the Church maintains certain principles of justice and equality to be applied to individuals, societies and international relations (#65). The way in which the Council suggests this be done reveals a classical conception of man in his world. These principles, considered to be the same ones which the Church has worked out in the course of centuries and in the light of the gospel, are now to be reinforced, that is, "applied," according to the circumstances of the times. There is no direct question addressed to the nature of the principles themselves, they are simply to be enlarged and extended into modern times (#66). Underlying the Church's suggestions for justice and equality seems to be the presupposition that "the world", "the Church" or "Christian principles" are global terms embracing the same reality everywhere. This attitude presumes that there is such a thing as "the Church" which is the same everywhere. that there are such things as "Christian principles" which, when applied, would be always the same everywhere, etc.

However, the ways in which men are encouraged to take up their responsibilities for building a better (although seemingly classical type) world, suggests more of a view of man as relational.

The first principle reflecting a relational conception of man and concern for the world is that labor - expended in the production and exchange of goods - is superior to other elements in the economic life because it comes immediately from the

person (#67). It is the way in which the person stamps the things of nature with his seal and subdues them to his will. In this process he is joined with his fellowman and serves him. From within a Christian view, it is the way in which man becomes associated with the redemptive work of Jesus.

Secondly, free and active participation in economic enterprises should be promoted and in this way man will have control and be able to direct economies to contribute in the universal purpose for which all created goods are intended. The third principle is that these created goods be shared by all men and this in turn develops into a fourth that man is responsible for balancing the needs of present day consumption with those calculated as necessary for tomorrow (#68-#70).

Principles guiding ownership of property stress how private control over material goods contributes to the development of the person (#71). By emphasizing the fact that the nature of private property has a social quality coming from the law of the communal purpose of earthly goods, the Constitution calls attention to its main concern in this section: the economy must be in a balance beneficial to the common good. In this sense, it reveals a relational world-view. Christians are encouraged to work for the development of the earth by responsibly controlling the economy (#72). If this is done in the spirit of "seeking first the Kingdom of God", they will receive a "stronger and purer love for helping all his brothers."

Although this chapter consistently encourages Christians to see it as their responsibility to take-up justice, balance of economies, etc. in light of the given of the gospel of Jesus, it does still seem to presuppose a classical world-view

This latter presupposition can be appreciated in the implications that "one-world" of perfectly balanced economies is the goal; that all nations will have (or should have) an identical understanding of the place of labor and leisure in their culture;⁷⁵ that all nations will share in the Christian insight of the common purpose of all created things;⁷⁶ and will agree on what comprises a "decent life",⁷⁷ ownership and property.⁷⁸

The suggestions of the previous chapter which encouraged cultural diversity and sensitivity to differences does not carry into this chapter perhaps for the same reason that it was absent in the chapter on marriage: a different commission worked on this chapter. Additionally, this topic of economy has a well known although relatively recent body of traditional teachings on the Church on the working man, just wages, etc.⁷⁹ The Constitution states at the beginning of this chapter that it intended to repeat the traditional concern of the Church that the dignity of the person and welfare of society be advanced in the socio-economic realm.

75: Ibid., p.275.

76: Ibid., pp.278-279.

77: Ibid., pp.279-280.

78: Ibid., pp.280-282.

79: Leo XIII. Rerum Novarum, (May 15, 1891).

CHAPTER IV: The Life of the Political Community

This chapter seems to have a basically classical conception of man underlying its description of: modern politics (#73); their nature and goal (#74); political participation (#75); and place of the Church in politics (#76). The fundamental presupposition implied is that if all men became conscientious enough to assume a responsible role in the world's political society, the world would be a better place.

The ambiguous part of this presupposition is that it is so broad and obvious that everyone would agree with it in theory, but find themselves, almost immediately, incapable of bringing it about in practice. For while it rests rather solidly on a classical conception of man, it encourages, as well, a view of man as in relation to the world as he takes up his political responsibilities in light of the given of the gospel. This latter bears within it the inherent possibility of diversity, whereas the former suggests a subtle uniformity by the apparent assumption that "one world" is possible.⁸⁰

These two emphases can be seen as well in the section on modern politics.⁸¹ There is an awareness that men are learning to respect the different opinions and religious beliefs of others. This deeper awareness of human dignity is seen as

80: Pastoral Constitution; op. cit., p.285.

81: Ibid., pp.282-283.

giving rise, in many parts of the world, to a desire to establish a political juridical order in which personal rights can gain better protection.

This is followed by a quite classical world-view since there is a listing of the means by which this is to be brought about. This list includes the rights of free assembly, of common action, of expressing personal opinions, and of professing a religion both privately and publicly (#93). These are listed as "the goals" to which all societies must conform, and therefore develop a classical world-view.

The nature and goal of politics,⁸² however, suggests a more relational world-view; "the practical ways in which the political community structures itself and regulates public authority can vary according to the particular character of a people and its historical development."⁸³ The given could be considered as the ultimate aim: "to mold men who are civilized, peace-loving and well-disposed to all...."⁸⁴ There seems, however, in a classical sense, little doubt in the minds of the Council Fathers what this world "should be" like.

The place of authority and need for law is reaffirmed as having an essential role in the political order.⁸⁵ The description of the function of authority and law reinforces them

82: Ibid., pp.283-285.

83: Ibid., p.285.

84: Ibid., p.285.

85: Ibid., pp.286-287.

as having their traditional roles and structures in a rapidly changing society. There is no suggestion that any of these basic political systems might be of questionable value for man today. Nor is there any suggestion that man not "fit-into" the already existing political patterns. The challenge offered to modern Christians, and to all men, is to take their places in the civic arena - with the traditional understanding of justice, peace, love and equality.

By reaffirming the more recent traditional position that the Church is in no way to be confused with the political community, nor bound to any political system, the Constitution reveals the classical conception of the world.

By remaining free from a political identity, the Church maintains in ahistorical and universal terms that it will be able to preach the faith with true freedom, to teach social doctrine, to discharge its duty among men, pass moral judgments even on the political order, whenever basic personal rights or the salvation of souls make this necessary.⁸⁶ Such a classical conception of the Church as institution is upheld in this section as the way in which both Church and governments can be depended upon to encourage such a clear separation of civic and religious roles.

86: Ibid., pp.288-289.

CHAPTER V: The Fostering of Peace and the Promotion of a
Community of Nations

This chapter, like ones before it, reveals a classical world-view, even though throughout its sections on the nature of peace (#78), the avoidance of war (#79-#82), and the building of an international community (#83-#90) there seems to be, as well, an underlying conception of man as relational.

Peace is not a static state - for example, merely the absence of war. Although described rather classically as the result of "that harmony built into human society by its divine Founder", it is described in a relational perspective, as "actualized by men as they thirst after ever greater justice."⁸⁷ The given of the eternal law is seen as something with which one must deal within the constantly changing common good. Men in a relationship with each other which is based on peace, love, brotherhood and justice build an earthly peace.

This description of peace is followed by a relational conception of man's responsibility to avoid war. However, this emphasis on man's conscience is followed by a classical statement: "... the Council wishes to recall first of all the permanent binding force of universal natural law and its all-embracing principles."⁸⁸ These principles are evidently still seen as "outside" of man, "objective", and ahistorical. Man, therefore, has no alternative but to conform to them.

87: Ibid., p.290.

88: Ibid., p.292.

Along side this classical view, however, we see another. "The horror and perversity of war are (so) immensely magnified by the multiplication of scientific weapons ..., (that) all these considerations compel us to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude."⁸⁹ The Constitution evidently does not recommend today the automatic application of the operating principles of the "just war theory" which, within a classical view were previously acceptable. The modern Christian is, therefore, challenged to create a different Christian response to war.

Also, conscientious objectors are given a specific mention: "it seems right that laws make humane provisions for the case of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, provided ... that they accept some other form of service to the human community."⁹⁰ The footnote accompanying this statement holds to the purely implicit level any suggestion of a relational view because no official stance is taken by the Church.

The Constitution is careful in its statement of concern ... (to) make no judgment on the objective moral claim of the conscientious objector. It neither accepts nor rejects the arguments in support of such a position. It simply appeals in the name of equity for humane treatment under the law of those who experience difficulties of conscience with respect to bearing arms.⁹¹

89: Ibid., p.293.

90: Ibid., p.292.

91: Ibid., pp.292-293; footnote (256).

From this, one can only assume that if the Church is encouraging Christians to have "a whole new attitude towards war" as well as respect for conscientious objectors, it is shifting its conception of man in his world.

The Council states that, although the arms race is considered by many an effective deterrent to war, it is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace. It is, instead, "an utterly treacherous trap for humanity, and one which injures the poor to an intolerable degree."⁹²

Working for peace on an international level requires a renewal in educational attitudes.⁹³ The suggestion that this would be a feasible way to begin, with no mention of the inherent diversity which would arise according to culture, etc., implies the classical view of "one world" based on the same understanding of justice, peace, love and brotherhood.

This same basically classical world-view with some relational overtones is seen as well in the section on building an international community. The causes and cures of discord (#83) are suggested in the relational terms as rooted in excessive economic inequalities and slowness in applying remedies, as well as in jealousy, distrust, pride, egotistic passions, etc.⁹⁴ A cure is seen in the classical terms of having international institutions cooperate with each other on social (#84) and economic (#85) levels.

92: Ibid., p.295.

93: Ibid., p.297.

94: Ibid., pp.297-298.

The listing of four norms as particularly useful (#86), epitomizes the dual conception of man which has become characteristic of this section. The fact that specific norms are listed suggests a classical world-view. The kind of norms given reveal a more relational conception of man:

1) developing nations should seek the human fulfillment of their citizens as their fixed goal of progress - aware that progress comes primarily from the efforts and endowments of the people themselves; 2) advanced nations have a responsibility to help developing peoples; 3) the international community should encourage economic growth; and, 4) in reforming economic and social structures nations must beware that technical solutions prematurely proposed could militate against the spiritual nature and development of the people.⁹⁵

The section on international cooperation in the matter of population (#87) exemplifies how confusing this dual conception of man can be for those who read the Constitution with the idea that it has only one conception of man. On the one hand, this section insists upon the supreme necessity of international cooperation on population control for those people who are "burdened ... with difficulties stemming from a rapid population growth."⁹⁶ On the other hand, the Council insists that "the question of how many children should be born belongs to the honest judgment of the parents"⁹⁷

95: Ibid., pp.300-301.

96: Ibid., p.301.

97: Ibid., p.302.

The difficulty arises when one tries to reconcile setting up, in classical efficiency, international organizations for controlling the population and a respect for the parental decision in each family and culture. Yet both are clearly encouraged in the same section and neither is possible in practice without cancelling out the other. This is the kind of question that points up the urgency of coming to some more primary understanding: which conception of man is operative in a particular document of RCC as institution?

The insistence of the Council on the duty of Christians to provide support for establishing an international order (#88) is a definite change from previous attitudes which encouraged an individualistic type of Christian living. However, it is still a classical view insofar as it encourages a universal, acultural international order. The statement does, however, emphasize a relational conception of how intimately God and man are united:

this objective is all the more pressing since the greater part of the world is still suffering from so much poverty that it is as if Christ Himself were crying out in these poor to beg the charity of the disciples.⁹⁸

Even the Church as an institution (#89) seems to conceive of itself in the relational terms of making contributions to peace and brotherhood by being thoroughly present in the midst of the community of nations. "She must achieve such a presence both through her public institutions and through the full and sincere collaboration of all Christians, a collaboration motivated solely by the desire to be of service to all."⁹⁹

98: Ibid., p.303. :

99: Ibid., p.304.

The role of Christians in international institutions (#90), however, seems to be seen in the classical way: cooperating with existing institutions for peace; establishing their own (Catholic) organizations; and contributing "to the development of a universal outlook - something certainly appropriate for Catholics"; and, finally, cooperating with "separated brethren" for peace.¹⁰⁰

The Conclusion (#91-#93) acknowledges that the proposals of the Synod look to the assistance of every man of today, whether or not he believes in or explicitly recognizes God.

Their purpose is to help man gain a sharper insight into their full destiny, so...they can fashion the world more to man's surpassing dignity, search for a brotherhood which is universal and more deeply rooted, and meet the urgencies of our age with a¹⁰¹ gallant and unified effort born of love.

Although the Council realized its mission required, among other things, a recognition of lawful diversity, and dialogue,¹⁰² it did seem to presume that the "container" of this diversity and dialogue (#92) was the world as known and therefore - classical. The following statement serves as an example: "while it presents teaching already accepted in the Church, the program (suggested in this Constitution) will have to be pursued further and amplified, since it often

100: Ibid., p.304.

101: Ibid., p.305.

102: Ibid., p.306.

deals with matters in a constant state of development."¹⁰³ This is the context out of which Christians are encouraged to serve men of the modern world, recognizing in them their brother, Christ, and, by this, witness to the truth of the Father's love and arouse in all men the lively hope of the Spirit that peace will come.¹⁰⁴

In final analysis, we maintain that there is no one conception of man underlying the Pastoral Constitution. Instead, it testifies to at least two different world-views and an awareness of yet another. These co-exist within a document produced over a four year period by the most official representatives of the Roman Catholic Church as an institution working in its most official council in a century.

In summary therefore: the Constitution is classical insofar as the ultimate meaning and design of God for man are posited outside of the area of man's daily life, and insofar as all its suggestions for change are contained within, and are often reduced to, the world-view held by classical traditionalists.

The Constitution reveals a relational conception of man to the extent that it encourages humanity in general, and Christians in particular, to take-up their individual and collective lives according to culture, time and personal

103: Ibid., p.305.

104: Ibid., p.307.

maturity. The consequent diversity is encouraged and the givens of the Christian life are re-affirmed as the basics out of which man takes up his life. Man is perceived as co-creating meaning in the relationship between himself and his world (God, other men). There is a sense in which this Constitution can be considered as revealing a profoundly relational world-view: its consistent focus on the place of the Church as in the world. The raison d'etre of the document was, from its very beginning until its final acceptance on the Council floor, primarily to express how it considered itself in an intimate relationship with the world.

From this analysis it is possible to suggest that a third world-view is in an embryonic stage in this publication: a newly emerging view of man. This conception must remain on the level of being incomplete because, unlike the other two, it is not possible to construct what form of relationship between God and man is being encouraged. It is possible, however, from what is implied in the Constitution to suggest that, in 1965, the Church was at least aware that a more emergent conception of man was existing "in the modern world."

Through this analysis of the content and emphasis placed on the God-man relationship, we maintain that no one conception of man can be constructed as the only one underlying the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. Because there is no one underlying conception of man this document reveals a phenomenon of that decade: there were at least two conceptions of man present and operative simultaneously within the institution. This is not only explainable but understandable primarily because it was written in a new age in the history of man. In terms of growth men move imperceptibly from within the limits of their current perspective

towards another. This shift in world-views was the first one in centuries for the Church as an institution. It found itself in the position of having to express insights in officially acceptable forms. The consequence was that this Constitution appeared to express apparently contradictory views on man.

The presence of a dual conception of man is understandable, secondly, because the document was written by hundreds of people in various commissions with the assistance of hundreds of periti representing numerous cultures and stages in Christian development. The appearance in the Constitution of at least two conceptions of man leads the Church to an awareness that as an institution it was phenomenologically beyond a one-dimensional view of man. We will interpret some of the theological implications of this in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV
SOME THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF A
SHIFT IN THE CONCEPTION OF MAN

This chapter intends to consider some of the implications of a shift in the perspective on man which seems to have occurred in the RCC as an institution. These implications will be confined to those arising from three pastoral publications used by the RCC as an institution in North America between 1958 and 1970 and studied in this dissertation. Before considering them, we will note three areas in which the shift seems to have manifested itself: 1) in the new relationships which seem to be encouraged; 2) in the new values which seem to be emphasized; and, 3) in the new horizons which seem to open as a result of a shift in the perspective on man.

New Relationships

In order to deepen an appreciation of the kind of shift which seems to have occurred in the institutional Church, we will recall briefly the kind of God-man relationships it encouraged in North America between 1958 - 1970. The Pastoral Constitution marks the beginning of an expressed desire on the part of the officially gathered hierarchy to move away from the classical view of man held for centuries as the only acceptable Catholic world-view. It officially started the move towards another appreciation of man in his world. As a result of our analysis, however, we see that in fact both "classical" and "relational" ideas of man are present so that the Constitution does not articulate any single, consistent conception of man. Yet, to the extent that the Church as an institution indicated a concern and revealed an effort to reconsider its former perspective, the Constitution stands as a sign that the shifting process was taking place.

The Dutch catechism reveals more than a shift away from the classical view of man. The publication of this catechism marks the first consistent reflection in four centuries of an

alternative perspective on man which received hierarchical approval. We refer to this view of man as "relational" and note that not only did it exist alongside the classical in the Pastoral Constitution, but that the publication of the Dutch catechism, which expressed the relational conception of man, took place in the same decade and on the same continent as the classical one of the Baltimore catechism.

It is possible to appreciate the kind of new relationships encouraged by the Dutch catechism and parts of the Pastoral Constitution by recalling briefly some characteristics of each. From the Baltimore catechism we constructed a classical conception of man. From within this view, man describes himself in reference to himself in the individualistic terms of being a spirit higher in the hierarchy of being than body and moving in an upward direction in this vertical hierarchy towards God as a Pure Spirit whose exclusively spiritual nature makes it possible for man to enjoy Him fully only after death when and where the soul, free from the prison of "its" body, can partake of a spiritual eternity (although the body is finally to rise to join the soul at the end of time on earth.)

The relationship encouraged from within this classical understanding of man emphasizes an obediential relationship to God, as creature-redeemed to Creator-Redeemer of the universe whose mysterious order and design exists outside of man. Life within this mysterious order can be lived in proportion to a man's ability to withdraw from the bodily and material world and conform to the laws of God and nature. In this way, balance in the universe is considered achievable and the moral order solidified.

God and man are in a one-to-one relationship. Man is encouraged to experience himself as created, to reflect a God whose image is mainly in his soul. The relationships he builds with his neighbors are more material and, therefore, of less significance than the one he is to build in his life with God. The latter is to last for an eternity. Neighbors are to be loved, but mainly because their souls are images of God.

The events of man's salvation are seen as past and their consequences (merits and graces) are carried into the present in order to ensure man's free choice in regard to them for his own eternal salvation. God is three divine persons in one divine nature residing somewhere outside of this world - beyond time and space. The givens of the Church, that is the theological starting points, are contained in the Apostles' Creed and are unquestioned. Unquestioned as well are the ways in which these truths of faith are to be taken up by the individual believer.

Although this classical understanding of man has been imperceptibly weakening for decades, the RCC as an institution did not acknowledge this publicly or officially until circa 1965 with the result that what we refer to in this dissertation as a relational view of man appeared as a rather dramatic shift in perspectives during the years of Vatican Council II.

The Dutch catechism, published seven years after the Baltimore, suggested that the RCC was shifting perspectives on man. From a study of the Dutch catechism, and the Pastoral Constitution, we constructed a relational conception of man.

In a relational view, man describes himself in reference to the world in the more human and social terms of being a person who comes into being in proportion to his relation to

the world rather than in proportion to his withdrawal from it. Man considers his spirit and body as distinct dimensions of his person but not as divided one from the other. The spiritual and bodily aspects of man are not discussed in terms of a vertical hierarchy rising in value as materiality is diminished.

Man is encouraged to develop a relationship with a personal God within the world, yet not of this world; a God who is still creating, redeeming, calling man to participate in his own personal and social development. God is to be known in the present world, in man's today. He is to be known as One who is here, yet not exclusively here; in the present and in the future. This relationship is not an individualistic legalistic one geared towards salvation-events as those exclusively of a past and for a future. Man, encouraged to see himself primarily in terms of his responsibility to his neighbor, is responsible for co-creating the earth, for revealing the presence of Christ already incarnate and redeeming. The relationship is to be one which is nourished by the tension between the now and the future, between the presence of Christ today and His final coming.

In this relational perspective on man, man sees himself in relation to God in the strictest sense of "relationship": at least two persons in mutual awareness of each other's love and responsibility, not just towards each other but for their world. The givens of this perspective remain, as in the classical view, unquestioned by the RCC as an institution. However, as developed in Chapter II, the way in which one is to take up these givens of faith is indeed a matter of serious question. How to do it today is the very challenge placed before man by Vatican Council II and developed in the Dutch catechism.

The first indication that a shift in the perspective of man seems to have occurred is that new relationships are being encouraged by the RCC as an institution - relationships which are based on a different understanding of the self and of God. It is only from within a relational understanding of man that the institutional Church raises the question: how is man to take up his life in God? (that is, how is man to take up his givens) - an unheard of, and unnecessary question for classicists.

