

EPILOGUE

A HALF CENTURY OF *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.

Georgetown University

IT LENDS an eerie feeling, this writing of an epilogue to the first 50 years of *Theological Studies*. In my own person the journal seems to have come full circle. A half century ago, not every American Jesuit theologian was convinced that we should launch out into this particular theological deep. I recall that even future editor John Courtney Murray had reservations: Did we Jesuits (the original intention was to “go it alone” for at least a while) really have the manpower—not simply accomplished teachers but experienced writers? Were there enough potential subscribers sufficiently interested to invest five dollars annually? And remember, 1940 Catholicism was still walking warily in the wake of Modernism’s condemnation. Not to mention a world war beckoning the States ever more imperiously and suggesting that a new theological periodical might not have high priority, might even be foolhardy.

Murray’s early qualms about manpower (four decades before person-power) seemed to some initially justified when the first article in the first issue of *TS* (February 1940) had for author a second-year theological student at Woodstock—yes, Walter J. Burghardt, lavishing ink on Ignatius of Antioch and his knowledge of John’s Gospel. The fears mounted when the second issue (May) continued the selfsame article. To sighs of relief, more experienced theologians were not wanting: moralists Gerald Kelly and John Ford; missiologist Edward Murphy and political scientist Wilfrid Parsons; Scripture scholars Michael Gruenthaner, James Coleran, and John Collins; liturgical expert Gerald Ellard; systematic theologians Philip Donnelly and Malachi Donnelly, Cyril Vollert and Bernard Lonergan; fundamental theologians Laurence McGinley and Anthony Cotter; archeologist Augustin Wand; canonist T. Lincoln Bouscaren; interracial and interconfessional activist John LaFarge. . . .

My recollections (not genuinely a history) involve three stages: (1) a brief word on *TS* editors and some of their problems; (2) a more leisurely reflection on significant articles and their authors; (3) swift musings on how the years to come may learn from and improve on the half century that has fled.

I

To grasp the genesis and continuing operation of *TS*, you must remember that it falls under publications mandated by all the provinces (distinct geographical areas) of the Society of Jesus in the United States. Fairly early in its adolescence its masthead stated that the journal was "issued by the theological faculties of the Society of Jesus in the United States." At that time the "theological faculties" in question were understood to be the six theological seminaries staffed by U.S. Jesuits: Alma College in California, St. Mary of the Lake in Illinois (for diocesan seminarians), St. Mary's College in Kansas, West Baden College in Indiana, Weston College in Massachusetts, and Woodstock College in Maryland.

During its first half century the journal has had but three editors in chief: William J. McGarry (1940–41), John Courtney Murray (1942–67), and since then this epiloguer, who served as managing editor under Murray from 1946 to 1967. For some months after the death of McGarry, Laurence J. McGinley, future president of Fordham University, served as acting editor.

Father McGarry had a checkered career. He moved from professor of Scripture at Weston College (1930–35) to professor of dogmatic theology there (1935–37) to reluctant president of Boston College (1937–39). In a change of status with little if any precedent, he was relieved of his presidency by superiors after only two years so that he might become first editor of the newly conceived journal. This task he assumed in August 1939 at Campion House on West 108 Street in New York City, then the editorial offices of the Jesuit weekly *America*. Plagued with a troublesome heart, this gracious and generous Jesuit left our world quite suddenly September 23, 1941, from the hot 59th Street platform of New York's Broadway subway.

Under Murray *TS* moved from the sidewalks of west-side Manhattan to the open fields of Woodstock in Maryland, where Murray taught from 1937 to his death. In 1970, when the seminary pulled up its rural roots in Maryland and relocated on Morningside Heights in New York City, *TS* was lodged in a large ecclesiastical office building officially titled the Interchurch Center, irreverently dubbed the God Box. In 1974, to the dismay of many a Jesuit and the puzzlement of institutions such as Columbia, Union Theological, and Jewish Theological, Woodstock was closed. *TS* accompanied me to Washington, its offices in the former Car Barn of the District of Columbia not far from Georgetown University, its editor at Catholic University as professor of historical theology. In 1978 the operation moved with me to the campus of Georgetown, where it continues to share quarters with the Woodstock Theological Center, a research institute established in 1974 by the Maryland and New York

Provinces of the Society of Jesus to examine contemporary social issues from the standpoint of Christian faith.

Early *TS* records show the names of subscribers written meticulously in Murray's distinctive hand. My own memory is gratefully cluttered with scholastics (Jesuit theological students) handling professionally the imperative but unexciting day-to-day tasks from finances to proofreading—and delighting in the high intelligence and charming wit of the distinguished editor who was already beginning to put his singular stamp on American intellectual life. Hosting a prime picnic for this devoted staff in Woodstock's woods, Murray offered them a typically gracious toast, sipped the wine in his glass, looked up quizzically, then simply asked in injured tones, "Who chilled the Beaujolais?" The question remained a joyous shibboleth among the staff for months thereafter.

In my early years as editor in chief, it became increasingly clear to me that the original conception of *TS* as published by the U.S. Jesuits' "theological faculties" could no longer be realistically sustained. Not only would the original six be down to three by 1974 (currently two: Weston now in Cambridge and old Alma now in Berkeley), but even more importantly, serious theological work was taking place in "theological faculties" at our 28 U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities—e.g., at Fordham and Boston College, Marquette and Chicago Loyola, Georgetown and the University of San Francisco. It seemed to make sense to the Board of Directors of *TS* (incorporated in 1959) to proclaim quietly on our masthead, "Published by Theological Studies, Inc., for the Theological Faculties of the Society of Jesus in the United States"—no names mentioned.

II

So much for bare history, cold chronology. My warmer memories wash over authors and articles, theologians and theology. I dare not essay comprehensive recall, but certain people and certain moments stand out for their uncommon contributions to the Church's ceaseless effort to grasp what God has said and is saying to us.

MORAL/ETHICS

For openers, take moral and ethics. I recall what must surely be the most significant series of U.S. contributions to moral and ethical discourse: the "Notes on Moral Theology." The Notes began modestly with several pages in the first volume (1 [1940] 190–92, 315–16), more fully with 32 pages (412–43)—all by McGarry (though unsigned), a clearly voracious reader and reporter from biblical fundamentalism to testicle transplantation to restore impaired virility. Through half a century these Notes have ceaselessly accompanied and significantly influenced the evolution of ethics and moral theology here and abroad.

Moral theology assumed a highly critical appearance quite early, with John Ford's entrance on center stage in 1941. Besides the formal Notes which he fashioned between 1942 and 1945, as well as in 1954, he authored a groundbreaking article on "The Morality of Obliteration Bombing" (5 [1944] 261-309). It was a year before the first atomic bombs would demolish Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but the article was prescient. The conclusion of this careful analysis was devastatingly simple: "Obliteration bombing, as defined, is an immoral attack on the rights of the innocent. It includes a direct intent to do them injury. Even if this were not true, it would still be immoral, because no proportionate cause could justify the evil done; and to make it legitimate would soon lead the world to the immoral barbarity of total war" (308-9). After 45 years, with total war threatening total destruction, Ford's arguments are not yet dated.

