

THE SCIENTIFIC RENEWAL
OF
AMERICAN CATHOLIC BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP
by
David Balk, B.A.

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School, Marquette University, in
Partial Fulfillment of the Re-
quirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
May, 1970

The Scientific Renewal

of

American Catholic Biblical Scholarship

Introduction1

Table of Contents 2-3

Chapter One

 "1934-1941 4-22

Chapter Two

 "1941-1949 23-55

 a) Up to Divino Afflante Spiritu 23-33

 b) Divino Afflante Spiritu 33-35

 c) 1944-1949 -- After the Encyclical 35-55

Chapter Three

 "1950-1959" 56-107

Chapter Four

 "David Stanley"108-59

Chapter Five

 "1960-1965" 160-256

 a) The Historicity Debate 161-222

 1) A Deceptive Calm 161-66

 2) The Attack Against the New Exegesis 167-98

 3) Further Clarifications of the Type
 of History in the Gospels 198-211

 4) Rome Discusses the Gospels and History 212-22

b)	Vatican II Champions the New Exegesis	222-31
c)	The New Exegesis in Book Form	231-56
1)	Quentin Quesnell's <u>This Good News</u>	232-52
2)	John McKenzie's <u>Dictionary of the Bible</u> ...	252-56
Bibliography		257-62

Chapter One

"1934-1941"

Form criticism entered American Catholic circles suddenly and its method and results were new and startling. As a result, battle lines became quickly drawn. The first ten to twenty years exhibited a great quantity of defensive, apologetic, and hostile articles; most of the articles attempted to refute form criticism because it was seen as a doctrine which inevitably led to a denial of Catholic beliefs. The most radical conclusions of individual form critics such as Rudolf Bultmann and Martin Dibelius were equated by many Catholics with form criticism itself. On the whole, the American Catholic biblical scholars during this period never appreciated form criticism as a tool, a technique that could have been profitably employed.

The first American Catholic to address himself to form criticism was Francis X. Peirce.¹ Peirce showed the battle lines which would be drawn up as soon as other Catholics began to feel an imminent threat from the early proponents of form criticism. He raised three of the four predominant issues in the battle soon to ensue: historicity, creative community, and the presence of the supernatural in human affairs.

¹Peirce, a Jesuit who studied at the Biblical Institute in Rome from 1929-1931, became professor of scripture at Woodstock College, Maryland, in 1931.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly" XVII (January, 1946), p. 40.

5

Peirce objected to an a priori denial of the miraculous. He claimed that the Gospels are rendered meaningless and worthless if their miracle accounts are not understood literally and accepted as factual.² In a second article, he briefly alluded to "apocalyptic eschatology."³

In his criticism of the form critical notion of a creative community, Peirce insisted that the evangelists were truly authors.⁴

His footnotes indicate that he used only English translations of the German form critical scholars, for example the English translation of Martin Dibelius' Formgeschichte des Evangelium (From Tradition to Gospel). The monumental form critical study of the Synoptic Gospels, Rudolf Bultmann's Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition (The History of the Synoptic Tradition), was not translated into English until 1963. Karl Schmidt's Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu has never been translated into English. Peirce made no reference to the German editions.

²"Christ Himself, at times, explicitly calls upon such miracles as objective evidence of His supernatural status, and He performs them...in the presence of hard-headed, stiff-necked unbelievers. Unless we drop down out of the clouds, into the realm of actual fact, and accept such signs for what they really are, namely, visible actions and results of God's power and divinity, divorced from and impossible to mere nature, then the Gospel story becomes meaningless and worthless."

F. X. Peirce, "The Problem of Jesus," Ecclesiastical Review XC, (January, 1934), p. 92

³

F. X. Peirce, "Form Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels," Ecclesiastical Review XCIII (July, 1935), pp. 86-90.

⁴

Although Peirce took the creative community idea to task, he quoted Maurice Goguel verbatim: "The story as we have it in the Gospels today is...but a production that is anonymous and collective in origin, for which no individual is responsible."

"The Problem of Jesus," op. cit., p. 95.

Redaktionsgeschichte, which accepts oral tradition and Sitz im Leben, is a method to uncover the work of individual Christians who consciously reshaped early traditions to fit a specific theological framework. This method does call the evangelists authors. Two practitioners of the method are Günther Bornkamm and Martin Käsemann.

Peirce's 1935 article stressed his previous objections but included a few new twists. For example, Peirce maintained that only a passé Hegelian philosophy could lead the form critics to look for influences of oriental literature upon the Synoptic Gospels.⁵ To substantiate his judgment he referred to only one of Bultmann's works, "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels", which was translated by Frederick C. Grant.⁶

Twice Peirce claimed that the goal of the form critics is to obtain the minimum of historical fact.⁷ Peirce accused the form critics of nearly absolute skepticism.⁸ Peirce believed the Gospels to be fully factual reports and was shocked by scholarly questioning which probed for the origin of each Gospel story. He accused the form critics of denying the historical basis of Christianity.

⁵"(The presupposition of an influence from oriental literature has its only foundation in an) outworn Hegelian philosophy of evolution."
F.X. Peirce, "Form Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels," op.cit., p. 87.

⁶Ibid., p. 85, fn. 1.

⁷"The theory of which (form criticism) is the herald is confined at present to the Synoptic Gospels, and seeks to discover the minimum of historical fact at the base of the Gospel narrative."
Ibid., P. 85. See also P. 88.

⁸William J. McGarry's discussion of the historical interests of the form critics includes the same accusation of skepticism. However, he speaks of a "maximum quantity" not "minimum quantity".
"(The purpose of the form critical method) is to ascertain the maximum quantity of historically credible material of which we can be sure in the history of Jesus."
William J. McGarry, "The 'New' Approach to Gospel Study," Thought XI (June, 1936), p. 92.

Because Peirce assumed that the gospels are a factual presentation, he argued that the Christian communities themselves would have published denials of any tradition they found to be "inaccurate history."⁹

In his 1935 article Peirce wished to expose the presuppositions or dogmas of the form critical school.¹⁰ But, since he knew only a few form critics, what he called a school was actually the work of a few individuals. At this time, however, it seemed that the method and the individuals using it were inseparable. Besides using Hegelian philosophy, the very foundation of form criticism totally denied the supernatural and altogether misunderstood the Kingdom of God as "exclusively apocalyptic."¹¹ He characterized Dibelius' "preaching Sitz im Leben" as the fruit of form criticism's exclusively apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God.¹²

⁹"Life is too precious to be risked foolishly. Yet we have not a single voice raised in admission of an unhistorical account of Christ composed solely from cultic motives. On the contrary the testimony is unanimous that the Gospel narratives are both authentic and historically true. It is enough."

F.X. Peirce, "Form Criticism of the Synoptics," op.cit., p. 96. In this argument there are hints of the insistence upon eye-witnesses which many opponents and modifiers of form criticism are to make.

¹⁰"There are several accepted 'dogmas' which by no stretch of the imagination can be considered as having any foundation in fact, and which are at the root of the entire interpretation of the Gospel records as proposed by Dibelius et al."

Ibid., p. 86.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 86-87.

Apocalypticism took many forms. Among its chief doctrines was an expectation that the present order of things was destined for a sudden, violent change -- with God, or the aeon of Good, to conquer the present aeon of Evil and redeem the faithful who now suffered. In his interpretation of the New Testament, especially of the consciousness of Jesus, Albert Schweitzer argued a strict apocalyptic thesis. He was a major source for Bultmann's apocalyptic understandings.

¹²The theory of the growth of the tradition according to the law of preaching is "purely subjective, with no proof whatever beyond a few texts conveniently mangled to suit. It has its origin in the preconceived, utterly unwarranted interpretation of the Kingdom of God as exclusively apocalyptic.

Ibid., p. 90.

For Dibelius to maintain that the evangelical tradition had developed solely from preaching, Peirce termed the mark of a genius who had mistaken a single aspect of the picture for the entire panorama.¹³

Peirce criticized Bultmann's use of "apophthegms" because Bultmann looked outside Jewish culture for insights into apophthegms. In his form critical investigation Bultmann had looked for similarities between Greek narratives and Gospel apophthegms. Peirce argued that only Jewish narratives have apophthegmatic form.¹⁴

Peirce investigated Dibelius' "paradigm" and maintained that the German's paradigmatic rules do not fit any of the texts chosen as illustrations of this form.¹⁵

From the beginning of their work the form critics highlighted the cohesiveness of the Passion narrative in the Gospels. Whereas they found that most of the narratives in the Synoptic tradition are short, isolated units linked together by the evangelists, the form critics were impressed that each passion account more resembles a single, long narrative.

¹³"...and uncanny instinct for fastening on a half truth."
Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 88

An apophthegm is a unit which consists of a saying of Jesus placed in a brief narrative framework.

¹⁵"Of all the paradigms selected for examination by the Doctor, not a single one even remotely fits the frame. This might give pause to a less courageous man, but his marvelously fertile imagination manages successfully to add what is lacking."

Ibid., p. 90.

A paradigm is a short illustrative notice or story of an event, not more descriptive than is necessary to make the point for the sake of which it is intended.

Peirce said that form criticism collapses altogether in its presentation of the Passion narrative.¹⁶ Although Peirce offered no explanation for this judgment, perhaps the presence of such a complex, long narrative in the Gospels led Peirce to question form criticism's principles concerning the history of the Synoptic tradition. One of these principles is that disparate units were gathered artificially from a vast oral tradition. Another principle is that the original impetus to the formation and transmission of the Gospel tradition arose from the early Christian preaching and not from interest in preserving a biography of Jesus. Peirce probably reasoned that the Passion narrative is obviously a long unit of historical reporting and does not fit the criteria for Gospel stories set forth by Dibelius and Bultmann.

Peirce accused Dibelius of having fallen victim to numerous subjective judgments while verbally having maintained the principle of objective research. As his prime example of Dibelius' lack of objectivity, Peirce presented Dibelius' refusal to accept Papias' claim that the evangelists were responsible for the form of the Gospels.¹⁷

The next article dealing with form criticism is the article by William J. McGarry.¹⁸

McGarry probably was not familiar with the German works of the form critics. Although McGarry did refer to works in German by such

¹⁶"The crowning absurdity of the formgeschichte school, and the focus of its greatest attention, is the treatment of the Passion story."

Ibid., p. 93

¹⁷Ibid., p. 97

¹⁸Wm. J. McGarry, former Theology Editor for Thought, taught New Testament exegesis at Weston College.

scholars as Harnack, Holtzmann, and Schweitzer, the only work by a German form critic mentioned in the article is the 1934 English translation of Rudolf Bultmann's Jesus.¹⁹ This book by Bultmann deals with form criticism only secondarily at best. Jesus is an investigation of what Jesus thought. To explain the German form critics, therefore, McGarry employed a translation of a work not precisely dealing with form criticism.

McGarry's purpose was to present the methods and principles of American (Protestant) form criticism and to point out the weaknesses of the method.²⁰ Although in some respects similar, the German and American form critical approaches to the Gospels are not the same, McGarry maintained.²¹ However, his criticisms against the American form critics were no different from the criticisms voiced against the Germans, who were usually harshly criticized by the early American Catholic commentators on the method. Form criticism remained a monolith, despite trans-Atlantic differences, and McGarry portrayed it as espousing doctrines opposed to Catholic beliefs.²²

¹⁹McGarry, op. cit., pp. 86-87, fn. 4.

²⁰Ibid., p. 87.

²¹Ibid., pp. 86-87.

²²After listing many of the items which he found the form critics denying (for example, the divinity of Jesus Christ, miracles wrought by Christ, the Church established by Christ), McGarry stated that "Catholics sustain all these doctrines, and they are eternally and objectively true; we assent to them by an act of faith..." And McGarry remarkably contended "...but they (the doctrines assented to by faith) can be proved and are proven as well by reason and historical investigation."
Ibid., p. 102.

McGarry rejected the idea that the Gospels have been edited,²³ and he would not accept Mark as the first written Gospel.²⁴ McGarry was concerned that he would compromise the authorship of the Gospels if he accepted stages in the compilation of the Gospel tradition. He was basing himself on the statements which Papias made that individuals such as Mark wrote the Gospels. McGarry's insistence that Mark was not the first written Gospel stemmed from St. Augustine, who maintained that the first written Gospel was Matthew.²⁵

It is interesting to compare McGarry's views and Peirce's views of the form critics' use of comparative literature. Because the form critics unhesitatingly accepted Jewish, Greek, and Oriental secular tradition to substantiate their claim concerning the formation of the Synoptic tradition, Peirce criticized them for not remaining true to their own rules against overevaluating external sources.²⁶ However, McGarry accused the form critics of not looking to these outside literary sources and of placing preponderant value upon the norm of internal criticism.²⁷

²³"Such a manner of diverse criticism, in which the Gospels become a string of varicolored beads is overwhelmingly refuted by the unity of style, diction, scope and atmosphere which is discoverable in the Gospels. The new theories make the writers compilers or editors, not authors; the philological and literary word-chopping which is alleged to prove the view leaves one quite dissatisfied."

Ibid., pp. 102-103.

²⁴

Ibid., p. 103.

²⁵Further information on these issues can be found in any good New Testament Introduction, for example, Kummel's. (14th edition, pp. 60-72.)

²⁶Peirce, "Form Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels," op. cit., p. 95.

²⁷"(Form critical reliance upon the norm of internal criticism should be seen as) secondary, confirmatory only, and not of itself probative."

McGarry, op.cit., p. 103.

Peirce thus condemned the form critics for doing exactly what McGarry condemned them for not doing.

McGarry's view of historical presentation led him to accuse form criticism of advocating historical skepticism of the gospel events. He attacked the form critical notion of Sitz im Leben upon the same grounds.²⁸ According to McGarry, historical claims of the form critics are refuted by the Acts of the Apostles, whose historicity, he interjected, is confirmed by many Protestant authors.²⁹

McGarry's method of posing the question of historicity is a prime example of what Peirce himself termed "an uncanny instinct for fastening on a half truth."³⁰ McGarry was correct to insist upon the historical foundations proclaimed in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles. Yet one must first determine what type of history is being proclaimed. McGarry's anachronism, to which Peirce also fell victim, became evident in his remark that the early Christians would neither have accepted nor advocated "inaccurate history."³¹

²⁸ Sitz im Leben refers to an actual situation facing an early Christian community. For example, questions about Christian discipleship arose within Christian communities, and the gospel message was applied to fit specific circumstances.

²⁹ The form critics "transgress the limits of scientific history" when they present the Sitz im Leben of later Christianity as "the matrix of the Gospels."

Ibid., p. 104.

³⁰ Peirce, "Form Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels," op.cit., p. 89.

³¹ The form critics fail "to take into account the psychology and attitude both of the authors and of their audiences.... Inaccurate history, deliberate embellishment, false arguments, proofs and supports, would neither be proposed by the advocates of the faith, nor acceptable to the faithful."
McGarry, op.cit., p. 105.

The next American Catholic to consider form criticism was Edward A. Mangan. Certain historical difficulties were uppermost in his mind when he reviewed D. W. Riddle's book The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth in 1940.³² Mangan said that Riddle, a scholar familiar with New Testament research, was either a reviver of discarded theories concerning the origin and growth of the Gospels or a man who wished to be considered as such.³³ He maintained that Riddle's book is filled with theories which Riddle should have realized had been discarded long ago. The book provides incontestable evidence, Mangan said, that important consideration must be given in Scripture courses to studying the historical origins of the Gospels lest form criticism erase history.³⁴ (According to John J. Collins, who is discussed later in this chapter, Mangan's review demonstrated that the principles of form criticism are utterly at loggerheads with Catholic doctrine.³⁵)

³² Edward A. Mangan, C.S.S.R., studied in Rome at the Biblical Institute (1926-1928) and did special work on the Talmud at Cincinnati's Hebrew Union College (1930). He became professor of scripture at both St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee and Oconomowoc, Wisconsin, in 1928 and 1929 respectively. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly" VIII (Jan., 1946), p. 37.

