

GRASPING THE TRADITION: REFLECTIONS OF A CHURCH HISTORIAN

Those who have followed the development of theological thought in the Roman Catholic community these past twenty years or more have been struck by the significant influence which biblical scholars have had in that development. It has been for Roman Catholics truly an age of the rediscovery of the Bible.

The same has not been true of church history. For most Roman Catholics, that subject remains a closed book. The neglect is not restricted to the parishes. The university and seminary scenes are hardly better.¹

There is enormous paradox here. John O'Malley has recently pointed out that Martin Luther opposed his teaching of "Bible alone" not so much to tradition as to philosophy's domination in Catholic circles.² But historically it has been on tradition that polemic subsequent to the 95 theses focused as division-point between Protestant and Catholic Christianity. It becomes all the more odd that Catholics have done relatively so little to familiarize themselves with the tradition.

Since Vatican II, the urgency should be even greater. The council, in its Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, adopted a dynamic rather than a static interpretation of tradition. The decision was conscious and deliberate, its consequences foreseen. Joseph Ratzinger stated this when he wrote of the threefold, classically static test of Catholicity framed in the fifth century by Vincent of Lérins—"quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est"—that it "no longer appears as an authentic representative of the Catholic idea of tradition."³ The Protestant theologian J. K. S. Reid correctly understood this dynamic appreciation of tradition as "the broadest and deepest gulf that separates the Reformed churches from the Roman."⁴ Cambridge historian Owen Chadwick was more sanguine. He knew that acceptance of tradition as dynamic demanded study of history: "Commitment to tradition was also

¹ John Tracy Ellis, "In Defense of the Church's Memory," *America*, Oct. 9, 1982, 186-87.

² John W. O'Malley, S.J., "Developments, Reforms, and Two Great Reformations: Towards a Historical Assessment of Vatican II," *TS* 44 (1983) 373-406.

³ Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, chap. 2, "The Transmission of Divine Revelation," nos. 8-10, in Walter M. Abbott, S.J., ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder & Herder/Association Press, 1966) 115-18; Joseph Ratzinger, "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation," in Herbert Vorgrimler, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* (5 vols.; New York: Herder & Herder, 1967-1969) 3, 186-98, at 186.

⁴ Quoted *ibid.* 188.

commitment to history, and a main reason why the study of history was inescapable in Catholic teaching.”⁵

Roman Catholicism has made it a point to involve “tradition” in explaining how we meet God revealing Himself. Reid saw that and objected; Chadwick saw it and applauded. But when we move from theory to practice, the plain fact is that church history, where presumably one finds the tradition unfolding, has not achieved in modern times the major role in the Roman Catholic theological enterprise to which the theory just outlined would seem to entitle it.

The church historian’s ecclesial mandate, but that of other churchpersons as well, is suggested in the letter to Titus (1:9): the presbyter must have “a firm grasp on the tradition.” The tradition is enshrined in the church’s history—or so Vatican II would have us understand when it speaks, in chapter 2 of the Constitution on Divine Revelation, of “what was handed on by the apostles” and then perpetuated and transmitted “to every generation” in the church’s “doctrine, life, and worship.”

There are problems with the study of church history. I propose to deal with three of them. (1) What is the “church” in church history? Through what lens, what prism, do we look? (2) What do history and tradition have to do with one another? Involved here are such subquestions as: How does one appropriate the tradition? Where is it to be found? How is it communicated? (3) What is the purpose of church history? The enhancement of piety? Truth? One hopes that these are not mutually exclusive. But what if they are, or seem to be, such? Finally, what are the consequences if careful study of church history is seriously introduced into the theological enterprise?

I

What is the “church” in church history? There are at least three subheadings. One is as old as the church itself. A second is more the product of fissions and fusions in the modern world. The third has again reappeared after being in recession for some centuries.

In a presidential address now nearly twenty years old, Albert Outler of Southern Methodist University protested what he termed “radical secularization in ecclesiastical historiography.”⁶ Union Theological Seminary’s David Lotz has pleaded for “interpreting the Christian community in light of the Christian world view,” accepting its own understanding of its origins, mission, and destiny and God’s providential care for it.”⁷

⁵ Owen Chadwick, *Catholicism in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1978), quoted in a review by John Tracy Ellis, *America*, Nov. 4, 1978, 315.