This shifting, which should not be minimized since it was the first in four centuries, opens the door to what perhaps will be yet another perspective on man. This newly emerging view of the world is one which arises from the possibility of questioning the way man is to take up the givens of his Catholic life. In the last part of this chapter, we will suggest how a new understanding of the God-man relationship may be opening the door to a new perspective on man.

New Values

In order to appreciate further the kind of shift in perspectives which seems to have occurred in the institutional Church, we will suggest some of the different emphases on values which man is encouraged to develop from within the relational view of the world. Perhaps all changes in emphasis on values can be understood in terms of the shift in an understanding of unity. Although unity is a value which underlies both the classical and the relational world views, there has been a shift in the meaning of unity from the ideal being uniformity to the ideal being acceptance of diversity and pluralism.

In this section, we will consider whether this change in an understanding of unity is perhaps the most significant and critical one arising out of the shift from a classical to a relational world-view. From within a classical perspective, and according to the Baltimore catechism, unity is encouraged in terms of uniformity in what one believes and in how one is to keep laws. This in turn encourages an attitude of conformity to an order and design of the universe conceived as being mysterious and outside of time and space and known only to God. If one conforms by keeping the same laws and believing the same truths in the same way, one ensures a greater moral balance of this world and is guaranteed a place in the world to come.

The logical, reasonable, almost predictable world of classicists rests solidly on an awareness that this world has an objective meaning of its own, which it is man's role to discover and in which he must participate. Both man and world are a part of the more important, eternal, supernatural and universal plan of God.

This kind of unity, therefore, requires uniform responses from man. When man is certain that there is an external meaning to the world, his individual life can participate in it by keeping certain carefully laid down rules and believing very specific truths. In this case, both truths and laws are guaranteed to be correct by the authority of the Church. This kind of unity as uniformity is reinforced in a classical view by the Church's position on the infallibility of the Pope. Each person therefore would share in the same beliefs and keep the same laws as the one next to him and as the ones on the other side of the world. Personal meaning to life would come from individual conformity to the external objective meaning of God's plan.

With the breakup of the monolithic classical world-view (partially brought about by man's growing awareness of an alternative way of understanding himself in his world and of relating to God), comes the dissolution of uniform behaviour and belief. There are no longer any guarantees of an objective meaning and order to the universe outside. Man began to speak of different experiences of the world. While still seeing his nature as reflecting God, man began to understand himself as one called by this nature to assume his part of the responsibility for building the earth. Through this insight, he also began to see himself as invited by God to participate uniquely in the on-going process of co-creating the world with Him.

Unity was no longer encouraged in terms of conformity to eternal meanings and patterns, objectively already fully complete and ready to be discovered outside of man. Any meaning to life was to be co-created by man and arise from the way in which he personally would take up the givens within his perspective. Man co-creates meaning by the tension of relationships. Unity is encouraged, therefore, not in terms of sharing in a uniform way of believing and acting, but more in terms of the plurality arising from the diverse ways in which men take up their givens within the body of Christian traditions.

Diversity is an inevitable characteristic of a relational view of man. But once there is a shared understanding of social responsibility for co-creating the world with God, plurality becomes a sign that man is personally coming to grips with his own life in light of his tradition. Unity then becomes not only a possibility but an actuality arising from the experience of diversity.

A noticeable difference in these two emphases can be seen in terms of their focus. Within the classical perspective,

unity focuses on the extrinsic: God, order and design of universe, are perceived as outside of man's world. Within the relational perspective, unity focuses on the tension between the person and his world - neither subjective nor objective, but in relation to each other. We suggest that the former, in its preoccupation with helping man focus outside of himself, paradoxically becomes an individualistic, self-centering concern. Since man is made aware of the importance of conforming uniformly to certain beliefs and keeping specific laws he becomes preoccupied with his personal achievement of these goals. In the latter, however, through his concern for helping others become aware of the personal responsibility to take up life, man can become more socially concerned. He even describes himself in terms of his responsibility to his brothers and to history (article 55 of the Pastoral Constitution).

The differences in perspective on unity between the classical and relational world-views are so great that the one would consider the other's perspective as not contributing to unity at all. The uniformity of the classicists would break down the unity within the relationalists' perspective where plurality arises from the creative diversity of individual responses to the task of co-creating. Likewise, if it were possible to place the plurality of the relationalists within the classicists' perspective, it would destroy its unity which emerges from a uniformity and conformity. We conclude, therefore, that unity is a term strictly relative to the perspective on man in his world.

Within these differing understandings of unity we can appreciate the shifting emphasis on obedience and authority. A classical perspective necessarily would encourage man to obey God and laws in absolute terms. The balance of meaning

and order in the universe would depend on man's obedience to God's authority. Uniformity and conformity are descriptive of the obedience to an almighty God who is perceived as an outside authority who alone knows the whole story of man's life and who is seen as possessing all power. Authority is seen as external to man, as entering into man's world through the Church divinely established by Jesus Christ.

A relational perspective on the other hand, discourages such a vertically hierarchical obedience-authority echelon. Instead, based on its understanding of man as co-operator and co-creator of the world with God, authority is viewed as arising from within the responsibilities of God-man relationships. Man obeys God to the extent that he respects himself and his world as his responsibility. A certain body of Christian traditions in the form of beliefs and laws (givens) are a part of man's challenge as he takes up his life within a Christian perspective. Authority, therefore, is never encouraged as something outside of man, nor is obedience presented as doing something in a uniform way. Rather, both are co-created and are dynamic principles which change continuously in relation to man's perspective on life. The emphasis is on sharing responsibility for the world and for fellowman and moving in a unity which not only allows but encourages questions on how this is to be done. Authority, therefore, is not seen as an answer, and obedience is not doing something one is told to do, but is a response to a responsibility.

An understanding of this move away from an external and hierarchical form of obedience and authority gives rise to an application of another shift in value emphasis: one which manifested itself in moral terms. It is a logical shift, one which might perhaps have been predicted. It involves a move away from a morality which is legalistic, static, authoritarian,

external, ahistorical, universal and final, towards a morality which is more personal, fluid, questioning, internal, historical, particular, responding and arising from within the subjective-objective tension created by a person coming to terms with his world in light of a body of traditions. It erases the boundary lines of natural and supernatural, of an authoritative Creator/obedient creature relationship.

The morality arising from within a Christian relational world-view reveals a new perception in regard to man's relationship with God. The believer conceives of himself as led by the Spirit of Life and sees his human responses as responses to this personal God present within the world. The moral response is one which affirms a personal presence in the world.

It would take us beyond the scope of this dissertation to develop at length the degree and implications of this new emphasis on morality. The point of concern here is merely to note that the changes in emphasis in regard to morality are part of a larger perspective which is shifting its understanding of unity and authority.¹

This shift from a "classical" interpretation of morality in which man questioned neither his givens nor the ways in which

1: Cf. Charles E. Curran, A New Look at Christian Morality. Notre Dame, Fides Publishers, 1970; Louis Monden S.J., Sin, Liberty and Law, trans. Joseph Donceel S.J., New York, Sheed and Ward, 1965; John L. McKenzie S.J., Authority in the Church, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1966; Marc Oraison, Morality for Our Time, trans. Nels Challe, Garden City, Doubleday, 1968; Cornelius J. van der Pol C.S.Sp. The Search for Human Values: Moral growth in an evolving world, New York, Newman Press, 1971.

he was to take them up, to a "relational" interpretation in which man does not question the givens but is encouraged to question the way in which he could best take them up, opens the door to the development of a conception of man which, as mentioned, seems to be newly emerging. New values, like new relationships, indicate that a shift has taken place in an understanding of man in his world.

New Horizons

A third indication that there seems to have been a shift in a world-view or conception of man within the RCC as an institution is that horizons are seen from within a relational perspective that were not visible from within a classical one. One of these new horizons has been discussed in terms of a change in the meaning of unity from a unity-in-uniformity to a unity-in-diversity.

A second horizon appears from within the relational perspective on man: A new principle for evaluating and interpreting the official statements of the institutional Church has become possible. In fact, it has become necessary. Perhaps the most obvious consequence of the simultaneous existence of more than one conception of man within the same institution at the same time is the dispelling of the myth that there exists only one correct Catholic view of man. Once the institution acknowledges that there is more than one world-view officially operative within the Church, the individual is faced with an opportunity to deal with alternative conceptions of man.

The RCC as an institution has never accounted for the apparent conflicts and confusion of today in terms of a shift in the conception of man which underlies its official position. Indeed, it is our thesis that it has never even taken notice

of the fact that these particular conceptions of man are operative within the official Church.

The opportunity arises within a relational perspective to develop more than one way of interpreting the official position of the institutional Church. If the Catholic within the institution can no longer presume that only a classical perspective on man underlies an official statement, it becomes the task of those for whom the statement was made to discover the conception of man which does underlie it in order to be able to interpret not only what it says, but what it means for those holding another and/or the same conception of man.

The procedure which we are suggesting for discerning and interpreting official Church positions can be used by both those for whom the document is intended as well as by those who compile it. It would give the former an opportunity to realize their own personal perspectives on man. It would give the latter an opportunity to place themselves publicly within their own world-views. The application of, or the extent to which any position of the institutional Church would be taken as significant would depend on the interpretation of the underlying world-view.

This acknowledgement of or approach to the study of an officially presented position of the RCC as an institution, opens the door inevitably to a third horizon: any position of the institutional Church can no longer be considered automatically as a "norm" to be followed. It ought, instead, to be seen as a call to reinterpret the body of tradition. Since there is at least one possible world-view existing within the

Church other than the one underlying any one document, the ecclesiastical position expressed cannot be taken as a norm to be followed.²

There are therefore at least two possible responses within the institution. Those holding a classical world-view will interpret any officially presented position as a norm to be followed. Those holding a relational view of man will confront any officially presented position in light of the body of traditions and decide how it should be taken up (reinterpreted) within the relational view. Man's decision as to what is to be considered part of the body of tradition comes from his understanding of what has been considered as revelation and as commonly shared points of reference throughout the history of the institutional Church.

Without stopping to develop these, we mention by way of examples, three areas considered as part of the body of tradition, which present themselves in both a classical and a relational world-view. First, an emphasis on life as more than it is now (salvation at some point outside of time; salvation as transcendent dimension of the now). Second, an awareness of the Persons of God as Father-Creator who redeemed man

2: If any example is needed to point up that this is not a daily procedure, we need only recall the hesitancy on the part of the Council Fathers to sanction or encourage the use of artificial means of birth control. This was interpreted as normative by most Catholics in 1965. They were waiting for the 'official' papal commission's sanction which they thought was imminent. The July, 1968, publication of Humanae Vitae's reversal of this expected position resulted in the kind of crisis indicative of a mentality that sees the official position as normative.

through the life-death-resurrection of Christ the Son and through the power of His Spirit of Love; third, an emphasis on man's responsibility to love and to serve God and his neighbor.

The possibility that there is an alternative to a classical conception of man underlying an official statement of the Church, gives rise to a new principle for evaluating and interpreting such statements. The danger to avoid is that of reducing this more recently developing view to being "the same" as the older one - thereby ignoring any genuine difference. This thinking falls into a trap which is, according to Herbert Marcuse, typical of American society in general. He charges that "a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behaviour (is emerging) in which ideas, aspirations and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe."³ Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann used Medieval Christendom as an example of this type of universe-maintenance. They mention "liquidation" as the process it used to rid itself of any real diversity. First of all:

open heresy had to be physically destroyed whether it was embodied in an individual (say a witch) or a collectivity (say, the Albigensian Community). At some time, the Church, as the monopolistic guardian of the Christian tradition, was quite flexible in incorporating within that tradition a variety of folk beliefs and practices so long as these did not congeal into articulate...challenges to the Christian universe as such...; and (thirdly), certain competing definitions of reality at least could be segregated within Christendom without being viewed as a threat to it....⁴

3: Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man, Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society, Boston, Beacon Press, 1968, p.12.

4: Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, New York, Doubleday, 1967, p.122.

The challenge is to be able to live from within one's perspective and not deny another's. Man must not only face the possibility of multiple world-views existing simultaneously, but he must be able to live creatively and aware that there are possible alternatives for him as well.

Lastly, a fourth horizon could appear - one which calls for a new view of man because it encourages, even requires, man to question the givens of his faith. It is important to clarify that we do not intend to imply that the new horizons which could appear are being explicitly encouraged by the institutional Church as the next step. We are suggesting rather, that these horizons seem to be possible as a result of the shift in the perspective on man which, we maintain, can be seen in the pastoral works published by the RCC as an institution in North America in the 1960s. Once man is encouraged to question the ways in which he should take up his givens (as was the case within a relational view) the next step required seems to be that of questioning or reinterpreting the givens themselves. This possible fourth horizon will be mentioned in the section: "theoretical dimensions of a shift from a classical to a relational conception of man."

There are theoretical and practical dimensions of a shift in the perspective on man. Both dimensions will be referred to briefly in order to point up that a shifting conception of man is not a phenomenon which can be discovered exclusively in the Church's official pastoral publications. To develop either one of these other dimensions, however, would be material for another thesis. The following two sections are intended, therefore, merely to suggest that in practical and in theoretical dimensions of the Church's development there are signs that the question of an underlying conception of man arises.

Within the context of the practical dimensions, we point up that in the 1960s at least three of the pastoral institutes of Europe indicated they were dealing concretely with the question of the Church's understanding of man. Even a brief study of these institutes suggests that the changes in curricula, study programs and publications of both faculty and students during this period centered on a reinterpretation of the God-man relationship they were encouraging. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to develop the sense in which we could see this shifting in terms of it being one which goes from a classical towards a relational conception of man. We merely state that, as a result of our research at each of these institutes, we maintain that this was the direction of the shift. The purpose for mentioning these institutes however, is not to develop the nature of their theological reinterpretations but rather to point up that there are signs that the shift we saw occurring through the three pastoral publications, has dimensions in practice as well as in the official positions of the Church.

Within the context of the theoretical dimensions, we will mention some experimental speculations of contemporary theological authors who have published in the two years after the decade in question. As mentioned, the brief consideration of the theories of these authors expressed between 1970-1972 implies neither that their ideas were explicitly encouraged by the institutional Church, nor that these theories are the next logical step if the Church were to acknowledge that it shifted its conception of man in the 1960s. We suggest merely that since we maintain it is possible to speak of a shift in the conception of man having taken place in the institutional Church in the 1960s, the kinds of reinterpretation suggested in the 1970s by these theological authors are possible.

Practical Dimensions of the Shift from a Classical to a
Relational Conception of Man

It is significant that a shift in the conception of man which we propose underlies three of the pastoral publications used by the institutional Church in North America in the 1960s seems to underlie as well, the practical orientations of at least three pastoral institutes of Europe during that same decade: Lumen Vitae in Bruxelles; l'Institut Supérieur de Pastorale Catéchétique in Paris; and, the Higher Catechetical Institute in Nijmegen.⁵

By the end of the decade of the 1960s, none of these institutes concerned themselves primarily, as they had at the beginning of that decade, with presenting the 'official' position of the Church. Each was more concerned with directing the ways in which its participants were personally integrating the Church's most recent encouragement for Christian presence in the world. This focus placed the emphasis on personal reflection and communal research rather than on information about the content of official Church positions. The institutes, each in its own way, dealt with pastoral implications of the change from focusing primarily on God to focusing primarily on man as one open to God.

5: The material on these institutes is drawn from personal experience at these centers as well as from information which was generously and graciously shared by the Directors of each institute and by the faculty present in the fall of 1971. It is based as well on personal research and study of the curricula developed by the faculties and on the theses or works published by the student and/or faculty participants between 1960-1970.

Although all three centers differ from each other in their purpose for existence, as well as in the ways in which they consider themselves centers of religious thought, two of them - l'Institut Supérieur de Pastorale Catéchétique and Lumen Vitae - hold at least this in common: their curricula changed at sometime in the mid or later 1960s from lecture type courses which were mainly theocentric, towards courses which were mainly anthropocentric and offered in seminar type situations.⁶

The third, Nijmegen, never offered 'courses' as such, but worked constantly towards new theological insights by a method of on-going discussions and seminars which involved not only theologians but also bishops, parish priests, religion teachers and laymen of all parishes. In 1956 at the request of the Dutch bishops, Nijmegen began its project to develop catechetical material that would replace the existing catechism of 1948.

6: Courses at the Lumen Vitae Institute began to change from their exclusive focus on God to one on man in 1962-63 with the offering of anthropologie religieuse, psychologie religieuse and sociologie religieuse. By 1968 this direction had developed to the extent of opening a separate and special section for the study of the African, Asian and South American cultures. By 1969, it became apparent that radical cultural diversity was a phenomenon not to be limited to the Afro, Asian, South American cultures. To organize pastoral work in every culture, people must know the political, economic, socio-cultural and psychological dimensions of that culture. Therefore, instead of this emphasis remaining in a "special section" it became the main project of the institute. This institute is presently in an on-going process of researching through interpretation of life experiences and seminars, ways to recognize Christ as already present in the culture.

The 1965 curriculum of the Institut Supérieur de Pastorale in Paris suggests a shifting from its objective focus on God or on man towards a more relational focus.

The emphasis was on man in the Church searching for truth rather than on man as one in full possession of truth based on the teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1970 the focus on man in all three centers was nonetheless a focus on God. Each maintained that the relationship between God and man can be appreciated better if time is spent interpreting today's events in light of the gospel. This Christian interpretation is partially accomplished in team seminars and personal reflection on life from within one's own personal and cultural situation. All three centers concerned themselves with developing in theory and in practice ways in which man could live creatively in diversity.⁷ They also

7: From my conversations with the directors, some faculty and students of each center it became clearer how this was their fundamental question. Rev. J. Bouvy, Director of Lumen Vitae expressed it when he explained that he saw the basic pre-occupation of the students and faculty to be that of how to develop this international center in such a way that a profound respectfulness for each other's world-view would encourage unity based on essentials, stimulate further study and deepen concern for la pastorale. As an international institute, Lumen Vitae seems aware that it is in an ideal position to try to work through the "project" of a kind of unity that can come through diversity.

The Rev. C. Neven, Director of Nijmegen, expressed concern that cultures would fail to study their own uniqueness and would use the solutions of other countries as if it were their own. In this way unity could not come from the cultures because they would not have acknowledged their diversity. It seems that the paradox of Nijmegen lies here: it claims to be concerned primarily with only the local Church of Holland yet by doing this it presents alternative world views to the other cultures still in search of their own Christian identity.

Rev. J. Audinet, Director of l'Institute Supérieur de Pastorale in Paris, stressed that they considered themselves international to the extent that students were enrolled from many countries. However, unlike Lumen Vitae, they seemed less concerned that the diversity be used as a basis for seminar research and more concerned that globally anthropological material be offered and that students use it accordingly.

reconsidered ways in which religious leaders could be educated to respect these profound diversities in their respective cultures as well as encourage the different cultures to discover God's presence at the source of what for each of them would be considered a human existence.

In the 1950s these institutes gave the new answer to all who came to study how to 'proclaim Christ's message'. By 1970, all three institutes had moved in some way towards individual and collective research which involved interpreting the 'signs of the times' in light of the body of Christian tradition in order to know what God is saying in diverse cultures. It is from this kind of diversity, that unity in the Church can arise.⁸

Theoretical Dimensions of a Shift from a Classical to a Relational Conception of Man

A second dimension which can increase awareness of a shifting conception of man, is one which seems to be manifesting itself in the experimental theories of some contemporary North American theological authors.⁹ The following brief considera-

8: No one at any of these institutes claimed that this kind of respectful research together was an answer. They only saw it as a way of achieving religious unity based on the diversity of their human experiences. This kind of diversity would have been considered threatening within a classical world-view.

9: Cf. Eulalio Baltazar, God Within Process, New York, Paramus, 1970; Gregory Baum, Man Becoming, New York, Herder and Herder, 1970; New Horizon: Theological Essays, New York, Paulist Press, 1972; Leslie Dewart, Foundations of Belief, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969; Eugene Fontinell, Towards a Reconstruction of Religion, Garden City, Doubleday, 1970; Gabriel Moran, The Present Revelation: A Search for Religious Foundations, New York, Herder and Herder, 1972; Ray L. Hart, Unfinished Man and the Imagination, New York, Herder and Herder, 1968.

tion of some speculations of these theological writers is two-fold: firstly, to illustrate certain contemporary trends which substantiate the claim that a shift in the perspective on man has taken place; and secondly, to point up that a shift from a classical to a relational conception of man opens the door to the possibility of even further redefinitions of man.

In this consideration of theoretical dimensions we do not imply that there is necessarily a connection between theories expressed by these authors and our thesis that the official pastoral position of the Church had manifested signs of a shift in its conception of man. Nor does mention of some theoretical insights these authors suggest imply that their speculations are being singled out as inevitable or as the most important ones in light of a change from classical to relational conceptions. Neither is this section intended as an exhaustive study or even survey of current theological trends. Nor, as mentioned previously, does the present consideration of these experimental speculations intend to imply that these ideas are being encouraged by the institutional Church as the only or logical next step for Christians.