³³ Edward A. Mangan, Catholic Biblical Quarterly II (April, 1940), p. 188.

³⁴"The book is an object lesson, I think, to a Catholic Scripture scholar and above all, to ecclesiastical students. There seems to be an opinion rife in these days that Introduction to Holy Scripture is an unimportant branch of study, that it isn't needed. The book by Mr. Riddle shows what is being taught and believed and only makes us realize how diligently we must study the historical origins of our Gospels, so that we may not be deluded into forsaking history for wild theories based on wilder internal criticism." Ibid., p. 189.

³⁵"...how completely the principles of Form Criticism are opposed to Catholic doctrine." John J. Collins, "Form Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels," Theological Studies II (Dec., 1941), p. 389.

In a late 1941 Catholic Biblical Quarterly survey of periodicals, John P. Weisengoff and Patrick W. Skehan had some brief remarks for D. W. Riddle's article "The Problem of the Gospels" (Journal of Biblical Literature 59 (1940), pp. 97-111). Riddle's article discussed the "Jesus of history - Christ of faith" problem. This problem highlights the difficulty of finding Gospel narratives which do not color the earthly Jesus as the risen Christ. The title "the Christ" was given to Jesus only by Christians who experienced Jesus as risen in majesty from the dead; in his public ministry Jesus was not risen and therefore could not have been called the Christ. Skehan and Weisengoff implied rather strongly that Riddle's dichotomy between a "Christ of history - Christ of faith" stemmed from docetism, the early heresy which claimed that Jesus only appeared to be a man.³⁶ Their objections to Riddle fit the pattern of concern for the historicity of the Gospels being followed by most American Catholics.

In their same survey, Skehan and Weisengoff featured another article by Riddle, "The Influence of Environment on the Growing Gospel Tradition" (Journal of Religion 21 (1941), pp. 135-46).

³⁶"(Riddle) sees no loss in maintaining the dichotomy of a Christ of faith and a Christ of history. The First Epistle of St. John might suggest some thoughts on this subject."
John P. Weisengoff and Patrick W. Skehan, Catholic Biblical Quarterly III (July, 1941). p. 370.
Skehan studied scripture and Semitic languages at Catholic University (1933-1938) and became assistant professor of Semitic languages at this school in 1943. Weisengoff studied theology at the Gregorianum in Rome (1934-35; 1937-38) and studied scripture at the Biblical Institute in Rome (1935-37). He came to Catholic University in 1938 to teach Hebrew, koine Greek, and Scripture.
"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly", op. cit., p. 43-45.

Without offering any rebuttal, they directly quoted Riddle on the nature of Sitz im Leben and on the form critical attempt to recapture the growth process of the Synoptic tradition.³⁷ However, such a presentation does not indicate these American Catholics agreed with the form critical tenets.

John J. Collins wrote the next major article on form criticism.³⁸ Collins was the first American Catholic to indicate in his footnotes an acquaintance with the primary texts of the German form critics.

Collins pointed out that the English term "form criticism" does not bring out the important aspect of history which Geschichte conveys. This history being uncovered by the form critics is the life of Gospel stories as they underwent reshaping in the early Christian communities.

According to Collins the Gospels themselves belie the form critical claim that the Synoptic tradition evolved smoothly.³⁹ However, contrary to Collins' claim, the form critics do not maintain that the Synoptic

³⁷Riddle's article is an attempt "to show that Sitz im Leben is a highly efficient method of Gospel analysis."
 "Form criticism does not limit itself solely to the task of discovering the original form and nature of the materials which make up the Gospels; it undertakes also to work out the processes by which these materials had their rise and by which they grew into the Gospels."
 Weisengoff and Skehan, op.cit., p. 371.

³⁸John J. Collins, a Jesuit who studied at the Biblical Institute in Rome (1933-36), became professor of New Testament at Weston College in 1936. In 1956 he became editor of New Testament Abstracts. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," op.cit., p.26.

³⁹"The principle of gradual growth in detail does not work out in the Synoptics. The laws of folklore evolution do not fit the Gospels. Definiteness of detail comes from other reasons such as personal recollections of Saint Peter in Mark's Gospel, or from the author's scope."
 Collins, op. cit., p. 393

10

tradition grew in a tidy, unbending, smooth manner; they emphasize that the Synoptic tradition had omissions, deletions, expansions, and additions to its originally simple oral forms. They insist that the simplicity of Mark's stories is evidence of Mark's early position in the tradition. Because he found some Markan narratives expanded beyond Matthean or Lukan narratives, Collins claimed that the Gospels themselves refute the conclusions of form criticism. These Gospel passages disclosed for Collins that the form critics force the evidence to fit their theories.⁴⁰

The form critics handle mainly the Synoptic Gospels and they see the evangelists as only compilers and editors.⁴¹ The purpose of form criticism is to isolate the Synoptic tradition's oral forms before they were collected and documented in written form.⁴²

Collins found three principles in form criticism. The first principle is that the Gospels are composites of traditions similar to folklore, joined together by non-authors in an artificial framework; small sections of these composites can legitimately be isolated from the framework.⁴³ The second principle is that the isolated material can

⁴⁰"The claim that Mark must be late in this matter, because he mentions the names, is begging the question."
Ibid., p. 392.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 389.

⁴²"(Form criticism) proposed to investigate the stage of oral tradition, to study the Gospel material as it was current in detached pieces before the parts were collected and incorporated in the written documents."
Ibid., p. 389.

⁴³"(The Gospels) are compilations of infra-literary writings (Kleinliteratur), similar to folklore, and the small sections are joined together artificially. The scholar, detecting that these units are strung together like beads, simply unties the string and isolates the various sections."
Ibid.

be classified according to its literary category.⁴⁴ The third principle is that the form indicates the reason for the material's origin and inclusion in the tradition; this third principle involves the Sitz im Leben notion of the form critics.⁴⁵

In his critique of the first principle Collins maintained that a person must deny both extrinsic and intrinsic evidence (for example, the statements of Papias and considerations of literary style) if he wishes to deny the evangelists were true authors.⁴⁶ He simply did not agree that the Gospels are similar to folklore.⁴⁷

When considering the second principle Collins put forth what he termed the official Catholic view. Although he admitted the Bible obviously contains literary forms, he categorically dismissed the presence of myths in the Bible. He maintained that myths are unworthy of God and contrary to revelation.⁴⁸

⁴⁴"...the material so isolated can be classified in different forms such as paradigms (that is, examples for preaching), tales, legends, and exhortations."

Ibid.

⁴⁵"...the form gives the clue to the history of the piece. Every form arises from a definite need or life situation of the community, which manifests the relative date of the unit and sometimes indicates the group from which it sprung."

Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 390.

⁴⁷As regards folklore and the Gospels, Collins raised the same objections presented by Laurence J. McGinley, whose dissertation is discussed in Chapter Two. It seems plausible that an acquaintance with McGinley's dissertation led Collins to make his objections.

⁴⁸"Myths or any such forms which contain error or would necessarily lead men into error could not be part of God's inspired word." Collins, op.cit., p. 393.

10

Collins agreed with the principle that each literary form must be considered in its own right and not be forced to measure up to the standards required of another form. He granted, for example, that poetry is different from a form such as straight history.⁴⁹

Collins maintained that the sociological determinism coloring from criticism's perception of forms indicates the extreme difference between Catholic and form critical understanding of forms.⁵⁰ Collins maintained that the Sitz im Leben theory could only originate from ideas closely linked with the Durkheim school of sociology.⁵¹ Emile Durkheim maintained that the community dictated and controlled all growth; Durkheim spoke of autonomous, creative communities. Collins linked the form critical emphasis on the power of the community to Durkheim's theories. He declared he would accept only creative individuals stimulated by the community and the community's environment, and he emphatically

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 393-93.

Cardinal Ruffini, who is encountered in Chapter Five, also upheld the distinction between poetry and straight history. The initial schema on revelation prepared for Vatican II's first session also admitted this distinction. Yet both Ruffini and the schema, which was rejected on the Council floor, bitterly opposed form criticism.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 394

Note the dichotomy established by Collins as he differentiates Catholic from what is form critical.

⁵¹

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) developed a system of thought known as "sociological positivism," which John Macquarrie calls "not just an anthropological or sociological theory, but a complete philosophy." Macquarrie explains Durkheim's views in the following manner. "The idea of society stands at the centre of this philosophy, and supplies the key for the understanding of philosophical problems. Truth and falsehood are objective in so far as they express collective and not individual thought. Even the laws of logic reflect the needs of civilized society....Society itself is not just the sum of the individuals included in it, but a peculiar kind of entity which is the source of constraints governing the thought and behavior of its members."

John Macquarrie, Twentieth Century Religious Thought, p. 156.

denied the possibility of communal creativity.⁵² This latter point remained a major objection of nearly all Catholics to form criticism.

Collins stated four objections to the creative community idea. His first objection stemmed from his notions of the historical origins of Christianity: the creative community idea actually means that the Christian community fabricated the doctrine of Christ and resurrected Jesus.⁵³

His second objection stemmed from his understanding of the presence in the early Christian communities of eyewitnesses to the ministry of Jesus: the creative community idea does not recognize that the preaching of the Gospels was directed by certain leaders (for example, Peter) from the beginning.⁵⁴

His third objection concerned the unlimited domain given by the form critics to Sitz im Leben in the life of the early Christian communities: the Sitz im Leben should be sought in the life of Jesus since no "creative community" could have arisen apart from the life setting produced by the historical ministry of Jesus.⁵⁵ This objection

⁵²Ibid., p. 394, p. 397, p. 398.

⁵³A creative community idea "would mean that the Christian community produced the sublime doctrine of Christ."
Ibid., p. 398.

⁵⁴"The tradition could not grow up except under the control of eye-witnesses."
Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid.

Collins quotes from E. Basil Redlich's book Form Criticism, Its Value and Limitations: "(Most of the form critics) forget that the religion which turned the world upside down was one based on belief in a Person who truly lived, and died, and rose again, and who spoke as no man ever spoke before....Bultmann, who explains so much by the Christian community, has not explained how and why the living active community existed."
Ibid., p. 398.

contains seeds of later modifications to be made in the Sitz im Leben theory.⁵⁶

His fourth objection to a creative community idea stems from the amount of time Collins reckoned is needed for a folk tradition to develop. Folklore cannot develop over so short a space of time as forty or fifty years, whereas the Gospel tradition did.⁵⁷ Conclusion: The Gospel tradition is not folklore.

Collins happily mentioned that the form critical emphasis upon oral tradition is a benefit of the method. The Catholic Church has always insisted upon the period of oral tradition.⁵⁸ However, the Catholic Church's understanding of this oral tradition would be radically transformed due to the scholarship of the form critics. The complexities involved in the early stages of the tradition were never considered in the Catholic Church's earlier substantially correct but somewhat overly simplistic understanding of the oral proclamation of the Gospel. In fact due to form critical work alone, the Church's scholars gradually enabled other Catholics to understand some of the features of a living oral tradition, which is adapted to meet needs and answer questions not previously asked.⁵⁹

Another benefit stemming from form criticism, would be a better

⁵⁶[See Chapter Four, pp. 133-36]

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 398-99.

⁵⁸"It is good to have scholars recall what the Catholic Church has always insisted upon and what the Reformers forgot, that for thirty years Christians knew not the Written Book, but only the living tradition."

Ibid., p. 399.

⁵⁹Collins remarked that "unfortunately formgeschichte supposes that tradition of its nature deforms the truth transmitted."

Ibid.

understanding of particular texts gained by a study of literary forms, especially apophthegms or paradigms.⁶⁰

The final benefit from form criticism comes from its emphatic underscoring of the early Christians' recognition of Christ's divinity.⁶¹

Collins also summarized the defects which he found in form criticism. One defect was arbitrary, simplistic, and generalizing argumentation on the part of the form critics.⁶² Another defect was skepticism, especially a historical skepticism about the Christian basis.⁶³ The third defect weighing down form criticism was its dependence on the theory of sociological determinism.⁶⁴ An unnamed professor at the University of Chicago, whose school of sociology provided open-armed acceptance for form criticism's emphasis on creative communities, practiced the method in the United States.⁶⁵

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹"Finally, these writers have emphasized that Christ's divinity was very early recognized."

Ibid.

⁶²"Based upon a limited number of instances, distorted by excessive simplifications and generalizations, their system sins against the elementary laws of induction. In the handling of the study of individual paragraphs these scholars show unusual arbitrariness."

Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴"Ultimately Form Criticism, which would make the Gospels have their origin in folklore, derives from the theory of sociological determinism."

Ibid.

⁶⁵"While Form Criticism has not won general acceptance, some of its attitudes are having influence in non-Catholic circles. In this country it is not surprising that Chicago University should contain an advocate for the new method. The sociological school there prevalent has a natural affinity for the fundamental postulate of Formgeschichte (namely, creative, self-sufficient communities.)"

Ibid.

The attitude of American Catholics to form criticism obviously had become one of suspicion and in some cases of hostility. William McGarry and John Collins even saw form criticism to be heretical doctrine rather than a scientific method for uncovering the oral forms of a tradition. Doctrinaire views of form criticism would become commonplace among many Catholics. The method had not yet found its Catholic exponents. Furthermore, when Collins or Peirce or most any of the other Catholics in the 1930's and 1940's said form criticism, they really know only certain form critics such as Bultmann, whose radical conclusions they equated with the method itself. In exaggerated reaction to a few pioneers with a new method, Catholics were in danger of throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Chapter Two

"1940-1949"

a) Up to Divino Afflante Spiritu

Theological Studies opened this period in American Catholic biblical studies by beginning a serialization of Laurence J. McGinley's doctoral dissertation on form criticism.¹ The serialization, which continued for five issues, was concluded in 1943. For the first time an American Catholic studied form criticism in detail.

McGinley chose the synoptic healing narratives as his major object of study. He presented an overall picture of form criticism, criticized the method in the same manner as had most American Catholics before him, and finally concentrated on a study of healing narratives. He presented mainly the form critical views of Dibelius and Bultmann, revealed a vast bibliography, and, most important, showed familiarity with the primary form critical works in German.

McGinley's dissertation quickly impresses its reader as a concerted effort to disprove form criticism. Although McGinley insisted that he would accept form criticism as a tool, he asserted that an analysis of form criticism's results reveals few new insights for

¹McGinley studied theology at Gregorian University (1937-39) and scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute (1937-39). He taught theology and scripture at Fordham University from 1939 until he was appointed President and Rector of Fordham in 1949, a position he held until 1963.
 "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly", CBQ XXVI (Jan., 1964), p. 49.

Scripture studies. The good points of the method would occupy a permanent, though subordinate position in Scripture studies.² He said the major contribution of form criticism arose from its comparative studies of the Synoptic Gospels and other literature. He also applauded form criticism's emphasis on oral tradition.³ He caricatured the form criticism developed by Bultmann and Dibelius, described their work as pagan exegesis, and constantly paraded their work as a villain to be removed from the Scripture scene.⁴

The concerns present in his dissertation can be traced to his historical viewpoint, a type of historicism present among many scholars.