Perhaps the most effective Catholic moralist contemporaneous with John Ford was his occasional coauthor Gerald Kelly—not merely a master of matters moral but a lover of the unethical Limerick as well. Though inevitably influenced by the magisterial morality of his era, he was not inclined to parrot Roman documents. On the one hand, he respected the fact that "many theologians think that the solemn condemnation of contraception expressed by Pope Pius XI in *Casti connubii* fulfils all the conditions laid down by the Vatican Council [II] for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement," and noted that even theologians reluctant to admit this would have to concede that "this paragraph in the Encyclical makes it clear that the moral teaching given by the Pope is an expression of the constant and universal teaching of the Church on a matter of natural and divine positive law" incapable of change (17 [1956] 324). On the other hand, he noted with customary wryness that "One writer has recently deplored the tendency of theologians to 'interpret' the papal statements; according to him the theologians' function is to explain the papal teaching, not to interpret it. This is a distinction without a difference" (*ibid.* 324-25).

Kelly authored the Moral Notes from 1947 to 1956, and in 1963. He had an uncommon gift for grasping the strong and weak points of both sides of an argument, was unfailingly gracious while finely critical. He covered issues strikingly different in nature: from artificial fecundation, through income-tax reports and labor relations, to professional prize fighting. He dealt with organic transplantation, especially in a mind-wrenching effort to harmonize the morality of such transplants with the rigorous thesis of Pius XI (8 [1947] 97-101; see 24 [1963] 627-30). To his high credit is his revisionist article on "The Morality of Mutilation" (17 [1956] 322-44). And quite sensible for those days was his approach to dancing, still under the shadow of a 1916 decree of the Sacred

Consistorial Congregation. To the claim of certain moralists that "any dancing involving physical contact is bound to cause temptation in a majority of cases" Kelly responded: "Perhaps this is true in some countries; I sincerely doubt its truth in our country" (13 [1952] 94).

But surely *TS*'s most influential moralist has been Richard McCormick. The basic problem that confronted him in 1965, when he yielded to Murray's persuasions to "have a try at" the Notes, was the radical change in moral theology as a discipline. He has recently observed that in the 40s and 50s Catholic moral theology, though "very pastoral and prudent, critically respectful, realistic, compassionate, open and charitable, well-informed," nevertheless "was all too often one-sidedly confession-oriented, magisterium-dominated, canon law-centered, and seminary-controlled" (*TS* 50 [1989] 3-4). Through the past three decades he has been in the forefront of what Daniel Callahan in 1964 called a theological "revolution."

The ten "revolutionary phases or ingredients" McCormick listed in our March 1989 issue are indicative of his own concerns and involvement: Vatican II's ecclesiology; Rahner's theology of fundamental freedom; a quarter century of discussion about moral norms and method, revolving in large measure around proportionalism; *Humanae vitae*; the emergence of feminism; the maturation of bioethics; liberation theology; the person as criterion of the morally right and wrong; the Charles Curran affair; and the effort to "tighten things up" in the Church, especially by authoritative intervention in matters theological (50 [1989] 7-18).

McCormick is admittedly controversial. If scores of scholars say amen to his so-called proportionalism, prominent opponents of this methodological move have not been silent: e.g., Joseph Boyle, John Connery, John Finnis, Germain Grisez, and William May. In these very pages Jesuit Paul Quay took a strong stand against McCormick on "The Disvalue of Ontic Evil" (46 [1985] 262-86), arguing that a basic equivocality in the use of "ontic evil" and its equivalents prevents proportionalist moralists from formulating a self-consistent position.

This epilogue is not the place to appraise McCormick's positions. I submit, however, that he merits regard as a model for moral/ethical scholarship. His contributions to *TS* (and elsewhere) reveal (1) a life consecrated to research; (2) ceaseless search for moral method and fundamental norms; (3) a knowledge of the field unsurpassed in our time, with a rare control of non-English literature; (4) close contact with Protestant ethics and ethicists; (5) accurate and courteous presentation of adversaries' arguments; (6) openness to opposition and willingness to reconsider; (7) courage in the face of contradiction and even slander; (8) books, articles, lectures, and dialogues that day after day lay his scholarly

reputation on the line; (9) an impressive wedding of respect for tradition and historical consciousness; (10) profound concern to link moral theory with the demands of everyday justice, the cry of the poor. In this connection McCormick's examination and critique of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* and his reflections on the broad scope of abortion (35 [1974] 312-59) deserve careful reading today, when the Supreme Court's decision of July 2, 1989, has intensified the passions originally raised in 1973. To grasp McCormick's vision of the moral/ethical enterprise, mull over the following paragraph (ibid. 313):

Abortion is a matter that is morally problematic, pastorally delicate, legislatively thorny, constitutionally insecure, ecumenically divisive, medically normless, humanly anguishing, racially provocative, journalistically abused, personally biased, and widely performed. It demands a most extraordinary discipline of moral thought, one that is penetrating without being impenetrable, humanly compassionate without being morally compromising, legally realistic without being legally positivistic, instructed by cognate disciplines without being determined by them, informed by tradition without being enslaved by it, etc. Abortion, therefore, is a severe testing ground for moral reflection. It is transparent of the rigor, fulness, and balance (or lack thereof) that one brings to moral problems and is therefore probably a paradigm of the way we will face other problems in the future. Many of us are bone-weary of the subject, but we cannot afford to indulge this fatigue, much as the inherent risks of the subject might be added incentive for doing so. . . .

Artificial Contraception

Artificial contraception entered the pages of *TS* years before *Humanae vitae*. But in the 40s and 50s the occasional references to it made it quite clear that such activity was assumed in RC theological circles to be unalterably inconsistent with Catholic doctrine. In the late 50s and very early 60s antifertility drugs, anovulants (e.g., for greater effectiveness in sports), and overpopulation entered the Moral Notes without affecting the accepted moral position. In March 1960 John J. Lynch averred that "the question is theologically a dead issue" but "at the popular level the topic is currently so live as to be all but inescapable" (21 [1960] 227). He went on to say: "... it makes absolutely no difference what the [demographic] forecast may be, since even the avoidance of the most dire of world disasters could not justify the use of intrinsically evil means" (ibid.). In those years the use of rhythm (periodic continence) for the purpose of avoiding conception claimed more space.

A cloud the size of a moralist's hand appeared in 1964. In June, in line with the tradition, John Lynch could write: "It is difficult to understand how one can reconcile with the principles of ecclesiology a conviction that the Church can change the substance of her teaching on contracep-

tion" (25 [1964] 237). But in December, in the context of a controversial article by Louis Janssens likening the use of progestins to the practice of periodic continence, and stimulated by Paul VI's statement (June 23, 1964) that the norms of Pius XII must be considered valid "as long as We do not perceive Ourselves obliged in conscience to modify them" (AAS 56 [1964] 588-89), Felix Cardegna expressed his "hope that the Church will again and more strongly condemn all forms of contraception which destroy the natural structure of the marital *act* between husband and wife, but that it will refrain from pronouncing on the question of intervention in the *generative* system, i.e., that it will allow theologians to reflect further on the meaning of human sexuality and the concept of sterilization. I hope, therefore, that the use of the pills as proposed by Janssens will be allowed by the Church, at least as a probable view among theologians and permissible in practice" (25 [1964] 636). On a lighter note, I recall that a Baltimore newspaper summarized Cardegna's article—in the Sports section, under the racing results from Hialeah.