Since this dissertation has centered its analysis in the kind of God-man relationship encouraged by the institutional Church in the 1960s, this part of the chapter on some theoretical dimensions of the shift will confine itself to those theological areas which are presupposed in any interpretation of the God-man relationship: an understanding of God, of man and of revelation.

Gregory Baum notes surprising convergences of thought which appear from the works of four theological authors who

published in North America between 1969-1972.¹⁰ Baum's own book and those of Baltazar, Dewart and Fontinell differ considerably in their methodology and in many significant points of what they see as 'the God problem'. However, the four points of consensus which Baum singles out are significant for the purposes of this section since they are concerned with the God-man relationship.

Firstly, Baum believes that the four authors see the world as a process. Each

presents man and his world as an unfinished reality that is still in the process of coming to be and in whose becoming man himself is creatively involved. The world is not a given set of objects, and man is not an intelligent substance facing these objects... the human world has been made through man's responses to his environment, and we ourselves come to be as we respond to the world around us - until we reach a point where our free action in turn modifies the environment, and changes the objective world.¹¹

Secondly, Baum believes that all four authors, in a clearly definable sense teach that man creates himself. "Consciousness is not a given; it is created in man by his response to other people and their world, and this process in some way passes through his freedom."¹² Baum's insights into

10: Eulalio Baltazar, God Within Process, New York, Paramus, 1970; Gregory Baum, Man Becoming, New York, Herder and Herder, 1970; Leslie Dewart, Foundations of Belief, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969; Eugene Fontinell, Towards a Reconstruction of Religion, Garden City, Doubleday, 1970.

11: Baum, New Horizon, p.59.

12: Ibid., p.61.

the importance of this consensus clarify the area of the new question. He sees man as being able to come to a knowledge of this world

only through a process of interpretation, by which he discerns this world in himself.... Since the developmental understanding of man and his world transcends the simplistic view of subject and object it may indeed provide the possibility for thinking of God in terms beyond the categories of subject and object.¹³

Thirdly, Baum interprets Fontinell, Dewart and Baltazar as agreeing that man's true being includes who he will be. "Man is not wholly definable in terms of his own powers and resources.... The definition of man, therefore, includes an element that transcends him."¹⁴ This future orientation, in Baum's opinion, draws man more deeply into his humanity and allows for God's presence in man's making of man.

This understanding of man as more than man is at any given moment, rests on a belief that a divine mystery is present in man's becoming; this, in turn, opens the door to a reinterpretation of revelation,¹⁵ as well as a renewed awareness of Blondel's insights into the presence of God in all of human history. Baum sees the direction of this move as significant since it makes God neither an objective nor a subjective reality. He is not a supreme being facing man:

13: Ibid., p.63.

14: Ibid., p.65.

15: Cf. Gabriel Moran, The Present Revelation; Ray L. Hart, Unfinished Man and the Imagination; Gregory Baum, Man Becoming.

Whether God's presence is described in terms that apply simply to the human situation (Fontinell, Baum) or in terms of a pull toward the future or open background that applies also to the cosmic order (Baltazar, Dewart), the four theological authors agree that this presence is an ever unobjectifiable reality.¹⁶

This means that one ought not to speak in terms of the existence of God.

God does not exist: he is not an object of which existence may be predicated. 'There is God' is not information about a being that exists but the acknowledgement of the deep dimension of history that transcends history... which orientates man toward a more human future.¹⁷

Such insights suggest the possibility of a move away from a relational understanding of the God-man relationship towards another kind of mutual presence.

Fourthly, Baum explains, the authors reinterpret the meaning of divine transcendence.¹⁸ He suggests that, formerly, divine transcendence usually affirmed God as a supreme being, out of time in eternity, outside of man and history. These four authors, each in his own way, come to a reinterpretation of divine transcendence in terms of an understanding of it as referring to a dimension of history which is never fully expressed, exhausted or absorbed by history.¹⁹ It is "a principle pronouncing judgement on the human structures

16: Baum, op. cit., p.64.

17: Ibid., p.65.

18: Ibid., p.65.

19: Ibid., p.65.

of the present and hence a source of the transformation of man and society."²⁰

Baum suggests that this way of speaking about God's presence is a commitment to the critical and constructive process by which man assumes responsibility for his future, personal and social.

To speak of God's presence without speaking of his otherness would, in this perspective, justify contemporary culture and its institutions and thus lock man into patterns he has inherited. The otherness of God, as understood by these four authors, speaks of the new that is being created in history.²¹

The swing towards a new understanding of God and man, which seems to be suggested by at least three of the authors,²² does not make God impersonal. Rather, according to Baum, he, Dewart and Baltazar, mean that God is personal.

Man's relationship to the deepest dimension of history, the ever new and gratuitous summons present in his life is personal, that is, (it) consists of listening and responding, of receiving gifts and being grateful for them, of being called, and, like Abraham, leaving the past and moving with confidence into the future.²³

20: Ibid., p.65.

21: Ibid., p.66.

22: Baum would perhaps not believe that Fontinell belongs with the others on this point, since he feels Fontinell presents God as a processive-relational God. (cf., Baum, op. cit.), p.68.

23: Baum, op. cit., pp.69-70.

So far Baum has considered the need to reinterpret an understanding of God and of man.

This line of thought now raises a third theological area in need of reinterpretation today: revelation. If we are going to be able to recognize the direction of some of the experimental speculations in regard to the need to reinterpret age old understandings of God and man, there is need to reconsider the understanding of revelation. This last phenomenon not only moves away from the objectifying, ahistorical, universal categories of the classicists but even goes beyond the more historical and concrete ones of the relationalists.

Theologians such as Gabriel Moran, Ray Hart and, again, Gregory Baum root their study of revelation in its widest possible meaning - in human life - rather than beginning with it as a body of truths which enters into human history as a message told to man by God. This reinterpretation of revelation is so marked that in The Present Revelation Gabriel Moran himself sees a different fundamental question than he did when he wrote Theology of Revelation in 1966. In the latter, Moran worked to develop the meaning of revelation through the established theological channels.

Beginning from texts of Vatican I and a traditional Christology, I tried to show that biblical and Church sources would themselves lead to a much broader meaning for the word revelation. The conclusion...was that revelation is a universal phenomenon, present in the life of every individual and all religions.²⁴

24: Moran, op. cit., p.19.

Moran suggests that presently he is travelling a route which is the reverse of his former book, that is, "I am beginning with a universal meaning of revelation and moving toward the Christian community as a possible expression of revelation."²⁵ He further explains this as establishing a new paradigm.²⁶ "Revelation is a paradigm for theology in the sense that the choice of a pattern-use for the word will determine the fruitfulness of theological inquiry to follow."²⁷

The Present Revelation suggests that the real meaning of revelation cannot be found in the bible or other theological sources. The meaning of revelation can be established only through some wider human experience (which, of course, can include theology).²⁸ Moran's concern throughout this work is to place revelation as the central and most basic starting point of theology and of faith. In his opinion, most theologians begin with faith and project a meaning onto revelation.²⁹ They also frequently think that if revelation is spoken of as a central issue of theology it is assumed to mean the same as it did for Barth, Bultmann, etc.³⁰ Thus, according to Moran, they come in the end no further than into theological 'intramurals'.

25: Ibid., p.20.

26: Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1968, is the source of the meaning of paradigm as used by Moran in this context. Prior to this, Moran used paradigm to mean simply a model to be imitated.

27: Moran, op. cit., p.21.

28: Ibid., p.21.

29: Ibid., p.45.

30: Ibid., p.22.

Moran attempts to establish the human foundations of revelation by closing the fissure between object/subject and developing the distinction between them in terms of the relational structures of reality. These in turn can be ways for understanding human experience. This understanding of human experience brings Moran to the question: "whether revelation is more than human?"³¹ He concludes that it is more than human, at least in the sense that human experience includes more than the human. Human experiences bear within themselves the elements of a non-human world, for example, the sea has a certain 'superiority' to man in the sense that it gave birth to man.³² In this way Gabriel Moran tries "to understand the non-human other which men from earliest days have encountered in their religious acts."³³

The working understanding of 'divine', according to Moran, implies this sense of the more than human. The emphasis is placed, therefore, on the continuity between the human and divine. Within the context of this understanding of the divine, Moran develops his speculations in regard to revelation. He does not see revelation as a universal, ahistorical pronouncement coming into man's life as a message from outside of that life and then passed on untouched by centuries of thought and response. Moran sees it, instead, as arising from the continuity between the human and divine and finding diverse expressions in uniquely personal and cultural experiences.

31: Ibid., p.149.

32: Ibid., p.150.

33: Ibid., p.159.

This kind of experimental theological speculation regarding the continuity between the human and the divine can encourage a greater awareness of the role of perspectivity in revelation.

Ray L. Hart seems to share the same insight from within a very different context when he writes of the absurdity at this present point in history of speaking of a "universal history", or a common history out of which all men everywhere have their being.

A telling point against the actuality of such a history is the fact that there is no universal language, and nothing is sillier, pace George Bernard Shaw and all forms of Esperanto, than the effort to create a universal language in advance of a universal history. The time may come... when men will stand out of a universal history. But for the time being, we "see" as our several and radically different historical images let us "see". This is of no small moment for a doctrine of revelation: revelation solicits us to be, out of our own history, before God the Lord of the Ages. It does not lay my western historicity upon a Vietnamese peasant as the condition of his being authentic man before God, nor does it subjugate our two historicities to some primordial or even eschatological universal history.³⁴

Theological speculations which do not place the roots of revelation exclusively in biblical tradition have not arrived

34: Ray. L. Hart, op. cit., p.212. Further development of this work would take us beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, a study of this theological book seems fundamental to an understanding of the question of revelation since it deals with the links between the creative imagination and revelation.

on the contemporary theological scene as if fully blown from the brain of Zeus. Their roots go back at least as far as Maurice Blondel. Gregory Baum sees Blondel as "the initiator, in the Catholic Church, of a new style of thinking about that transcendent, redemptive mystery in human history which we call God."³⁵

Even though Blondel was a man out of his times his conviction that God is redemptively present to the whole of human history, indeed that this redemptive presence "takes place in human life and creates history,"³⁶ has had an irreversible impact on theological thought. His rejection of extrinsicism, that is, of a divine revelation bursting into the human arena as a message from God, has become almost a sine qua non in any serious reinterpretation of revelation today.³⁷

Blondel substitutes immanentism for extrinsicism. By immanentism he means a method which asserts that no truth can exist which does not arise from man's experience of reality. Truth is, according to Blondel, present in man's action. Reflection on man's action, as Baum explains Blondel, results in a discovery of man's values, his vision of life and his view of reality. "Action incarnates man's grasp of reality...."³⁸

35: Baum, Man Becoming, p.1.

36: Ibid., p.11.

37: This brief reference to Blondel illustrates that the theory has been long in Catholic theological circles, if never within official ones.

38: Ibid., p.25.

The philosopher sees man's unending concern leading him to wider circles of action. He discovers his world, organizes it, comes to love others, assumes responsibility for them, expands this love to embrace his own family, nation, whole human race and, inevitably, it leads to an option: either he will follow his concerns and open himself to the infinite, or close himself into the finite order and violate the thrust of his own action.³⁹

This cursory consideration of some of the experimental speculations of these contemporary theological authors can increase awareness of the theoretical dimensions of a shift in the conception of man. The ways in which God, man and revelation are reinterpreted in these recent books, suggest that perhaps another shift in the Church's perspective on man could be taking place. We mention again that this kind of shift is only one among many that are possible today. Likewise, the reinterpretations of God, man and revelation suggested by these theological authors are only some among many others possible. They were referred to as illustrations of the kind of experimental speculations occurring in North America today which have multiple theological implications.

The reinterpretations suggested by these authors would involve Christians in questioning even their givens, for the traditional interpretations of God, man and revelation which were unquestioned up until this decade are being reinterpreted by these authors. This questioning of the givens could be a

39: Ibid., p.17.

sign of a future shift away from a relational world-view towards a newly emerging one: one entailing as profound a shift as that from a classical to a relational perspective.

However, it may be that, instead, the relational view of man will go through many 'neo-relational' types of development before the Church as an institution shifts away from it completely. If this is the case, then what we are suggesting as a possible new perspective may become, by process of one-dimensional reductionism, merely an updated version of relational man. If this latter should become the case, this 'new' understanding would become to a relational view of man what Transcendental Thomism has become to a classical view of him.⁴⁰

40: Transcendental Thomism is variously described. (Here we draw on the works of Leslie Dewart, Foundations of Belief, Appendix 2, p.499-522; Gregory Baum, Man Becoming, pp.26-28; O. Muck, The Transcendental Method, New York, 1968). It is an approach to understanding St. Thomas Aquinas which began with Joseph Maréchal under the influence of Blondel. Some of its well known proponents are Karl Rahner, Bernard Lonergan, Johannes Lotz, André Marc, and Emerich Coreth. Transcendental Thomism's central preoccupation is with the questions of the 'object known' and the 'subject who knows'. Its method is called 'transcendental' since it was adopted from German philosophy of the nineteenth century which was concerned with the presuppositions and limits of knowledge as an approach to metaphysics. The main distinction is drawn between what a man knows and puts into words and the vaster truth that is co-known and co-intended in his explicit knowledge. Baum suggests that it is upon this distinction that Catholic theologians have been able to reject the extrinsic appreciation of revelation. Within this understanding, divine self-communication is offered in human life and, if accepted, is implicitly co-known and co-intended in man's knowledge of the finite world (cf. Baum, p.27). Be this as it may, Transcendental Thomism's preoccupation with reconciling its new philosophical insights with the theology of Thomas exemplifies our exact point: the shift in world-views is very gradual, it can make no leaps. New insights, if they are to last historically, are usually integrated into the currently existing thought structures and then usually the original and profound insight moves beyond that structure, loosening ancient cornerstones of thought. Cf. Dewart, op. cit., pp.500-501 for distinction between Transcendental Thomism and Neo-Thomism.

The theoretical dimensions of the shift in the Church's perspective on man mentioned in this section are intended only to be tentative projections and illustrations of the kind of theological speculation going on in North America at the beginning of the 1970s. Since the traditional interpretations of three of the most basic givens of the faith are being questioned by the authors discussed, we can suggest that a new conception of man could emerge from these reinterpretations. If this should occur, it would be a conception of man unlike the classical or relational, since it would question the givens as well as the way in which these should be taken up.

Not only would any further development of the theoretical dimensions be material for another dissertation, but also any further suggestions on the kinds of theological questions arising from within this dimension would go beyond the scope of this present thesis. We note, therefore, merely by way of examples, that the kind of questions raised from within either a classical or a relational perspective would be considered false questions from within any possible future view of man which may be emerging.

Some examples of these false questions would be: what is the future of marriage as an institution? Will the Church change its teaching on birth control? Will the Church allow priests to marry? Is celibacy still a valid life style today? Should priests actively participate in politics - take a position in regard to war, run for political offices? Should Christians be conscientious objectors to all wars? Should men and women have identical roles in the same institution or society?

Whether these questions arise from within a classical or a relational perspective, they fully expect an authoritative answer. Depending on which way the answer comes, it could then be categorized as 'liberal' or 'conservative'. If the answers are: "Yes, priests can marry; divorce is possible; Catholics can use the pill; women can be ordained;" these answers are labeled 'liberal'. If these questions are given negative answers, they are labeled 'conservative'. Each attempt to answer such questions perpetuates the remnants of a classical and prolongs the ambiguity of the relational world-views. In either case, the Church as institution does not move out of its long established role as 'problem solver'.

The speculations of the theological authors mentioned, however, move in the direction of making "relationalism" the content - or the new given - for concepts of both God and man. Different questions are implied by this kind of movement. Responses to these questions involve a reinterpretation of givens rather than suggestions on ways in which the same givens could be taken up differently. Questions as to whether or not there is salvation after death, evil is a phenomenon or force outside of man, the division between ordained priest and people is a valid distinction, etc., all require interpretation in light of both the body of tradition and the conception of man which may be newly emerging. Whatever the diverse responses of the institutional Church might be, they would seem to presuppose "relationalism" as the new given.

The purpose of these sections on the practical and theoretical dimensions implied by a shift from a classical to a relational world-view was to point up that the phenomenon of a shift in the conception of man has implications which extend beyond the hierarchically approved position of pastoral publications.

CONCLUSIONS

The initial question of this thesis is answered affirmatively. We maintain there has been a shift in the conception of man in the Roman Catholic Church as an institution.

The general purpose of this dissertation is to suggest that partially accounting for and underlying the apparent shift in the emphasis on values in North America in the 1960s was a shift in the very understanding of man himself. Although it was beyond the scope of this dissertation to develop this suggestion, it is hoped that our specific study of one institution in North America in which such a shift apparently occurred: the Roman Catholic Church, contributes to the on-going scholarly study of the places and ways in which the shift seemed to be occurring in the North American society in the 1960s.

The method employed to arrive at the construction of a perspective on man underlying each of the three publications used in this dissertation is that of a comparative analysis of the texts. We center the analysis in a consideration of the emphases placed on the faith-content and the kind of God-man relationship encouraged by the institutional Church in each publication. We deal with the material in terms of two phenomena familiar in the everyday process of integration: a) the starting points of man's life which are so basic that they are considered givens, and, b) the process by which he chooses the ways in which he should take up these givens. Life develops or does not develop in proportion to the way in which man takes up the givens of his life. In the case of this dissertation, we consider the content of faith as presented by the institutional RCC as givens and the way in which man is encouraged to take them up gives an indication of the kind of God-man relationship the Church was encouraging by the publication of a particular pastoral work.

The interpretation of this change in world-views given in this dissertation is not intended to suggest that one world-view is better than the other, merely that there is a difference between them, and, therefore, that the integrity of the God-man relationships encouraged by the institutional Church are relative to their time and place in history and culture. For example, unity-through-diversity is as normal a form of integration for relational man as he takes up his life in relation to God as unity-through-uniformity is a normal form of integration for classical man as he takes up his life by conforming in order to "fit himself into" the acceptable roles within the institution.

As stated in the Preface of this dissertation, the suggested theological implications and conclusions of this study were broadened as a result of the research and time spent at the three pastoral institutes of Lumen Vitae in Bruxelles, l'Institut Supérieur de Pastorale Catéchétique de l'Institut Catholique in Paris, and, the Nijmegen Higher Institute in the Netherlands. As a result of studying the directions of these institutes between 1960 and 1970, the suggestion of a shift in the perspective on man can be appreciated as a practical dimension to what might have otherwise been considered exclusively the result of a study of three pastoral publications.

Besides the practical dimensions of this dissertation, there are as well theoretical ones. The theoretical dimensions have roots in the writings of some contemporary North American theological authors. The experimental speculations of these writers which call for a reinterpretation of our understanding of God, man and revelation make it possible for us to suggest that as a result of the shift from a classical to a relational conception of man which we maintain took place within the institutional Church, the door opens to a newly emerging perspective on man.

As a result of a comparative analysis of three pastoral publications used with hierarchical approval in North America between 1958 and 1970, we suggest that the Church did not repeat in the Pastoral Constitution or in the Dutch catechism the centuries old understanding of man expressed in the Baltimore catechism. This apparent change in the understanding of man is discussed in this dissertation in terms of a move away from a classical conception of man towards a relational view.

The thesis that there has been a shift in an understanding of man which underlies these works does not imply that the change was a deliberate or even a conscious move on the part of the Church. Nor does it imply that a clear-cut break from the classical perspective occurred. Rather, this shift is discussed in terms of an encouragement for man to move away from a classical type relationship with God towards a relational one. We suggest there is no indication the institutional Church was aware that underlying its reinterpretation of its content of faith and of its God-man relationship is a change in its perspective on man. Indeed, the North American Church of the 1960s never officially recognized it was simultaneously encouraging Christians to develop two different kinds of relationship with God and their world.

The Pastoral Constitution is a pivotal example of this ambiguity. It encourages man to develop his relationship with God in ways typical of both a classical and a relational perspective on man. For this reason, we maintain there is no one conception of man which controls the direction of the Constitution. Likewise, the concomitant use of the Baltimore and Dutch catechisms in North America suggests that the institutional Church was not aware it "officially" was expressing two different understandings of man.