2" ...we may sum up the general impression received from study of the new method by saying that if, at best, much of what is true in form-criticism is not new and much of what is new is not true, still, at the worst, there is wheat in the chaff for the winnowing. To the writer it seems that the good points of the method will find a permanent though subordinate place in future scriptural studies...." Laurence J. McGinley "Hellenic Analogies and the Typical Healing Narrative, Theological Studies IV (Jan., 1943), p. 419.

3" ...our investigation itself has shown the value of one contribution of form-criticism to synoptic studies: the use of form-analysis in comparative research. Employed as a tool -- not as a weapon -- form-analysis should be of much assistance to the Scripture student. Nor is this all. The new method has illustrated many traits of the synoptic forms -- by comparisons drawn from other literature; and it merits no little praise for deterring rationalist critics from aimless vivisection of the text and from that idle source -- speculation which fails to take into account the oral period of the Gospel tradition." Ibid., p. 418.

4" ...the theory as a whole, in the extreme form proposed by Bultmann and Dibelius, is moribund. As the flowering of a century and a half of German rationalist criticism, it may perhaps be hoped that the blossom, being inbred, will be sterile, and that in the new Germany the line will be more clearly drawn between the exegesis which is truly Christian and that which is fundamentally pagan." Ibid., p. 419

McGinley's discussion of eyewitnesses,⁵ of a creative community,⁶ and of Sitz im Leben⁷ was guided by his understanding of the type of history contained in the Gospels. He believed the Gospels give factual reports of events in a manner similar if not identical to modern biography.

⁵"There was no anonymous, uncontrolled elaboration of community preoccupations and pagan anecdotes into an idealized conception of Jesus. A revolutionary message, that rapidly transformed Syrians, Greeks, and Romans into Christians, was told in growing detail, under the supervision of the 'witnesses' and their authoritative successors, from the first Pentecost sermon to the writing of the prologue of Luke. The Synoptic Gospels, and the oral and written tradition they fixed in permanent form, represent Jesus -- not merely the community that adored Him."

Laurence J. McGinley, "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," Theological Studies II (Nov., 1941), p.461.

⁶"...the second principle of the form-critical method rests on a double error: a psychologically false theory of collective creation, and an historically inaccurate picture of the primitive Christian community."

Theological Studies IV (Jan., 1943), op. cit., p. 458.

"Any strong religious movement, such as primitive Christianity, is pervaded by a warm and stimulating atmosphere. The contact of member with member within the group stirs and inspires to stronger feelings and a more vivid expression of them. But the common force is stimulating, not creative, expansive and not determinative. Its real but indecisive power can be pointed to definite activity only by an individual intellect and will: the choice of definite means to a definite end is always personal work."

Theological Studies II (Nov., 1941), op. cit., p. 459.

⁷McGinley maintained Sitz im Leben has four internal weaknesses.

1)Insisting on uncontrolled community creation. 2)Assigning definite classifications to indefinite or intermediate forms, which, by definition, elude classification. 3)Ruling out several motives in the formation of a single Gospel unit. 4)Overlooking a form's ability to outlast its function. He specifically objected to form criticism's attempt to correlate Sitz im Leben with Gospel forms in order to measure Gospel historicity. Such a study can only uncover general trends, not specifics, he argued.

Ibid., pp. 472-73.

He insisted that all of the events portrayed in the Gospels are literally, empirically true.⁸

Not only McGinley's dislike of form criticism but also the major thrust of other American Catholics' objections to the method can be traced to this historicism. The entire structure of Christian faith, based on historical claims, seemed under attack when the form critics talked about situations which influenced the early Christian communities to rework Gospel stories.

Advocates of this historicism look to the Gospels for biographical information about Jesus because they suppose the early Christians shared the same historical viewpoint and asked the same type of historical questions. For this reason McGinley thought it remarkable that the form critics never considered investigating the Gospels for biographical information about Jesus. He maintained that this lack of form critical investigations into the Gospels indicated the radical, extreme, and arbitrary reasoning of these biblical scholars.⁹

⁸"The style is real, sober, so concise that much of Jesus' marvelous activity is merely summarized; frequent mention of the occasion fits the stories into the general framework of the tradition; names are recorded if known, without effort at completeness. Jesus' power is portrayed as sovereign, personal, purely preternatural, due neither to medical skill nor prayer; He is moved by pity, a desire to reward men's faith in Him; He is compassionate, never complacent. Through every story there runs a lofty spiritual tone and the Healer's holiness and modesty; the significance of the miracles is clear: they prove His mission as Messiah and Incarnate Son of God; the historical reality of every deed is quietly assumed."

McGinley, "Hellenic Analogies and the Typical Healing Narrative," *op. cit.*, p. 417.

⁹"...we may note one startling omission. Neither Bultmann nor Dibelius will admit a *Sitz im Leben* for any of the categories of Gospel forms that Kohler terms 'das biographische Interesse.' Interest in the person of Jesus, a desire to know the life of Jesus -- these are assigned no part in that life of the primitive Christians which formed the Gospel....Such a position is completely indefensible. Despite any 'apocalyptic enthusiasm,' the early Christians did tell

McGinley did not seem to appreciate the possibility that the primitive Christian communities expressed their "historical" interests by means of an oral tradition which resulted in embellishment and growth according to contemporary needs. His historicism led McGinley to accuse the form critics of an unusual lack of scientific vision and of incompleteness because they denied the historical testimony in the Gospels.¹⁰

Because the rapid growth of the Synoptic tradition presents an external control for testing the form critical method, McGinley cited the form critics' failure to face this external element as likely the method's most serious defect.¹¹

Why did McGinley attach so much importance to the time element? He offered three reasons. 1) While Christianity was first developing it had bitter enemies who were also eyewitnesses to the ministry of Jesus; these enemies of Christians would have challenged the tradition had it been unhistorical. 2) The fact that Mark's Gospel was accepted in Rome indicates that the tradition was directed in a univocal fashion; if such direction had been lacking, the tradition would have become unrecognizable after thirty years of proclamation in different areas of the world. 3) The incredibly short space of time needed for the growth

the story of the past. And whatever Semitic terms of thought or Hellenic phrasing that story may contain, it still tells of Jesus of Nazareth, not of the problems of primitive Christianity -- whose ritual and organization and evolved theology are absent from its pages. Without deep interest in the personal history of Jesus neither the Gospel nor the community itself can be conceived. If such an extreme, radical attitude as this is necessary for form-criticism, the method stands indicted from the beginning."
McGinley, *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*, "op. cit.", pp. 473-74.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 475.

¹¹Ibid., p. 478.

of the tradition is paralleled in no other literature.¹²

McGinley's first and second reasons strike this author as begging the question. His third reason merits consideration, and later scholars also emphasize the remarkable time limit in which the Synoptic tradition grew. They also question what characteristics such a time limit would give to the tradition.¹³

Basic to all three of McGinley's reasons were his insistence on eyewitnesses and on community leaders who directed the formation of the Synoptic tradition and his objections to the term creative community. When McGinley compared the rabbinic literary form of debate with parallel Synoptic literary forms, he concluded from the laws governing the former that eyewitnesses and leaders in the Christian communities would have prevented an anarchic altering of tradition.¹⁴

Because of his historicism McGinley did not understand what the Christian oral tradition entails. His criticism of Bultmann's analysis of apophthegms is a clear illustration of the point. In his analysis of apophthegms Bultmann proceeded according to the principle of reduction, that is, he uncovered the primitive form by removing later accretions. The principle of reduction says that a story in an

¹²Ibid., pp. 477-78.

¹³See Chapter Three, pp. 85-86, for John McKenzie's discussion of Hermann Gunkel.

¹⁴"There is not the slightest proof of community creation in this rabbinic method of debate. Moreover, though the community undoubtedly disputed, we know nothing of the postulated collection of quotations from Scripture at hand for use on such occasions; and it is fantastic to picture the early Christians of Palestine, with eyewitnesses still in their midst, ascribing such texts to Jesus and inventing situations for the disciples which would be symbolic of their own."

Theological Studies III (Jan., 1942), op. cit., pp. 64-65.

oral tradition begins simply and becomes more complex as the story is retold. However, McGinley maintained that such reasoning is not only arbitrary but also destructive of its own goals. He also accused Bultmann of making apophthegms fit his theory rather than of judging them on their own merits. According to McGinley, by rejecting chronology, location, definite names, and constant opposition to Jesus and to the early Christians, Bultmann erased the very reasons for the apophthegm and reduced Jesus to a shadow.¹⁵

The process of going from simplicity to complexity is quite clear in the Synoptic accounts of the raising of Jairus' daughter. (See Mark 5:21-43; Luke 8:40-56; Matthew 9:18-26) Matthew does not know the ruler by name whereas Mark and Luke do, and this single fact indicates some history of this narrative. Because Luke specifies the girl as Jairus' only daughter whereas Mark simply describes her as Jairus' daughter, Bultmann maintained that Luke's account is definitely a worked-over tradition. McGinley's response, that this would be true only if earlier accounts had somehow denied the fact, totally missed Bultmann's meaning.¹⁶

¹⁵By such reduction "(Bultmann) constructs a typical apothegm but destroys its reason for existence. Jesus lives at no time and in no place; He does nothing of His own account; He moves in a world of impersonal shadows; there is no reason for His rejection, trial, and execution. While being molded to fit the theory, the facts have disappeared."

Ibid., p. 64

¹⁶"It is false, therefore, to see in all such details a growing novellistic interest, and to reject them as subsequent legendary traits. The maiden whom Jesus resuscitated did not 'become' Jairus' only daughter in the account of Luke: such a conclusion would be warranted only if, for example, Mark had portrayed her brothers and sisters as among the mourners."

Laurence J. McGinley, "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," Theological Studies III (June, 1942), p. 221.

McGinley's dissertation gave much more detailed discussion to form criticism than anything else which had appeared in this period of American Catholic biblical scholarship. His concern for the same themes which have been previously pointed out confirms the attitudes toward form criticism which were becoming popular with many American Catholics. These people saw form criticism as an attack upon the foundations of Christianity. If not absolutely, then for the most part, the method was in need of refutation, and refutation could only occur if various themes such as creative community, eye-witnesses, and historical validity were systematically, thoroughly refuted. However, they granted that the form critics deserved some credit because at last some Protestants were admitting the Catholic Church's rightful insistence on the importance of oral tradition in Christianity.

In 1943 America magazine published a short article dealing with "The Last Half-Century in Biblical Scholarship." The article was written to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Providentissimus Deus, Pope Leo XIII's encyclical on biblical studies. The article did give notice to form criticism's presence in biblical studies, but America saw the method as a step backward in biblical investigation. It considered form criticism a change, an extravagance, a child of the 'Neo-critic School.'¹⁷

¹⁷"Through the trends evident in this recent biblical literature we learn of further developments in biblical scholarship. We should speak of this as change rather than progress. The literary and historical criticisms of the Bible, so prominent an aspect of its scholarship in the last century, have been forced by late investigation of a more objective character to recall or modify many of their widely held hypotheses. Some would even maintain that the old 'Neo-critic School' is now dead. That is perhaps too great a claim.

John A. McEvoy's article "The Thesis of Realized Eschatology. A Study in Form Criticism" closed out this period of Catholic biblical work.¹⁸ McEvoy listed the German editions of form criticism in his footnotes. He dealt mainly with the thought of C. H. Dodd, who uses form criticism as a method in his research. McEvoy sketched first what the German form critics Schmidt, Dibelius, and Bultmann were working to accomplish. He characterized the form critical desire to return to the earliest stages of the Gospel tradition and to discover the laws of its formation as the most recent phase of the rationalists' assault on the authenticity of the Gospels.¹⁹ From the beginning of his article, McEvoy evidenced concern for the history contained in the Gospels, and this concern directed all his probing into Dodd's book The Parables of the Kingdom.

It might be more accurate to say that it has divided into two schools, both more or less retaining the rationalistic temper of their progenitor. There are still many interpreters who carry on the best tradition of this rationalism, presenting us with such extravagances as formgeschichte, the most recent theory for the origin of the Gospels. There are many more, however, who have been influenced by the advance in archaeological research. These, as a rule, even when disregarding entirely the Divine inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures, take a sounder position." William L. Newton, "The Last Half-Century in Biblical Scholarship," America LXX (Nov. 1943), p. 153.

¹⁸ John A. McEvoy studied scripture both at St. Mary's College in St. Mary's, Kansas, and at Weston College in Weston, Mass. He received a pontifical degree in theology from Weston College in 1942. He began teaching fundamental theology and introduction to scripture in 1943.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," CBQ VIII (April, 1946), p. 35.

¹⁹ "(Form criticism is) the latest phase of a rationalistic attack on the authenticity of the Gospels."

John A. McEvoy, "The Thesis of Realized Eschatology. A Study in Form Criticism," CBQ V, (Oct., 1943), p. 396.

McEvoy's historical concerns were connected always with presentations of the Sitz im Leben theory and/or the creative community notion. He maintained these two form critical tools only distort the Gospel message, and he claimed there was much evidence which refuted them and which thereby protected the historical witness of the Gospels.

McEvoy refused to accept the notion that the teaching proclaimed in the Gospels had been greatly conditioned by the needs of the primitive communities and their creative responses to these needs.²⁰ He demanded to know what trust could be given to historical sources about Jesus Christ if the Gospel forms are the work of the early Christian communities in response to contemporary situations.²¹ The Sitz im Leben theory and all of form criticism's other tools should be seen as nothing less than another attack on our ability to know the historical Jesus.²²

In order that the form critics may use their creative community idea, McEvoy maintained that they must verify the existence of communities with creative powers,²³ According to McEvoy the Pauline letters refute

²⁰Ibid., pp. 402-3.

²¹"...what becomes of reliance on the Gospels as the historical picture of Christ."
Ibid., p. 403.

²²"...though these Gospels, according to the form critics, would give us the 'setting in life' of the early Christian community, they would by no means give us the 'setting in life' of Christ's ministry. It seems to me that we are thus brought back to the old convention that the Gospels give us a picture of the 'Christ of faith' while the 'Jesus of history' still remains for us an unknown figure -- if indeed He ever existed."
Ibid.

²³"...was this community of such a nature as to be capable of creating the tradition?" "Can the critics show that a community, such as they postulate, ever existed in reality?"
Ibid.

any hypotheses that the primitive communities were able to shape a tradition. These letters indicate that the Pauline communities received the good news from appointed individuals rather than forming it according to their own needs.²⁴ Because no creative Christian community can be found to have existed in New Testament times, the form critical postulates are disproved and the objective character of the Gospels retained.²⁵

McEvoy's article was actually published in two parts, but part two did not appear until 1947 and it is considered in the section of this thesis devoted to that period of time.

The conclusion of part one of McEvoy's article closes this period in the survey. When the next period opens, although at first there may seem to be little difference in tenor or atmosphere, an important event will have occurred: the publication of Divino Afflante Spiritu.

b) Divino Afflante Spiritu

Modern Catholic biblical scholarship can generally be dated from Pope Pius XII's encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu. Scholarly contribution from American Catholic biblical experts were most certainly inspired by it. It is the first official Church statement not only to review extensively the scientific Scriptural advances produced since the

²⁴"Even a cursory reading of the great epistles of St. Paul will show that the primitive Christian community far from being 'creative,' as the critics maintain, was rather the recipient of a closely regulated teaching coming down from and through the Apostles." Ibid., pp. 403-4.

²⁵"Since, then, such a community as the form critics postulate cannot be shown to have existed, the theory that the written Gospels represent the formed tradition about Christ created by such an imaginary community cannot stand. Consequently, the written Gospels remain what they have always claimed to be -- objective historical records based on the testimony of eyewitnesses who wished and who could testify to what they had heard and seen of the 'Word of Life.'" Ibid., p. 406.