⁶ Albert C. Outler, “Theodosius’ Horse: Reflections on the Predicament of the Church Historian,” *Church History* 34 (1965) 251–61.

⁷ David W. Lotz, “The Crisis in American Church Historiography,” *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 33 (1978) 67–77.

Peter Meinhold wrote: "The real subject of church history . . . is the eschatological congregation of God's people, called by Christ, in which he himself is present, intending to give them participation in his divine kingdom."⁸ Echoes sound there of *The City of God*, of Bossuet, and of Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*. Orestes Brownson would understand the approach; it was the way Issac Hecker read history.⁹ But in our day the providential approach, except trivialized into apologetic history, is more clarion call than realization.

For the medieval European, the word "church" had little ambiguity about it. For us, it describes many realities. It has been theologized in many ways. It can be studied from a variety of perspectives and in many contexts. The history of Catholicism in the United States, for example, can be studied within the context of American social or political history. The Roman Catholic Church may be considered as one denomination among many in general American religious history. It can be studied, as in fact I first studied it, as a branch of Europe's church. Catholic church history can be seen in a vertical context stretching back through twenty centuries or it can be studied in the context of contemporary globalization, in (to use Johann Baptist Metz's terms) a world Christianity no longer "Eurocentric" but now "polycentric."

In fact, each of those contexts, and others which may be conjured up, offer different and important perspectives. Since *Lumen gentium* it is hard to see how the Roman Catholic historian can ignore them. But not everyone sees it that way, as the reader of the Jedin-edited *History of the Church* will notice.¹⁰

What is the "church" in church history? There is another way in which the question may be asked. In civil history these days, social history is "in"; drum-and-trumpet and glorious-leader history are out. *Lumen gentium* seemed to signal, if not induce, a similar change in church history when it highlighted the image of the church as the people of God. Not a

⁸ Peter Meinhold, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Historiographie* (Freiburg/Munich: Karl Alber, 1967), quoted in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 22 (1970) 86–88.

⁹ Orestes A. Brownson, "The Philosophy of History," *Democratic Review* (May–June 1843), in Henry F. Brownson, ed., *The Works of Orestes A. Brownson* (20 vols.; Detroit: T. Nourse, 1882–1907) 4, 361–423, particularly 392–423. See also William L. Poirier, "Providential Nation: An Historical-Theological Study of Isaac Hecker's Americanism," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, 1980, and his forthcoming *Isaac Hecker and the First Vatican Council* (New York/Toronto: Edwin Mellin, 1984).

¹⁰ See my reviews of Hubert Jedin, gen. ed., *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* 6/1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1971), in *TS* 33 (1972) 679–80; 6/2 (1979) in *Catholic Historical Review* 62 (1976) 640–41; 7 (1979) *ibid.* 68 (1982) 75–76; *History of the Church* 10 (New York: Crossroad, 1981), *TS* 43 (1982) 532–34. My temerity has not escaped unchallenged. See Hubert Jedin, "Kirchengeschichte als Theologie und Geschichte," *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift* 8 (1979) 496–507; and Thaddäus Schnitker, review of *my American Catholics* in *Theologische Revue* 79 (1983) 36–37.

new notion, as biblical scholars and early-church historians know. But emphasis on the equation of church and people was a model gone out of style at least since the eleventh century, if not earlier. It is back, and at a time when people-history is otherwise fashionable. What then is the "church" in church history? Is it the church of *Lumen gentium*, chapter 2? Or is it the church of chapter 3, the hierarchical church? Or does the historian combine the two, as the council did? How does one conceptualize the "church" in our church history? Is it the *ekklēsia*, the assembled people? Or is it the "hierarchical church," a term apparently coined surprisingly late, in the sixteenth century, by St. Ignatius Loyola?¹¹