7

HISTORICAL APPENDICES

APPENDIX I
THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE
BALTIMORE CATECHISM

There is a twofold purpose of this brief historical section on the roots of the catechism "... prepared and enjoined by order of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore, for the use of Catholics in the United States."¹ First, its purpose is to point up why it can be stated that the RCC as institution has not changed significantly its working classical conception of man in its catechetical publications from at least the Middle Ages until the 1960s. And, if we accept that Robert Bellarmine was influenced by Augustine's catechism,² this classical world-view does not seem to have been displaced since the Patristic Age. Second, its purpose is to point up what a frail hold the Baltimore catechism has on the title of "national" catechism. In order to accomplish these two aims, this section is a cursory history of the more immediate roots of the Baltimore catechism.

Although it has not been possible to discover with any certainty the sources and author(s) of this work, it is possible to arrive at the generally accepted consensus of those who agree

1: Nicolai Nilles, Commentaria in Concilium Plenarium Baltimoreense Tertium, Pars I, Acta Concili. Editio Domestica Privatis Auditorum Usilius Accomodate. Oeniponte ex officina F. Rauch (C. Pustet), 1888.

2: Gerard S. Sloyan, editor, Modern Catechetics: Message and Method in Religious Formation, "The Influence of Bellarmine", New York, Macmillan, 1968, footnote 11, p.70.

on probable sources and authors.³ Sloyan mentions "the clearest claimant to the title (of primary source) seems to be a volume of unacknowledged origins, entitled 'An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine', ... widely available before 1860".⁴ Also, Joseph DeHarbe's Catechism (Katholischer Katechismus oder Lehrbegriff Regensburg, 1847) appeared in United States editions before 1882 (Creed, Commandments, Means of Grace). Circulating as well in 1865 was the bilingual (Gaelic-English) catechism compiled by

3: This research into the question of the probable common sources draws upon The Ecclesiastical Review 1927-1936. These sources are referred to by almost everyone who has written on this problem, as well as Gerard S. Sloyan's Modern Catechetics: Message and Method in Religious Formation, 1968. We are using as well the "Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii" (1884) to which we were able to gain access through the library of the Catholic University of America; and we are drawing upon a conversation with Rev. Joseph B. Collins S.T.D., Ph.D. of the National Office of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, D.C., who is an acknowledged scholar in the field of catechetics and has been consistently involved with preliminary discussions, revisions, and research questions trying to establish the sources and authors of the Baltimore catechism.

4: Sloyan, op. cit., p.83.

John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam.⁵ In light of the use of the Dutch catechism⁶ in this dissertation, it is interesting to note that the Baltimore catechism which was "to enjoy tacit acceptance and widespread use, and become the national catechism of English-speaking Catholics (in the United States) in fact, if not in the usual sense of formal adoption by the entire (American) hierarchy",⁷ was never to receive full hierarchical approbation. In fact, "... once this 1885 Council was dissolved, the archbishops of the country as a national body never attended to it further except to cope with the complaints against it in their annual meetings of 1895".⁸

5: John McHale, The Christian Doctrine, Dublin, Warren, 1865. During a reading of this little buff colored catechism in the Library of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., we noticed a very curious answer which we only later discovered had caught G. Sloyan's eye (cf., p.84). On page 22 of McHale a mistake is made in answering the question: "By what authority do you divide the catechism into these four parts?" (previously listed as to believe; to fulfill the commandments; to receive the sacraments and to put our hope in God by prayer). The answer reads: "By the authority, and after the example of the best and most explanatory catechism that has ever been compiled." What is that? Answer: "The Catechism of the Council of Trent, composed under the direction of the first authority in the Catholic Church and earnestly recommended to all pastors in their instruction of the faithful." (The order in Trent's catechism is (1) faith and creed; (2) sacraments; (3) decalogue; (4) prayer and its necessity). The point is not only the question of how this mistake found its way into McHale's catechism, but also that the Irish bishops must have had little knowledge of the implications of the orderings in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. (cf. footnote 44, pp. 249-250).

6: A New Catechism: Catholic Faith for Adults, new authorized edition, with Supplement, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969.

7: Sloyan, op. cit., p.86.

8: Ibid., p.85; John K. Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated", The Ecclesiastical Review 81 (December, 1929), p.581.

In an effort to recall the events surrounding the attempt of the hierarchy to decide on a national catechism,⁹ Sebastian C. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee,¹⁰ recalled from his own private minutes taken at the meeting and from the printed (unpublished) minutes the Council sent to Rome that: 1) a circular was sent to all the Archbishops fully two months before the Council; 2) an "out of time" report was read and referred back to the Commission, and, at this meeting there was "a strong sentiment in favor of Butler's Catechism...."¹¹ But the opinion in favor of a new catechism prevailed." 3) the catechism question then arose within the regular agenda in the Private Congregation, November 29, and in its report, the Commission suggested several changes to the schema. They were adopted, and, from the minutes, Messmer believes that it was at this meeting that a new Commission of Bishops was appointed, and they were, as he recalls, to report once more to the Council.¹² 4) This report was given, December 6.

At that meeting a draft (printed on galley proofs) of the new catechism was distributed to the Bishops for their suggestions. Time must have been too short however, because the Bishops were

9: This effort spanned the first three Plenary Councils of Baltimore: 1852, 1866, 1885.

10: Sharp, op. cit., p.574. The following four statements are from Messmer's recollections contained in a letter to Sharp, December 4, 1928.

11: James Butler, Catechism of the Diocese of Limerick, revised edition, Cork, Guy and Company, 1775. Butler was Archbishop of Cashel 1774-1791 and the Synod of Maynooth claimed its 1782 revision. It is often referred to as the Maynooth Catechism and would have been a most recently accepted catechism for the bishops gathered in Baltimore in 1884.

12: Sharp, op. cit., p.575.

requested to forward their suggestions to Bishop Spalding of Peoria and he was to make a full report to the next Conference of Archbishops. After the Archbishops had adopted the final form of the new catechism, it was only then to be given to Spalding for publication. Messmer does not know the sequence of events that followed.¹³

He does recall, however, that "from beginning to end, the greatest stress was laid on having a uniform catechism for all our Dioceses.... To several objections raised at the last meeting that the proposed catechism was very imperfect, in fact inferior, answer was made that uniformity was more important...." Messmer writes that he has "a faint recollection that the Catechism Commission placed the actual making of the New Catechism in the hands of Monsignor de Concilio...."¹⁵

This recollection that Monsignor Jannarius de Concilio of St. Michael's Church, Jersey City, New Jersey was the final author was further supported by Rev. John R. Hogan, Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Cleveland; Rev. Joseph Schrembs, Bishop of Cleveland; Bishop Denis O'Connell and Rev. Michael J. Duffy, New York.¹⁶

Others, however, recalled different authors: Rev. Francis Moran, Rector of St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland, Ohio, said O'Connell had thought Dr. Moes had contributed; Rev. F. J. O'Reilly of St. Patrick's Church, Danville, Illinois, had written that he

13: Ibid., pp. 574-575.

14: Ibid., pp. 575-576.

15: Ibid., p.. 576.

16: Ibid., pp. 578-579.

had lived with Bishop Spalding as pastor of his Cathedral and Chancellor of Peoria for fourteen years, and was under the impression that Spalding had done most of the work.¹⁷

Perhaps Rev. Thomas McMillan, C.S.P., joint editor with Rev. Dr. Fox of the revised DeHarbe's Catechism, had a key to the solution: he had the opinion that the catechism was to have been composed only after questionnaires had been sent out to and received from veteran teachers of the whole country, but that "Bishop Spalding, of impetuous nature, foresaw much protracted discussion, and, with the permission of the Archbishop of Baltimore (Gibbons), hurried its preparation."¹⁸

The final stages of this preparation seem to have taken place at St. Paul's Church, New York City where both Spalding and Monsignor de Concilio were guests of the Paulist Fathers from the end of the Council in early December, 1884 until at least January 25, 1885. Spalding preached at the dedication of this Church on this date and, according to McMillan (in a 1929 conversation with Sharp), both worked on the catechism.¹⁹

From F. A. Walsh's article, one can conclude logically that de Concilio had a great influence on its compilation. In the Mullen Library of the Catholic University of America, there is a copy of its translation into Italian with the note "Humble respects of the author De C."; and de Concilio held the copyright on the Italian edition.²⁰

17: Ibid., pp. 579-580.

18: Ibid., pp. 579-580.

19: Ibid., p.580.

20: F. A. Walsh, "More About the Catechism of the Council of Baltimore", The Ecclesiastical Review 95 (July-December, 1936), p.278.

According to Walsh, "The catechism commonly called the catechism of the Third Council of Baltimore had been printed before either the recognition at Rome or the promulgation of this recognition by Cardinal Gibbons."²¹ It must have been precisely the way in which this approval came about that prompted J. A. Newman to write to the Editor of The Ecclesiastical Review in 1936 suggesting that the word "enjoined" be deleted from the title page of the catechism:

As a necessary condition that the decree of the Third Baltimore Council should have any binding force, "enjoining" the use of the Baltimore Catechism, the Council expressly decreed that the proposed catechism be submitted to the body of archbishops (of the United States) and be "examined" (reviewed, authenticated) by them.²²

The following will place Newman's excerpt from the proceedings of the Third Plenary Council in fuller context:

.... Re igitur mature perpensa statuimus ut comitatus instituatur Rmorum. Episcoporum quorum erit: 1) Catechismum seligere et si opus fuerit emendare aut de novo exarare, prout magis necessarium et opportunum aestimaverint. 2) Opus suum ita perfectum ad coetum Rmorum. Archiepiscoporum remittere qui denuo catechismum recognoscent, et typis accurate mandan curabunt.²³

Newman continues that this proposed catechism in question was never submitted to the body of archbishops (of the United States), nor was it ever "examined" by them. The requirements of the

21: Ibid., p. 275.

22: J. A. Newman "Authorization of the Baltimore Catechism", The Ecclesiastical Review 94 (June-December, 1936), p.518.

23: Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, A.D. MDCCCLXXXIV. Praeside Illmo ac Revmo. Jacobo Gibbons, Arch. Balt. et Delegato Apostolico, Baltimore: Typis Joannis Murphy Sociorum, MDCCCLXXXVI, p.119-120.

Baltimore Council therefore, were never fulfilled, its "enjoining" decree never became a reality. "In truth, the real, genuine, Baltimore catechism never came into existence. The approval of Archbishop Gibbons in no sense fulfills the requirements of the Third Plenary Council. Archbishop Gibbons spoke ... for one archbishop, and not for all ... (as was required by the Baltimore decree)."²⁴ The fact that Gibbons was Apostolic Delegate of the United States did not empower him to act for all the archbishops of the country, since every bishop has the right to decide what text he wishes used in his own diocese.

Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis, wrote to Sharp²⁵ that the question arose regarding the advisability of revising a catechism that was, in the first place, quite unpopular. It was decided that Gibbons should consult and then appoint a special committee with Archbishop Kain of St. Louis, Chairman, in order to revise the catechism according to the suggestions of all the bishops. After this, writes Glennon in 1928, there seems to have been "no definite action by the archbishops then, nor by the bishops since then."²⁶

One explanation offered for this lack of any attempt to revise the catechism is suggested by Francis P. Harvey of the Sulpician Seminary in Washington, D.C. He proposes to Sharp²⁷ that perhaps they realize the inherent difficulties of making a catechism "national" in a country with "prepossessions from various early training in a Church spread in the different sections of a

24: Newman, op. cit., p.518.

25: December 13, 1928.

26: John J. Glennon to Sharp, op. cit., p.581.

27: Sharp, op. cit., pp.582-583.

vast country." He also suggests that the delay is accounted for partly by rumors that the Holy See was contemplating a universal catechism, and partly by the death of Archbishop Kain (1903), President of the Committee. (It was to be 1935-1941 before the revision was to take place. It is this revision (No.2) that is being used in this dissertation and was to be so widely used throughout the United States).

The basic sources used by the author(s) of the Baltimore catechism are more complicated to discover than are its author(s). Sloyan maintains that textual criticism establishes Butler's Catechism of the Diocese of Limerick, and the manual done by the Christian Brothers as the basic ones.²⁸ These were influenced by Carroll's Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, 1772,²⁹ and McCaffrey's catechism.³⁰

"Presbyter Septuagenarius"³¹ believes both Butler's and the catechism of the Christian Brothers were basic sources. Rev.

28: Sloyan, op. cit., pp.89-90, footnote 50.

29: Sharp's article mentions that the Carroll catechism was "undoubtedly an English importation. The Catholic Encyclopedia V, 81, Col. I, states that this was approved by Archbishop Carroll... (it) was probably the English Bishop Challoner's Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, produced in 1772 at St. Omer ... (which) was in turn derived from the Catechism of Laurence Vaux of Manchester, 1597, and from the Abstract of the Douai Catechism written in 1649 by Henry Turberville" op. cit. p.584. Also, Sloyan mentions (pp.82-83) that Carroll put out an abridgement of Bishop Hay's catechism (An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine, Philadelphia, Matthew Carey, 1803), and many of its questions and answers found their way into the Baltimore catechism of 1885.

30: We know McCaffrey was President of Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg and that his catechism was recommended to the Second Plenary Council, 1866.

31: Presbyter Septuagenarius, "Why Not Have a Better Catechism," The Ecclesiastical Review 76 (February, 1927), p.166.

Raymond J. O'Brien³² mentions that the Carroll catechism was in its twelfth printing by 1793; that it was adopted by a decree of the First Diocesan Synod of Philadelphia, 1832; that it was approved in the next Provincial Council of Baltimore; that it was decreed the catechism for the English-speaking by the First Diocesan Synod of St. Louis, 1839; and, finally that Bishop Fenwick of Boston issued its revision in 1843. O'Brien concludes this listing by saying "the Baltimore catechism is a synthesis of all that seemed best in the earlier catechisms, but combined with its original matter is much that was taken from McCaffrey's and Butler's catechisms."³³

"Presbyter Septuagenarius" connects the Baltimore catechism as closer to that of Butler's by remarking that "the author" of the Baltimore catechism accepted the task (of compiling) "... . evidently convinced that the burden of his duty consisted in removing the more objectionable features in Dr. Butler's manual."³⁴

Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Collins, currently at the National Office Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, D.C. recalls that the conclusion of his own comparative study of Butler's catechism with that of Baltimore was that 75-80% of the latter was almost word for word from the catechism of Cashel.³⁵

32: Raymond J. O'Brien, The History of Our English Catechism, in Petit Seminaire of the Quigley Preparatory Seminary of Chicago, (June, 1920), p.253.

33: Sharp, op. cit., pp.584-585.

34: Presbyter Septuagenarius, op. cit., p.167.

35: This was learned in an informal conversation with Father Collins at the National Office in Washington, D.C., July, 1972. Father Collins was involved in research for the 1935-1941 revision of the Baltimore catechism. His book, Teaching Religion: an Introduction to Catechetics proved most helpful.

Walsh concludes his study on the sources and authority of the Baltimore catechism with the insight that "the general result of the comparison made between the (below) named catechisms is almost negative."³⁶ Walsh continues that the only Italian catechism at hand which possibly could have been used by de Concilio is "Tipografia Editr. Degli Accattoncelli", published in Naples, 1875. He sees no resemblance between this catechism and that of Baltimore's or between this one and de Concilio's translation. Nor does Walsh believe there is any resemblance between the Baltimore catechism and the edition of the one of Robert Bellarmine in 1853, issued for students of the Propaganda. Walsh concludes that no one of them "can be said to have any more points of resemblance with the Baltimore catechism than would be expected from authors dealing with material so dogmatically certain as that ordinarily included in catechisms."³⁷

Mary C. Bryce was of similar opinion when she mentioned two reasons for her selection of the Baltimore catechism as a significant influence on widely used elementary religion text books.³⁸ She saw the catechism as significant because it was (in 1970), the only national catechism written for the use of the RCC in the United States. Yet, she considers the catechism itself insignifi-

36: Walsh, op. cit., p.279 lists three: the catechism of Bishop James Butler, both in its small edition and its revised and enlarged edition as recommended by the four Archbishops of Ireland; the general catechism of Christian Doctrine made by the Sulpician Bishop Augustin Verot, printed in Baltimore, by John Murphy and Company, 1869; Catechism of Christian Doctrine in the Muller "C.S.S.R" Series, approved by Archbishop R. Bayley of Baltimore, 1875.

37: Walsh, op. cit., p.279.

38: Mary Charles Bryce, O.S.B. (Sister), The Influence of the Catechism of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Widely Used Elementary Religion Text Books from its Composition in 1885 to its 1941 Revision, submitted in partial fulfillment for a Ph.D., to Catholic University of America, 1970.

cant, and this substantiates the conclusion of Walsh: "It was insignificant because of its lack of originality and its merely taking its place in a continuous and almost unbroken pattern of catechizing since the 16th century."³⁹

Since it is beyond the scope of this historical appendix to research the connecting catechisms from Augustine through the Catechism of the Council of Trent up to the one of the Third Plenary of Baltimore, mention is being made merely of the commonly accepted opinions of those scholars who have undertaken such studies and who generally agree that the influence of Robert Bellarmine⁴⁰ and Peter Canisius⁴¹ are central to any appreciation of the links between European and North American catechisms.⁴²

In an introductory note in his Dottrina Cristiana breve, Bellarmine praises the literary style of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Bellarmine evidently appreciated the fact that it had no question and answer style and was written in a very humanistic way.⁴³ However, Bellarmine's Dottrina is in question and answer style. He also changed the four-fold division of Trent's (1) faith and creed; (2) sacraments; (3) decalogue; (4)

39: Ibid., p.19.

40: Robert Bellarmine, Dottrina Cristiana breve (1597).

41: Peter Canisius wrote the three handbooks; one commonly referred to as a maior, 1555 (Vienna); a minimus, 1556 (Ingolstadt); and a minor catechismus, 1558 (Cologne).

42: J. C. D'Hotel, S.J. Les Origines du Catechisme Moderne d'après les Premiers Manuels Imprimés en France, Paris, Aubier, 1967, pp.65-116; Sloyan, op. cit., pp.66-77.

43: Sloyan, op. cit., p.67.

prayer and its necessity, by placing the decalogue, precepts of the Church and councils before the sacraments.⁴⁴

By placing the sacraments after "faith and the creed" Trent's sequence makes them a part of the faith life rather than commandments or precepts to be kept as Bellarmine's ordering suggests. It is, however, Bellarmine's order that found its way into the revised edition of the Baltimore catechism.

According to Sloyan, Bellarmine indicates that his framework is basically that of Augustine,⁴⁵ namely: those things a Christian must believe (the articles of the creed), must hope for (petitions of the Lord's prayer), and must do to prove his love (commandments, precepts, counsels).

Peter Canisius' three catechetical works on the Catholic faith were written "to cope with Luther's catechisms (printed many times in six different editions between 1529 and 1542), and to supplant the many complex Catholic catechisms available."⁴⁶ The work of Canisius found its way into England in 1567 through the translation and adaptation of Laurence Vaux. It was then put into the "Turberville-Challoner" stream, arriving in the United States

⁴⁴: The sequence of Dottrina Cristiana: (1) faith; (2) creed; (3) Lord's prayer and Hail Mary; (4) commandments of God; (5) precepts of the Church and the Councils; (6) sacraments; (7) theological and cardinal virtues; (8) gifts of the Holy Ghost; (9) works of mercy; (10) sins; (11) four last things and the mysteries of the rosary.

⁴⁵: Sloyan, op. cit., p.70, footnote 11: "The fundamental catechetical idea of Augustine is chiefly developed in his treatise on Faith, Hope and Charity" (in English trans. in Louis A. Arand, No. 3 of "Ancient Christian Writers" (Westminster, Newman Bookshop, 1947), p.10.

⁴⁶: Sloyan, op. cit., p.74, footnote 18.

as Challoner⁴⁷ or in the form of Bishop Hay's Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine⁴⁸ which was at times called the "Carroll's Catechism".

The broader historical context of these roots of the Baltimore catechism, is, then, 16th century Europe at the time of the Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation. It was at the Council of Trent (1545-1563) that Thomas Aquinas came into his own as the doctor communis of theologians. This rather deliberate recognition of a theologian who had synthesized his scholastic world-view 300 years prior to the Council, pushes the roots of the Council of Trent and Trent's catechism back to the Middle Ages of the 13th century.

Thus it is not far-fetched to suggest that these catechisms have roots as far back as Augustine. Not only Bellarmine acknowledged his debt to Augustine but Thomas Aquinas himself quotes him approximately 80% of the time - and even though he uses Augustine in the context of arguing against him, by basing his arguments within an Augustinian world-view, Thomas argues on Augustinian grounds.

The purpose of this historical appendix is to put Chapter I into the historical context of the more immediate roots of the Baltimore catechism. The more remote, though nonetheless important roots, were mentioned only in footnotes throughout Chapter I of this dissertation in order to place the analysis within its broadest classical perspectives.

⁴⁷: Richard Challoner, The Catholic Christian Instructed, Baltimore, John Murphy, 1737.

⁴⁸: Bishop Hay, An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine, Philadelphia, Matthew Carey, 1803.