In our March issue McCormick noted sufficiently the "firestorm that greeted *Humanae vitae*" (50 [1989] 12). Besides his own occasional surveys of the literature on contraception in the Moral Notes, he has insisted that the issues reach far beyond the liceity of contraceptive acts. They touch, e.g., the nature of the Church and the magisterium, natural law, the theological significance of *consensus fidelium*, and doctrinal development. Perhaps *TS*'s best-known contribution to the ecclesiological aspect of the controversy came a decade after the encyclical, when the June 1978 issue featured two forceful articles. John Ford and Germain Grisez claimed that the conditions articulated by Vatican I for infallible teaching by the ordinary magisterium have been met in the course of the tradition, and so a divinely guaranteed teaching is involved (39 [1978] 258-312). Joseph A. Komonchak argued that the controversy over *HV* cannot be settled simply on the grounds of "formal" authority, whether of the encyclical itself or of the tradition behind it, and he outlined "one fundamental criticism" of the argument employed and the conclusion reached by Paul VI (*ibid.* 221-57). These two approaches still appear to hover compellingly over the continuing discussion on the level of ecclesiology.

War and Peace

Born amid the bombs of World War II, *TS* has never actually neglected war-and-peace issues. Fifteen years after Ford's strong condemnation of obliteration bombing, John Courtney Murray penned some penetrating "Remarks on the Moral Problem of War" (20 [1959] 40-61), wherein his probing and creative intelligence lent new life, in a contemporary context

of international conflict, to fundamental questions: the exact nature of the conflict, the means available for insuring defense of the values at stake, and "the arbitrament of arms as the last resort" (44). Recalling that the moral principle of proportion supports war-theorist Clausewitz' "We must . . . familiarize ourselves with the thought of an honorable defeat," Murray insisted that the same principle condemned the hysteria in Washington the preceding August, when the Senate voted 82-2 to deny government funds to any person or institution that ever proposes or actually conducts any study regarding "surrender of the government of the U.S." At that point (55) he appended surely the most pungent footnote in *TS*'s half century.

When "Washington" thinks of "surrender," it apparently can think only of "unconditional" surrender. Thus does the demonic specter of the past hover over us, as a still imperious *rector harum tenebrarum* ["ruler of the present darkness": cf. Eph 6:12]. Thus patriotism, once the last refuge of the scoundrel, now has become the first refuge of the fool. It is folly not to foresee that the United States may be laid in ruins by a nuclear attack; the folly is compounded by a decision not to spend any money on planning what to do after that not impossible event. There is no room today for the heroic romanticism of the apocryphal utterance, "The Old Guard dies but never surrenders." Even Victor Hugo did not put this line on the lips of Cambronne; he simply had him say, "Merde." For all its vulgarity, this was a far more sensible remark in the circumstances. . . .

In point of fact, however, it was the U.S. bishops' pastoral *The Challenge of Peace* (1983) that stimulated the most prolific literature in *TS* on the problem of war. Four pertinent articles were written before the final version. Francis X. Winters offered a dossier of recent episcopal statements on nuclear deterrence morality, suggesting a sharp divergence of approach between Anglo-Saxon nations and Continental Europe (43 [1982] 428-46); a continuing chronicle by Winters two years later uncovered, surprisingly, a striking harmony: consensus on nonuse, some divergence on moral acceptability of threat to use (45 [1984] 343-51). John Langan linked the current debate over the Catholic response to U.S. nuclear weaponry to absolutist and contextualist types of moral argument, concluding that the norms of just-war theory rule out most possible uses of nuclear weapons but do not make deterrence illegitimate (43 [1982] 447-67). David Hollenbach's overview of the Catholic debate reached three conclusions: both pacifist and just-war approaches to the morality of war must be represented within the Church; no use of nuclear weapons can be justified within the present international political and military order; and deterrence policies must be individually evaluated from their contribution to war prevention and disarmament (43 [1982]

577–605). William V. O'Brien analyzed nuclear deterrence and defense under the just-war principle, concluding that a counterforce nuclear deterrence/defense policy combined with new defensive systems could meet just-war requirements and provide a long-term basis for free-world security and arms control (44 [1983] 191–220).

The definitive version of the pastoral hardly slowed *TS*'s interest. Besides regular critical roundups of the literature in the Moral Notes, we published James McGray's contention that, to escape conviction on the charge of inconsistency, the American bishops must separate deterrence from an intent to use; otherwise we are left in an occasion of appalling sin, at best justifiable for a brief period because there is no alternative (46 [1985] 700–710). O'Brien returned to the fray with an effort to demonstrate the relevance of just-war doctrine to counterterror deterrence/defense, drawing on examples from recent Israeli and U.S. practice (48 [1987] 647–75).

But the essay that provoked more discussion than any of the above was a rigorous rejoinder to the pastoral in 1987 by Sir Michael Quinlan (actually composed in 1984, after the writer had moved on from service in Britain's Ministry of Defence and therefore a personal document in no way expressive of UK Government policy). Quinlan argued (48 [1987] 3–24) that the position taken by the bishops on nuclear deterrence (possession permissible, but virtually all use condemned) is logically and practically incoherent. If the significance of nuclear weapons for warfare is rightly grasped, he claimed, it can be seen that the considerations (notably an escalation risk) by which the pastoral rules out use have not the absolute force claimed for them. The same year Winters, while sharing Quinlan's skepticism about the long-term adequacy of the bishops' formula, found his assertion of logical incoherence "uncharacteristically precipitous" (48 [1987] 517–26). Quinlan is unconvinced.

Medicomoral Issues

One of *TS*'s consistently impressive contributions to church and society has been its high-level involvement in medicomoral issues. Here we have profited in the past from theologians like Kelly and Connery, Ford and Farraher, McCormick and Lynch, Springer and O'Donnell, who could write knowledgeably about sterilization, organ transplants, experimentation on children, "sex change," abortifacients, ordinary and extraordinary medical procedures, and in the process develop a *TS* tradition that would carry us into the present age of mind-boggling engineering, where Lisa Cahill can speak persuasively on seriously abnormal newborns, William Spohn on moral dimensions of AIDS, Edward Vacek on reproductive technology, Thomas Shannon and James Walter on with-

drawal of medical nutrition and hydration, Franciscan brother and M.D. Daniel Sulmasy on transplanting fetal tissue into the brains of adult patients. The power over the human body that the sciences increasingly command compels theologians to take seriously the Christological challenge posed in this issue of *TS* by Jesuit Robert Brungs, director of the Institute for Theological Encounter with Science and Technology:

The human body, and hence the human person, is going to be "transfigured" one way or another—through the power of God and/or through the power and genius of human beings. . . . Does the conformity of our bodied form to [Jesus'] . . . militate against any significant changing of that form through the use of the technologies we are gathering to ourselves? . . . Does [Christ's incarnation, death, and resurrection] help us in determining the extent to which we may deliberately alter the body, and hence the person? We know that there are faith limits to living in the community of God. We know that there are moral limits to such living. Now, in the light of our growing biotechnological capacity, we must ask if there are physical limits to that living in God's community.