Practical responses have varied. Hugh McLeod has a book called *Religion and the People of Western Europe 1789-1970*, which leaves out most of the things I have always thought important in that period, but which I found stimulating and informative.¹² John Bossy's *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850* is similar.¹³ My own *American Catholics* disappointed some critics. We obviously disagreed on what made "people-history." They judged me overmuch concerned with prelates and institutions; I found it hard to think of the Roman Catholic community without them.¹⁴ There are others more clearly immune from the people-history virus. They remain defiantly institutional. The new history of the Archdiocese of New York is a fine example.¹⁵ An ecclesiological sensitive reviewer has described the "church" in that church history as a "serene fortress church," offering its members "an admirable security and sense of well-being and direction." "Ecclesial unity," he wrote, "skates dangerously close to a concept of authoritarian uniformity." The "image of the church is clerically and hierarchically dominated," the "ideal bishop is one who by exercising authority decisively is able to protect the church from potentially destructive and/or disruptive threats mounted either by internal or external troublemakers."¹⁶ There are different "churches" in the writing of church history. The end result depends on the one chosen.

II

A second major heading is that of the interrelationship of history and tradition. If tradition is, as an Irish theologian recently described it, "the

¹¹ Yves Congar, O.P., *L'Eglise de saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970) 369.

¹² Oxford: Oxford University, 1981.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 1976.

¹⁴ *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University, 1981; Galaxy paperback, 1983). See, e.g., reviews by Garry Wills, *New York Times Book Review*, Nov. 28, 1981, 9; and Martin E. Marty, *America*, Feb. 13, 1982, 117-18.

¹⁵ Florence D. Cohalan, *A Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York* (New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, 1982).

¹⁶ Joseph D. McShane, S.J., *America*, April 30, 1983, 344-346.

process by which the risen Christ remains with His people, touching the lives of individual men and women in the church until the end of time,¹⁷ there are two elements to be kept in mind. There is a process, the actual handing down; and there is the content of what is handed down. History records the process by studying and preserving the memory of the life, the thought, and the worship of the community. It keeps safe for our study the differing formulations which the content has known down through the ages, "that series of formulations," in Congar's words, "of the one content of faith diversifying and finding expression in different cultural contexts."¹⁸

A classic example of this approach to understanding Christianity is the *Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America* penned in 1784 by John Carroll, the newly named superior of the Mission of Federated North America.¹⁹ Carroll's essay is an apologetic piece, an answer to a challenge issued by his cousin and former fellow Jesuit Charles Wharton, who had become an Episcopal clergyman. Carroll's *Address* combined sympathetic awareness for the contemporary scene with rich knowledge of the church's past. He obviously took for granted that this was how the thing was done. Church leadership for him meant a personal grasping of the tradition. It meant going to a library, in this case at Annapolis in the heat of summer. He read the Greek New Testament and studied interpretations by church Fathers as well as by current Protestant and Catholic exegetes. The *Address* argues from all these sources and from contemporary systematians, both Protestant and Catholic. Carroll is plainly familiar with the historic life and practice of the church. He knew the classical theologians. Dealing as he is with someone who has rejected church authority, he does not appeal to that source in itself, but only as explanatory of the tradition, and then sparingly. He saw his own role as that of expounder of the tradition and refuter of one who argued against it (Titus 1:9). He did so on the basis of personally acquired knowledge. His approach was a straightforward historical one: to grasp the tradition personally, by studying it in history, and then to use it to expound and defend.

John Carroll was neither theoretician nor original thinker. He simply did theology as he had learned to do it. But, as the nineteenth century wore on, others did construct theories to explain the historical approach: Newman in England, the "Black Forest theologians" centered on the

¹⁷ Thomas Norris, "Tradition: Variations on a Theme," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981) 62.

¹⁸ Yves Congar, O.P., "Church History as a Branch of Theology," *Concilium* 57 (1970) 87.

¹⁹ Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S.J., ed., *The John Carroll Papers* (3 vols.; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1976) 1, 82-144.