1890's but also to recommend that Catholics adopt these methods in their Scriptural research.²⁶ Divino Afflante Spiritu's far-reaching statements were an implicit confession that the cautious and defensive approach need no longer be the distinguishing mark of Catholic biblical studies. The encyclical said that the dangers such as Modernism which the Church authorities had feared from about 1900 on had disappeared.²⁷ Now that these dangers were past, Pius XII strongly encouraged that the scientific, scholarly, rigorous standards required for competent biblical research become a habit among Catholic students of the Bible. Catholic scholars were to give evidence of fluency in original languages and recourse to original texts,²⁸ competency in textual criticism,²⁹ expert knowledge of archaeological methods and findings,³⁰ and skill in the interpretation of literary forms.³¹

The key teaching of the encyclical concerned the interpretation

²⁶Divino Afflante Spiritu (#11-13 of English translation), Rome and the Study of Scripture, pp. 86-88.

²⁷Ibid. (#42-44 of English translation), pp. 99-100.

²⁸Ibid. (#14-16 of English translation), pp. 88-89.

²⁹Ibid. (#17-19 of English translation), pp. 89-90.

³⁰Ibid. (#11-13 of English translation), pp. 86-88.

³¹Ibid. (#35-39 of English translation), pp. 97-99. It is important to clarify immediately that to study literary forms is not the technical use of form criticism. Literary form investigation studies the fixed, written forms a tradition finally reached. Form criticism gets behind the literary forms to uncover pre-literary forms, those forms which disparate Gospel units had in oral tradition. Form criticism isolates the function which individual Gospel stories had in the early Church's preaching and teaching. And form criticism shows that what now resembles a continuous story is really the linking together of separate units from oral tradition. In Chapter Five, p. 208 see Raymond Brown's remarks on this topic.

of literary forms,³² whose acceptance by the Catholic Church had been steadily progressing regardless of the fears and arguments and controversies raised by the method's opponents.³³ Pius XII removed officially all obstacles which were preventing Catholic scholars from openly employing the theory of literary forms in the study of scripture, especially of scripture's historical writings.³⁴ Of course, twenty-five years were needed for the encyclical's effects to be felt in certain powerful quarters of the Church,³⁵ but no one could plausibly deny Divino Afflante Spiritu championed the recognition, isolation, and study of literary forms.

c) 1944-1949 -- After the Encyclical

In this period of American Catholic biblical studies, amenability to form criticism first appeared. However, the predominant attitude previously displayed was still far from vanishing. Most Catholics remained apologetic, defensive, hostile, and self-protective when confronted with form criticism. Concern for the historicity of the Gospels and dislike for the notion of a creative community remained the central themes in almost all of the articles and book reviews from 1944-1949.

³²Raymond E. Brown, New Testament Essays, p. 14.

³³Jean Levie, The Bible, Word of God in Words of Men, pp. 161-62.

³⁴Cf. fn. 30.

³⁵The twenty odd years following Divino Afflante Spiritu are filled with obstacles to the progress of Catholic scripture scholars who took seriously Pius XII's encouragement to interpret literary forms. The remarks against form criticism by certain bishops and cardinals at Vatican II demonstrate that even by 1964 the impact of Pius XII's encyclical was regarded entirely negatively by some important Church authorities. See, for instance, Xavier Rynne, The Third Session, pp. 35-48.

Stephen A. Donlon, former Dean of the Faculty at West Baden College, wrote a two-part article on "The Form Critics, the Gospels and St. Paul." He primarily wished to locate any evidence which would substantiate the form critical description of the primitive Christian communities. However, before handling this topic, Donlon presented the form critical method itself as found in the German texts of the form critics.

This scholar gave the most penetrating presentation of form criticism's principles yet to occur in American Catholic literature on formgeschichte. His work shows no traces of anxious apologetic. He explained the role of oral tradition forming the Gospel traditions,³⁶ presented the notion of the artificial framework of the Gospels,³⁷ and then showed the real implications of the Sitz im Leben theory. Because Sitz im Leben enables scholars to make careful studies of the function of Gospel narratives, he prophesied that a vast treasure of information

³⁶"The first of these assumptions is that before our Gospels and before all written source-matter of the Gospels, whatever it may have been, there was a period of oral tradition. It is a marked characteristic of the school to stress this early transmission....The second assumption, one that is implied in Schmidt's reconstruction of the early Christian meetings, is that the material of tradition, that is, Christ's words and deeds, circulated from mouth to mouth mainly as individual, independent units in 'forms,' which can even yet be recognized and restored. In this second assertion we approach the vital core of the theory. And it is from this assertion of the transmission of the Gospel material in 'forms' that the school takes its name." Stephen A. Donlon, "The Form-Critic, the Gospels, and St. Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly VI (April, 1944), pp. 162-63.

³⁷Ibid., p. 166.
Cf. also pp. 169-70.

concerning the era of primitive Christianity would be unearthed.³⁸

Donlon expressed no concern with the historical problems which had bothered previous critics when they had considered the implications of Sitz im Leben. Indeed, he reckoned such worries stemmed from presuppositions about what should be the contents of the Gospels rather than honest acceptance of what are the contents of the Gospels.³⁹

The Sitz im Leben theory is an honest, scientific approach to the Gospel contents, Donlon stated. He explained that the form critics accepted what the primitive Christian communities have offered to us because they want to deal with what evidence we actually have, not to quibble about what it would be nice to possess from early Christian times. In short, Donlon sided with the form critics because he found them open to the testimony contained in the New Testament and because

³⁸"Thus the Gospels open to us a rich mine of information about the life, the activities, the interests, the difficulties, the gradual growth and development of the years from 35 A.D. to the end of the Apostolic age."

Ibid., p. 167.

³⁹"In a word, let us say openly and boldly with Bultmann, 'we can know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, are moreover fragmentary and often legendary, and other sources about Jesus do not exist.'Or with Dibelius, 'consequently we must conclude that all original knowledge of the historical order of events in the life of Jesus was lost in the early communities,' or again, 'modern New Testament scholars have come to the conclusion that the first communities were not interested in chronology at all.'"

Ibid., pp. 168-69.

"The whole significance of the Sitz im Leben conception is missed if one does not understand that the Synoptic Gospels are a cross-section first and foremost of their own sociological stratum. And they become more or less historically significant, not as they give us more or less accurately the teachings and the actions of Jesus of Nazareth, but as they give more or less completely the best and most representative features of the Christian faith and life during the period in which their material crystallized."

Ibid., p. 167.

he found their method filled with exciting possibilities for understanding the Christian faith more deeply.⁴⁰

Donlon took time to defend Rudolf Bultmann from critics who accuse him of being radical. ("Arbitrary," "biased," "unscientific," and "capricious" are some other accusations which Donlon might have listed.) Donlon said that he believed that Bultmann had actually only applied the form critical techniques more honestly, completely, and consistently than had other form critics.⁴¹

Taking up the form critical concept of the Christian community, Donlon isolated five characteristics which the form critics maintain were determinant factors in the shaping of the tradition. He himself agreed that these five characteristics contain every significant influence upon the development of the tradition behind the Synoptic Gospels.⁴² The

⁴⁰"The Form-critic, in other words, offers us in place of an objective history -- that phantom pot-of-gold at the end of the rainbow -- the attainable reality of the Christian conception of Christ before the Gospels were written. Why should we wistfully pine for impossible treasures when we can stretch out our hands to riches that are within our grasp?"
Ibid., p. 168.

⁴¹"I am aware that Bultmann is regarded as more radical than many other Form-critics. But I am also inclined to believe that it is quite possible that he is really only more honest and thorough in his applications of the essential principles of the group to which he belongs."
Ibid., p. 168, fn. 30.

⁴²"My intention is to catalogue under several headings the principal features of this early Christian community as reconstructed by the method being studied, and then by applying an independent control to judge the accuracy of the Form-critics' reconstruction....There are, then, it seems to me, five qualities which are in the minds of Form-critics determinant factors in the shaping of the gospel before the Gospels and which we can readily isolate and catalogue. And I believe that these five will embrace all the important forces that came into play in the development of the real tradition basic to the Synoptic Gospels."
Ibid., p. 170.

In Part two of his article Donlon checked the same five points against the description contained in the Pauline letters. See below.

early Christian communities were 1) eschatologically oriented, 2) unregulated and democratic, 3) desirous of finding set norms for living the message of Jesus, 4) creative, and 5) independent.⁴³

Donlon did wonder how the Christians' early, zealous missionary preaching which recalled the immediate past fit in with form critical insistence that eschatological orientation totally erased concern for chronology.⁴⁴ He admitted that the Gospels offer no positivistic historical presentation, but he also thought that an immediate concern to preach the good news should have prevented the early Christians from losing all contact with verifiable facts, that is, with "objective historical reality."⁴⁵ Since he already described objective history as a "phantom pot-of-gold" and agreed that the early Christian communities had no chronological interests,⁴⁶ Donlon seems at this point to be at least imprecise if not contradictory. However, on the whole he is actually, although subtly, indicating that modern day historicism was

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴"As the [form-critical] opinions which we have cited show, these expectations operated in every case to produce a great carelessness about the actual sequence of events in the past. And when we take together the early Christian's exclusive concern with the Parousia and his absolute disregard of past historical sequence, we would seem to be at a loss to account for the activity of the early communities and their zealous spreading of their recollections of the immediate past."

Ibid., p. 172.

⁴⁵"If...the missionary purpose was operative from the very beginning ...then it becomes very hard to see how the Christians, try as they might, could lose practically all contact with objective historical reality."

Ibid.

⁴⁶Cf. fn. 39 and fn. 40 of Chapter Two.

not the view point from which early Christian communities handled their material.⁴⁷

Donlon noticed that none of the form critics mention hierarchical organization as a constitutive element where such mention would be expected.⁴⁸ The absence of any hierarchical element in these communities would be, for them, one of the reasons why the communities attempted to find norms for Christian living in the words and deeds of Jesus.⁴⁹ The autonomy postulated for each Christian community likewise derived from a supposed absence of hierarchical elements in the early Church.⁵⁰

⁴⁷"I do not wish to deny that Form-critics can now and then see rather clearly traces of creative community modification. And it may be well to cite a few examples adduced by Form-critics so that we may more clearly grasp the process that was going on throughout the whole expanse of biographical data about Christ in the first decades after the Ascension. From these examples the reader will be able to see how irresponsible a creative community can be, or rather how we are at fault in expecting a creative community to handle an originally historical incident after the manner of a professional and conscientious chronicler."
Ibid., p. 176.

⁴⁸"We have here a point which, I think, is more tacitly accepted than explicitly stated and proved. The evidence is rather privative than positive: there is no mention in the works of Form-critics of rulers or control or hierarchic organization, where it would be expected if Form-critics admitted the existence of rulers and organizations."
Ibid., pp. 172-73.

⁴⁹"Again, the assertion of Form-critics that the communities sought their laws of life and conduct in the words and deeds of Jesus presupposes an absence of recognized authorities who by reason of appointment and office could and did decide questions of cult, creed, and code, without necessarily citing chapter and verse."
Ibid., p. 173.

⁵⁰"The final quality which Form-criticism assigns to the early communities and which we have isolated for consideration is that of being autonomous. By that term I wish to indicate that this method denies that there was present among the various communities any uniformity based on single or hierarchical control. Naturally it is not to be expected that there be difformity among the Christian communities in every point, but the basis of any uniformity

At the close of the first part of this article, Donlon suggested that the real value of our present gospels may lie precisely in the fact that they represent the coming together of many independent streams of tradition representing the many different ways the life and teaching of Jesus had influenced men in various parts of the first century world.⁵¹

The second part of the article compared the Pauline communities of Corinth, Galatia, and Rome with the five qualities listed above. The Pauline letters, after all, provide evidence of an unquestionable Sitz im Leben within primitive Christian communities. Donlon examined them with a concern for objective, factual history and certain misgivings

that is present is to be sought in the common and inevitable residue of the very earliest Christian life and cult and, among certain churches, in their own native background of culture and religious practice, and not in any common authority imposing identical practice and cult on various Christian centers."
Ibid., p. 178.

⁵¹"In fact it would seem that the real value of our present Gospels is to be found in the answer that criticism will give to the question whether the Gospels proceed from centers which were of such importance in the life of early Christendom that the tradition which they preserved was likely to be more than purely local, was likely to have been fed by tributaries and to have been exposed to correction from many quarters. In the mind of Form-critics the more of these independent streams of life that flow into the reservoir of the Gospels the better, for the more we have, the more trustworthy becomes the composite photograph of one whose life and work had little value in themselves, but much in the spiritual and creative forces they unloosed in the Mediterranean world of the first Christian century."
Ibid., p. 179

about an unrestrained, creative element's handling the tradition.⁵²

Donlon stated that the form critics must answer whether the Pauline converts distorted historical events due to a hypertension produced by Parousia expectations.⁵³ Paul apparently contradicted the form critics on this point, especially with the concern exhibited in I Corinthians for mundane affairs.⁵⁴ Such practicality, Donlon concluded, applies to all Christians of Paul's era and makes them as sanely capable of telling a straight story as anyone else.⁵⁵

⁵²"We have then in the Pauline Epistles unquestioned and unquestionable material for the study of the life within the Christian communities during just those years when the tradition which we see finally crystallized in the Gospels was forming itself. Nowhere else can we hope to find so detailed a picture of the real Sitz im Leben. Do these Epistles present us with a sociological stratum in which undisciplined creative elements, unconfined by historical judgment, evolved a Christ in whom it hypostatized its aspirations, religious needs, and social ideals?" Ibid., pp. 307-308.

⁵³"What we wish to discover is whether Paul and the Gentile Christian of the period from 35 to 70 A.D. were so dominated by the thought of the approaching consummation to the present order of things that they could not lead normal lives, could have no interest in preserving the memory of past events with anything like historical accuracy. Before any discussion it should be clear that it is one thing to hope for or expect an event of cataclysmic proportions within the lifetime of persons now living and quite another to be so tense under the spell of that expectation that one cannot lead a normal life and preserve fundamentally accurate records of past events. The Form-critic needs to establish more than a mere expectation on the part of the first generation Christian. He must establish a state of mental distortion and tension induced by this expectation." Ibid., p. 308.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 315-17.

⁵⁵"Unless, then, we find other reasons for disqualifying him, the Christian of that age is to be considered as objective in regard to past events and future contingencies as his non-Christian contemporary in the urban centers of the world of that day." Ibid., p. 318.

Because Paul's letters do not reveal unorganized, uncontrolled, democratic communities, Donlon considered these characteristics major evidence against the form critical notion of a creative Christian community. Rather than uncontrolled and democratic, these communities come forth from Paul's letters as stable bodies with hierarchical organization, clearly under the direction of eyewitnesses of the resurrected Lord.⁵⁶ Thus, although Donlon conceded that there are certain creative community modifications present within the tradition, he found New Testament testimony that the communities and their traditions were under the guidance and safekeeping of leaders.

After Donlon's article, nothing of consequence appeared on our topic until John A. McEvoy concluded his article on C. H. Dodd. Nearly four years separated Donlon's and McEvoy's articles.

McEvoy still strove to repress any attacks from the form critics upon the factual history recorded in the Gospels. He continued his assault upon the creative community concept and introduced no new concepts in this section of his article.