Before leaving the moral scene, I must mention the special issue (March 1974) on population. Intrastaff discussions, consultations with United Nations personnel and other agencies, and contact with mounds of literature gradually clarified the specific role *TS* could play in World Population Year. Our articles set forth the demographic background, opened up the new population debate, looked at population policy from the perspective of resource consumption, recommended a strategy for the Church, examined the notion of human rights in four traditions, studied the role of housewives and mothers in human development, explored a contraceptive culture's implications for sex and family, and challenged the Catholic hierarchy to approach the problem with broad vision, in all its dimensions. In the "Now it can be told" department, it may be of historical interest to reveal that the editor was requested by the Vatican Secretariat of State, via Jesuit channels, not to publish the "challenge" article on the responsibility of the magisterium (which the respected episcopal author had sent in manuscript to Rome FYI). On receiving the telex from Rome, the editor was able to respond with restrained happiness: the issue was mailed out yesterday. At which dear Father Pedro Arrupe, superior general of the Jesuits, is reliably reported to have exclaimed, "Oh, thank God!"

SYSTEMATICS

Turn now to systematics. I recall Bernard Lonergan's five articles on the concept of *Verbum* in Aquinas (1946, 1947, 1949). In those days it seemed to some of us benighted folk that, while with Lonergan *TS* might

well be clambering up unscaled theological heights, we could easily lose hundreds of subscribers unaccustomed to such rarefied air. As it turned out, we were not submerged with cancellations, and we had been privileged to usher in the rich effort of one of our century's most remarkable thinkers to understand as Aquinas understood, a methodology that "unites the ideals of the old-style manual written *ad mentem Divi Thomae* and, on the other hand, the ideal of contemporary historical study" (10 [1949] 389). Little wonder that, as the years went on, we were, if not swamped, at least peppered, with requests to use these seminal articles and even to reprint them in book form.

Church and State

Writ large in my mind and heart is John Courtney Murray's agonizing effort, largely through the pages of this journal, to uncover the authentic Catholic tradition on church and state. The "received" tradition involved "thesis and hypothesis." The thesis is the ideal. Given that the Catholic Church is the only true religion, it alone has a strict right to public existence and expression; error has no rights. Wherever possible, therefore, Catholicism should be recognized as sole religion of the state, and public expression of religious error should be repressed by governmental intervention. The hypothesis obtains in a situation, e.g. Catholic minority status, where such legal establishment and intolerance are impossible. Here the Church accepts the constitutional situation as the lesser of two evils, without approving it.

Murray was convinced that the "received" position had confused permanent principles with historical relativities. His historical consciousness and theological sophistication—e.g., in rigorous research from Gelasius I through John of Paris and Robert Bellarmine to Leo XIII—persuaded him that no constitutional relationship between church and state is the theologically necessary, permanently valid, unalterably ideal realization of Catholic principles. Catholicism's essential claim on the state—the freedom of the Church—does not by intrinsic exigence require political embodiment in a religion of the state.

Within this context Murray found it possible to adapt church-state doctrine to the constitutional structure, political institutions, and ethos of freedom characteristic of the democratic state, especially as exemplified in the United States Constitution and political system. His efforts to demonstrate the difference between U.S. church-state separation and the antireligious secularism of Continental democracy; his insight into the development of church-state doctrine as the temporal order has progressively grown into its natural autonomy; his insistence that repres-

sion of religious sects does not lie per se within the state's competence, that citizenship and accompanying rights are grounded not in religious belief but in a political reality—these and related departures from the regnant theology were vigorously resisted by a core of Catholic theologians in the U.S. (Francis Connell, Joseph Clifford Fenton, and George Shea come prominently to mind) and eyed with suspicion in Rome (by Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani in particular). By 1955 this opposition resulted in especially strict censorship of his writings on church-state issues and his decision, fortunately not permanent, to abandon research and publication in these areas.

I recall the bleak spring day in 1955 when I watched Murray sift out the books on his shelves at Woodstock in Maryland. *These* books would stay: they dealt with grace and the Trinity, with education or social issues, with the old humanities and the new atheism. But *those* would go—back to the Woodstock library: they dealt with religious freedom, with church and state, with Catholicism and the American proposition. His research was indeed incomplete, but before he could present his ideas to his peers for challenge and criticism, they would have to undergo a prior critique—in Rome. And recent experience had revealed a Rome officially and powerfully hostile to him and his ideas. With his love for the Church of Christ and the Society of Jesus, Murray felt that he could not disobey. But with his love for truth and the human person, he did not see how he could operate honestly in such chains. So he cleared his room—as he wrote later—“in symbol of retirement, which I expect to be permanent. And all other practical measures will be taken to close the door on the past 10 years, leaving all their mistakeness to God.”

Ten years later, December 7, 1965, Pope Paul VI affixed his signature to Vatican II's Declaration on Religious Freedom—a document that carried the imprint of Murray's mind, sealed with conciliar sanction some of his most significant and controversial research, and stamped with authority his work as an “expert” at the Council. About the same time, in what John told me was one of the most moving moments in his experience, he stood proud and tall at the main altar in St. Peter's with theologians of similar stature and suffering like Yves Congar and Henri de Lubac, and by papal invitation celebrated with Paul VI the Eucharist of our reconciliation with God and with one another.

If *TS* had done no more for the Church and the world than publish the fruit of Murray's research on church-state issues between 1945 and 1966, it could have closed its theological shop at his death and murmured gratefully, “It is very good” (see Gen 1:31).

God, Christ, Mary

Happily, Lonergan and Murray are but two instances of the large role speculative theology played in *TS* before Vatican II. Profound thinking on the Trinity, on human union with the triune God, and on "proper" relations to each of the three Persons was translated into print by Malachi Donnelly and Philip Donnelly, by P. De Letter and François Bourassa—with extraordinary attention to Maurice de la Taille and his "created actuation by Uncreated Act." But since then, Trinitarian speculation and God-talk in *TS*, while still concerned to some extent with the problem of Trinitarian "persons" and "proper" missions, with a triune God in "real relation" to creation and with humans relating to each Person, has focused in large measure on Christology and the Holy Spirit: the God who reveals God's self in the "condescension" of the Word, NT Christology, the theological significance of the earthly Jesus, Chalcedon in the late 20th century, the Christology of the mystics, Christology in Latin America, a Trinitarian theology of the Spirit, Spirit Christology, and the "incarnation" of the Holy Spirit in Christ. Interestingly, divinity as process has claimed a fair measure of attention, even warm dispute (Anthony Kelly, Norman Pittenger, David Burrell, Philip Devenish, Bernard Lee, Joseph Bracken, J. J. Mueller). Do I detect a significant shift away from "God in God's self" to "God for us"?