APPENDIX II

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE
DUTCH CATECHISM

The purpose of this brief historical section is two-fold; 1) to suggest that some of the perspectives and world-views expressed in the Dutch catechism have roots in theological-philosophical thoughts prevalent in Germany, France and the Netherlands at least as far back as the beginning of the 19th century; 2) to note the sense in which the catechism is a national catechism. There are unique implications of the presence of a catechism in the Church which is truly representative of a particular culture, and yet is not intended to be taken as a "universal" position for the whole Church as an institution.

This cursory view of these theological-philosophical ideas can be appreciated even more if it is realized that many of them finally found expression in an event in the 1960s which both European and North Americans share as a common point of reference: Vatican Council II.

European theologians however, tend to appreciate Vatican II as merely an expression, even endorsement, of ideas long nourished by the movements and universities of Germany, France, and Netherlands since the 19th century. Some of the North American Catholics on the other hand, tend to appreciate Vatican II more as a serendipitous event,¹ and as a breath of fresh air that caught them off-guard.

It is the event to which the RCC of all countries can refer as one in which a collective and official hierarchical gathering publicly expressed its concerns and questions regarding its

1: Serendipity is used here in the sense in which Sam Keen used it "as a gift of finding valuable or agreeable things not sought for." To a Dancing God, New York, Harper and Row, p.123.

beliefs and structures of the modern world. It is tangible evidence that the official Church realized not only that it might not have all the answers to contemporary problems, but that it even might not be raising the right questions. The Council is, therefore, the event which gave collective expression to the various individual movements and issues which were quietly accruing in the European world for decades.

The North American Church, with its tendency to be pragmatic and authoritarian in its approach to Christian living, welcomed the Council as the latest authoritative position of the Church and set about trying to put the new theories into practice. The lack of experience with the intellectual roots which gave rise to some of the conciliar positions left the North American Church naively free to attempt to move from one mental structure to another as if it were only a question of good intentions. This lack of living experience with the 19th century sources of Christian ideas partially accounts for why the RCC in North America could have been publishing with simultaneous hierarchical approval, both a Baltimore and a Dutch catechism in the 1960s.

North America can in fact pinpoint the expression of a shift in an understanding of man to the decade between 1958-1970. This Church can refer as well to Vatican II as a pivotal event partially accountable for the difference in its official approach to the God-man relationship. While the North American Church tends to label Vatican II as a "cause" of its changes in attitude and the Church of Europe can allude to Vatican II more as an expression of paradigms already embryonic in the community, both could agree that it is a focal point in the Church's history and a pivotal Church event of the 1960s.

In order to appreciate some of the historical roots of the Dutch catechism, it is important to consider some of the theological insights existent prior to Vatican II. The insights

and approach of Vatican II to the relationship of modern man with God in his world has roots back at least to the earliest works of the Tübingen School at the beginning of the 19th century. Since it is impossible even to sketch adequately all of the movements and nuances in the Church for these years, mention is made only of those which seem to have directly or indirectly had some influence on the concept of man underlying the Dutch catechism.

Today we appreciate the earliest works of the members of the Tübingen School as indebted to the romantic movements. "The climate of their thought was conditioned by the use of such emotionally charged terms as Geist, Leben, and mystischer Sinn, preference for dynamism, organic growth and a community inspired by Volksggeist."² These theologians were open to different acknowledgements of historical research and biblical criticism, and felt it their responsibility to integrate these into an expression of their faith reflective of the new moods, thought and speech. This school of theologians struggled continually with the tension involved in working through the distinction between the constancy of the idea or event and the constantly changing way in which it was expressed.

In later years, under the direction of J. E. Kuhn, Tübingen's Von Drey and Möhler moved away from the romantic movement toward the objective spirit of the philosophy of Hegel. Schoof finds it remarkable that Tübingen survived the first half of the 19th

2: T. Mark Schoof, O.P., A Survey of Catholic Theology 1900-1970, introduction by E. Schillebeeckx, O. P., trans. N. D. Smith, New York, Paulist Press, 1970, p.25. N.B. Throughout this section I use Schoof as my main reference. Since most of the content of this appendix is "folklore" to most Catholics of both Europe and North America, I will refer explicitly to Schoof's text by footnotes only when I use him directly or offer his insights.

century without Rome's condemnation. Evidently this was due largely to the fact that Rome condemned very little during this time period compared with the period after 1848. From that time, the list of persons censored soared, with the result that Tübingen's sphere of influence as a center of theological thought narrowed, and finally hardened into withdrawal tactics, into the "old fortress of the Church."³ At about this time both the Church and theology fell into a depression which was later to bring about a change in structural theological attitudes.

This atmosphere prevailed during the pontificate of Pius IX who felt obliged to preserve the Church from all attacks from outside. Schoof mentions how the walls of the Catholic fortress were built higher and thicker with condemnations and warnings. Loyalty meant unanimity of opinion. Within this context, the Syllabus of 1864 appeared, and Vatican Council I was convened.

Times changed - almost imperceptibly - and with them the mental patterns became more impressed with empirical data in history and nature; with thought processes directed towards positive data. Analysis and specialization, no longer synthesis, nor all-embracing structures, became the central concerns. There was such exclusive preoccupation with sensory phenomena that all else was regarded illusory. Within this context, emphasis was placed on the reality of God and its manifestation in the world.⁴

Against this background, plus an increase in the "isolationism" of the Church, the relatively sudden structural change of Catholic theology is no surprise. Theology became defensive vis-à-vis this

3: Schoof, op. cit., pp.28-31.

4: Ibid., p.33.

empiricism; and scholasticism, long quiet in the Church, found itself similar to the analytical and objective type of thought prevalent since it favoured exact definitions and tended to consider things with an analytical "proof-text" mentality. This was so much the picture that:

In retrospect, it is possible to say that the 19th century theologians who revived scholasticism understood it in accordance with the spirit of their own times - concentrating to such an extent on the separate details of the building that they were too close to be able to see the whole structure of the medieval synthesis.⁵

Neo-scholasticism was born of this revived interest in scholasticism and the defensive attitude in theology. It was characterized by an apologetical attitude, a theological language which was unimaginative and cautious, and Catholic theologians who focused on interpreting traditional sources, and defining concepts. In this atmosphere, man's personal conscience seemed of far less importance than centralized authority and objective laws. Schoof suggests that this was perhaps the first time in history that the hierarchy exerted such influence on theological thinking. This clerical control of theology was to remain characteristic even beyond the second half of the 19th century.

Neo-scholasticism took hold more officially at Vatican I, convened in 1870. The negative attitudes and fearful defensiveness so characteristic during this period were made worse and more explicitly formalized as a result no doubt of the Church's political entanglements in Europe and the interruption of the Council by the Franco-Prussian War at an inopportune moment. The

5: Ibid., p.35.

anti-Roman curia movements of France and Central Europe, and the Church's struggle to maintain its credibility in matters of faith and morals polarized so thoroughly, that instead of a simple statement on "papal infallibility", it was defined to the point of excluding the central place of bishops.⁶

Neo-scholasticism was embraced and became the working method of approach to all new ideas for the next century. Tübingen, which tried to see Christianity as a developing movement in society and tried to include in it all the conclusions of positive research, failed to survive in the days of a defensive and clerically controlled theology. The Church changed its theological attitude towards history around 1850. History and biblical criticism were then viewed as threats to the security of the "fortress" and faith was further entrenched in definitions as a "timeless, changeless metaphysical 'system' ... able to ignore all new discoveries and to keep the 'spirit of the times' safely outside the walls."⁷

Today if the movement condemned by Rome as the "Modernism Heresy" were reinterpreted, it might be seen differently than it was by the "average" Catholic of the 19th century who politely submitted to the hierarchical opinion that it was the "sum total of all heresies". Today, although Catholics agree that the condemnation was no doubt justified, they appreciate that the half-

6: After Vatican I, the theological emphasis was so heavily on papal authority that the "bark of Peter" was surely "listing starboard". It was almost 100 years later, during Vatican Council II, that E. Josef de Smedt, Bishop of Bruges, described this view of the papacy as a childish display of "triumphalism, juridicism and clericalism." Xavier Rynne, Vatican II, New York, Farran, Straus and Giroux, 1960, p.11.

7: Schoof, op. cit., p.36.

truths it contributed were valuable and significant for that time.⁸

It is difficult to sift through the nuances and contributing elements in a conflict between the traditional interpretation of the Church's teaching and a theology searching for renewal. However, movements and people in France, Germany and the Netherlands played leading roles in developing the theological thought later referred to as that of Vatican II and which we now see concretized in the Dutch catechism of 1966.

France was a country of conflicts by the end of the 19th century. The Republic was trying to banish clericalism from the country. In the minds of the people, clericalism was synonymous with the Church. The questions of fundamental importance raised by theologians all during this time were ignored until a most inopportune moment: the final stages of the Church and state controversy. Temperatures were high and when the condemnation of modernism was handed down it was so vehement that many consider it the most violent ever pronounced in the Church's history.⁹

Although the French theologians were pioneering two paths followed later by some theologians of Vatican II, they were not especially acclaimed at the turn of the 20th century. The two

8: Modernism held: "that man's only means of knowing anything about God was by internal, personal religious experience; that there was no objective reality behind such concepts as the Trinity, Divinity of Christ, the Incarnation and the Resurrection, although within the cultural milieu in which these notions had their origins, they were good and useful for focusing a man's attention on his religious experiences; and that these dogmatic formulas were undergoing a constant, purely natural evolution...."

9: Schoof, op. cit., p.48.

directions, one of returning to the sources of the gospel of Christ, and the other leading to contact with contemporary experience.¹⁰ were significant because both movements occurred outside of the quasi-official theology of neo-scholasticism.

The philosopher Maurice Blondel who, convinced that a strictly philosophical analysis would lead inevitably to the basic questions on the meaning of life and to the threshold of Catholicism, had a decisive influence on the French theology of that period. Alfred Loisy had a different point of departure: historical research and biblical exegesis. His aim was "to return to the sources" and his cause was marked by curtailments and threatening warnings familiar to theologians who move beyond the commonly accepted paradigms of the hierarchy.

Loisy, whose interpretation of free exegesis led to his dismissal from the Institut Catholique in Paris as well as to the publication of the encyclical Providentissimus Deus, found himself in debate with Harnack on his book Das Wesen des Christentums.¹¹

The repercussions of these conversations were far reaching. They pivoted around the idea that the essence of Christianity - man's personal relationship with God and others - was so thoroughly covered over by centuries of historical deposits that the Christian was indeed not only not living in the original essence but also was ignorant even of what it was.¹² Loisy expressed in his L'Evangile

10: Ibid., p.48.

11: Leo XIII, Providentissimus Deus (November 18, 1893).

12: Schoof., op. cit., p.60.

et L'Eglise¹³ the view that the gospel of Christ was destined to grow into the Church of today - and this was fulfillment, not diminution of the biblical message as it developed in history and took new forms. Loisy's position that the gospels were not historical documents but testimonies of faith,¹⁴ led finally to the condemnation of his book by Richard, Archbishop of Paris. Loisy himself was finally excommunicated and condemned.

Blondel and Loisy stand as figures of the struggle to renew theology during this period. Space and the limits of this sketch make it impossible even to begin mention of the others who followed their spirit and in agreement and disagreement with them furthered the development of theology.

Pius X's documents condemning modernism: Lamentabili and Pascendi appeared.¹⁵ This left the Church bereft of any official endorsement of new thoughts, and capable only of leaning on neo-scholasticism. This state of affairs lasted until World War I, after which event theological thought shifted to the German-speaking countries.

It is clear that up to this time the classical concept of man underlay the official position of the Church. Efforts to screen out any new ideas on the dimensions of man or theological

13: Alfred Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, Alphonse Picard et Fils, editeurs, Paris, 1902.

14: Schoof, op. cit., p.61.

15: Pius X, Lamentabili Sane (July, 1907); Pascendi Dominici Gregis (September 8, 1907).

thought had been so successful that no profound changes in the RCC's concept of man had been expressed so far.

German-speaking countries firmly resisted the papal censures, and, curiously, the papal condemnations were not enforced in Germany. University professors and Catholic thinkers there were not obliged to take the anti-modernism oath, with the result that Catholic thought continued.

The names of Herman Schell, Karl Adam, Romano Guardini and the other theologians of "kerygmatic" theology appear. They were outside the mainstream of thought of the well established neo-scholastic theologians¹⁶ who were not impressed with Schell's persistent speculations on how the Church could be reformed. In 1898 his works were placed on the Index. His dynamic doctrine of God, ideas on sin, and later support of progress and evolution did not help to put him back in Rome's good graces or prompt authorities to scratch his name from the Index.

Germans can point to World War I as the time in which their world-view changed. The Empire collapsed and Lutheranism tumbled from its secure position. The shift is described by Schoof as one felt in terms of "a 'change of direction', a change from the subjective to the objective, from the individual to the community, from society to an eschatologically tinged religiosity".¹⁷ 'Dialectical' theology came into its own and the influences of Kierkegaard, Barth, Brunner, Bultmann, Husserl, Scheler and Heidegger were so deeply felt that no serious Roman Catholic theological work after this period could ever ignore them.

16: Schoof, op. cit., p.73.

17: Ibid., p.77.

The "youth movements" emerged in opposition to the pressures of home and school and became a vehicle of social response to a post World War I society. These social concerns gave rise almost automatically to the liturgical movement. The emphasis shifted from the liturgy being part of Catholicism as an institution, to being a reflection of Catholicism as a community of the socially concerned. Included in this shifting was the rediscovery of the Mystical Body, the role of the laity, renewal of the liturgy as a "celebration in mystery", renewal of Christianity and of the ultimate meaning of faith.¹⁸

R. Guardini and K. Adam are surely not the only lights of this period, but they exemplify two important theological preoccupations finally to influence Vatican II and the perception of man in the Dutch catechism. 1) Guardini, a soul-brother of Augustine, emphasized the concrete and the 'real' in Christian living rather than the 'material'. His concrete approach to symbolism of the liturgy based on movement, gesture and play in worship makes his affinity with Augustine more evident. Most of his work is "outside" the mainstream of systematic theology. He is acknowledged as the inspiration and the basis of much of what later became conciliar theology about Church, liturgy, Christ and the Christian faith in the modern world.¹⁹

2) Karl Adam appears as a scholar of a theology of life. His audience was wider than his fellow theologians. His accusers insisted on his "theological inaccuracies" - a judgment which today is taken to mean that he avoided using neo-scholastic

18: Ibid., p.81.

19: Ibid., pp.82-84.

terminology. Adam's 1924 book on the Church,²⁰ with its emphasis on Christ's continuing life in the Church was, in Schoof's opinion, just short of revolutionary.

During the years before the outbreak of World War II various political movements were afoot and the positioning of the Christian Churches vis-à-vis a dictator who would "put order back" is only too sadly known. However, at this time the liturgical renewal was rapidly developing through the inspiration of Abbot Odo Casel. He provided a theology rooted in the liturgical events of the paschal mystery and interpreted scripture, the Fathers and tradition in light of the liturgy, seeing it as a renewal presence of Christ's saving actions. These ideas are in fact the basis for the document of Vatican II On the Liturgy.²¹

This ten year period prior to World War II saw the beginning of the catechetical movement. J. A. Jungmann placed an emphasis on the catechetical aspect of worship. He perceived a discrepancy between proclaiming the gospel and the current neo-scholastic theology of his day. Jungmann therefore suggested a separate branch of theology to go side-by-side with neo-scholasticism, one in which God's revelation could be presented as a call and a living value, as a message which could be proclaimed,...a 'theology of proclamation' or "kerygmatic theology".²² The war interrupted this movement temporarily.

20: Published in English as The Spirit of Catholicism, New York, Macmillan, 1935.

21: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium) December 4, 1963, in The Documents of Vatican II, ed., Walter M. Abbot, S.P., New York, Guild Press, 1966, pp.137-178.

22: Schoof, op. cit., p.90.

In France, at the same time, Catholicism was stirring in the youth worker movements of Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne (J.O.C.). The Jocistes came from the initiative of a Flemish priest, L. Cardijn, and flourished as the only hope of rechristianizing the French people. French theologians were forced to be aware of this "existential approach". Their efforts were therefore renewed to work within a context of dialogue between the Church and the modern world.

The mention of dialogue however, had its problems. Since Loisy, the relationship between history and faith was considered a basic theological difficulty. Therefore an attack on the prevailing neo-scholasticism came by way of reinterpreting it in light of scriptural, patristic and historical backgrounds. In France, the real questions of life were raised behind this "facade" of neo-scholasticism. The names mentioned at this time are ones whose influence can be traced straight to Vatican II and the beginning of what this dissertation considers to be a shift in the conception of man.

M. D. Chenu, O.P. stands as one who took part in, and often initiated, the most risky experiments of the French Church, for example, the priest-worker movement.²³ His numerous articles testify to his theological reflections on the social issues of his days, especially the worker, the "new Christian in the world" and Marxism.

Chenu seems to be a living incarnation of both a theology committed to the scholasticism of his Dominican tradition and the

23: Schoof, op. cit., p.103; M. D. Chenu, La Parole de Dieu I "La Foi dans l'Intelligence" et II, "L'Evangile dans le Temps," les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1964.

theology committed to a present day issues and questions. Schoof notes that Chenu himself saw this and wrote:

It might be thought that there are two Chenus, one the medievalist...the other caught up in the hustle of the modern world, sensitive to its demands, quick to commit himself to the most critical problems of the world and of the Church ...This is not true - there is only one Chenu. The unity of theology is revealed in a paradoxical unity of two personalities and two commitments - the word of God in the world, where the Spirit even now still continues and realizes the meaning of Christ's incarnation of human things both individually and collectively.²⁴

The source of Chenu's theology was always the constantly moving life of the Church in the world. It is suggested that it was no doubt this recognition of historicity and experience within theology which led - much to the disbelief of his colleagues and dismay of his students - to his private issue on the theology of Le Saulchoir being placed on the Index in 1942 and to his withdrawal from its faculty.²⁵ Paradoxically, his Dominican faculty replacement, Yves Congar, was to be the one through whom much of Chenu's work was to bear fruit.

The contributions of Henri de Lubac were different from those of Chenu and Congar. Although his own approach was classical, his ability to synthesize and appreciate the more existential

24: Informations catholiques internationales (233) February 1, 1965, p.30.

25: Schoof, op. cit., p.104 mentions in footnote 64 that the main chapter of Chenu's book Une Ecole de Théologie, Etioilles, 1937, is included in his La Foi dans l'intelligence, Paris, 1969, pp.243-268.

N.B. Twenty years later Chenu was not invited as an official expert to Vatican Council II.

works of others was a great and welcome response. His book Surnaturel,²⁶ published shortly after the war, was the result of new awakenings which came to him while 'chaplain' of the Resistance. He was brought in contact with Communism and consequently introduced himself to the works of Marx, Proudhon, Feuerbach, Nietzsche and Comte. In Surnaturel, de Lubac assumed a new position in the historical debate. He saw the nature of man in terms of a creation open to community with God.²⁷ The controversy now began around de Lubac.

In one sense it is questionable whether Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., belongs in the midst of an historical sketch of contributing elements to the new theology. He did not claim to be a theologian. He was, by profession, a paleontologist. Teilhard is, however, probably the most well known and widely read author to take hold of the mentality of a people. His relaxed grasp of the relationship between science and theology, culminating in his mystic insights which saw all of creation moving towards God by an evolutionary process, caused rumblings of horror and caution to issue from the Vatican. Teilhard was censored, forbidden to publish, and sent to Peking. But, as is often the case for those whose works are condemned and who are themselves sent into exile, his works are to be found not only on the forbidden lists of Rome but also in the documents of Vatican Council II.

Out of post-World War II Germany came the writings of a contemporary of Teilhard, Karl Rahner, S.J. In his first works he

26: Henri de Lubac, Le Mystère du Surnaturel, Theologie Etudes publiées sous la direction de la faculté de theologie S.J. de Lyon, Fourvière, 64, Aubier, 1965.

N.B. De Lubac was invited to Vatican II as an official expert.

27: Schoof, op. cit., p.113.

questioned the historicity of the medieval philosophy and scholastic theology of Thomas Aquinas. Considered by most as a member of the neo-scholastic school, Rahner nevertheless is mainly preoccupied with questions affecting theology of the day. With Rahner there seems to be initial evidence of a shift in the scholastic concept of man. His writings up to 1969 testify however to his attempts to incarnate his anthropological insights into the well established and existing classical structures of Thomas Aquinas. The degree of his concern for the present day is exposed in these "anthropological" roots which are at the basis of his ideas.