University of Tübingen.²⁰ But other approaches prevailed. In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, Catholic concerns had shifted in the direction of substantialism. For Bossuet, variations in religion were clear sign of error. The great Spanish scholastics Vasquez, Molina, Suarez, and De Lugo explicitated what was implicit in the immutable as they proceeded by logical inference to draw out the ineluctable consequences of revelation. From this side of the Atlantic, Orestes Brownson informed John Henry Newman that "there has been no progress, no increase, no variation of faith. . . . What [the church] believes and teaches now, she has always and everywhere believed and taught from the first." He further let Newman know that "if you believe the church, you cannot assert developments in your sense of the term. If you do not believe her, you are no Catholic." Owen Chadwick has rightly observed that for Brownson "sound and scholarly appeals to history were uncatholic . . . historical inquiries forms of private judgment . . . and we must receive our history of the primitive church from the infallible teaching of the present church."²¹

There is need here for the kind of careful attention not always found in Brownson's polemic. Christian orthodoxy had from the classical period of the formative councils stressed the immutability of doctrine. The passage from the letter to Titus already twice cited spoke of "the unchanging message of tradition." But down through Christian history this insistence had been coupled with the kind of historically conscious understanding represented by John Carroll and the way of being a theologian which he had learned in the English Jesuit scholasticate at Liège.

The nineteenth century brought curious paradox. Its middle years saw, as Stephen Tonsor noted a quarter century ago, that regrettably brief reign of history as queen of the sciences. He added that, for Roman Catholicism, history's reign was "effectively terminated by the Vatican Council in 1870" and that it was replaced by "theological systems and system-builders."²² The way in which Catholics believe, and the way in which their church teaches, had another shaping altogether with the nineteenth-century triumph of neo-ultramontaniam. A century later, in the Second Vatican Council, the road came to another turning, as the

²⁰ Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1957); Wayne Fehr, S.J., *The Birth of the Catholic Tübingen School: The Dogmatics of Johann Sebastian Drey* (Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1981); Thomas O'Meara, O.P., *Romantic Idealism: Schelling and the Theologians* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1982).

²¹ Chadwick, *From Bossuet* 5-20 (Bossuet); 21-48 (Spaniards); 171-72 (Brownson).

²² Stephen J. Tonsor, "Lord Acton on Dollinger's Historical Theology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20 (1959) 329.

standing, declaring as it did that Catholics look for God's Word in the interplay of Scripture and tradition, "one sacred deposit of the Word of God," and the interpretative function of "the living teaching office of the church."

Nineteenth-century theologians had tended to collapse the process and confuse the roles. The classic, if perhaps apocryphal, statement is that attributed to Pope Pius IX as he dressed down Cardinal Guidi of Bologna for a speech he had given at the Vatican Council. Pius reputedly declared: "La tradizione sono io" ("I am tradition"), as if the hearer and interpreter had somehow become the content.²³ Not apocryphal and equally classic as an expression of the nineteenth-century mind is Jedin's statement in a book published in English translation in 1981: "Tradition is the living teaching office of the church, which authoritatively interprets and complements scripture."²⁴ Vatican II's Constitution on Divine Revelation had already said otherwise in 1965. If, as Cardinal Ratzinger has written, "the clear antithesis of subject and object" is not in our day as plainly seen as it once was, still, the object has not become the subject, nor the subject the object. Tradition is not the teaching authority—neither as process nor as content. Nor is the teaching authority the tradition. Rather, as Vatican II had it, it is tradition's hearer and servant, "teaching only what has been handed on."²⁵

It is in the recovery of a sense for the role of tradition that church history's role in the theological enterprise is cast. It is, as the University of Chicago's Robin Lovin recently said, an eminently Catholic way of approaching things. Commenting on the American bishops' 1983 pastoral letter *The Challenge of Peace*, he pointed out that it was "not based on a hasty reading of *The Fate of the Earth* and two or three quotations from Amos. It belongs to a tradition of Christian reflection on violence and the limits of power that goes all the way back to the fall of Rome."²⁶

III

There are some corollaries. If knowledge of the church's history is essential to forming the Catholic Christian understanding, it goes without saying that the goal of the researcher must be truth. But there are

²³ Michele Maccarone, *Il Concilio Vaticano I e il 'Giornale' di Mons. Arrigoni* (2 vols.; Padua: Antenore, 1966) 1, 428–29, n. 4. Maccarone deprecates the incident and provides adequate references to historians who agree and who disagree with his position. The story dates from the time of the council.

²⁴ Hubert Jedin, "The Second Vatican Council," in Jedin, gen. ed., *History of the Church* 10, 141. His original text (*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* 7, 143) is "Tradition ist das lebendige Lehramt der Kirche."