Mariology in *TS* recaptures in large measure (but not fully) the movement in theology from defense of privileges (Mary in herself) to the significance of Mary in the divine scenario for redemption (Mary for us). I can recapture five significant moments (besides the virginal-conception discussion I shall mention under Scripture). First, William McGarry's two-part article in 1940–41 on "A Fundamental Principle in Mariology" was concerned with Mary's consummate sanctity. Second, Paul Palmer's 1954 article on "Mary in Protestant Theology and Worship" focused on Max Thurian's request to his coreligionists to put aside their fears of the Virgin Mary, to call her "blessed" in harmony with her prophecy, no longer to think it improper to ask her intercession. Third, Raymond Brown's short 1975 article on women in the Fourth Gospel spoke presciently of Mary and John as models of discipleship. Fourth, in 1980 Patrick Bearsley argued for Mary as the perfect disciple, a paradigm unifying various facets of the mystery of Mary. Fifth, Elizabeth Johnson's September 1989 essay on "Mary and the Female Face of God" gleaned from the Marian tradition female metaphors suitable for use in thinking about God.

Ecclesiology

In September Avery Dulles surveyed "the ecclesiological harvest" of the past half century within Catholic theology, concentrating on comprehensive works that represent creative contributions. Happily, Dulles himself has been our most prolific single contributor in the area that links revelation, faith, ecclesiology, and ecumenism. From his first submission, on Paul Tillich in 1956, he has graced our pages with 14 articles consummately clear ('tis not always thus, even in *TS*), wedding tradition to a fine feel for development, ecumenical openness with a strong sense of where the doctrinal buck stops. I have never ceased to learn from him—perhaps most profoundly from his study of the five dominant approaches to revelation, where he concludes that in Christ the five aspects coalesce into a kind of unity, but insists that the first four (propositional, historical, mystical, dialectical) are reconciled and held in unity through the fifth, the symbolic (41 [1980] 51–73).

Liberation Theology

Back in 1948, Jesuit Gustave Weigel was just beginning to teach at Woodstock College after 12 years in Chile. On a brief vacation—or so he thought—in the States, this highly popular and influential gringo had been informed by high ecclesiastical authority in Santiago that his return was undesirable. His first article in *TS*, that same year, dealt with "Theology in South America." In six pages (9 [1948] 561–66) he admitted, in clear but sympathetic tones, that "South American theology. . . has made no transcendental contribution," that "no great movements can be discerned," that "hardly any South American name rings familiar to northern theologians," (561), that there was "no organ dedicated exclusively to theological studies" (564), that genuine scholarship was hampered by lack of time and organized instruments of research, by multiple ministries devolving on theologians from shortage of priests, by publishing houses uninterested in scholarly publications, by a cultural evolution that made metaphysical penetration, scientific method, and analytical thought uncongenial to the *Sudamericano*. Weigel concluded: "If and when the environment comes to esteem the value of scholarship, there will come forth at once notable contributions. . ." (566). Weigel was, as always, soberly optimistic, but I suspect that even he would have been surprised by the turn South American theology took not long after his untimely death in 1964.

In June 1970, after listening (as a *peritus*) to a young theologian addressing a partly skeptical meeting of North and Latin American bishops in Miami, I requested his paper for *TS*. The theologian was Gustavo Gutiérrez; his paper, "Notes for a Theology of Liberation" (31

[1970] 243–61). The *TS* article was, I believe, his English-language introduction to the States. A description of the Church's ways of being present in "the only continent of underdeveloped and oppressed peoples who are in a majority Christians" (243) led him to reflect, in the light of faith, on the Church's mission there. The article was then theological dynamite; not every theologian would sing amen; but I was persuaded that the Church could not avoid this challenge from a socioeconomic situation where the rich were growing richer and the poor becoming poorer, with little hope for a more human or Christian existence.

Within three years Gutiérrez' overture had begun to stimulate many a movement in *TS*. Phillip Berryman described passionately the social and ecclesial context of developing Latin American theology (34 [1973] 357–95). T. Howland Sanks and Brian Smith, concentrating on the experience of the Chilean Church over 15 years, examined the ecclesiology of liberation theology and analyzed the new structural and behavioral components that this theology legitimates for the Church (38 [1977] 3–38). Two articles by Alfred Hennelly found Juan Luis Segundo posing a sharp challenge to "academic" or "classical" theology in the West, and spoke to the fundamental problem of theology's structure, method, and content dividing North and South (38 [1977] 125–35, 709–35). Sanks returned with an effort to situate liberation theology within a larger stream by comparing it (similarities and differences) to the Social Gospel movement in the U.S. (41 [1980] 668–82). Michael Cook raised the question whether a Christology indigenous to Latin America is possible, found inadequate the Christologies till then produced, and sought to articulate the conditions that would enable such a Christology (44 [1983] 258–87). A by-product of an article by Marcello do C. Azevedo on basic ecclesial communities (46 [1985] 601–20) was the realization that "liberation theologies are a meaningful and important way to approach and understand BECs" (601). In an uncommon contribution Paul Ritt probed the meaning of Jesus' lordship in the Christologies of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Jon Sobrino, sketched the differences and similarities in the mystical approach of the former and the political orientation of the latter, and suggested a synthesis (49 [1988] 709–29).

Hardly impertinent to this movement gradually polarizing the Church was Francis Schüssler Fiorenza's profound essay "The Church's Religious Identity and Its Social and Political Mission" (43 [1982] 197–225). Taking as starting point the interpretative and functional role of religion, he explained how the social mission can be proper to, and constitutive of, the Church's religious identity.

Theology and Cultures

Latin American liberation theology involves a broader context. In December 1979 we published the final English text (the first in any language) of an address delivered by Karl Rahner the preceding April at the Weston School of Theology. Titled "Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II," this groundbreaker proclaimed a startling thesis: Vatican II is, in a rudimentary form, the Church's first official self-actualization as a world church ("for the first time a world-wide Council with a world-wide episcopate came into existence and functioned independently"); and this break or transition has only one genuine parallel in church history, i.e. when the Church changed from a church of the Jews to a church of the Gentiles.

In response to my measured (read "slow") response to Rahner's implicit challenge, Justin Ukpong of Nigeria offered a synthesis of the background and content of African inculturation theology, African black theology, and African liberation theology (three major theological currents that had emerged in the preceding two decades), evaluated them, and showed how they can contribute to universal Christian theology (45 [1984] 501-36). Two years later Gerald Arbuckle argued from the Philippines that to relate their thinking to the cultures of people, theologians need the assistance of social or cultural anthropologists (47 [1986] 428-47). A year later Raymond Moloney, then seconded from Dublin to Nairobi, examined how the growing phenomenon of African theology affects Christology in particular (48 [1987] 505-15). The same year Francis Clooney and three collaborators (all with extensive research in Indian religions) introduced some major themes of particular theological interest: the development of Hinduism in the intersection of pan-Indian and local traditions; the knowability of God in Hindu rational theology; a reappraisal of the value of theological anthropology in light of Buddhist notions of the human person; the usefulness/limitations of certain anthropological/history-of-religions categories in organizing information about religion (48 [1987] 677-710). Robert Schreiter's article in the present issue explores some major approaches to faith-and-culture, hindrances to theological development, and challenges for the years ahead.