Man, according to Rahner, is transcendent towards God.²⁸ For him it is, therefore, impossible to speak of man without speaking of God and nothing can be said of God without speaking of man. Rahner's constant concern in these writings is the relationship between God and man. Rahner's reinterpretation of neo-scholasticism is considered by some as resulting "in the neo-scholastic point of departure becoming hardly distinguishable from the conceptual system of traditional theologians who were in any case unable to understand why the 'eternal truth' had to be 'adapted' to the continuing life of the Church and (above all) of the world."²⁹

The scope of Rahner's thought, and his pastoral concern that the new insights be integrated into tradition, places him in a unique position of being the theologian who tried to bring the

28: (Cf.) Karl Rahner, Theological Investigations, Vol. I-V, especially Vol. II: Man in the Church, trans. H. Kruger, Helicon Press, Baltimore, 1964.

29: Schoof., op. cit., p.131.

"best of both worlds together". He exemplifies how thoroughly the mind-structure of an era conditions and controls the ways in which one is open to insights that step beyond the traditional outlook of the age in which they are living.³⁰

How did the Netherlands escape any profound influence from modernism? Schoof mentions that J. Rivière,³¹ acknowledged French expert on the modernist issues, suggests that it was due to their concern with practical activities rather than with intellectual questions.³² This attitude changed after World War II and the movements of Germany and France found themselves being adopted. The Catholic University of Nijmegen, founded in 1923, became a center of thought and writing which has now become known internationally.

The concern with practical and concrete experiences remain and are central to Dutch theological thought patterns. However Schoof, himself Dutch, does not see that this emphasis on 'theology of life' is really a new movement in the Church. If placed in historical context, the difference lies in the Dutch inclination to look at man in his concrete experience and follow this back through tradition to biblical sources, whereas the German and French tend to start with philosophy.

P. Schoonenberg is, in many ways, the Dutch counterpart of Rahner. Both Jesuits are basically concerned with the God-man relationship and the consequence of this for man's life in the

30: N.B. K. Rahner was to be an official expert at Vatican Council II.

31: J. Rivière, Le Modernisme dans l'Eglise. Paris, 1929, p.70-71.

32: Schoof, op. cit., p.132.

world. Both have been influenced by Teilhard. Schoonenberg, however, begins his theological reflections with concrete human experiences or biblical sources. He is so at home in the catechetical environment of Nijmegen that he "hardly needs to descend to the extreme depths of a transcendental anthropology in his attempts to interpret man in his contemporary experience."³³

Edward Schillebeeckx O.P., is a Belgian whose interest in anthropology, in the philosophy of D. de Petter and in Husserl, led him into essentially different areas than Rahner. De Petter synthesized the Thomist tradition and phenomenology of Husserl. Rahner's point of departure for interpreting the Thomist tradition was the philosophy of J. Maréchal.³⁴

Schillebeeckx studied under Chenu and while in Paris followed lectures in historical theology, existentialism, personalism etc. with the result that he became more and more concerned with the relationship between the Church and the world of today.³⁵

Since 1957 Schillebeeckx has been teaching at the University of Nijmegen and has been a guiding inspiration behind the Dutch theological movement during the 1960s. His personal ability to be sensitive to the practical and the concrete experiences of modern man make him a "natural Dutchman". This ability, coupled

33: Ibid., p.135.

34: Ibid., pp.137-138.

35: His appointment to teach sacramental theology at Louvain interrupted his work on the Church-world relationship temporarily but resulted in the publication of The Sacramental Economy of Salvation which is but a foretaste of his ability to integrate tradition with contemporary insight and with how Christ is present in the midst of man.

with a deep and vast knowledge of many traditions, may partially account for Schillebeeckx's suspicion "of any claim to hold a monopoly of truth, especially of the truth of faith."³⁶ In him we see the outlines of the value of radical diversity in the name of unity and a conception of man who can possess only a perspective on the truth.

Throughout this brief sketch of the theological-philosophical roots of the Dutch catechism, the focus was on movements and theologians addressing themselves to the God-man relationship.

Clearly, these were attempts to view man-world-God from perspectives other than the exclusively classical. These alternative world-views had to be constructed. Each person and each movement moved out of a classical perspective and ventured with perspicacity and imagination into unknown territories.

Even though many of these more person-oriented and relational concerns were to find their way into the official documents of Pius IX, Pius XII, and Vatican II, there was tension between the Church's 'teaching authority' and the theology of renewal; and, whenever the two conflicted, the resolution was always in favor of the 'teaching authority' which was equated with neo-scholasticism. Schoof suggests that this is so because "history is to a very great extent responsible for this alliance between the teaching office and the Catholic Church and neo-scholasticism. The Church embodied scholastic theology in her definitions of dogma in the Middle Ages, when scholasticism was

³⁶: Schoof, op. cit., p.143.

N.B. Schillebeeckx, like Chenu, was never to achieve official status as an expert at Vatican Council II.

a distinctively modern mode of thought."³⁷ By the time of the Council of Trent, scholasticism had fallen behind in the development of the ideas of the Church and world. When formulations previously considered unchangeable were questioned in the 19th century, this questioning was interpreted as an "attack on the fortress" and the response was to defend the traditionally stated truths. This was the birth of neo-scholasticism. The Church tried to ignore the theological implications of current events, sociology, psychology, and phenomenology of man in the world and insisted instead upon the absoluteness of an unchanging and unchangeable tradition. From a classical perspective, there was no other way for the Church to see itself as a stabilizing force in society than to manifest an awareness that these "new sciences" exist - but that they in no way pose any threats to the centuries old traditions.

Since all Catholic theologians assume their positions within an already existing and on-going theological tradition, they know that their contributions will always be in some relationship with the teaching authority of the Church. Given the classical world-view of the time - a view requiring that "everything must eventually fit into it" - there was no alternative open to these theologians. There was a basic presupposition that loyalty and contributions were only possible by conforming to the working assumptions of the community and that to venture beyond these, even if possible, would be to no avail.

Unity was indeed uniformity, although certain creative theologians, as mentioned, tried to show the dynamism in the continuity of man's knowledge and beliefs. These efforts,

37: Ibid., p.149.

apparently scattered and even considered paltry in proportion to the needs, finally moved their way into Vatican II where the theology of renewal made itself felt and became a viable alternative and finally terminated the magisterium's exclusive contract with neo-scholasticism.³⁸

Vatican II and John XXIII: magic words in Catholic circles in the 1960s. They meant different things to different people, but their effect on the Church - especially in North America where there were no comparable theological roots to those in Europe - was irreversible. If the leading theologians of Europe had sown the seed of the Conciliar movement, some in North America at least recognized its fruits. It can be said that the North American Church, however, awaited the Council with a different attitude from the European one. This can be seen in the North American responses to the surprise announcement that the Council was to be convened: Rome has spoken, respectful obedience, recognition that it was needed. Although the ideas which gave rise to the Ecumenical Council originated in Europe, it does not follow that the ideas were completely foreign to North American Catholics, or that they were less ready for a Council, simply that they were less prepared intellectually.³⁹

38: Ibid., p.151.

39: Although French speaking Canadians had Cardinal E. Léger at Vatican II, and were more exposed to the European thought patterns, they were just beginning to awaken from the clerical controls which were not dissimilar to those of 19th century France. French speaking Canada could appreciate the movements of Europe not only because of similar experiences with the clergy and Church authority but also because of language. Doors opened for the more gifted clergy: they were sent to Paris to study. Paris in the 1950s was not Rome where the more astute clergy of the U.S. were sent to study.

The spirit of Pope John encouraged changes based on love. The person of Jesus, His Spirit of love, and His Father's life in man, were all to be experienced on earth. They had long been encrusted in the traditions of centuries which had focused on defense of the faith, on preservation of unchangeable truths from error and on authoritative pronouncements coupled with the promise of heavenly reward for all who "keep the laws". The pastoral concerns of an historian Pope who saw the Christian people struggling to bring together both their classically presented Christian traditions and their modern educational insights from science, psychology, sociology, etc., struck sympathetic chords in the hearts of those who were in such a tension. It no doubt confused those who were not in such tension and who saw the traditions only in classical terms. They could not see the urgency of the questions nor could they imagine that the Church could say anything different from what it had already said through the centuries and repeated in Vatican Council I. Space does not permit description of the spirit and tension of Vatican Council II, but mention must be made of the refreshing spirit which accompanied this Council. This spirit, as important as it was intangible, was the soul of the open discussions and resolutions flowing from the sundry committees of the Council. There was a "feeling in the air" to the joy of some and the sorrow of others - that nothing would ever be the same again in higher ecclesiastical circles. The fact that this was not lamented but rather encouraged by the papacy was a new - often confusing - development in the experience of the Cardinals of the Curia as well as for many Catholics around the world. This apparently swift and unexpected turn of events testified to the fact that the paradigms of the community had been long shifting, otherwise the spirit would not have taken hold so quickly nor would it have had the far-reaching consequences it had during those Council years and for at least a little while afterwards.

By March 1, 1966, a mere three months after the closing of Vatican Council II, a catechism which had been in preparation for five or six years appeared with the Imprimatur of Bernardus Cardinal Alfrink of Nijmegen and with unanimous approval of the Dutch hierarchy. The catechism, inspired by 15,000 discussion groups and written in constant teamwork, is considered by the Dutch their national catechism. Neither the purpose of the catechism, nor the way in which it was written, suggests that the world-view of the Dutch was identical to Baltimore's No.2 or No.3.⁴⁰ Neither was it that of the supplement issued by the Commission of Cardinals in 1968.

The purpose of the catechism emerged spontaneously from the needs expressed in the on-going adult education discussion groups for a more mature expression of the faith in light of the

⁴⁰: The Baltimore Catechism No. 3 for adults was edited in 1960 at the very time the Dutch were in the discussion groups formulating their catechism for adults. The No. 3 edition of Baltimore's, only a lengthened version of No. 2, places its emphasis on being "for adults." This is odd, insofar as the catechism from which No. 1 and No. 2 drew their content, seems from all that is known to be finally from Bellarmine's (1597) which was written for uneducated adults, from Canisius' (1558) written for a small, elite group of adolescents being educated in letters, and from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, written for pastors. The strangest part would seem to be that the catechism for "adults" was used for children. It was used for adult "convert" instructions, and in almost all the parish grade schools. Why a No. 3 version for adults, which was simply made longer by more questions and answers, could have been considered helpful and worth publishing in the U.S. as recently as 1960, is a most amazing indication of how exclusively a classical view of man focuses on content as unchanging.

emphasis on renewal and ecumenism.⁴¹ The catechism was destined to be a unique expression of the Dutch people. It had no desire to be any more - or any less - than that.

The catechism was hammered out and chiseled in the workshops of the teams involved. It made its way through initial drafts in a methodical process worthy of the Dutch. By early 1962 three staff members of the Nijmegen Higher Institute composed a 200 page draft for the bishops. Their concern was faith-content, not style. One-hundred and fifty copies⁴² were sent to scripture scholars, theologians, priests, husbands and wives, - people of every sector of the country and representative of almost every profession and non-professional occupation of Holland. The entire catechism was rearranged on the basis of the resulting 10,000 comments.

By the spring of 1963, the final stage began: the reworking of each chapter. It was not until this point that a four man team assumed the main responsibility for editing the work. The team was Rev. William Bless, then Director of the Nijmegen Institute; Gerard Mulders, professional theologian and industrial relations

41: For basic sources of the details of the publication of the Dutch catechism, I am again indebted to Rev. C. J. Neven, C.S.Sp., Director of the Nijmegen Institute, who discussed with me the spirit behind their catechism and to Sister Dr. M.T. Smit, secretary of the Institute, who graciously gave me access to the background material and spent her valuable time sharing the "oral tradition." which accompanied the publication of this catechism. I also use the article written by Ray R. Noll, S.J., "A New Catechism Is Born," National Catholic Reporter (May 24, 1967), Kansas City, National Catholic Publishing, p.9.

42: 75 copies were sent by the bishops, the other 75 were sent out by the Nijmegen Institute.

expert; Guus van Hemert, artist, poet, and final editor of the text; and Jan Hermans, college catechetical expert and author (and later Provincial Superior of the Dutch Jesuits.)⁴³

These four worked continuously for three years, not only with each other but also with hundreds of helpers and advisors. Chapters were written and re-written in light of the flood of incoming comments, discussion group suggestions, and ongoing evaluations of strengths and weaknesses. Father van Hemert's final copy of each chapter was then brought back to the group for further criticism and texts were sometimes completely rewritten before being sent to experts for further advice.⁴⁴

The style and length of the catechism reflect the difference in its world-view from that of its predecessors up to this point in history. It is not surprising that the style caused some difficulties for those who equated catechisms with information giving answers, rather than thought-provoking questions. It is perhaps the authors' call or challenge to the reader to take a position, and to raise fundamental questions, that caused some of the controversy which surrounded the catechism when it was

43: These names are not listed in the catechism. The authors saw it as a team work. The title page of the original edition carries the note (Intrans.) "A New Catechism was commissioned by the Hierarchy of the Netherlands and produced by the Higher Catechetical Institute at Nijmegen in collaboration with numerous others."

44: Ray R. Noll, S.J., mentions especially the chapters containing biblical problems, morality questions and Church as examples.

first published.⁴⁵ To present the basic mysteries of the faith from three or four⁴⁶ different angles and not opt for one single expression as "the only one which is Catholic doctrine," seemed to some an unconventional approach - especially to those who were waiting for "universal" answers and patterns to carry through the directives of Vatican II.

For the first time in history, the RCC as an institution was face-to-face with an alternative world-view truly representative of the Church in a particular culture, yet one not intended to become the "universal" position of the whole Church. It was intended to be exactly what it already became: an alternative Christian world-view which would contribute to the development of the freedom of man as he was given an opportunity to choose and/or to recognize that the classical world-view was no longer the only one viable for the Roman Catholic.

45: Noll, op. cit., page 9, notes that the catechism was not without its problems even in Holland. Its first appearance (October) was highly praised. In November some Catholic laymen circulated for signatures 35 copies of a Latin petition claiming it contained things either in total contradiction to the faith or at least too ambiguous to be helpful. These were sent to Rome over the heads of the Dutch hierarchy. Someone leaked a copy of the petition to Holland's oldest Catholic daily, De Tijd and this fanned the fire. Discussion groups doubled and articles appeared explaining the position of the catechism. In general, the hierarchy felt this was a time in which the Dutch Church grew to a new level of understanding dogmatic problems. Meanwhile, the "left" began criticizing it for not going far enough. They claimed it failed to demythologize the gospel sufficiently and, instead filled it with too many facts, rather than faith experiences of the first century Christian.

46: Noll, op. cit., p.9 lists them as 3 or 4.

APPENDIX III

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE PASTORAL
CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH IN THE MODERN WORLD

The ideas which gave rise to the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World have their roots in the same areas of thought which underlie the Baltimore and Dutch catechisms.¹ There is a sense therefore, in which the Constitution can be appreciated as the culmination and embodiment of centuries of theoretical insights and concrete positions of the Church.

The more immediate roots, however, go back to "John's Council" and, more specifically, to the person of John XXIII. The announcement of Pope John to call an Ecumenical Council for the first time in a century took everyone - even perhaps John himself - by surprise.²

The spirit in which the Council began is significant. It is an example of how a very personal concern for the anguish of the world captured and gave expression to the feelings of most "men of good will" at that time. The idea of coping with these problems of peace and agitation in the world by calling a Council seems to have come to Pope John in a 1958 conversation with Cardinal Tardini in which they were discussing the state of the world and the role of the Church within it.³ John was asking Cardinal Tardini what might be done when the words, "call a Council" came from his own lips. It is recorded that John was

1: (cf.) Appendices I and II of this dissertation.

2: Xavier Rynne, Letters from Vatican City: Vatican II (First Session): Background and Debates, New York, Farrar, Straus and Company, 1963, p.1. N.B.: X. Rynne is the pseudonym used by Francis X. Murphy, C.S.S.R.

3: Ibid., p.1.

overcome with surprise, when instead of a torrent of objections, Tardini replied, "Si, si, un Concilio!"⁴

None of the planning was as simple. The preparatory meetings for the Second Council of the Vatican began in January 1960. There were four planning stages, culminating in the official opening on October 11, 1962. It is, therefore, only within the context of the spirit of this Council, prompted by a personal concern for the suffering world and a desire to have the Church (Christ) serve better, that the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World can be appreciated.

From beginning to end it was no usual document of the Church; nor was it the usual Church which brought it into existence. This document, which was the first in history to begin spontaneously on the floor of a Council, revealed a Church which was, for the first time in its history, raising the question of its place in the world of men.

Yet the concerns which motivated the Pastoral Constitution at its beginning and guided it to its end were the ones expressed by John XXIII in the Apostolic Constitution Humanae Salutis of December 25, 1961, with which he officially convoked the Council for the following year.⁵ These same concerns, expressed in the following excerpts from "Introduction historique et doctrinale" were to be developed and integrated into the Pastoral Constitution.

4: Ibid., p.2.

5: Roberto Tucci, S.J., "Introduction historique et doctrinale", Vatican II, L'Eglise dans le Monde de ce temps, Rome II, commentaries, Paris, les Editions du Cerf, Unam Sanctam 65b, 1967, pp.33-34.

Le "don d'un nouveau Concile oecuménique" est offert "à l'Eglise catholique et au monde," "pour donner à l'Eglise la possibilité de contribuer plus efficacement à la solution des problèmes de l'ère moderne"; "il s'agit, en effet, de mettre en contact avec les énergies vivifiantes et éternelles de l'Evangile le monde moderne, un monde exalté par ses conquêtes dans le domaine technique et scientifique, mais qui porte aussi les conséquences d'un ordre temporel que certains ont voulu organiser en faisant fis de Dieu...en faisant nôtre la recommandation de Jésus de savoir distinguer "les signes des temps" (Mt. 16:4)....

Cet ordre surnaturel doit faire sentir toute son efficacité sur l'ordre temporel qui, malheureusement, est souvent le seul qui intéresse et préoccupe les hommes. Dans le domaine temporel aussi l'Eglise s'est montrée "Mère et éducatrice" Bien que l'Eglise ne poursuive pas des fins directement terrestres, elle ne peut cependant pas se désintéresser des questions d'ordre temporel qu'elle rencontre sur son chemin, ni des travaux que celles-ci comportent....

Tucci points up that this same two-fold purpose of the Council was even more strongly emphasized in the radio-message of September 11, 1962 (exactly a month before its opening):

L'Eglise veut être cherchée telle qu'elle est, dans sa structure intime, sa vitalité ad intra - présentant à ses propres enfants tout d'abord les trésors de foi éclairante et de grâce sanctificatrice. Considérons aussi l'Eglise sous la rapport de sa vitalité ad extra. En face des exigences et des nécessités des peuples - que les vicissitudes humaines tournent plutôt vers l'estime et la jouissance des biens de la terre - elle se sent obligée de faire honneur à ses responsabilités par son enseignement en apprenant aux hommes "à passer par les biens temporels, de manière à ne point perdre les biens éternels".... Le monde a besoin du Christ, et c'est l'Eglise qui doit apporter le Christ au monde.... Elle en a fait l'objet d'une étude attentive, et le Concile oecuménique pourra proposer, en un langage clair, les solutions que réclament la dignité de l'homme et sa vocation chrétienne.⁶

6: Ibid., p.35.

It was this very emphasis on the Church ad intra and the Church ad extra that was expressed three months later by Cardinal Suenens on the floor of the Council. He proposed that the conciliar schema be redrafted on an entirely new basis:⁷ as Vatican I was the Council of the Primacy, Vatican II should be the Council of the Church of Christ. Suenens suggested that, in keeping with the Pope's ideas in the opening talk, the doctrine of the Church could be considered in two stages: ad intra in regard to the nature of the Church as Mystical Body; and ad extra, in regard to its mission to preach the gospel to all nations⁸ or, as Tucci phrases it,

ad intra, c'est-à-dire, du dialogue de l'Eglise avec ses fidèles et ses frères 'pas encore visiblement unis', et de l'Eglise ad extra, c'est-à-dire l'Eglise établissant le dialogue avec le monde, en proposant à ce sujet la constitution d'un Secrétariat spécial pour les problèmes du monde contemporain.⁹

Although the actual shape of the Pastoral Constitution could never have been foreseen at the moment of this intervention, this is considered the moment of the birth of Gaudium et Spes. Although Suenens is credited with inspiring the actual document, it is fondly and usually referred to as John's constitution. He is the one who originally articulated its orientation, and the spirit of its birth reflects John's outlook and basic concern regarding the place of the Church in the modern world.

7: Charles Moeller, "History of the Constitution," Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Volume V. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, edited by Herbert Vorgrimler, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969, p.11; Rynne, op. cit., p.225; Tucci, op. cit., pp.38-40.

8: Rynne, op. cit., p.225.

9: Tucci, op. cit., p.38.