²⁵ Ratzinger, in Vorgrimler, *Commentary* 188.

²⁶ Robin Lovin, "Theology and Society in the '80s," *Criterion* 22 (1983) 12.

temptations. One is the temptation to surround the church with what Lord Acton called "an ideal halo," creating a "transfigured Catholicism," which is "a mere shadow of Catholicism, not the church, but a phantom of the church."²⁷ There will be those who question John Acton's credentials. He was, after all, an undeniable liberal Catholic. But on this point he differed not one whit from the impeccably conservative German Catholic historian Baron Ludwig von Pastor. Hearing that Cardinal Gaetano de Lai had remarked "Prima la carità, e poi la verità anche nella storia" ("First charity, and then truth, even in history"), the German historian wrote in his diary: "If that were true, all history would be impossible." And he added the reflection: "Christ said: I am the Truth."²⁸

There are other temptations. There is the temptation to conceal the truth, or even to resort to outright falsehood, in the name of piety. That is the famous scandal "of pious ears." There is the curious epistemology reported as current in Rome during Vatican I in which sometimes "dogma," sometimes "philosophy" was announced to be "conquering history."

Some thoughts of Pope Paul VI are helpful at this juncture. Speaking on June 3, 1967, to the general assembly of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, he stressed the need in historical research of attention to that "demanding mistress," the critical spirit. He added that "what gives history its dignity" is its goal: "It tends toward truth, it is at the service of truth." Later in the same talk, Pope Paul quoted as "the historian's golden rule" Cicero's dictum: "Dare not say anything false; dare not withhold the truth" ("Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat").²⁹

Emphasis on history means emphasis on truth. It also means emphasis on change. How true is the picture which H. Richard Niebuhr drew over two decades ago when he contrasted Catholicism and Protestantism? He argued that "between the polarities of order and movement, of structure and process, the Protestant finds himself and his communities always drawn to the dynamic side," while the Catholic has a "sense, expressed in all his actions and utterances, of being part of an established order of things, member of an enduring and fundamentally unchanging church, recipient of a truth once and for all revealed, believer in a well defined

²⁷ J. Victor Conzemius, "Lord Acton and the First Vatican Council," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 20 (1969) 286; Lord Acton to Ignaz von Döllinger, Rome, April 13, 1870, in Victor Conzemius, ed., *Ignaz von Döllinger Briefwechsel 1820-1890* (4 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1963-81) 2, 314-15.

²⁸ Ludwig von Pastor, *Tagebücher, Briefe, Erinnerungen*, ed. Wilhelm Wuhr (Heidelberg: Kerle, 1950) 695-96 (Dec. 28, 1920).

²⁹ Documentary Service, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C., Jan. 30, 1967, 2-3.

and articulated 'true religion,' subject of constant and known laws, follower of leaders who stand in unchanging office and succession."³⁰ That was in 1961. Three years earlier, on his way to Rome for the conclave at which he was elected pope, Patriarch Angelo Roncalli of Venice had remarked to a group of seminarians about that same Catholic Church: "The church is young. It remains, as constantly in its history, amenable to change."³¹ The developments were already long under way, in the life of the church, in its thought and in its worship, which would crystallize at the Second Vatican Council.

The present pope, John Paul II, has pointed to tensions which have arisen as a result of the renewed dynamic understanding of tradition. Speaking to a group of French bishops, he asked for balance and caution in not offending people's sensibilities. He warned against a "historicism" which equated "truth" with the "perspective of an age . . . its culture, prevailing mores and opinions." But at the same time John Paul also warned of those who "shut themselves up rigidly in a given period of the history of the church, and at a given moment of theological formulation or liturgical expression which they have absolutized . . . without considering history in its totality and its legitimate development."³²

There are, and have been, various ways of coping with the unease. There were Newman and German theories of organic growth in the nineteenth century. The question is one for philosophical wrestling. The historian's consideration should at least provide fair warning not to absolutize the contingent. Clearly, things have not always been as they are now. Clearly also, then, they need not be in the present or the future as they have been in the past.