SCRIPTURE

I have long been persuaded that, if only for limitations of space, priority in *TS* should be given to those biblical articles that have a more immediate pertinence for theology. We were not always so inclined. In 1953-54, e.g., learned Jesuit biblicist Mitchell Dahood honored our pages with four impressive philological notes, including "Ugaritic *drkt* and Biblical *derek*." But increasingly our eyes have looked with special favor on

theological significance. Under such an understanding of *TS*'s role, we published in the last two decades articles on, e.g., Scripture as the Word of God; the use of Scripture in theology; the theological meaning of the canon; NT Christology; the historical Jesus' call to faith; Jesus' approach to death; the soteriological value of Jesus' death in Luke-Acts; divorce texts in Matthew and Paul; what Jesus himself did toward founding the Church; the parable of the Pounds and Lucan anti-Semitism.

All these are genuine contributions to theology. But a handful of scriptural articles hold a special place in my editorial memory. Etched deeply is Raymond Brown's inaugural lecture at Union Theological Seminary in New York on the virginal conception of Jesus, published (33 [1972] 3-34) at a time when Catholic columnists and editorial writers were damning him and his carefully nuanced presentation without having the text before them, when he was charged in print with reliving Herod and his party "who sought the death of the Child," and it was even suggested that Brown and his kind "have a secret death-wish against the Divine Child." Publication in *TS* did not soften the hard-liners, but it did open Brown's position and argument to objective analysis. Two indications of the pastoral concern that is never far from Brown's scholarship are his struggle to recover the meaning the Our Father had for the early Church after Jesus' resurrection, emphasizing the prayer's eschatological yearning (22 [1961] 175-208), and his "Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel," with its insightful ending: "... John has left us with one curious note of incompleteness: the disciples [in the episode of the Samaritan woman], surprised at Jesus' openness with a woman, still did not dare to ask him, 'What do you want of a woman?' (4:27). That may well be a question whose time has come in the Church of Jesus Christ" (36 [1975] 688-99, at 699).

Most helpful of all scriptural scholars on a continuing basis has been Joseph Fitzmyer. Not only his many reviews, crafted of uncommon knowledge and a no-wasted-words style; not only his ever-available advice to a harried editor; but even more significantly some full-length articles of lasting worth to theology. I recall his translation of, and illuminating commentary on, the Biblical Commission's instruction on the historical truth of the Gospels, particularly important for the "three stages" of the Gospel tradition (25 [1964] 386-408). I recall his thorough examination of the biblical evidence on the virginal conception, largely confirming Brown's research while disagreeing at several points (34 [1973] 541-75). I recall his effort to sort out what the NT has to say about the ascension of Christ and Pentecost, to deepen our theological understanding of two intimately connected events (45 [1984] 409-40). I recall his translation of the Biblical Commission's 1984 document *Bible et christologie*, with

useful commentary on the Commission's assessment of eleven modern approaches to Christology and his own attempt to summarize the total biblical testimony to Jesus Christ and his mission (46 [1985] 407-79). I recall how, earlier this year, he defended the historical-critical method and explained its role in the life of the Church (50 [1989] 244-59).

A precious scholarly quality I admire in both Brown and Fitzmyer is that, for all their critical acumen, they rarely, if ever, take away without giving us something even better.

Though heavy in our pages, historical criticism has not blocked fresh approaches to interpretation. For example, Sandra Schneiders has suggested the contribution which contemporary philosophical hermeneutics, especially as developed by H.-G. Gadamer, might make to an understanding of the biblical text, even by God's "little ones" (39 [1978] 719-36). Three articles this past June paid scholarly tribute to the role of the social sciences, feminist hermeneutics, and narrative criticism.

Finally, it would be ungracious not to acknowledge earlier contributions by biblical scholars such as William Albright, Augustin Bea, Christian Ceroke, Paul Gaechter, Francis McCool, John McKenzie, Frederick Moriarty, and David Stanley. They merit the gratitude of all religious people for linking the past to the present, research to human living.

HISTORY AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Destined for patristics ever since I was cutting my classical teeth in the Jesuit juniorate, I have been partial to historical studies, especially as history affects theology. Most influential on my future were doctoral studies at the Catholic University of America under a world-renowned patrologist, archeologist, and historian of early liturgy, Johannes Quasten, who revealed day after day the Christian richness hidden not only on parchment but on burial stones like the Inscription of Abercius, priceless for Eucharistic belief before 216. But in my seminary days and early professorial years at old Woodstock (a place and experience I cherish) history did not play an important role in theology. In rural Maryland as elsewhere, the dogma professor handled all matters that concerned doctrine, including the interpretation of Scripture. "Proofs" from the Fathers came mostly from a convenient *Enchiridion patristicum*, designed by its compiler to provide texts to confirm Catholic doctrine already established from magisterial documents, with no indication of conflicting patristic evidence. Nor can I forget the evening after my first exams as a professor. At dinner I mentioned my surprise that a young Jesuit examinee, after citing the Council of Florence for proof of a thesis, did not know when the council had met. "Was it before Trent [1545-63] or after?" "I don't know." "Was it before Nicaea 1 [325] or after?" "I

don't know." A much older colleague broke into my jeremiad: "You had no right to ask him that question. He's not responsible for it." Dogma then hung in midair, unaffected by history.

Fortunately, *TS* has sponsored historical studies from early days. I believe this was due in large measure to the influence of John Courtney Murray: (1) his singular methodology in teaching the Trinity at Woodstock, moving from the scriptural "mode" of expression to the patristic, to the theological, to the conciliar; (2) his patient research, published mostly in these pages between 1945 and 1966, to recover the Church's genuine tradition on church-state relationships; (3) his stress on historical consciousness, a recognition of the fact that in every phase of its pilgrim life the Church is inescapably involved in the ebb and flow of history, a rejection of what Michael Novak 25 years ago called "nonhistorical orthodoxy." More recently James Hennesey has maintained that, despite Catholic emphasis on tradition, church history (where tradition is discovered) has been a neglected subject, and contends that as the dynamic nature of tradition comes to be better appreciated, so does the function of historical study (45 [1984] 153-63).

Space forbids specific mention of all the *TS* wealth in this area. Theology has profited from a number of articles on early writers from Ignatius of Antioch and Cyprian of Carthage through Augustine and Chrysostom to Gregory the Great and Isidore of Seville; on subjects as diverse as Roman primacy in the second century, early Christian rejection of military service, discernment of spirits in the early Church, Arianism, medieval studies (exegesis, nominalism, Eucharist, satisfaction), Lateran IV on angels and demons, the Great Western Schism, tradition after Trent, missionary accommodation and ancestral rites in the Far East, American bishops and the definition of the Immaculate Conception, Americanism, millennialism in America, German historicism; on John Peter Olivi and John Donne, Newman and Teilhard, Heidegger and Bultmann, Lamennais and Loisy, Rahner and Balthasar; and a complete issue commemorating the 450th anniversary of Luther's 95 theses.