If the form critics' notion of a creative community were to be disproved, McEvoy felt assured that the parables and their interpretations in the Gospels would be authenticated as records of what Jesus

⁵⁶"...only in uncontrolled and democratic (or one might better said unorganized) bodies could flourish those creative talents, which, according to Form-critics, acted upon the words and actions of Jesus to produce both standards of conduct for the Urgemeinde and our present Gospels."

Ibid.

Donlon likely had in mind such Pauline passages as I Cor. 15:1-11 and Galatians, Chapter Two.

actually taught.⁵⁷ McEvoy was convinced that his 1943 article had demonstrated the untenability of this creative community idea.⁵⁸

Words such as "authenticity" and "historical happenings" recurred when McEvoy treated specific Kingdom of God parables. He argued that even if the most stringently critical standards are applied to the parable of the Sower, people have sufficient evidence to accept it as genuine because all of the Synoptic Gospels record it.⁵⁹ Not only

⁵⁷"Since the assumption of re-interpretation by a 'creative' Christian community seems to have no basis in known historical fact, we can conclude that the kingdom parables and their interpretation as found in our written Gospels are to be accepted as the teaching of Christ remembered by those who heard Him speak. In other words, the Gospels as we have them are reliable historical records."

John A. McEvoy, "Realized Eschatology and the Kingdom Parables," Catholic Biblical Quarterly IX (Oct., 1947), p. 330.

⁵⁸"The purpose of my earlier article was to point out that the activity of this supposed 'creative' community has no basis in early Christian history."

Ibid.

Later in this article, McEvoy answered in the same fashion Dodd's claim that the Church developed an eschatology different from that of Christ's: "That such a new eschatology could arise, and, what is more, find its way into the record of the Gospels would suppose that the primitive Christian community was creative rather than receptive. We have called attention above to the fact that this supposition of the form critics is impossible, as is clearly shown in the early Epistles of St. Paul."

Ibid., p. 341.

⁵⁹"The parable of the Sower...is recorded by all three Synoptics, and this is sufficient basis to establish its authenticity. The same argument of agreement should hold for the authenticity of the explanation, even according to the principles of form criticism; though authenticity for these critics, of course, would mean that the explanation, as we have it, took form in the period of oral tradition before the written Gospels and is the product of the creative Christian community."

Ibid., p. 331.

the parable but also its explanation are from the lips of Jesus.⁶⁰

There is no need to use Sitz im Leben to account for the explanation attached to the parable unless it is presumed that no one opposed Jesus during his ministry.⁶¹

The very laws of Sitz im Leben work against the form critics in this case because, Sitz im Leben influences would have consistently transformed the parable and its explanation and removed all parts without community functions.⁶² Consequently, McEvoy concluded that the Sitz im Leben theory must be discounted because the parable contains many elements which its explanation does not account for.⁶³

Contrary to McEvoy's claim, no form critic demands a neat, logical development of the Synoptic tradition. Non-corresponding elements in a narrative are the very clues for deciphering the history of change and of formation which portions of the tradition experienced. As to the interpretation of the Sower, Dodd and the rest argued not from the

⁶⁰"Suffice it to say that all three (Synoptic Gospels) clearly record one historical happening...."

Ibid

⁶¹"It seems to me that here Dr. Dodd is denying the authenticity of the explanation of the parables on the ground that the supposed conditions which called it forth were not those of the time of Christ. Would this mean to say that all who actually heard Christ preach must have accepted His teaching but that only in the time of the early Church were men found who would reject it?"

Ibid., p. 334

⁶²Julicher contends that the parable is invented in view of the explanation; Dr. Dodd would say that the explanation is a late allegorical interpretation of the parable as a cryptogram. If either of these opinions were correct, we would expect complete and exact correspondence between every term of both the parable and the explanation."

Ibid., p. 338

⁶³Such is the inference to be drawn from McEvoy's argument.

impossibility of anyone's opposing Jesus, but from the length of time implied in references to persecution, early faith choked off by cares, etc.

At about this same time, Paul Gaechter was just beginning a three-part study of literary forms in the Apocalypse.⁶⁴ By inquiring into the literary forms present in the Apocalypse, he realized he could understand more clearly the tradition preserved in this book. The laws of literary forms, which people often regard as trite,⁶⁵ can often enable a scholar, Gaechter said, to understand the text before him and to locate discrepancies.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Gaechter was and remains a teacher at Innsbruck, Austria.

⁶⁵"Take for example the seven bowls. That they are arranged after the traditional sacred number seven, excludes any further-bowls as also belonging to that group; the same number also requires that there be no less than seven, not five or six. There seem to be truisms, but the truisms have not always been sufficiently taken into account."

Paul Gaechter, "Semitic Literary Forms in the Apocalypse and Their Import," Theological Studies VIII (Dec., 1947), p. 559.

⁶⁶"The closed forms offer a welcome means by which to judge omissions. If an author like St. John in the Apocalypse had mentioned the seven churches, but then had put down letters to only six of them, everybody would agree that a seventh was due, but had been lost, or had been omitted for some reason or other, contrary to the intention of the author."

Ibid., p. 561.

"The closed forms are also means to discover intrusions and additions. But we have seen that this is a delicate matter. Unless the entire forms are known with all their accessory facts, that is, with all the matter inserted in order to separate and join their essentials, portions might be eliminated that belonged originally to the text as St. John had conceived it. We have found to be of that kind what now goes under the fifth seal (6:9-11, probable), the heavenly praises (12:10-12; 16:5-7; 19:1-8 or 10), the exhortations (13:9-10; 16:15), and the Lamb or Shepherd (14:1-5)."

Ibid., p. 565.

In his second and third articles Gaechter demonstrated the importance of the Apocalypse's literary forms for the final editor of the book. Gaechter felt certain that discrepancies to the original tradition can be traced to the final editor, who had forgotten original material and had substituted forms which were similar to it.⁶⁷

Because Joseph L. Lilly's article "The Idea of Redemption in the Gospels" concerned the same topic which David Stanley would handle ten years later, it provides interesting points of comparison. It will indicate how the use of form criticism gave Stanley a wholly new perspective on the idea of redemption in the Gospels.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ "Memory also sometimes takes hold of a literary form whose genuine contents are forgotten and replaced at random, or with matter similar to the original one. When our editor had finished writing what he remembered of the description of the eternal city, his memory fell upon a form which in other passages was applied as a formal conclusion of a major section..." Paul Gaechter, "The Role of Memory in the Making of the Apocalypse," Theological Studies IX, (Sept., 1948), p. 520. The other article by Gaechter is in Theological Studies X, (Dec., 1949), pp. 419-52.

All of Gaechter's articles were certainly in the spirit of Divino Afflante Spiritu's call for close attention to literary form.

⁶⁸ Joseph L. Lilly received the licentiate of sacred scripture from the Biblical Commission in 1932. Prior to receiving this degree he had studied in Rome at the Angelicum. In 1932-33 he studied at the Ecole Biblique. He is the co-translator of the Kleist-Lilly translation of the New Testament. "Proceedings of the 1937 General Meeting," The Catholic Biblical Association of America, p. 151.

Lilly wished to remove suspicion that the Christian idea of redemption stemmed from sources other than Jesus' teaching.⁶⁹

After offering a summary of the word lutron in order to demonstrate the history of this word for the early Christians,⁷⁰ Lilly presented Jesus' prediction of his passion and death as evidence that the idea of redemption originated with Jesus.⁷¹ He concluded that the Gospels themselves substantiate that ultimately no one else but Jesus formulated the Christian understanding of redemption.⁷²

69" ...there is no need to look to pagan myths and mystery cults for the origin of the Christian belief in regard to redemption. Neither is it necessary to say that the doctrine was devised by St. Paul, in an effort to give a satisfactory explanation of the death of Jesus, which was so disappointing and so perplexing to His first Jewish disciples, since Our Lord Himself taught the doctrine."

Joseph L. Lilly, "The Idea of Redemption in the Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly IX (July, 1947), p. 257.

70 Ibid., p. 258.

71" ...we have the several predictions of our Lord's passion and death as something necessary to His life's work. The word dei is used in each of the three Gospels, indicating that Jesus' suffering and death were an essential part of His mission. If this prediction, which was reiterated three times by our Lord shortly before His death, is deferred so long, it is because only at the close of His life had the Apostles become sufficiently prepared for this startling prediction, which was wholly alien to their concept of the Messiah."

Ibid., p. 260.

72" ...the idea of vicarious redemption...is found directly or by implication in more than one passage in the Gospels, and unless we are prepared, on a priori grounds and with no objective evidence, to wave aside all these passages as subsequent Christian speculation falsely attributed by the Evangelists to our Lord Himself, we have no alternative but to admit that He Himself gave us the main ideas of the Pauline and subsequent Christian theology on this point."

Ibid., p. 257.

Cf. also p. 261.

Some of Lilly's statements included the familiar words of attack upon form critics.⁷³

Like most Catholic critics Lilly did not seem to grasp what happened to the Gospel tradition as the early Christians, in response to specific circumstances, probed the meaning of the good news. Like most Catholic critics Lilly believed Gospel authenticity depended on the preservation of Jesus' exact words and deeds in the context in which they occurred. As biblical scholarship began simply to overwhelm these men, they eventually had to face the confusion of reorienting their understanding of what type of history the Gospels proclaim.

A glance at typical book reviews from this era shows they were strikingly hostile in their attitude toward form criticism. The reviewers' major purpose was to uphold historical objectivity in the Gospels. Criticisms invariably were strident. It would seem that the less space offered, the higher the volume and virulency of the protests against the dangers of the form critical method.

One review looked at McGinley's dissertation, which was published as a book in 1945. John E. Steinmueller lauded McGinley for

⁷³"...which some critics try to discredit on wholly a priori grounds."

Ibid., p. 259.

"...whose authenticity there is no good reason to question or deny."

Ibid., p. 259.

"...on a priori grounds and with no objective evidence...."

Ibid., p. 257.

his objective, forceful refutation of the form critics' arguments. Steinmueller placed McGinley's work among those volumes indispensable for Catholic scripture scholars and apologists.⁷⁴ The others he recommended were the articles by Peirce in Ecclesiastical Review, 1935, and the articles by McEvoy and Donlon in Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 1943-44.

Joseph L. Lilly reviewed The Historical Mission of Jesus by Cecil John Cadoux in a manner which strikes us today as shrill and defensive. Although a Catholic Scripture scholar could vigorously object to Cadoux, he should choose a rational, scholarly manner if he is going to object. For example, Lilly proved nothing about the Synoptic tradition's presentation of damnation when he indignantly retorted that Cadoux was insulting modern Catholics with his remarks.⁷⁵

⁷⁴"The reviewer is impressed by the clear and logical presentation of the arguments of the critics as well as by the author's objective and forceful refutation of them. The book represents a substantial contribution to the correct evaluation of Form Criticism and of comparative religion. It may be regarded as an indispensable book for Catholic biblical scholars and apologists." John E. Steinmueller, Catholic Biblical Quarterly VII (Jan., 1945), p.126.

⁷⁵"(Cadoux) accuses Jesus of error because His teaching on eternal punishment contradicts His own revelation about God. In consequence of this 'the modern Christian conscience has definitely given up its belief in fiery and eternal punishment.' We infer, accordingly, that for Dr. Cadoux, the consciences of 350 million Catholics are not 'modern' or not 'Christian?'" Joseph L. Lilly, Catholic Biblical Quarterly VII (July, 1945), p.255.

Richard Kugelman reviewed a translation of Maurice Goguel's The Life of Jesus in order to determine one matter: Goguel's position on the Gospels as historical documents.⁷⁶ Kugelman accused Goguel of falling victim to the same arbitrariness for which Goguel himself had attacked the form critics.⁷⁷ Kugelman concluded that books such as Goguel's demonstrate the extreme care with which introductory Scripture courses must be taught in order to retain the basis of Christian apologetics, namely, the historical validity of the Gospels.⁷⁸

Laurence J. McGinley's review of The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels by R. V. G. Tasker was the first book review in Theological

76"(Goguel's) previous writings, his offices as Director of Studies at the Ecole des Haute Etudes and Professor at the Faculte libre de Theologie Protestante prepared the reviewer to find the book in disagreement with Catholic critics on many points of detail. He was preoccupied with only one question: What does Goguel think of the Gospels as historical documents?"

Richard Kugelman, Catholic Biblical Quarterly VII (July, 1945), p. 370.

77"In spite of his plea for objectivity and his condemnation of the arbitrariness of Formgeschichte, Goguel is guilty of the very crime he condemns -- subjectivism."

Ibid., p. 371

78"Books such as Goguel's witness to the timeliness and importance of our Seminary course on Special Introduction to the Gospels. The historical validity of the four Gospels, which is the very basis of our apologetics, is the Christian bastion, which modern unbelief has chosen for the object of its attack."

Ibid., p. 373.

Studies which explicitly mentioned form criticism.⁷⁹ McGinley offered some variations on the theme of Gospel authenticity, but his ideas did not fundamentally differ from all other objections to a community developing its tradition by faith-responses to its own situations.⁸⁰ These objections emphasized that the tradition is based in Jesus. However, the objectors did not see that even a developing, changing tradition can be based in Jesus Christ. In other words, the problem reaches back to each person's perspective on the historical orientation of the early Christians and on their understanding of their own traditions.

McGinley applauded the form critics for their emphasis on oral tradition, which he said had been a commonplace teaching among Catholics for years.⁸¹ (As noted in this paper already, such

⁷⁹"He (Tasker) is well acquainted with the tenets of form-criticism and of the older historico-critical schools...." Laurence J. McGinley, Theological Studies VII (Dec, 1946), pp. 594-5.

⁸⁰"The ultimate evidence' for the resurrection he finds in the faith and changed lives of the earliest believer: which is correct, of course, in the sense that we can understand the stories and be sure of their ultimate validity only in the living Church which believed and taught the resurrection it had witnessed -- but not in the sense that these narratives were merely faith-produced." Ibid., p. 598.

⁸¹"This book evidences the growing realization among Protestant critics of the significance of the period of oral tradition. Dr. Tasker estimates it as 'at least 35 years' and recognizes that 'the faith of the earliest Christians was independent (of the Four Gospels).' For Catholic scholars this has long been commonplace: the Church produced the Gospels, not vice-versa. It is to be hoped that non-Catholic scholars will soon progress to the further realization that it was also the Church which taught these books after they were written. Not only their origin but their meaning is to be studied in the framework of the Christian community: the authentic portrait of Jesus is not dependent on any one Gospel, or even on all four, today any more than it was in the time of the First Christian preaching." Ibid., p. 598.

satisfaction with the Catholic teaching on oral tradition was due for a rude awakening as the form critical exponents began more and more precisely to explain what this period of oral tradition entailed.)

The last book for review, written by Donald W. Riddle and Harold H. Hutson, was New Testament Life and Literature. Two reviews appeared on this book, one by McGinley in 1947 and one by William A. Dowd in 1948.

McGinley merely rehashed all the major objections which he had made to form criticism in his dissertation,⁸² and he concluded that any document purporting to be history contained either positive history or total illusion.⁸³

Dowd saw form criticism as attempted sabotage upon Christianity, but claimed that Catholic scholarship had utterly demolished the

82" ...the Catholic scholar will not object to the interpretation of the period of oral tradition as one of sporadic collections of stories about Jesus. But he will renew his charge that there are too many serious defects in the form-critical approach: arbitrary assignment of the Gospels to folklore because of similarities, with a complete neglect of essential differences; a psychologically false theory of spontaneous collective creation of so individualized a doctrine as that taught by Jesus, and an historically inaccurate picture of the primitive Christian community as amorphous; a failure to recognize in the Gospels the personal products of individual authors and not mere compilations; the essential difficulty of testing a human story by artificially elaborated standards of form or environment; and finally the form-critics' neglect of historical testimony...their failure to face the time element...and the negative results (for example, Christianity is presented as a vital, world-changing movement with no basis in reality)."