What kind of a history has this Pastoral Constitution which in the end was heralded as the best expression of the whole Council¹⁰ but which almost never made it to the Council floor at all?¹¹ Sigmond¹² describes it as unique in many respects. For a start, it went through five successive stages of preparation and editing, with each stage being completely different from the one preceding it. Its only continuity is found in its constant concern to make a doctrinal or pastoral pronouncement on the major problems of the modern world. It consistently returns to particular arguments, for example, the person, the family, peace and construction of a universal community. Because of its pre-occupation with drawing up a description of man, the central position of the human being as an "image of God" remained throughout every editorial phase. Man is "persona, creatura, spiritu et corpore constans, intellectu ac voluntate praedita, ad Deum directe ut finem ultimum ordinata et a Christo Verbo Dei Incarnato post lapsum redempta."¹³

10: R. A. Sigmond, O.P., "A History of the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World," I, Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church, Bulletin 66-2, p.1.

11: Xavier Rynne, The Third Session: Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II (September 14 to November 21, 1964), New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, p.115.

12: Although the following references are the main sources of this brief historical appendix, please consult the works themselves for a more complete and documented sequence of events leading to the final acceptance of the Pastoral Constitution, for the analyses, the reports of the preparatory commissions, and for the Conciliar debates and discussions: cf. the already cited works of Moeller, Rynne, Sigmond and Tucci; as well as the two other books of Xavier Rynne, The Second Session: Debates and Decrees of Vatican II (September 14 to December 8, 1965), New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1965; and G. Caprile, S.J., "L'annuncio e la preparazione (1959-1962). Vol. I, part I in Il Concilio Vaticano II, Rome, 1966.

13: Sigmond, op. cit., p.4.

Unlike other documents, the Pastoral Constitution was the fruit of Conciliar debates and discussion which extended throughout the four annual sessions of the Council. Its maturation therefore, was not divorced from that of the Council itself. In a special way, it was the reflection of Vatican II. The Pastoral Constitution had begun as two schemata; De Ordine Sociali and De Communitate Gentium.¹⁴ (Discussions on these two took place throughout 1961 and from January to June, 1962.) By the end of the first session, Sigmond writes, it seemed clear that the two principal doctrinal texts would be: "Ecclesia ad intra et Ecclesia ad extra;" the doctrinal Constitution on the Church¹⁵ and that on the relations between the Church and the Modern World. The latter was to be called schema 17 for a while before (in Zurich) it was to become schema 13.

A Mixed Commission was set up to discuss this first text. On it were members from the Theological Commission¹⁶ who were to edit the other document on the Church, De Ecclesia, and members of the Commission for the Lay Apostolate¹⁷ who were there to

14: Members of the subcommission established to deal with this schema, originally seen as one on social and international order, are listed by Sigmond, as: Mgrs. P. Pavan, A. Ferrari-Toniolo, Frs. F. Hurth, G. Grundlach and G. Jarlot (all S.J.), A.R. Sigmond, O.P.; the relator for marriage questions, Fr. E. Lio, O.F.M.

15: Although there is a sense in which the Pastoral Constitution should not be studied separately from the other document on the Church, De Ecclesia, since the latter gives a more doctrinal basis to many of the considerations in the former, I decided to analyze this Pastoral Constitution exclusively and on its own as a theological work precisely because of its pastoral orientation.

16: Chairman, Cardinal Ottaviani.

17: Chairman, Cardinal Cento.

discuss Schema 17. It is interesting to note that one of the reasons given for the difficulties met by this schema in the Mixed Commission is that it was "difficult to make the complexity of the moral, social and international problems...consistent with the doctrinal character of the schema...." Sigmond continues that if the Council was to promulgate texts which would be universally valid for every culture and era, it would have to limit itself to a few general principles derived from human nature, and all the actual and complex social problems would have to be set aside."¹⁸

This first draft was finally rejected by the Coordinating Commission as "...pas encore apte à être présenté au Concile."¹⁹ The main suggestion of the Commission was that: 1) it compose a new text with more general principles concerning the relationship between the Church and the world; 2) it draw its inspiration from the chapter on De admirabili vocatione hominis, taking into consideration corrections and modifications; 3) it set up a special commission for each area of man's relation with the world, and that these be studied in collaboration with experts - lay and ecclesiastical; and 4) it present its conclusions to the Council in forma globali (these could be published as "instructions.")²⁰

In August, 1963, a group met in Malines to begin this work. For this reason, the second draft was called the "Malines

18: Sigmond, op. cit., p.2. Evidently, the idea of one-world could only be conceived as a uniform one and therefore dealt with in terms of "the least common denominator": general, universal, ahistorical principles.

19: Tucci, op. cit., p.48.

20: Ibid., pp.49-50. For a complete listing of the interim texts and participants cf. Moeller, op. cit., pp.12-17.

text."²¹ The content of this draft, in three parts with two subdivisions each, is, according to Tucci,²² as follows:

I. De Ecclesiae propria missione. "La mission propre de l'Eglise est considérée avant tout sous son aspect d'évangélisation du monde, avec autant de paragraphes qui traitent de la tâche de proclamer l'Évangile, de la liberté d'accéder à la foi, de l'évangélisation des pauvres, de l'homme en tant qu'image du Christ, de la présence dans le monde en vertu de sa vie surnaturelle elle-même, résumée dans la divine liturgie. La seconde section... parle de l'influence de l'Eglise "in ipsum ordinem mundanum", soit par la doctrine proposée par le magistère ecclésiastique, soit par l'action des fidèles, qui, placés dans le monde, contribuent efficacement à son édification; elle indique ensuite d'une manière générale, les fruits qui proviennent de cette collaboration....

II. De mundo aedificando. "...nous trouvons une première sur l'autonomie du monde, où est établi....le principe de la distinction entre le monde des réalités temporelles, créé par Dieu et régi par ses lois, et l'Eglise;...la signification et la valeur du travail des hommes;...la nécessité de l'amour réciproque dans cette oeuvre de construction d'un monde plus humain. De l'unification du monde: on part...de la constatation d'une nouvelle conscience de l'unité du monde..., pour en découvrir ensuite le sens profond comme préparation d'une plus haute unité dans le Corps du Christ; pour finir, un paragraphe traite de l'ambiguïté des biens terrestres, qui ne peut être pleinement surmontée sinon dans le Christ.

21: These meetings took place in Cardinal Suenens' archiepiscopal palace of Louvain-Malines starting September 6, 1963, hence this draft is referred to interchangeably as the Malines text or the Louvain Schema. Sigmond, (IDO-C, No.6-3, p.10) lists the principal experts of this draft as: Fr. Daniélou, Mgr. Pavan, Fr. Labourdette, Fr. Lio, Fr. Hirschmann, Mgrs. Ferrari-Toniolo, Ligutti, P. Sigmond, P. de Riedmatten, Mgr. Ramselaar, Mgr. Klosterman, Fr. Tucci.

22: Tucci, op. cit., pp.52-54.

III. De officiis Ecclesiae erga mundum. La matière est développée selon un triple aspect; le témoignage, le service de la charité, et la communion....Le text se termine par un paragraphe de conclusion générale qui, tout en rappelant les dangers et les maux provenant de l'esprit du monde, et en insistant sur la nécessité pour les chrétiens de ne pas rester prisonniers des biens de cette terre, reconnaît l'inévitabilité d'une certaine tension entre la perspective eschatologique et l'obligatoire engagement terrestre et signale aussi le fait que entre l'Eglise et le monde, peut exister un utile échange de bienfaits.

The Malines draft presented, according to Sigmond, almost privately to the Mixed Commission during the second session was rejected as too abstract and imprecise.²³ The beginning of a new, more pastoral, text was now in the offing.

After the Mixed Commission discussed why the original draft was not acceptable, and why the Malines one was insufficient, a new editorial staff was set up composed of bishops and the periti to draw up the next text (Zürich.)²⁴

The staff met in Zürich in January, 1964. This draft, originally written in French, consisted of four chapters and five appendices or adnexa. It was translated into Latin by February 21,

23: Sigmond, IDO-C, No.62.

24: Tucci mentions that the redaction of this text was given to P. Sigmond and that Bernard Häring was the main collaborator, op. cit., footnote (29), p.59; taking part at latter stages, especially meetings of April 28-29 in which the revision of the first three chapters was completed were Mgrs. Ancel, Hengsbach, Ménager, Schröffer, Glorieux, Canon Moeller, Frs. Congar, Dalos, Häring, Hirschmann, Sigmond, Tucci; laymen M. de Habicht, Vanistendael, Mgr. Kominek and Prof. Ruiz Giménez had sent their views by mail; cf. Moeller, op. cit., footnote (32), p.35.

and the completed French text was ready for March 1964 distribution to the participants and lay "auditors" (the latter were present for the first time).

This text received its new title at Zürich: Ecclesia in mundo hujus temporis or, l'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps. The Zürich text is considered the beginning of a new period in the history of the Constitution, "...it tried to conciliate almost insurmountable contrasts."²⁵ Tucci speaks of it as a document which:

...devait avoir un caractère particulier par rapport aux autres textes (Conciliaires: ni strictement et uniquement doctrinal, ni encore moins disciplinaire au juridique mais plus réellement pastoral, exprimé en un langage plus approprié à la façon de penser des hommes d'aujourd'hui, mais pas dans le sens d'en faire simplement un "message". On n'entendait pas parler de l'obligation d'évangéliser le monde..., mais des rapports entre l'Eglise et les problèmes temporels...ne se proposait pas de composer tout un traité de théologie générale sur les réalités terrestres, mais plutôt l'offrir une interprétation théologique de la situation réelle du monde moderne et des tâches qui en découlent pour les chrétiens....²⁶

The direction of research and thought obviously took such a new direction that Bishop Guano, who was later to deliver the

25: Sigmond, op. cit., p.3; Sigmond, (IDO-C, No.3, p.10) lists the participants of the Zurich group as: Bishops Schroffer, Hengsbach, Ancel, Wright, McGrath; Secretary B. Häring, assisted by Frs. Sigmond, Tucci, Hirschmann, de Riedmatten, Mgr. Medina, Canon Moeller, Sigmond drafted the first text of this draft in French, assisted by Fr. Dingemans. Others were the same as Schema XVII.

26. Tucci, op. cit., p.61.

report to the Council in the Third Session, felt it necessary to caution the Fathers not to be put off because of the differences in tone and content from other conciliar documents.²⁷ It was, after all, unlike the other documents, one which emerged from within the discussion on the Council floor and was intended to initiate "dialogue" between the Church and today's world. The four chapters were: I. De integra hominis vocatione; II. Ecclesia Dei hominumque servitio dedita; III. De ratione christianorum se gerendi in mundo in quo vivunt; IV. De praecipuis muneribus a christianis nostrae aetatis implendis. The Appendices were: I. De persona humana in societate; II. De Matrimonio et Familia; III. De Culturae progressu rite promovendo; IV. De vita oeconomica et sociali; and, V. De communitate gentium et pace.²⁸

The drafting committee suggested that the Appendices be prepared and translated into modern languages so the Fathers could better understand them.²⁹

27: "Aequum erit prae oculis habere aliam quoque difficultatem practicam et etiam psychologiam in componendo hoc schemate adfuisse: alia schemata, quae Patribus transmissa sunt, maturescere potuerunt labore Commissionum antepreparatoriarum, praepreparatoriarum et, inde ab initio Concilii, Commissionum conciliarium, necnon meditatione Patrum; pro hoc autem schemate labores initium sumpserunt nonnisi post primam sessionem Concilii."

Relatio super schema De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis (sub-secreto), Typis Polyglottis Valticanis, MCMLXIV, p.8.

28: De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis, Adnexa, (sub-secreto) Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, MCMLXIV.

29: There was an increasing awareness of the inadequacy of Latin as the best language to convey the modern thought patterns of this schema. The "Zürich" document was the one which forced serious discussion of the issue.

The Zürich Commission voted almost unanimously to send the draft to the Council Fathers at the beginning of July, and the document took its place on the agenda as Schema 13.³⁰

The Zürich draft, Schema 13, De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis, almost failed to make the Council floor at all because of the rumors that the Third Session was to be the last one. However, with the relatio given by Mgr. Guano it appeared.

After the text was approved in principle, debate began on each article and chapter and continued until November 5. Moeller summarizes the discussion as centering on four points:

- 1) The absence of any mention of atheism in the Zürich document was called to the attention of the Fathers by Mgr. Guerra, Archbishop of Madrid: "The Marxist ideal is a genuinely human one."
- 2) Why should the Church speak about earthly things? - because dialogue with the world is based on revelation, it is primarily evangelical.
- 3) Person and family - and whatever affects racial discrimination were concerns. This discussion polarized on two different views of marriage. The speeches lined up (in the pattern which became all too familiar throughout the four years): on one "side": Cardinals Suenens, Léger, Alfrink and Patriarch Maximos IV etc., on the other "side", Cardinals Ottaviani, Browne, Ruffini, etc.;
- 4) Culture, development, peace and atomic weapons became key concerns with concluding debates centering on peace, war and the atom bomb.³²

30: Tucci, op. cit., p.69.

31: Rynne, The Third Session, op. cit., p.115.

32: Moeller, op. cit., pp.42-43.

The problem of a separate section of Appendices was settled in favor of having them included in the document. Originally given to the Fathers as instruments for the study of the "conciliar text," the Appendices assumed more and more importance as they became appreciated as "practical" and "pastoral" responses. Without them, l'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps, risked not being de ce temps, and not receiving the authority which they were to have once the decision was made to include them as part of the main text.³³

Immediately after the close of the Third Session the committees reformed and, assured that there would be a fourth session, began working on the fourth draft of Schema XIII.³⁴ The meetings began in January 1965 in a religious house in Ariccia, near Rome. The draft therefore was referred to as the "Ariccia text". The text went through another metamorphosis. Moeller names the people who belonged to the seven subcommissions which shared in the

33: Ibid., p.44.

34: Moeller, op. cit., p.44 lists the eight new members of the Central Subcommission chosen for the Dogmatic Commission as: Mgrs. Garrone, Šeper, Poma and Butler; for the Commission for the Apostolate of the Laity: Mgrs. Morris, Larráin, Errázuriz, László, Fernandez-Condé; Sigmond, (IDO-C, No.6-3, p.10) lists Mgr. Philips as coordinating Chairman, and the periti as: Mgr. Haubtman, Frs. Tucci, Hirschmann and Canon Moeller.

work.³⁵ After the basic texts were tentatively agreed upon, draft four went through six consecutive editings between January 31, and March 29, 1965. This undertaking took place between Ariccia, Rome, Louvain, and Paris.

Towards the end of April, the sub-commissions finally arrived at a general definitive division of the basic text.³⁶ It had the title of Schema XIII: Constitutio pastoralis De Ecclesia in mundo hujus temporis, and was divided into - Preface (#1-#3) which began Gaudiam et spes, luctus et angor hominum hujus temporis.... An exposé on the condition of man in the modern world (#4-#10); Part I (general doctrinal principles): De Ecclesia et condicione hominis (#10-#58): I. De humanae personae vocatione; II. De hominum communitate; III. Quid significet humana navitas in universo mundo; IV. De Munere Ecclesiae in mundo hujus temporis. Part II, (some problems of special urgency), (#59-#103): I. De Dignitate matrimonii et familiae fovenda; II. De cultus humani progressu rite promovendo; III. De vita oeconomico-sociali;

35: Ibid., footnote (66), p.49: Besides Cardinal Cento, nineteen of the twenty-three Council fathers of the augmented Central Subcommission (Mgrs. Blomjous, Edelby, Morris and Seper were absent): Mgrs. Charue, Dearden, Franic, Heuschen, van Dodewaard, P. Fernandez from the theological Commission, Mgrs. Castellano, Da Silva, Petit, P. Möehler. Clerical experts: Mgrs. Ferrari-Toniolo, Géraud, Higgins, Klostermann, Lalande, Prignon, Ramselaar, Thils, Worlock, Can. Haubtmann, Moeller, Dondeyne, Heylen, Houtart, Frs. Calvez, Goggey, Congar, Daniélou, de Riedmatten, Dubarle, Gagnebet, Giardi, Grillmeier, Häring, Hirschmann, Labourdette, Lebrete, Lio, Martelet, Mulder, Schillebeeckx, Semmelroth, Sigmond, Tromp, Tucci, van Leeuwen. Lay experts: Prof. Colombo, M. de Habicht, Prof. De Koninck, J. Folliet, Keegan, Prof. Minoli, Ruiz Giménez, M. Scharper, Prof. Swiezawaski, M. Vanistendael. Laywomen: Miss Belosillo, Goldie, Monnet, Vendrik. Nuns: Sisters Guillemin, Mary-Luke. Secretaries: Fr. Dalos and Miss Besson, cf. For further listings of other members Tucci, op. cit., footnote (81), p.92.

36: Moeller, op. cit., p.57.

IV. De vita communitatis politicae; V. De Communitate gentium et de pace promovenda. The conclusion follows (#104-#106).³⁷

Tucci calls attention³⁸ to the title "Constitutio pastoralis" which is explained in the general report of this Latin text of Ariccia:

Quoad qualificationem documenti, visum est ab eadem Commissione Coordinationis, in sessione diei 11 maii 1965 Romae habita, aptiorem titulum esse: "Constitutio pastoralis". Scopus enim praecipuus huius schematis non est directe doctrinam praebere, sed potius eius applicationes ad condiciones nostri temporis necnon consecraria pastoralia ostendere et inculcare. Altera ex parte, schema hoc difficulter posset vocari "decretum", cum fere nullam contineat praescriptionem. Momentum autem schematis bene exprimi videtur per verbum "constitutio". Quae cum ita sint, iure meritoque convenire videtur titulus "Constitutio pastoralis" per oppositionem ad "Constitutionem dogmaticam", scilicet De Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium).³⁹

The text was translated into the principal modern languages in order to be better understood by the Council Fathers.⁴⁰ Before it reached the Council floor, it had been circulated and

37: Constitutio Pastoralis de Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis (sub-secreto), Typis Polyglottis Vaticanae, MCMLXV

38: Tucci, op. cit., footnote (89), p.97.

39: Constitutio, op. cit., p.89.

40: Tucci notes: "Pour les traductions anglaise et allemande, la notice est datée du 16 sept., pour celles en italien et espagnol, elle est datée du 26 sept., 1965. op. cit., footnote (92), p.99.

discussed.⁴¹ It was already appreciated as a unique document before it was introduced to the Council September 21, 1965. In his relatio, Archbishop Garrone, speaking in the name of Bishop Guano who was ill, spoke of the significance of this constitution: it addresses itself to all mankind - a fact which makes it a document in accord with "the supreme intention and purpose of the Council as defined by Pope John XXIII":

Arduum ferme propositum quod optime a Commissione Coordinationis expressum videtur cum, ad determinandam qualitatem theologicam huius textus, titulum eligere decrevit: "Constitutio Pastoralis", quem modum dicendi Pontifici Ioanni placitum fuisse non dubitandum est, cuius voluntate Concilium hoc existit, et nobis videtur plene modo agendi et docendi Summi Pontificis cohaerere. Optime....⁴²

The debates and discussions were long and severe.⁴³
Mgr. Phillips' careful explanation of the difficulties involved

41: Une conférence du P. N. D Chenu, O.P., devait avoir une importante répercussion en faveur du Schema; reproduit aussitôt dans diverses langues par le Centre de Documentation Hollandaise sur le Concile, DO-C, No.25: "Une Constitution pastorale de l'Eglise, pp.1-13; repris dans Peuple de Dieu dans le monde, coll. "Foi Vivante", Paris, 1966, pp. 11-34. Le Père Chenu y défendait tout d'abord le juste sens de l'appellation du document, qu'il fallait absolument retenir. Notons en passant que cette intervention, comme tant d'autres précédentes du même auteur, sont d'autant plus appréciables, si l'on considère que, à la surprise générale, il n'avait pas désigné parmi les experts du Concile et pas même parmi les experts officiels de la Commission mixte, quoique indirectement, par ses écrits et ses consultations privées, il eût exercé une influence notable sur la rédaction du Schema XIII."

42: Relationes circa schema Constitutionis Pastoralis de Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis (sub-secreto), Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, MCMLXV, p.9.

43: Moeller, op. cit., p.59; Rynne, The Fourth Session, op. cit., p.58.

in writing such a document for "universal" approval is credited with being the insight which brought about the agreement to accept the text as a basis but to improve it.⁴⁴ "The Church", he said, "speaks, yet cannot give a definitive answer to all concrete questions...we are dealing with a document based on faith, but concerned with its application to problems of actual life.... The Council must speak a universal language. As far as the more concrete suggestions are concerned, their non-definitive but guiding character must be made clear."