It may well be argued that our most significant historical-theological contribution in the past two decades has come from three articles by John W. O'Malley intimately concerned with the Second Vatican Council. I mean his argument that Vatican II's reform cannot be understood in traditional fashion as correction or revival or development or even updating; it is transformation, which involves creativity, which means something new—in part, a rejection of the past (32 [1971] 573-601). I mean his related question: Did Vatican II, like the Gregorian Reform and the Lutheran Reformation, create a new ecclesial paradigm and effectively set it in place (44 [1983] 373-406)? I mean his insistence (1)

that the historiographical traditions which have determined how we understand the relations between priesthood, ministry, and religious life need to be reviewed and revised, for they have failed to take into account the *experience* of the Church, and (2) that evidence of this problem is graphically supplied by decrees of Vatican II (49 [1988] 223-57).

SPIRITUALITY

Between 1954 and 1958 *TS* was blessed with five surveys of ascetical and mystical theology by Elmer O'Brien. Not only did he cover a vast array of literature from Scripture to modern times; not only was he a masterly analyst and critic; he wrote vividly, pungently. " 'Devotion' is a thing in every way good: the total religious élan directly towards God. 'Devotions' are things in many ways bad: means which have a way of substituting themselves as ends, devices that can delude the practitioner into a false security, sweets much beloved by children and old ladies which can too easily introduce an excess of sugar into one's spiritual bloodstream" (17 [1956] 214). And a paragraph (18 [1958] 219) on a study of Fénelon you might expect to find in the *New Yorker*:

[The author] has a schoolgirl crush on Fénelon that has resulted in much mooning about in libraries and in archives, much perfervid literary composition, much ground for exasperation among scholars who have forgotten somewhere along the line what it is like to be young. . . . The pallid Prince Charming that eventually emerges, buttressed though he is with footnotes up to the hips, could not have stood for a moment against the mildest *moue* from Bossuet. In her companion volume, [she] manages to confuse indifference with fatalism, with *apatheia*, with the medieval *quies mentis*, and with *pur amour*—a notable achievement even for one so understandably distraught. . . .

Regrettably, we have not replaced Elmer O'Brien, have not continued his informative, delightful bulletins. Individual articles have addressed important issues in spirituality: grace, death, divine indwelling, mysticism, devotion to the Sacred Heart, ecumenism, commands and counsels, Christian encounter with Zen, contemplation, spiritual martyrdom, American Catholic devotional literature 1791-1866, active faith in the paschal mystery, charismatic piety, Loyola's spiritual discernment, relating to the persons of the Trinity—plus five interrelated articles on contributions of classical North American philosophical theology. And in this very anniversary issue we are fortunate to have Sandra Schneiders charting the progress of the discipline called "spirituality" in coming to grips with basic questions (e.g., relation to lived experience, to theology, to other areas of inquiry, to praxis). Still, I miss Elmer O'Brien—the warm, gently mocking smile he brought to spirituality.

ECUMENICAL THEOLOGY

Before the close of Vatican II the ecumenical face of *TS* showed itself only in Roman Catholic presentations: several early articles on interdenominational/interdenominational co-operation; appraisals of prominent figures such as Barth, Bultmann, Bishop Joseph Butler, Cullmann, Heidegger, Carl Henry, Pittenger, and Tillich (even Norman Vincent Peale's gospel of "Christ successful"); the question of prohibited books; the validity and fruitfulness of Protestant preaching; Trent and German Protestants.

Striking change can be dated from 1967, when the September issue commemorated the 450th anniversary of Luther's 95 theses with five articles linking the then and the now—and two of the five essays were authored by Protestant scholars: my dear friend the learned and devout Arthur Carl Piepkorn and Stanford's Reformation scholar Lewis Spitz. From then on, if not a spate of articles by non-Romans, an impressive two-score authors (some appearing several times): e.g., Eugene Borowitz, J. Robert Nelson, Norman Pittenger, Peter Berger, Langdon Gilkey, Schubert Ogden, Roger Hazelton, James White, Robert Wilken, James Childress, Leonard Sweet, George Huntston Williams, Paul Ramsey, Jack Sanders, Donald McKim, Gilbert Meilaender, James Gustafson, Philip Devenish, Phyllis Trible, and John Meyendorff.

THE FEMININE FACE OF *TS*

March 1971 saw the first article by a woman in *TS*: J. Massingberd Ford's biblical essay on "speaking in tongues" (to our slight credit, we did have book reviews by women before then). Ford was followed the following year by Rosemary Radford Ruether's effort to reconstruct the basic symbol system of Christian theology in the light of the crisis of our contemporary human situation. A year later we published Margaret Mary Reher's note on Leo XIII and Americanism. In 1974 two women, Margaret Farley and Irma Garcia de Mazelis, contributed to our population issue. The genuine breakthrough came in December 1975, the issue entitled "Woman: New Dimensions," with seven of the nine contributions by women. Then, ironically, a six-year hiatus, 1976–81, marked only by the first appearance of Sandra Schneiders (December 1978).

1982 witnessed a rebirth: a second article by Schneiders, on an unrecognized historical positivism in contemporary exegesis, and a promising new face, Elizabeth Johnson, on analogy in Pannenberg. In 1983 Margaret O'Rourke Boyle intrigued us with an appeal for historical method as an alternative to the hagiographical tradition on Ignatius Loyola. In 1984 Johnson returned to analyze three approaches to the use of female imagery for God, judge the "traits" and "dimensions" approaches inadequate, and deem the "equivalent imaging of God male and female" to

hold the best promise for both the renewal of the doctrine of God and the liberation of human beings. The same year Carol Tauer, applying the tradition of probabilism, concluded to some liberty in the moral treatment of early embryos. 1985 saw another giant step: besides Catherine LaCugna's re-examination of Aquinas on God's real relatedness to creation, we welcomed ethicist Lisa Sowle Cahill, who would grace our restructured Moral Notes for three successive years. 1986 introduced Karen Jo Torjesen, with particular interest in patristic hermeneutics and women's history. 1987 brought two new authors into *TS*'s fold: Leslie Griffin, arguing that changing understandings of the spiritual and temporal in church documents call into question traditional prohibitions of clerical participation in politics, and Susan Wood, addressing the complex theological and pastoral problem of baptized couples who request the Church to witness their marriage though they profess no religious faith. In 1988 Mary Ann Donovan lent fresh insight into second-century Irenaeus, while Griffin returned to argue that the question of participation in politics by members of RC women's religious congregations must be distinguished from arguments about priestly participation.

Of the 28 articles in this anniversary volume, seven are by women: joining Cahill (sexual ethics), Johnson (Mary as female face of God), and Schneiders (spirituality) are newcomers Monika Hellwig (Christology), Carolyn Osiek (Bible and social sciences), Phyllis Trible (feminist hermeneutics), and PHEME PERKINS (NT narrative criticism).