Laurence J. McGinley, Theological Studies VIII (June, 1947), p.311.

83"Such intellectual shoulder-shrugging fails to meet the central problem of how this very real New Testament life and literature could have been based on total illusion."

Ibid.

method⁸⁴ by establishing the historicity of the Gospels.⁸⁵

Dowd welcomed the book because it provided Catholic college students with a text to pick apart and easily refute.⁸⁶

⁸⁴"The aim of this book, as stated in its preface, is 'to present the results of scholarship to the student who is interested in the New Testament as a book of literature, of history, and of religion.' This introductory statement is quite misleading. 'The results of scholarship' presented are restricted to the work of advocates of form criticism, the latest rationalistic attempt to undermine the Christian religion. In using this book the young student would get the impression that form criticism has been solidly established on a scientific basis and that there is little or nothing to be said against it. But this system of criticism has been shown to be utterly false by Catholic scholars, and there is no call for a fresh refutation of it here."
William A. Dowd, Catholic Biblical Quarterly IX (Jan., 1948), p. 107.

⁸⁵"The historical reliability of the New Testament has been firmly established by Catholic scholars, with whom many outside the Church are in agreement, and this historicity sweeps away the foundations on which form criticism is built."
Ibid., p. 108.

⁸⁶"The teacher of apologetics may however find this book useful as a concise presentation of the principles, methods, and conclusions of the form critics. From it he will be able to take a mass of erroneous statements that his class will be able to demolish with ease."
Ibid., p. 107.

During the forties Divino Afflante Spiritu appeared and called for new scholarly advances to be taken by Catholics in Scriptural matters. By calling for an investigation of literary forms in Scripture, the encyclical told Catholics that the Bible was composed by men with standards appropriate to their own times. Literary form investigation thereby implied that the historicism of the nineteenth and twentieth century might not have been a biblical viewpoint.

The historicism behind most American Catholics' reactions to form criticism became more clearly evident during this period. Not clearly evident, however, was that only a new historical perspective on the New Testament would enable American Catholics to alter their opinions of form criticism and, indeed, to appreciate the historical quality of early Christianity.

During the forties the amenability of some Catholics to form criticism was overshadowed by the strident attacks upon the method coming from nearly all sides. Nevertheless, in an atmosphere of suspicion and hostility, Stephen Donlon did write an open, courageous, scholarly article inquiring into proper uses of form criticism. And yet he alone gave any hint in the 1940's that American Catholics might one day disagree with certain form critics' conclusions and yet use the method critically.

Despite the presence of Divino Afflante Spiritu and one article by Stephen Donlon, the forties closed as did the thirties. American Catholics still found that form criticism disagreed with their views of Christianity as well as with their views of the formation of the New Testament.

Chapter Three

"1950-1959"

The American Catholic biblical scholars' reactions to form criticism began to alter subtly in the 1950's as some American Catholics began earnestly to implement the directives from Divino Afflante Spiritu. They began to differentiate form criticism from various proponents of the method; some even began to employ form criticism in their own work. In most cases scholars at least guardedly accepted form criticism as a proven tool in biblical research. Worries about the evils of form criticism even began to drift into the background although many individual Catholics remained altogether suspicious of the method and continued to attack it in a manner reminiscent of the 1930's and 1940's.

This shift in the scholarly community of American Catholic biblical men is best described as an expanding of horizons. Topics such as the nature of the historical testimony in the Gospels began to dominate investigations. Literary form analysis began to appear. Commentary on form criticism still appeared, but, as the fifties neared completion, more and more scholarly articles, using form criticism and other new scientific methods, began to investigate the New Testament.

The manner in which American Catholic scholars began to handle Rudolf Bultmann's work was the first indication of the shift beginning to occur.

When John McKenzie reviewed Rudolf Bultmann's Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der Antiken Religionen, he criticized Bultmann mainly for losing sight of the very soul of Christianity in his minute analysis of details.¹ Bultmann's attention to common religious elements in Christianity fails to take account of the unique phenomenon of Christianity, namely, the transforming power which faith in Jesus did accomplish.² Although McKenzie placed much stress on historical problems and proper respect for history,³ later accounts by him clarify that he did not mean that

¹"The question we may ask here is whether Bultman's position is altogether consistent with itself, whether he has not elaborated a Christianity which is unintelligible, once he has made it 'Christian'; for that is what he has done....The fault of Bultmann's method is to lose sight of the soul of Christianity in the study of details, and to become so fascinated by the community of Christian ideas and expressions with those of the world of its own time as to forget that Christianity, as a whole, has an overpowering unity and consistency which it inherited from no predecessor."
John McKenzie, Theological Studies XI (Sept., 1950), pp. 439-40.

²"There is, Bultmann tells us, no historical apologetic for Christianity, and he is not concerned, as a historian, with demonstrating its truth. Be that as it may, Bultmann explains Christianity only at the cost of being unhistorical. The apologete runs no greater risk. As a historian, Bultmann is scarcely able to renounce also, as he does, the task of explaining the 'victory' of Christianity over ancient religions, or, at least, its unquestioned transcendence and its creative power. He will do well to consider profoundly that Gospel text which mentions putting new wine into old bottles."
Ibid., p. 440.

³"It must be conceded that primitive Christianity is a very complex phenomenon which cannot be placed in the categories of Jewish and Hellenistic religion and philosophy. Does one, then, solve the historical problem it presents by dissolving it back into these categories? Surely this is to take from it what it manifested historically, and what was claimed for it by both Jesus and Paul -- its newness. It is also to disintegrate it, to rob it of its inner unity, not only as a doctrine, but as a 'way', as it is called in the Acts. Primitive Christianity is presented in the New Testament not as a philosophy, nor as a cult, nor as a religion, as religion

the Gospels are positivist history.⁴

The "soulless" aspect of Bultmann's picture of Christianity, commented on by McKenzie appeared again in other reviewers. Perhaps McKenzie popularized the idea. McGinley had said the same thing in his dissertation when criticizing the form critics' methods of dissection.⁵ McGinley's remark is valid as a reminder that form criticism is a tool in literary criticism and that it can be only the beginning of a person's Scripture research.

was understood in the Judaeo-Hellenistic world, but as a way of life; and that way of life was Christ, the historical Jesus as the living redeemer. There is a tremendous difference between this and the gnostic redemption-myths, or the cultic communion with divinity or the mystery rites. Quite simply, Bultmann has not grasped the essence of primitive Christianity."

Ibid.

⁴On May 24, 1967, McKenzie explained in a personal interview that the history imbuing this tradition is anecdotal history, that is, a history of stories which the Christian storytellers found able to convey the significance of Jesus Christ. These storytellers never questioned the existence of Jesus, even though their stories lacked spatial, temporal, and even sometimes factual settings; their story forms did enable them to express deep insights into the meaning of Jesus' existence.

⁵"One further observation may be made here which applies not only to the whole process of form-analysis which we have been considering. Such labor is essentially only dissection. At its end we have the fragments of the mosaic, the threads of the tapestry, the bones and tissue of the cadaver neatly arranged and labeled. We have learned much, but while we learned, the living reality of the whole has disappeared. It is only when we consider the Gospels in their organic totality, vitalized by the message and personality of Jesus, that our knowledge ceases to be sterile."

"Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," Theological Studies II (Nov., 1941), op. cit., p. 471.

When James Visker reviewed Bultmann's Jesus, he made no attack upon Bultmann for being a rationalist, or a skeptic. He acknowledged Bultmann's genius and bowed to the true religious dimensions of the man.⁶ And still he disagreed with Bultmann's conclusions concerning large portions of the Synoptic and Johannine traditions. Visker maintained that these portions can be used to reconstruct the teaching of Jesus.⁷ He also objected that Bultmann mixes his exegesis with theological and philosophical presuppositions.⁸

Most scholars adopted Visker's approach. Smear tactics did not totally disappear. But even though Catholics continued to object to Bultmann's conclusions, at least in most cases the objections were scholarly not caustic.

⁶"A summary can scarcely grasp the spiritual strength of this small volume. It is written with profound religious feeling, in a vigorous style, and has its source in a strong religious conception which is that of an individualistic Lutheranism and of dialectical theology. The author's power of penetration and expression often throws a clear light on fundamental points of the teaching of Christ."

James M. Visker, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Jan, 1953), p.96.

⁷"Still it is impossible to accept Dr. Bultmann's conception. From a critical point of view, we cannot agree with him when he refuses to make use of large parts of the synoptic tradition and of the Fourth Gospel for the reconstruction of the teachings of Jesus."

Ibid., pp. 96-97.

⁸"From an exegetical point of view, he is not justified in understanding the message of Jesus in function of the modern categories of dialectical theology and existentialism."

Ibid., p. 97.

R. P. Bierberg discussed another product of Bultmann's research, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, which he said supplied the evidence as to where form criticism, as employed by Bultmann, would lead one.⁹ Christianity's body without its soul appears once more,¹⁰ and Bierberg regrets that for Bultmann Christianity had become illusion and fantasy and had lost its historical foundations.¹¹

Two penetrating, incisive reviews of Vincent Taylor's classic work, The Gospel According to Mark, indicate further the directions which the American Catholic champions of the form critical method were taking. The reviews were from David Stanley and John McKenzie.

Stanley and McKenzie took the occasion to handle certain objections against form criticism long associated with American Catholics. They found these objections to be something less than unshakeable refutations.

⁹"The significance of the present volume is this, then, that it supplies us with the total context of Form-Criticism as applied to the New Testament and illustrates once more the inevitable results of a science that ignores or divorces itself from intellectual faith."

R. P. Bierberg, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Oct., 1953), p.382.

¹⁰"The general impression one gets from reading Theologie des Neuen Testaments is similar to the feeling one has after a thorough course in anatomy. The body of Christianity has been scientifically analyzed and described, all or most of its organs have been weighed and measured, the interrelation and integration of parts have been contemplated with wonder and satisfaction. But one is not sure whether the organism studied is a corpse or a mental abstraction. One thing is sure: it is not living. What is lacking or entirely overlooked or simply denied is the internal principle of unity and activity -- its soul."

Ibid., pp. 385-86.

¹¹"Bultmann has, of course, an explanation for the soul of Christianity as it is reflected in the pages of the New Testament: it is a primitive intrusion of Gnostic fantasy into the cold structure of historical fact. Mystery is simply myth. Thus he rules out any philosophical or supernatural interpretation of Christianity."

Ibid., p. 386

But they did pick out what was valid in the old objections, give it the twist of their own individual genius, and thus promote both an intelligent acceptance of form criticism and a recognition of its proper limitations. Stanley immediately linked serious consideration of form criticism with serious consideration of Pius XII's emphasis on interpreting literary forms.¹³

By using a Sitz im Leben theory more flexible and more inclusive than Dibelius' strict emphasis on preaching and on the role of the

12

"Dr. Taylor's ability to evaluate the contributions of men like K. L. Schmidt,....of W. Wrede's Messiasgeheimnis, and particularly of the Form Critics, Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann, whose names recur constantly throughout the commentary, gives this book perhaps its greatest importance for the student of today."

David M. Stanley, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Oct., 1953), p. 393.

13

"Moreover -- and this contributes in no small measure to the usefulness of his work -- (Dr. Taylor) has broken down the results of his Form Criticism of the second Gospel....These results of his own formgeschichtlich investigations which contain Dr. Taylor's estimate of the various materials and influences that have gone into the making of Mark deserve to be carefully studied by anyone who claims to take at all seriously the desire expressed in Divino Afflante Spiritu:...'catholicus exegata, ut hodiernis, rei biblicae necessitatibus rite satisfaciatur, in exponenda Sacra Scriptura...eo quocumque prudenter subsidio utatur, ut percipiat quid dicendi forma seu litterarum genus, ab hagiographo adhibitum, ad veram et genuinam conferat interpretationem: ac sibi persuadeat hanc officii sui partem sine magno catholicae exegeseos detrimento neglegi non posse.'"

Ibid., p. 394.

creative community, Taylor offered another major contribution.¹⁴

Stanley himself would formulate explicit modifications of Sitz im Leben in the coming years, and thereby offer to scholars new tools for understanding the New Testament.¹⁵

Stanley rhetorically questioned Taylor on the historical nature of Mark.¹⁶ Stanley was the first American Catholic to qualify such a question and ask "What type of history ensues once the unique event of the Incarnation is proclaimed?"¹⁷ He also posed the question which so many other critics had addressed to the form critics: Does the fact of a developed tradition or of specific practical needs

¹⁴"(Dr. Taylor's) remarks in discussing the form of the Pro-nouncement Story are worth reporting here. 'It is in the isolating and description of this kind of narrative that Form Criticism has achieved its greatest success, but it is not wise to limit the formative influences to which they owe their peculiar character to preaching or to discussions within the community, or to describe the type too narrowly.' It is this openmindedness and balance of judgment which may be said to characterize the exegetical and critical methods of our commentator."

Ibid., p. 394.

¹⁵See Chapter Four, pp. 130-36

¹⁶"Here is a question which every critic has the right to ask: is the second Gospel to be considered historical?...What does Dr. Taylor mean by the historical?"

Ibid., pp. 397-98.

¹⁷"...and what does History mean in this connection? If the Son of God, a Divine Person, has entered our world by assuming a human nature, does not this unique fact create a conception of History quite removed from the profane? Modern historians have rejected the naive, 19th century 'liberal' view of History. The exegete of today needs to clarify his ideas about the nature of the religious History, produced by the fact of a Divine revelation, if the science of biblical criticism is to be free completely of the outmoded parti pris of Rationalism which hinders its advance."

Ibid.

invalidate accuracy within Mark's account?¹⁸ However, Stanley had already hinted, and later would explicitate, that the question of Gospel history must be posed correctly.¹⁹

McKenzie's massive review devoted itself directly and indirectly to the historical considerations constantly rearing up in any discussion of form criticism. Taylor's reservations regarding certain form critics' conclusions made McKenzie hesitant to call Taylor a form critic; however, McKenzie pointed out that Taylor willingly used much of form criticism in his commentary on Mark.²⁰

Taylor's evaluation of the doctrinal, catechetical, liturgical, and apologetic influences on the Gospel of Mark did not lead him to believe that Mark had been hindered in faithfully reporting primitive tradition.²¹ Note the subtle switch McKenzie interjected into the historical question: Primitive tradition is what is being faithfully reported,

¹⁸"If Mark's aim was to preserve the oral teaching of the primitive Church, and if 'it is undoubtedly true that Mark's Gospel reflects the ideas of the primitive Christian kerygma, but it does this because the earliest preaching rested upon what Jesus had done and taught,' then do apologetic, liturgical, catechetical, doctrinal aims tell against Mark's accuracy as an historian? Of what else could this oral teaching of the first Christians consist?" Ibid., p. 398

¹⁹ See Chapter Four, pp. 145-46.

²⁰"Taylor is familiar with the principles and the work of Formgeschichte, and accepts much of it, but with such notable reservations that he can scarcely be called a 'form critic' himself" John L. McKenzie, Theological Studies XIV (May, 1953), p. 300.