After the Schema had been accepted in principle, (September 23, 1965) the detailed debates began on each section that same day, and lasted until October 8.⁴⁵ The main criticisms were: that the uses of "world", "Church" were not clear; a greater refinement of the sections on atheism; more clarification on the relationship between Part I and Part II (Adnexis).⁴⁶

When the debate on the floor was completed the revisions of the text began. This fifth draft was to take into consideration

44: Moeller, op. cit., p.60.

45: Rynne, (op. cit., p.102) mentions that Paul VI's visit to the United Nations on October 4 was no coincidence. It was timed to coincide with the opening of debate on the last chapter of Schema XIII: the Community of Nations and the Building Up of Peace. This papal gesture was intended to convince the world of the Holy See's genuine and sincere desire to do everything possible to promote world peace.

46: Moeller, op. cit., p.62.

the oral and written suggestions of the Fathers.⁴⁷ A revised text of Part II was distributed to the Fathers November 12, and Part I was given November 13. Between these dates and the final day of Vatican Council II, the Fathers voted on this text section by section. It was finally voted and officially promulgated two thousand, three hundred and nine (placet), seventy-five (non placet), with seven invalid, December 7, 1965.

47: Moeller mentions that these suggestions filled almost five hundred pages, single type (op. cit., p.60). Time was at a premium. The work was divided into ten subcommissions, one for almost each chapter. Moeller, op. cit., footnote (88), p.63, and Tucci, op. cit., footnote (103) p.107 list the members of each of these sub-commissions as follows.

Subcommission I (Central): Cardinal Browne, Mgrs. Charue, Garrone, Hengsbach, Ménger, the presidents of the sub-commissions, Mgrs. Glorieux, Haubtmann, Philips, Canon Moeller, Frs. Haring, Hirschmann, Tromp, Tucci, Miss Goldie, Sister Mary-Luke.

Subcommission II ("De condicione hodierna"): Mgrs. A. Fernández, Fernández-Condé, McGrath, Nagae, Zoa, Frs. Anastasius a S. Rosario, Medina, de Lubac, Prof. Sugranyes de French, Vázquez.

Subcommission III ("De homine"): Mgrs. Doumith, Granados, Ménager, Parente, Poma, Wright, Frs. Benoit, Congar, Daniélou, Gagnebet, Kloppenburger, Nicolau, K. Rahner, Semmelroth.

Subcommission IV ("De humana navitate"): Mgrs. Bednorz, Gonzalez Moralejo, Garrone, Volk, Cattauri, Thils, Frs. Balic, B. Lambert, Molinari, Smulders.

Subcommission V ("De munere Ecclesiae"): Mgrs. Ancel, Pelletier, Spanedda, Wojtyla, Vodopivec, Frs. Grillmeier, Ochagavia, Salaverri, Miss Belosillo, Sister Guillemin.

Subcommission VI ("De matrimonio"): Mgrs. C. Colombo, Dearden, Heuschen, Morris, Petit, van Dodewaard, Géraud, Lambruschini, Prignon, Can. Delhay, Heylen, Frs. Schillebeeckx, van Leeuwen, the laymen Prof. Minoli, Adjakpley, Work.

Subcommission VII ("De cultura"): Mgrs. Charue, Valloppilly, Yu Pin, Frs. Moehler, Granier, Abbot Butler, Mgrs. Klostermann, Ramselaar, Canon Dondeyne, Moeller, Frs. Rigaux, Tucci, the laymen Swiezawski, Folliet.

Subcommission VIII ("De vita oeconomica-sociali"): Mgrs. de Araujo Sales, Franic, Granier, Gutierrez, Hengsbach, Larrain, Pessôa Camara, Mgrs. Ferrari-Toniolo, Pavan, Rodhain, Worlock, Frs. Laurentin, Calvez, Lio.

Subcommission IX ("De vita politica"): Mgrs. Henriguez, Laszlo, Quadri, Frs. Cuglielmi, Leethan, the laymen Prof. Ruiz Gimlnez, Veronese.

Subcommission X ("De pace"): Cardinal Šeper, Mgrs. Kominek, Nécsey, Schroffer, Fr. Fernandez, Mgr. Schauf, Frs. Alting v Ceusau, H. de Riedmatten, Dubarle, Labourdette, the laymen de Habicht, Norris.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. THESIS

A. Primary Sources

A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, revised edition of the
Baltimore Catechism, No. 2. Patterson:
St. Anthony's Guild Press, 1958.

A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults. New York: Herder
and Herder, 1966.

A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults, with Supplement.
New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.
The Documents of Vatican II, with notes and comments
by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities,
Walter M. Abbott, S.J., General Edition. New York:
Guild Press, 1966.

B. Secondary Sources

Baltazar, Eulalio. God Within Process. New York: Paramus,
1970.

Baum, Gregory. Man Becoming. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

_____. New Horizon. Theological Essays, New York:
Paulist Press, 1972.

Dewart, Leslie. The Foundation of Belief. New York: Herder
and Herder, 1969.

Fontinell, Eugene. Towards a Reconstruction of Religion, A
Philosophical Probe. Garden City: Doubleday and
Company, 1970.

Hart, Ray L. Unfinished Man and the Imagination. Towards an Ontology and a Rhetoric of Revelation. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Moran, Gabriel. The Present Revelation: in Quest of Religious Foundations. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

A Theology of Revelation. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

C. Related References

Augustine of Hippo. The City of God, abridged and translated J. W. C. Wand. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Augustini, Episcopi Hipponensis. De Civitate Dei Contra Paganos Volumes I and II, edited with introduction and appendices by J. E. C. Waldon. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1924.

Augustine of Hippo. Seventeen Short Treatises: chiefly on faith and works. Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. London: Walter Smith, 1884.

Bungener, L. F. History of the Council of Trent, edited with a summary of the Acts of the Council by John McClintock. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1855.

Cannon, William R. History of Christianity in the Middle Ages from the Fall of Rome to the Fall of Constantinople. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent. trans. into English with notes by Theodore A. Buckley. London: George Routledge and Company, 1852.

Deanesley, Margaret. A History of the Medieval Church. London: Methuen and Company, 1954.

Dods, Marcus. editor, The Works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. Volume VII on the Trinity. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1873.

Hughes, Philip. The Church in Crises: A History of the General Councils 325-1870. Garden City: Hanover House, 1960.

L'Institut Supérieur de Pastorale Catéchétique de Paris. Unpublished lecture notes of professors, 1960-1970.

L'Institut Supérieur de Pastorale Catéchétique de Paris. Unpublished "orientations pour les années universitaire" and published curricula, 1960-1970.

Jowett, B. Dialogues of Plato Volume IV. trans. into English with analyses and introductions. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.

Lumen Vitae; curricula development and published changes in courses taught at l'Institut International de Catéchèse et de Pastorale in Bruxelles, 1960-1970.

Lumen Vitae; unpublished thesis and final papers of students studying at l'Institut International de Catéchèse et de Pastorale in Bruxelles, 1960-1970.

Marcuse, Herbert. One Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Nijmegen Higher Institute. Unpublished seminar themes and workshop projects, 1960-1970.

Oates, Whitney J. Editor. Basic Writings of Saint Augustine. New York: Random House, 1948.

Przywara, Erich. An Augustine Synthesis. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958.

Rahner, Karl, Theological Investigations. II Man in the Church. translated Karl H. Kruger. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964.

Sloyan, Gerard S. editor, Modern Catechetics: Message and Method in Religious Formation. New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologica. First Complete American Edition in three volumes. Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.

van de Pol, William H. The End of Conventional Christianity. trans. by Theodore Zuydwijk, S.J. New York: Newman Press, 1967.

II. HISTORICAL APPENDICES

A. The Catechism of Christian Doctrine The Baltimore Catechism, No. 2.

1. Principal Catechisms

Bellarmino, Roberto, Cardinal. Dottrina Cristiana. Rome: Nella Stamperia della Sag. Congr. di Propaganda Fide, MDCCLXXXVI.

Butler, James. Catechism of the Diocese of Limerick, revised edition. Cork: Guy and Company, 1775.

Canisii, S. Petri. Catechismi Latini et Germanici, editionem criticism, F. Streicher, S.J. Tomus I et II Monachii Bavariae. Roma: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, MCMXXXVI

Canisius, Pierre. Le Grand Catechism de Canisius au précise de la Doctrine Chrétienne appuyé de temoignage nombreux de l'écriture et des pères par le R. P. Pierre Canisius, S.J. traduit pour le première fois en entier par M. l'Abbé A. C. Peltier. Tomes I-VI Paris: Louis Vives, Libraire - Éditeur, 1856.

Carroll, John, Bishop. An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine. Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1803.

Cathechisme Catholique. Edition Canadienne. Québec: Imprimé par l'Action Catholique, 1956.

Challoner, Richard. The Catholic Christian Instructed.
Baltimore: John Murphy, 1737.

DeHarbe, Joseph. A Shorter Catechism of the Catholic Religion.
trans. from the German, edited by R.R.P.N. Lynch, D.D.
New York: Schwartz, Kerwin and Fauss, 1879.

McHale, John. The Christian Doctrine. Dublin: Warren, 1865.

Turberville, Henry., D.D. An Abridgement of the Christian
Doctrine on Points Controverted by way of question
and answer. Composed in 1649 by H.T. of the English
Colleges at Doway, revised by R.R. James Doyle, D.D.
and prescribed by him to be used in United Dioceses
of Kildare and Leighlin. Philadelphia: Eugene
Cummiskey, 1839.

2. Related References

Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii. A.D. MDCCCLXXXIV.
Praeside Illmo ae Revmo Jacobo Gibbons, Arch. Balt. et
Delegato Apostolico. Baltimore: Typis Joannis
Murphy et Sociorum MDCCCLXXXVI.

Nilles, Nicolai, S.J. Commentaria in Concilium Plenarium
Baltimorensis Tertium, Pars I, Acta Concilii. Editio
Domestica Privatis Auditorum Usilius Accomodate.
Oniponte ex officina F. Rauch (C. Pustet), 1888.

3. References About the Catechism

Bryce, Mary Charles, O.S.B. The Influence of the Catechism of
the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Widely Used
Elementary Religion Text Books from its Composition
in 1885 to its 1941 Revision. Washington D.C.:
Catholic University Press, 1970.

Newman, Joseph A. "Authorization of the Baltimore Catechism."
The Ecclesiastical Review 95 (June-December, 1936),
pp. 516-518.

Presbyter Septuagenarius. "Why Not Have a Better Catechism?" The Ecclesiastical Review 76 (February, 1927), pp.165-174.

Sharp, John K. "How The Baltimore Catechism Originated." The Ecclesiastical Review 81 (December, 1929), pp.573-586.

Walsh, F. A. "More About the Catechism of the Council of Baltimore." The Ecclesiastical Review 95 (July-December, 1936), pp.274-279.

B. A New Catechism, Catholic Faith for Adults
"The Dutch Catechism"

1. Related References.

Adam, Karl. The Spirit of Catholicism. New York: MacMillan Company, 1935.

D'Hotel, Jean-Claude. Les Origines du Catéchisme Moderne: d'après les Premiers Manuels Imprimés en France. Paris: Theologie 71, Aubier, 1967.

de Lubac, Henri, S.J. Le Mystère du Surnaturel. Études publiées sous la Direction de la Faculté de Théologie S. J. De Lyon-Fourvière: 64, Aubier, 1965.

Jungmann, J. A. L'Annonce de la Foi, expression de la bonne nouvelle. Tournai: Editions Salvator/Mulhouse, 1965.

Leo XIII. Providentissimus Deus (November 18, 1893).

_____ Rerum Novarum (May 15, 1891).

Loisy, Alfred. L'Évangile et l'Église. Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, editeurs, 1902.

Peerman, Dean G. and Martin E. Marty. A Handbook of Christian Theologians. New York: World Publishing, 1967.

Pius X. Lamentabili Sane (July, 1907).

_____ Pascendi Dominici Gregis (September 8, 1907.)

_____ Quadragesimo Anno (May 15, 1931.)

2. Articles About the Catechism.

"Alfrink Defends Catechism." National Catholic Reporter, Vol. 3 (August 16, 1967), p.3.

"Bishop Retracts Imprimatur for U.S. Edition of Catechism." National Catholic Reporter. Vol. 3 (September 27, 1967) pp. 1, 3, 9.

"Bishops Get Catechism." Tablet. Vol. 221 (October 21, 1967) pp.1109-10.

Cooke, Bernard and William Doty. "The Dutch Catechism Symposium: Beyond Baltimore. Excerpts from the Dutch catechism. How Catholic is the Dutch Catechism?" Jubilee. Vol. 15 (October, 1967) pp.14-17.

Coventry, J. "The Dutch Catechism." Tablet. Vol. 221 (September 23, 1967) p.991-992.

"Dutch Adult Catechism to Undergo Vatican Scrutiny." St. Anthony's Vol. 74 (February, 1967) p.19.

"(The) Dutch Catechism Defended." Herder. Vol. 4 (March, 1967) pp.94-95.

"Highlights of the New Dutch Catechism." Catholic Mind. Vol.65 (June, 1967) pp.5-6.

Kersbergen, L. "The Netherlands Have a New Catechism." Living Light. Vol. 4 (September, 1967) p.100-103.

Murray, R. "The Dutch Catechism Dispute." Tablet. Vol. 223
(November 15, 1967) pp.1120-1121.

McKenzie, J. "Sophisticating the Catechism; the Dutch Bishops
as Authentic Teachers of Doctrine." Commonweal.
Vol. 87 (November 17, 1967) pp.201-292.

"New Adult Catechism, Dutch Work Follows Vatican II Spirit."
St. Anthony. Vol. 74 (January, 1967) p.24.

"New Dutch Catechism." Tablet. Vol. 220 (October 22, 1966)
p.1197.

Noll, R. "A New Kind of Catechism is Born: New Dutch Catechism."
National Catholic Reporter. Vol. 3 (May 24, 1967)
p.9.

O'Grady, D. "Outline Dozen Changes in New Dutch Catechism:
U.S. Edition Rolls On." National Catholic Reporter.
Vol. 4 (November 29, 1967) pp. 1, 5, 7.

"Report Investigations of Dutch Catechism." National Catholic
Reporter. Vol. 3 (August 9, 1967) p.1.

Sikorski, H. "The New Dutch Catechism." Louvain Studies.
Vol. 1 (Fall, 1967) pp.359-362.

Sloyan, G. "What About the Dutch Catechism?" U.S. Catholic
Vol. 33. (December, 1967) pp.6-10.

C. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the
Modern World.

1. Original Drafts.

Constitutio Pastoralis de Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis
(sub-secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium
Vaticanum Secundum. Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis
Vaticanis, MCMLXV.

Constitutio Pastoralis De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis
de quo agetur in Sessione publica diei 7 decembris
1965 (sub-secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium
Vaticanum Secundum. Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis
Vaticanis, MCMLXV.

Relatio Super Schema de Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis (sub-
secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum
Secundum Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis,
MCMLXIV.

Relationes Circa Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis de Ecclesia
in Mundo Huius Temporis (sub-secreto) Sacrosanctum
Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum. Vaticanis:
Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis MCMLXV.

Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius
Temporis. Textus et Correctiones Admissae necnon
Expensio Modorum. Partis Primae (sub-secreto)
Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum.
Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis MCMLXV.

Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius
Temporis. Expensio Modorum, Partis Secundae (sub-
secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum
Secundum. Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis,
MCMLXV.

Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius
Temporis. Textus Recognitus et Relationes. Pars I
(sub-secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium
Vaticanum Secundum. Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis
Vaticanis, MCMLXV.

Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius
Temporis. Textus Recognitus et Relationes. Pars II
(sub-secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium
Vaticanum Secundum. Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis
Vaticanis, MCMLXV.

Schema De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis (sub-secreto)
Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum.
Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, MCMLXIV.

Schema De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis, Adnexa (sub-secreto) Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum. Vaticanis: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, MCMLXIV.

2. Related References

Camara, Helder, R.R. "What the Council Could Not Say." Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-2. (1966) pp.1-6.

Chenu, M. D., O.P. "The Church in History: Basis and Norm for Interpretation of the Council." Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-19 (October 12, 1966) pp.1-5.

----- La Parole de Dieu I "La Foi dans l'Intelligence." Paris: les Editions du Cerf, 1964.

----- La Parole du Dieu II. "L'Evangile dans le Temps." Paris: les Editions du Cerf, 1964.

Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Volume V. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. Herbert Vorgrimler. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

de Francisco, M.. "Laity in the Government of the Church." Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-10 (April, 1966) pp. 1-6.

Freemantle, Anne, editor. The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context: The teachings of the Popes from Peter to John XXIII. Toronto: Mentor-Omega, 1956.

Gonzalez-Ruiz, J.M. "Social Problems and Post-Conciliar Theology." Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church, Bulletin 66-18 (October 5, 1966) pp.1-7.

Grootaers, Jan. "The Three Readings of Schema XIII and in particular of the Chapter on Marriage, "Part I. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-5 (1966) pp.1-9.

Grootaers, Jan. "The Three Readings of Schema XIII and in Particular of the chapter on Marriage," Part II. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-7. (1966) pp.1-8.

"The Three Readings of Schema XIII and in particular of the chapter on Marriage," Part III. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-8 (1966) pp.1-6.

Lambert, Bernard, O.P. "La Problématique Générale de la Constitution Pastorale." Vatican II, L'Eglise dans le Monde de ce Temps, Tome II. Constitution Pastorale "Gaudium et Spes". Ouvrage collectif publié sous la direction du Y. H-J. Congar, O.P. et M. Peuchmaurd, O.P. Commentaire. Paris: les Editions de Cerf, Unam Sanctam 65b, 1967.

McCormack, Arthur, M.H.M. "Organization for World Justice and Development." Part I. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-10. (July 13, 1966) pp.1-8.

"Organization for World Justice and Development." Part II. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-11 (July 20, 1966) pp.1-6.

"Organization for World Justice and Development." Part III. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-12 (July 20, 1966) p.1-8.

McGrath, Mark G. "The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World." Vatican II on Interfaith Appraisal International Theological Conference. John H. Miller, editor (Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1966).

Rynne, Xavier (pseud.) Letters from Vatican City. Vatican Council II, First session: background and debates. New York: Farrar, Straus, 1963.

Rynne, Xavier. The Second Session. The Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II. September 29 to December 4, 1963. London: Faber and Faber, 1963.

The Third Session. The Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II. September 14 to November 21, 1964. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1964.

The Fourth Session. Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II. September 14 to December 8, 1965. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1966.

Schoof, Mark, O.P. A Survey of Catholic Theology 1800-1970. Trans. by N. D. Smith. New York: Paulist Newman, 1970.

Sigmond, R. S., O.P. "A History of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World." Part I. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin No. 66-2. (1966) pp.1-7.

"A History of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World." Part II. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-3 (1966) pp.1-10.

Schillebeeckx, E. "Balance Sheet of the Council." Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-1 (1966) pp.1-9.

"Changes in Christian Conceptions Concerning Marriage." Part I. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-4 (1966) pp.1-6.

"Changes in Christian Conceptions Concerning Marriage." Part II. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-5 (1966) pp.1-5.

Steeman, Thomas M., O.F.M. "The Study of Atheism: Sociological Approach." Part I. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletins 66-20/21 (October 19, 1966) pp.1-18.

Steeman, Thomas M., O.F.M. "The Study of Atheism: Sociological Approach." Part II. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Bulletin 66-21/22 (October 26, 1966) pp.1-15.

Tucci, Roberto, S.J. "Introduction Historique et Doctrinale à la Constitution Pastorale". Vatican II. L'Eglise dans le Monde de ce Temps. Tome II. Constitution Pastorale "Gaudium et Spes," ouvrage collectif Publié sous la direction du Y. M.-J. Congar, O.P. et M. Peuchmaurd, O.R., Commentaire. Paris: les Éditions du Cerf, Unam Sanctam 656; 1967. pp.3-127.

van Kets, R., O.P. "The Church and Cultures." Part I. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Number 162 (1966) pp.1-10.

"The Church and Cultures." Part II. Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church. Number 167 (1966) pp.1-11.

Vatican II, L'Eglise dans le Monde de ce Temps. Tomes I, II, III. Constitution Pastorale "Gaudium et Spes," ouvrage collectif publié sous la direction du Y. M.-J. Congar, O.P. et M. Peuchmaurd, O.P. Commentaire Paris: les Editions du Cerf, Unam Sanctam 656, 1967.

III GENERAL BACKGROUND

Barbu, Zevedei. Problems of Historical Psychology. New York: Grove Press, 1960.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1967.

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Kwant, Remy, O.S.A. Phenomenology of Social Existence.
Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1965.

Luijpen, William A. and Henry J. Koren. A First Introduction
to Existential Phenomenology. Pittsburgh: Duquesne
University Press, 1969.

van den Berg, J. H. The Changing Nature of Man. Introduction
to a Historical Psychology. New York: Delta, 1961.