One neglects history at one's peril. A perceptive observer has declared the obvious: if the unique genius of a tradition is unknown, it is difficult to define a present stand by dialogue with it.³³ On the other hand, the trauma-inducing potential of serious historical study must not be underestimated. The later Modernist Albert Houtin got his church-historical career off to a rocky start with a monograph disproving the existence of his diocese's patron saint. The bishop was not amused.³⁴ There are more serious areas, each the object of current research: the primacy of Rome

³⁰ H. Richard Niebuhr, "The Protestant Movement and Democracy in the United States," in James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison, eds., *The Shaping of American Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1961) 22-23.

³¹ Jedin, *History of the Church* 10, 99.

³² John Paul II, "Tensions of the Post-Conciliar Period," *Origins* 10 (1980) 52.

³³ Michael J. Buckley, S.J., "Jesuit Catholic Higher Education: Some Tentative Theses," *Review for Religious* 42 (1983) 340.

³⁴ The essay, published in 1901, was *Les origines de l'église d'Angers: La légende de saint René* (Alec Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists* [Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970] 24-25).

in the early church³⁵ and the history of the sacraments³⁶ are two examples.

The sacrament of reconciliation has come under recent review. We know that over the course of history church practice has varied widely. Canon 11 of the Third Council of Toledo condemned frequent confession. The "seal of confession" is mentioned first in the ninth century. Ladislav Orsy has written: "The biblical tradition does not tell us more than that Christ gave the apostles the power to forgive sins." He concludes that, "since the church has known different ways of doing it in the past, there is no reason why new ways could not be found today."³⁷ Similar investigations are opening up other areas. A seminar in patristics at the Catholic Theological Society of America convention has led to reassessment of early Christian attitudes on war, military service, and nonviolence.³⁸ In his fine analysis of the frequency of the Eucharist through history, Robert Taft has produced the evidence to back up his warning against absolutizing "one or the other usage." "History," he wrote, "shows the past to be always instructive, but never normative." Tradition is normative. "But tradition, unlike the past, is a living force whose contingent expressions, in liturgy or elsewhere, can change."³⁹

The choice of bishops is still another area where practice has varied, from popular election to today's well-nigh universal appointment by the pope. Some think it unusual that John Carroll, our first bishop, was elected by the priests of his diocese, with the election confirmed by Rome. But, as Canon Garrett Sweeney has shown in considerable detail, local selection of bishops was quite normal practice at that period in church history. The process shifted to Roman choice in the nineteenth century, in reaction to extensive governmental interference.⁴⁰

There is more, but those examples must do for now. I shall make two final points only. I do not mean to suggest that simply because something

³⁵ Raymond E. Brown, S.S., et al., eds., *Peter in the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg/New York: Paulist, 1973); Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy, eds., *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974).

³⁶ Joseph Martos, *Doors to the Sacred: A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Catholic Church* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982).

³⁷ Ladislav Orsy, S.J., "Three Questions for the Synod," *America*, Sept. 17, 1983, 127; also his *The Evolving Church and the Sacrament of Penance* (Denville: Dimension, 1978); John T. McNeill, *A History of the Cure of Souls* (New York: Harper & Row, 1951) 116-17.

³⁸ Robert J. Daly, S.J., "Seminar on Patristics: Military Force and the Christian Conscience in the Early Church: A Methodological Approach," *Proceedings of the Thirty-seventh Annual Convention* (New York: Catholic Theological Society of America, 1982) 178-81.

³⁹ Robert Taft, S.J., "The Frequency of the Eucharist throughout History," *Concilium* 152 (1982) 13-24.

⁴⁰ Garrett Sweeney, "The 'Wound in the Right Foot': Unhealed," in Adrian Hastings, ed., *Bishops and Writers* (Wheatthampstead: A. Clarke, 1977) 207-34.

has been done in a certain way, it must be done again that way. As a norm, that is antiquarianism and hostile to a truly historical approach. Secondly, what I do suggest is that awareness of history demands that we confront the fact of change. A deeply-felt realization that things have not always been as they are, or as they have been in recent times, helps us realize that they need not be as they are or recently have been. The rediscovery of history—grasping the tradition—can then be for Catholicism as fascinating as has been this past quarter century's rediscovery of the Scriptures.

Boston College

JAMES HENNESEY, S.J.