²¹"Certainly Taylor does not accept the Gospel as a historical source as it is accepted in those circles called 'conservative' Taylor's introduction concludes with an evaluation of the historical value of Mark. Although he finds the Gospel affected by apologetic, liturgical, catechetical, and doctrinal interests, none of these prevent Mark from reporting faithfully primitive tradition." Ibid., p. 300, p. 303.

and this tradition is seen as already possessing a set form before being compiled into the written Gospel.²² McKenzie agreed with Taylor that the tradition reached its set forms by being constantly retold in the communities.²³ The widely varying original forms of the stories might well have come from different people claiming to be personal witnesses.²⁴

Taylor was not encumbered by any of the extreme notions about the creative community. Although he conceded that the communities shared in the composition of the Gospel tradition, he rejected any

²²"To this reviewer, the methods and the approach of Taylor seem sound; the Gospel is treated as a compilation, but a compilation of primitive traditions, which had already taken a set form in oral tradition to some extent before the Evangelist put them down."

Ibid., p. 300

²³"In Taylor's hypothesis, we see the early Christian communities as they must have been: telling and retelling the life of Jesus until its various episodes began to assume set forms according to their content...."

Ibid., pp. 301-2.

²⁴"...eagerly listening to each new form of the story which could be authenticated as coming from personal witnesses."

Ibid., p. 302

In the May 24, 1967 interview McKenzie discussed the appeal to eyewitnesses made by the opponents of form criticism. He pulled out a Greek synopsis of the Gospels and read the narratives in Matthew and Mark which state that the disciples fled when Jesus was arrested; then he asked whom the Gospels designate as eyewitnesses of the Passion. He pointed out that the Gospels concur in saying that all of the disciples fled from Jesus in the earliest moments. McKenzie agreed that there had been eyewitnesses to the ministry of Jesus, but he pointed out that these men did not compile their eyewitness observations until long after the incidents had occurred. McKenzie wished to consider the primitive Christians as human persons able, even prone, to add details and to forget circumstances of even the most important events. McKenzie also wondered whether the state of the tradition which we have is the report of the eyewitnesses or of a worked-over, later edition.

crude fabrication.²⁵

The break with the criticism of the 1930's and 1940's is clearly established with Roderick A. F. MacKenzie's review of Bibel-Lexicon. Although not typical of all American Catholic Scripture scholars,²⁶ MacKenzie did typify the new biblical scholarship making a solid entrance into the Church. In these new scholars, acceptance and skillful use of form criticism as a technique was part of the development of first-rate Catholic biblical criticism. In answer to the continuing hesitation of many, MacKenzie called attention not only to the directives given in Divino Afflante Spiritu, but also to the embarrassing history of the Catholic Church in scientific biblical studies. MacKenzie warned that this embarrassing history would repeat itself if the Catholics allowed confusion about form criticism officially to hinder biblical progress by Catholic scholars.²⁷

²⁵"(Taylor's hypothesis of Mark's literary origins) is free of the fantasies of the older critics. It does not treat the Gospel as the 'creation of the primitive Christian community,' but it gives this community a share in its composition." Theological Studies XIV (May, 1953), op. cit., p. 301.

²⁶More typical of most American Catholic Scripture scholarship in the 1950's would be William A. Dowd's continued opposition to form criticism per se. See Catholic Biblical Quarterly XII (Jan., 1950), p. 107, and Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIII (July, 1951), p. 233.

²⁷The article on Formgeschichtliche Methode is a good example of the sobriety and moderation of the work. Starting with the definite statement that form-criticism has yielded excellent results and is of indispensable value to the NT critic, it goes on to describe the exaggerated conclusions reached by some of its practitioners, especially in regard to the Gospels, and to mention that it is these abuses which have occasioned a certain distrust of form-criticism among Catholics. But abusus non tollit usum, and the emphatic recommendations of Divino Afflante Spiritu are once more quoted. This is well and opportunely said, for an unfortunate tendency is discernible in some writers today to confuse form-criticism as a doctrine -- scilicet, the conclusions of Bultmann,

Raymond E. Brown introduced the term "modified form criticism" in his review of Albert Descamps' Les Justes et la Justice dans les Evangiles et le Christianisme Primitif.²⁸ Brown employed this term in reviews and articles which appeared in the later 1950's. By the term he meant form criticism with some changes in the creative community notion and in the understanding of the role of the evangelists. Stanley called these two, Sitz im Leben ecclesiae and Sitz im Evangelium. In addition to the technical precision gained by these modifications, "modified form criticism" made more palatable to Catholics a method indispensable in any scientific biblical study.²⁹

John McKenzie continued the defense of form criticism as an indispensable, firmly established technique when he reviewed the posthumous publication of Martin Dibelius' Botschaft und Geschichte.

"Dibelius, et. al., mostly unacceptable to Catholics -- with form criticism as a technique. The latter Catholic scholars ought to make use of, in just the same way as textual criticism or the findings of archaeology. A similar confusion reigned, years ago, with regard to 'literary criticism,' and its effects on Catholic exegesis was not a little prejudiced."
R.A.F. McKenzie, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Jan., 1954), p.57.

²⁸"This method, then, is clearly an adaptation of the ideas of the Formgeschichtliche Schule. In fact, it is very interesting to notice the number of times the Bultman and/or Dibelius analysis of the literary form of a passage is accepted at face value. In view of the increasing enthusiasm with which modified Form Criticism is being received in English-speaking Catholic Scripture circles, the method employed with such fidelity by Descampe should be of interest to many."

Raymond Brown, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Jan., 1954), p. 108.

²⁹In the May 24, 1967 interview with John McKenzie, the Jesuit scholar remarked that Brown knows that form criticism is not modified one bit. He meant form criticism is not watered down, however, because he conceded that Sitz im Leben Jesu, Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae, and Sitz im Evangelium have given the early Sitz im Leben insight more precision and thus have modified form criticism.

While reading McKenzie's review I recalled William A. Dowd's remark that Catholic scholars had utterly demolished form criticism.³⁰ Contrary to Dowd, McKenzie demonstrated that he had not allowed conclusions by some form critics to obscure for him the real value of the form critical method. He stated explicitly that he would continue to employ the method, denied that it invariably led to heretical conclusions, and underlined that it produced Scriptural insights unattainable by any other means. McKenzie clearly saw form criticism as a tool, not as a doctrine.³¹

However, McKenzie did renew his criticism that Bultmann and Dibelius leave Christianity soulless. Because Dibelius and Bultmann appealed to "usual" occurrences to explain the revolution initiated by Christianity, McKenzie said they lost the dynamism and originality

³⁰ See above, p.53 , fn. 85, and p. 54- fn. 86.

³¹ "The method of criticism to which [Dibelius] devoted his life has been solidly established; we shall accept his principles and techniques, even if we shall not reach the same conclusions. In the last article (of this book), Dibelius was sincerely searching for the real Jesus and for His place in the modern world. We do not think that he found either; but we shall employ his methods to look for the real Jesus and for His meaning to us in places where perhaps we should not otherwise have sought Him."
John McKenzie, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (July, 1954), pp. 255-56.

of Christianity.³²

McKenzie did not stoop to attack Dibelius for being an irreligious person; on the contrary, he acknowledged Dibelius' genuine religious sentiments. Other reviewers, however, queried what they called Dibelius' new religious feelings. Elmer O'Brien even suggested that the religious sentiments in this posthumous work exposed Dibelius' underlying dissatisfaction with form criticism.³³

³²"It seems rather evident, at least to this reviewer, that [Dibelius' analysis of the Sermon on the Mount] evacuates Christianity. No doubt the 'doctrinal' elements of Christianity can be overemphasized, and the function of the Redeemer be reduced to that of teacher; but there has to be some intelligible content, some 'what' in our belief. What does this message of Jesus add to the categorical imperative admitted by anyone who believes in such a thing as ethics that a man ought to do always what he thinks right? Is this the Christian revolution? Dibelius remarks that the Sermon on the Mount does not lead to the Cross. Whether we view the teaching of Jesus historically -- which Dibelius says we cannot do -- or in the 'traditions' of form criticism, it is difficult to see how any one as familiar with the Gospels as Dibelius can fail to see that the cross is one with the whole life and teaching of Jesus. For His life and teaching are a negation of human values, and this is the cross; and this is more than a statement of the ethical principle that one must do good and avoid evil."

Ibid., p. 255.

³³"It would not be without interest were one to compare, as an indication of minor trend, (Vincent) Taylor's excessive use of Form Criticism with the posthumous publication of Dibelius.... One would not belabor the point that whereas Taylor busily adds hypothetical documents to his field of investigation, Dibelius busily subtracts real ones from his, for another divergency would impress itself on one as of much greater import. I mean the religious atmosphere that pervades this last book of Dibelius and the willingness, obscurely manifest here, to read biblical passages in terms of their present spiritual value."

Elmer O'Brien, "Theological Trends of 1953," Thought XXIX (June, 1954), p. 121.

The striking contrast between two reviews of Jacques Dupont's study of the beatitudes highlights the shift occurring in American Catholic biblical criticism. Herbert A. Musurillo's reservations about the book centered precisely upon Dupont's use of form criticism. Musurillo said there was no distinction in this book between form criticism and literary form investigation. One implication was that Catholics were misusing literary form investigation because they did not understand the method. Another implication was that form criticism, while not only unacceptable, led to another method -- demythologizing -- equally unacceptable.³⁴

Raymond Brown also objected to Dupont's procedure but only because Dupont did not employ form criticism more extensively. Although pleased with Dupont's modified form criticism, Brown wished that Dupont had given consideration to the community influences upon the history of the tradition.³⁵ Brown understood the Gospels to have been written for

³⁴"...like many other Catholic scholars, (Dupont) does not seem to have appreciated the difference between literary genre and the Form of German criticism, for the Form leads logically to (demythologizing)."
Herbert A. Musurillo, Theological Studies XVI (March, 1955), p. 133.

³⁵"Only one objection arises in this reviewer's mind: Dupont in general follows the method of a modified Form Criticism; yet perhaps he has neglected one of the cardinal ideas behind this method -- the influence of the community upon the formation of the Gospels. (One need not go to the extreme position of Bultmann and make the community the author and originator of the Gospels.)"
Raymond E. Brown, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Oct., 1955), p. 525.

communities which possessed traditions arranged in particular fashions familiar to the communities.³⁶

After providing a massive review of L. Vaganay's Le Probleme Synoptique, highlighting not only the importance of the book but also of the problem itself, David Stanley presented some observations pertinent to the form criticism debate occurring among American Catholics.

Stanley mentioned that there is a difficult problem in determining what is the final redaction of the tradition. Such queries into the present state of the Gospel tradition seriously undercut simplistic positions about eyewitness accounts in the Gospels. For example, later editions can easily alter details submitted by eyewitnesses, and later editions need not be composed by eyewitnesses. Stanley's queries into this matter also undercut notions about positivist history in the Gospels. For example, new contexts were given to some sayings and parables of Jesus to meet the needs of the early Church and then these sayings and parables were rearranged to fit the plans of the evangelists.³⁷

³⁶"Might not some of the additions of Mt. or omissions of Luke be better understood not as deliberate re-arrangements on the part of an individual, but as an acceptance of traditional arrangements familiar to the community which was to be the recipient of the written account."

Ibid.

³⁷"...one feels a difficulty about the seven steps of M. Vaganay's construction inasmuch as it does not appear to leave open the possibility of several redactions of one or other Gospel, and so allow for the influence of oral tradition at different moments in their composition. It has been suggested that Luke was an earlier edition of the Fourth Gospel. Can we exclude the possibility of the use, by Mt. or by Luke, of an earlier redaction by Mark? And would not this explain their positive or negative agreement with respect to Mark? ...Moreover, the presence in the Matthean discourses of elements which seem to have come from the Apostolic Church's application of some of Jesus' logia to events in her own experience (the second part of the missionary discourse, the explanation and re-adaptation of certain parables) would seem to indicate that the five-fold division is rather the original creation of Matthew himself."

In his review of C. K. Barrett's commentary The Gospel according to Saint John, Stanley appealed to literary form investigation as the means of removing errors made by Barrett. Barrett misunderstood that a biblical passage's meaning is garnered from its precise literary composition.³⁸ Stanley argued that biblical precision can come only if the exegete deciphers the function of each literary form in its specific time period.³⁹ Such literary form investigation would quickly dispel Barrett's remarks about contradictions and error in the Bible.⁴⁰

Stanley reiterated his remarks about the type of history recorded in the Gospels. He repudiated Barrett's notion that the Gospel of John can be considered poor history or unhistorical and yet be commended as good theology. He disassociated himself from the outmoded positivist understanding of history. He firmly maintained that to comprehend the Gospels we must understand that they proclaim, precisely through their

David Stanley, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Oct., 1955), p. 655.

38

"On one point we must differ radically with Barrett. It is an unavoidable corollary of the traditional Christian doctrine of biblical inspiration that every statement in the Bible is unequivocally free from error in the sense in which it was intended by the sacred author."

David Stanley, Theological Studies XVII (March, 1956), p. 250.

39

CF. John McKenzie, Theological Studies XXVII (June, 1966), pp. 266-67.

Also, Raymond Brown, New Testament Essays, pp. 21-25.

Naturally, to determine function in specific time periods means to determine Sitz im Leben influences at different stages of a literary form's history, even its pre-literary history which is the domain of form criticism.

40

"There can, then, be no question of any real contradiction within the Fourth Gospel, nor of a 'contradiction' of St. John by any other evangelist."

Stanley, op. cit., p. 250.

literary genre, salvation history.⁴¹

Stanley expanded his remarks on the literary genre of the Gospels by considering the non-chronological nature of both the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions. He attributed to form critical research the solidly established principle that none of the Gospels had chronological considerations behind its composition.⁴² Stanley implied that the primitive communities disregarded exact chronology in their faith appeals (Sitz im Leben ecclesiae) to their traditions.⁴³ If there ever was an exact chronology present in the traditions, we no longer have access to it in our forms of them.

⁴¹"...Barrett finds no difficulty in remarking that 'This may not be good history; but it does seem to be Johannine theology.' Such an unguarded statement by one who otherwise displays such sound critical, even conservative, judgment calls for the following observations. In the first place, it is an essential consequence of the truth of the Incarnation that Christianity is de natura sua an historical religion. There can be no 'good theology' which may at the same time be dubbed 'bad history'. In the second place, it is astonishing to discover such a fantastic conception of history cherished by a scholar who shows by his general scientific method that he is not uninformed by the progress made by modern criticism. To be sure, the Gospel narrative is not history in the now discredited 19th century liberalistic view of what history ought to be; it is Heilsgeschichte (that is, salvation history)."

Ibid.

See Chapter Four, pp. 145-46, for Stanley's article on the Gospels as salvation history.

⁴²"The truth of the matter is that several of the 'contradictions' which Barrett thinks to find in the New Testament are based upon the quite gratuitous assumption that John or Mark (or any other evangelist) intended to set forth events chronologically. Surely, if Form Criticism has taught us anything it is this: that regard for chronology was not one of the principles which presided over the composition of the Gospels."

Ibid., pp. 250-51.

⁴³"Surely Barrett cannot be unaware of the influence of oral tradition upon the formation of our Gospels."

Ibid.

When he reviewed Bruce Vawter's work A Path Through Genesis, John McKenzie praised it as one of the few books which popularly but skillfully explained the interpretation of literary forms and the meaning of the term "literary form." He singled out this accomplishment as one of the major contributions of Vawter's book.⁴⁴

Form critical emphasis upon the creative community and redactional emphasis upon the individuality of the evangelists dovetail into Edward Siegman's praise for La Lecture Chrétienne de la Bible by Dom Celestin Charlier.⁴⁵ Recognition of these elements had been an insight among a number of American Catholic scholars for some time; early opponents of form criticism, to counter creative community notions, had placed much emphasis upon the function of the evangelists. With proper recognition of both elements, Scripture scholars began proposing a modified theory of form criticism and a modified theory of individual authorship of the Gospels.