Need I say explicitly that *TS* is immeasurably richer for the new face with which our sister theologians have gifted the varied theological disciplines? What amazes me is that for 19 centuries we "did theology" without them, without even missing them. Another strong if needless proof that theologians as well as the magisterium are in large measure captive to their culture.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

For all its 50 years of original contributions, a goodly portion of *TS*'s influence and attractiveness would be lost without the full reviews and shorter notices that for many years now have covered 200 books annually. Not sheerly a question of numbers. Among several merits, *TS*'s reviews have brought foreign scholars to American attention, some even before English translations turned them into theological household words: e.g., Aubert, Balthasar, Benoit, Bonsirven, Botte, Bouyer, Bultmann, Cerfaux, Congar, Cullmann, Daniélou, Fuchs, Galot, Grillmeier, Häring, Jüngel, Kasper, Küng, Laurentin, Jean Leclercq, Lohfink, Lubac, Metz, Mouroux, Poschmann, Karl Rahner, Ratzinger, Schillebeeckx, Schnackenburg, Segundo, Spicq, and Thurian.

Here a largely unrecognized labor of love has been effected by review editors of long and short tenure. Two long-term gentlemen merit specific mention. Even as a young theological student at old Woodstock, Matthew O'Connell had a sixth sense about books: which were genuinely important, how much of a book to read, what to skim, which to postpone to another day. As a faculty member, he was a veritable polymath—so much so that he was disturbingly aware how much he did *not* know. In the *TS* office, I can still see him polishing off several terribly learned shorter notices (all sorts of square brackets within round brackets) on research volumes in a day or two. Joseph Tylanda, currently at the Jesuit Historical Institute in Rome, gave eleven devoted years to this task—quietly, methodically, unstintingly.

But when push comes to shove, reviews call for reviewers. And here we have been incomparably blessed: scores of scholars willing to appraise books in their fields and meet editorial deadlines. Looking back upon more recent years and reviewers most imposed upon, I realize how consistently we have profited from the critical appraisals of Raymond Brown, Frederick Moriarty, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Anthony Tambasco in Scripture; Harvey Egan on Rahner and on mysticism; Emmanuel Cutrone in liturgy; Thomas Morrissey in history; Thomas O'Meara and Avery Dulles in systematics; David Hunter and Joseph Lienhard on early Christianity; Joseph Bracken and Terrence Tilley on philosophical theology; Jeffrey Gros on matters ecumenical; Joseph Kelly on patristics and the Middle Ages; Ladislav Orsy on canon law; John Jay Hughes on current issues.

We have made it stringent policy (even returning a handful of reviews) to be critical without being caustic, censorious when called for but never snide. If a book is worth reviewing in our pages, even unfavorably, the author merits professional courtesy. Yes, we have nodded—as when a shorter notice concluded, “In any case, a perfect bore of a book by a brilliant theologian upon a fascinating subject” (20 [1959] 325).

III

Where will *TS* go from here? Prognosis is not my forte, not my charism. Where *should* we go?

I raise two broad questions for my successor—whomever and whenever. First, should *TS* focus more frequently on theme issues, with all the articles personally commissioned, inside and outside the States? Several factors argue a strong yes: (1) the contributions made by, and the enthusiastic reception accorded to, theme issues that have appeared here: on the Church, population, woman, abortion, the 1989 anniversary issues; (2) avoidance of an omnium-gatherum, what Webster defines as a receptacle for holding a miscellaneous collection of all sorts of things; (3)

greater possibility of fuller treatment and serious give-and-take on issues raised, and within the same set of pages. Contra: too many unsolicited articles of significance (out of 250 submissions a year) would have to be regretfully returned or delayed. Perhaps a compromise: one theme issue a year.

Second broad question: Should *TS* publish more frequently—say, become a bimonthly? The authors and the material are there, increasingly as theology has moved from the seminary to the university, as the laity constitute more and more of our theologians, as theology continues to transcend denominational barriers, as the areas and methods of theological discussion expand. And, at the risk of endangering *TS*, I feel compelled to say that the U.S. simply does not have the number of first-rate Catholic journals of theology demanded by our Catholic population and by the number of first-rate theologians of various persuasions clamoring professionally for publication.

Articles in this anniversary volume have revealed areas either neglected or demanding fresh research. One is theological *methodology*. Contemporary theology seems to have almost as many methods as there are theologians in print. In *Blessed Rage for Order* David Tracy did us a service by retrieving five basic models in contemporary theology, in the chronological sequence of their emergence: orthodox, liberal, neo-orthodox, radical, and revisionist. And yet Avery Dulles confessed himself comfortable in none of the five. Since methodology presumes a position on what theology is all about, we shall never have a single way of going about it. But can we rest uncritically content with scatter-gun proliferation? Especially where theology is expected to serve not simply the academy but the living Church—people. Are there *no* unacceptable methodologies?

A second specific desideratum is to confront intelligently what Michael Buckley in our September 1989 issue presented as the neuralgic issue of American *atheism* (459–61):

The confused situation which confronts the contemporary religious mind in the intellectual culture of the U.S. is not so much argument or even hostility. It is dismissal—a cultural indifference to the entire and increasingly discredited theological enterprise itself. . . . If the judgment of Rahner is correct that the efforts of the Church to deal with the contemporary situation have been ineffectual, may part of this not lie with the isolation of theology from a prolonged and disciplined attempt to mediate between religion and contemporary culture and to formulate the inherent problems correctly? Is not the initial and pressing question, what is the question?

Other issues surge up from this 50th volume: fundamental moral,

including norms and the problem of absolutes; the relationship between the historical-critical method in Scripture and social-science approaches, literary analysis, and feminist hermeneutics; follow-ups on Hellwig's appraisal of the disinterest in Christ's divinity and on Johnson's "Mary as the Female Face of God"; technology as boon or bane for the religious spirit; the role of the Church in an increasingly secularized society; a spirituality for the laity; historical studies that speak to contemporary issues. Very pointedly, David Tracy insisted in the September number that for Catholic studies to flourish in today's multidisciplinary academy, we must "not only possess the more familiar philosophical, theological, social-scientific, and historical studies of the Catholic religious element, but also encourage anthropologists and historians of religion to discern the forms, the interrelationships, and the history of the entire symbolic religious life of Catholic Christianity" (548).

We need regular *bulletins* (our Current Theology). The only hard and fast bulletin now is in moral, each March. We need bulletins—say, one every three years—on OT and NT, areas of systematics, segments of history and historical theology, local theologies, spirituality, etc. For one of *TS*'s expected services is to keep its readers abreast of theological developments by recording recent research, *and* to put that research in critical context: Where are we now?

If I were granted a golden-anniversary wish, it would be for closer collaboration among theologians who share much the same divine faith but find one another's human efforts to unfold it unacceptable. In an area as complex and mystery-laden as theology, profound disagreement is inevitable. Can we not transform sheer difference into a positive force for progress?

Not impertinent to that "mission impossible" are two short sentences that lay at the heart of John Courtney Murray's theology. I first heard them in class, when he was schematizing his vision of theology. He took the sentences from Aquinas, who had borrowed them from Pseudo Dionysius. The first sentence: "Amor est vis unitiva et concretiva." Love makes for oneness; the lover produces another self. In Murray's singular translation, "Love is a centripetal force." The correlative sentence: "Amor facit extasim." Love carries the lover outside him/herself; the lover becomes self-less. In the Murray version, "Love is a centrifugal force." Unity through "ecstasy." Such love, which distinguishes the inner and outgoing life of God One in Three—is not this ultimately why we theologians "do" theology?