⁴⁴"There are three points of the highest importance which are treated throughout the commentary. The first point is the meaning of 'literary form' and the identification of literary forms in the narratives of Genesis. Popular readers have heard of this, but there are as yet few places where they can find out what it is; this book is one of them."
John McKenzie, Theological Studies XVIII (Jan., 1957), p. 104.

⁴⁵"A good example of Charlier's deftness is his recognition of the roles of both the primitive Christian community and the synoptic authors in the composition of Mt, Mk, Luke."
Edward F. Siegman, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct., 1958), p. 571.

In his review of Hermann Diem's Der irdische und der Christus des Glaubens, John McKenzie voiced again the ever more insistent appeal that Catholics adopt the twentieth century insights into the historical contents of the New Testament. He rejected vox ipsissima arguments and all "mechanical interpretation" as fundamentalist misunderstandings of the New Testament.⁴⁶

Edward F. Siegman lauded Heinz Schurmann for his exhaustive three-volume work on Luke 22:21-38. Only through such a detailed, scientific, form critical approach to the Gospel material can we learn about the very structure of the Gospel narratives and, through them, about the experiences of the early Church, whose life is recorded in the developing forms of the tradition.

⁴⁶"Few will defend the attempt to reconstruct a doctrinal synthesis based on the vox ipsissima of Jesus, recovered by mechanical interpretation of the historical character of the New Testament; such an interpretation seeks in the New Testament a form of history which it does not contain." John McKenzie, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct., 1958), p. 576.

⁴⁷"This volume completes Schurmann's exhaustive source and form-critical investigation of Luke's account of the Last Supper....Not many scholars will have the patience or respect for minute details which this work evinces. But it shows clearly that this type of labor is necessary in order to understand the structure of the Gospels and the steps and factors that account for the present arrangement of the materials. Not only is the meaning of the text thereby made clearer, but insights are often gained into the life of the Church in the first decades of her history." Edward F. Siegman, Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct., 1958), p. 576.

When Vincent T. O'Keefe reviewed La Formation des Evangiles: Probleme Synoptique et Formgeschichte edited by Cerfaux and others, he captured much of the new spirit coming over American Catholic Scripture circles, not letting past misunderstandings hinder future profit.⁴⁸

In addition to the book reviews, certain articles of the fifties clearly show the gradual change occurring within American Catholic biblical studies. A somewhat muffled opposition to this change can be detected in other articles written late in this period.

In 1954 Andre Legault wrote the first article for our consideration.⁴⁹ Legault did not restrict himself to a study of form criticism,⁵⁰ but explicitly applied the form critical technique to

⁴⁸"Form-Criticism...has weathered the devastating blasts of critics rightly upset by the exaggerated conclusions of some of the early proponents of this method...Today, in a calmer atmosphere, the method has been separated from presuppositions brought to it and unwarranted conclusions tacked onto it by some of its users, so that exegetes are using this approach with productive results."
 Vincent T. O'Keefe, Theological Studies XIX (Sept., 1958), p. 417.

⁴⁹Legault took graduate studies in theology at Grand Seminaire de Montreal, 1940-42. He studied scripture at three schools: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1946-47, Ecole Biblique, 1947-48, and Institut Catholique, 1948-49. Legault taught scripture at Grand Seminaire de Montreal, 1951-52, at Ecole Normal Sainte-Croix, 1952-54, and at Institut Pedagogique in Montreal since 1953.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly" XXII (1960), p. 39.

⁵⁰With the exception of Stephen Donlon's Sitz im Leben investigation.

account for differences within the Gospel narratives of the anointings in Galilee and Bethany.

Legault summarized the Catholic attitude toward form criticism as one of suspicion.⁵¹ He commended Stephen Donlon, whose article on the Sitz im Leben and creative community notions he called noteworthy and judiciously written. He said Donlon's article was noteworthy to a great extent because it stood alone.⁵² Legault felt that other Catholic authors either ignored form criticism or dismissed it as of no value.⁵³

⁵¹"It would not seem rash, however, to say that this new method of investigation continues to be held suspect among a great number of exegetes."

Andre Legault, "An Application of the Form-Critique Method to the Anointings in Galilee and Bethany," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 16 (1954), p. 132.

⁵²

"Apart from one noteworthy article of Father Stephen E. Donlon, S. J., who made a judicious use of certain conclusions of form-criticism to give proper value to the life situation of the early communities, very few among us pay attention to this new method of interpretation."

Ibid.

⁵³

"For instance, Father Charles J. Callan, O.P., who gave a brief survey of the principles of this School in Angelicum, could only observe that 'Form Criticism is an unworkable hypothesis.' Likewise we cannot but regret that the most reputable Catholic Commentary published in London this year pays very little attention to this Formgeschichte Methode."

Ibid.

Legault acknowledged that there were certain authentic grounds for suspecting form criticism. He cautioned his readers to accept the method's basic principles only with care,⁵⁴ and warned that an a priori dismissal of the supernatural⁵⁵ and extreme notions of a creative community⁵⁶ could not be defended.

Legault argued that the Incarnation has indicated the intimate relation between history and the supernatural.⁵⁷ This argument resembles Stanley's defense of the Gospels as salvation history.

Moreover, Legault refused to postulate creative talents for anonymous social groups. To accept community-created narratives, would be to deny that eyewitnesses and apostles directed the formation and guarded the history of the tradition in even its earliest

⁵⁴"There is in fact a genuine foundation for suspicion. The basic principles of this School should be accepted very cautiously."

Ibid.

⁵⁵"First of all, it is evident that a Catholic exegete cannot admit the philosophical postulate which vitiates the system by its refusal a priori to recognize the existence of the supernatural."

Ibid., p. 133.

⁵⁶"Secondly, neither can a Catholic exegete admit the sociological postulate which attributes to the early Christian communities the creation (I emphasize the word), the creation of the Gospel source-material."

Ibid.

⁵⁷"The Incarnation should certainly have taught us the compatibility of the supernatural with history."

Ibid.

stages.⁵⁸

However, he endorsed the competent use of form criticism, emphasized that it is a method and not an anti-Catholic or even anti-Christian doctrine, and defended the method as one of the most important advances in Scripture studies, which Catholic exegetes dare not overlook.⁵⁹

In his first remarks about eyewitnesses and apostles, Legault spoke of history in tones uncomfortably similar to those used by adherents of positivist history. Further in his article he somewhat clarified his position on this matter. He appealed to eyewitnesses and apostles only to assure readers that the Gospel traditions are grounded in the person and events of Jesus Christ. He accepted the opinion that the evangelists used an artificial,

⁵⁸"A social group, indeed, cannot create a saying; only an individual can....And as for the narratives: If they had been created by and in the communities, we would be forced to admit that, even immediately after the Resurrection, the communities were without apostles and eye-witnesses who would certainly have protected any unhistorical tendency."

Ibid.

⁵⁹"However, just as some good grain is often found together with weeds, so it would be regrettable that a wholesale condemnation should deprive Catholic exegesis of the worthwhile fruits which may be derived from this system....Following Father Benoit, other Catholic exegetes, in studies dealing particularly with the NT, have striven to profit by literary and historical principles advanced by Form Criticism....Is it not significant that a Catholic review, having as its primary purpose the popularization of the Bible, namely Bible et Vie Chretienne, in its initial issue of last spring, presented a large article on the merits of Form Criticism in the study of the Gospel?"

Ibid., pp. 132-33.

seldom literally historical framework to connect the individual units of an already formed tradition.⁶⁰ Such a postulate did not endanger the historical value of the Gospel narratives, which did not present chronology but rather accounts of memorable, significant events worked over by oral tradition.⁶¹ Thus the Christian communities related their traditions in imaginative ways faithful to the original message.⁶²

⁶⁰"Third, there remains the literary postulate which deserves a rather complete acceptance on our part. We agree on the following two well-defined points, namely: First, that the framework of the Gospels is the literary work of the Evangelists, with the result that the connecting links of the pericopes are mainly artificial and seldom historical. Secondly, that the material so transmitted by the Evangelists had already its original form imposed by popular tradition." Ibid., p. 134.

⁶¹"These two admissions do not weaken the historical value of the facts reported. Actually, to record history does not necessarily mean to reproduce a photograph or tape recording of events. So we must concede that the Evangelists bring us not so much the real sequence of events as a collection of individual units concerning the memorable happenings in the life of Christ, most of the time simply connected in a literary order....To this first statement that the actual Gospel framework represents a later literary arrangement not always faithful to history, should be added a second which likewise can hardly be questioned, namely, that the eyewitnesses' remembrances of Christ were in the beginning transmitted in the forms of little popular narratives before being crystallized in the Gospels. That is to say that the original Gospel narratives were born, were circulated and developed according to laws of popular narration, which must be taken into consideration when we evaluate these narratives. Again, this second statement does not weaken substantially the history of the Gospels." Ibid., pp. 134-35.

⁶²"It is one thing to say that the people created these stories but quite another to admit that the people dressed up the historic facts in the telling. People have their own way of relating events." Ibid., p. 135.

Legault stressed that the Catholic position on biblical inspiration and the encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu demand respect for literary forms.⁶³

With these preliminaries behind him , Legault felt safe in initiating openly his form critical investigation of the anointing narratives. His first task was to analyze each of the narratives and then to form conclusions from the data uncovered. We shall center attention upon his conclusions.

Each anointing narrative was composed, he concluded, from intentions wholly peculiar to the narrative.⁶⁴ Legault's reasoning strengthens the argument against a positivist sort of history in the Gospels. In Legault's opinion, the evangelists modified their narratives according to the portrait of Jesus which each Gospel intended to paint.⁶⁵

Legault attributed to the community an influential role in the literary development of the anointing narratives. He explained that

⁶³"These contentions do not undermine the inerrancy of Scripture, for such details are not presented as having value in themselves. Inspiration, and the Encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu stresses this point, takes into consideration the various literary forms, popular narration as well as others. The principles outlined above can be of great help in solving certain exegetical problems." Ibid.

⁶⁴"That the scene of the anointing at Bethany was radically distinct from the scene describing the sinner in Galilee reported by Luke, is emphatically affirmed by Father Pierre Benoit, O.P.... It is not difficult to justify his position....The scenes are 'radically distinct'....The theme of the two narratives is completely different....The two narratives have totally different objectives which leave no doubt as to their being distinct." Ibid.

⁶⁵Ibid.

details from different accounts of the same basic story tended to intermingle when people encountered varied traditions. Cross-influences became a natural occurrence.⁶⁶

Legault's exegesis was the most radical yet to come from an American Catholic. He was more radical precisely because he admitted openly and honestly the facts of the case. He admitted that insertions and accretions became part of Luke 7:36-50 as the oral tradition confused the details of the Bethany and Galilee narratives.⁶⁷ By

⁶⁶"The two narratives, as we have said, were born, were circulated and developed according to laws of popular narration. Thus circulating in the community in a living and oral form before being put in writing, they naturally underwent certain transformations. Far from saying that the community had either the will or the audacity to create the whole story or to transform substantially the facts, we must admit that the community could have unconsciously modified certain details of the setting, especially when, as in this instance, there were so many points of similarity which lend themselves to confusion...it was almost inevitable that details were juggled back and forth from one scene to another."

Ibid., pp. 143-44.

⁶⁷"We can admit, then, that in the narrative of Luke, some details are borrowed from the scene at Bethany, namely the name Simon, perfume in an alabaster box, and an anointing. If we subtract these from Luke's narrative, we are left with a scene much more understandable and much less encumbered than the actual text. In the traditional story, Jesus is dining in the home of a Pharisee; a penitent woman ashamed of her sins and moved by the merciful understanding of the Master, throws herself in tears at His feet, which she wets with her tears, wipes with her hair, and kisses with love. There follows wonderment on the part of the Pharisee and the words of Jesus: 'Simon, I have something to say to thee.' We notice that the name of Simon is not at the beginning of the pericope but appears now for the first time. We suspect at once an involuntary, spontaneous, unconscious insertion on the part of the narrator in his vivid dialogue. The narrator gets his story mixed up and inserts here the name of the host of Bethany. After that comes the parable and its application. The theme remains, namely, the repentance of the sinner, expressed so dramatically by her tears."

Ibid., p. 144.

stripping the Lukan narrative of its later additions Legault did the same type of work as had Bultmann in Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition: Legault reproduced the more primitive form of the narrative. No other American Catholic at that time had dared make such an unaffected, uncamouflaged use of form criticism.

John McKenzie displayed his now famous gritty temperament in an article dealing with Genesis, Chapters Two and Three.⁶⁸ Emotional arguments within the Roman Catholic Church over the origin of man made any literary form interpretation of the creation narratives a delicate, controversial topic. Literary form interpretation of the creation stories suggested that Genesis did not give a strict scientific account of creation; literary form interpretation suggested that Genesis 2-3 did not contain positivist history.⁶⁹ McKenzie not only discussed the

⁶⁸John L. McKenzie did graduate studies in Greek at St. Louis University from 1930-32 and in theology and in scripture at Weston College from 1940-42. He taught Old Testament at West Baden College from 1942-60, and he was professor of biblical history at Chicago's Loyola University from 1960-66. In 1966 McKenzie joined the theology faculty at Notre Dame University, where he teaches at present. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), pp. 50-51.

⁶⁹Today, less than twenty years later, it is difficult to imagine the intense concern that flourished in the early 1950's over the message of Genesis 2-3. If the reader consult the pages of Theology Digest for this period, he can gain perspective on the subject. See, for example, Theology Digest I (Spring, 1953), pp. 72-79, pp. 123-28; Theology Digest II (Spring, 1954), pp. 43-47, pp. 47-48, pp. 155-59.

narratives from a biblical scholar's perspective but also openly used literary form methods.

Declaring that he intended to use Sitz im Leben and literary form principles to the hilt, McKenzie immediately dispelled any doubt concerning his attitudes to form criticism.⁷⁰ He carefully considered Hermann Gunkel's research of Genesis, and had found a basic harmony between Pius XII and the German form critic over the issue of literary forms.⁷¹

Any literary form study of Genesis 2-3 eventually encounters the problem of the narratives' original forms. Agreeing with the almost universal scholarly acceptance of the literary unity of these chapters, McKenzie investigated how these chapters were brought to a literary unity. He believed that the final redactor had but disparate narrative units available for creative combination.⁷²

⁷⁰"...the first task of exegesis is to determine the intention of the sacred writer. The intention of the author is manifested in his manner of speaking, the concrete circumstances in which he writes, and his choice of literary form."
John McKenzie, "Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3," Theological Studies XV (Dec., 1954), p. 543.

⁷¹"...it is evident that in many respects Gunkel's exposition is in harmony with...the very brief remarks on literary form and species contained in...Divino Afflante Spiritu...."
Ibid., p. 548.

⁷²"The question of the literary form and characteristics of the narrative reduces itself, sooner or later, to the vexing question of its unity. This does not mean the literary unity of the passage as it stands. With the majority of exegetes, I accept the story in its present form as the work of one mind, and that a mind of no small dimensions. The question is the unity of the material which he employed."
Ibid., p. 553.

McKenzie thus said that Genesis 2-3 shared the normal history of all other oral narratives; they invariably became changed, modified, and appropriated to fit new situations. For example, the genius of the final redactor, McKenzie remarked, must be lauded for creating the Paradise story out of the materials at his disposal.⁷³ In soft words, McKenzie also told theologians that their theology would be more scriptural, their decisions about Genesis 2-3 more biblical, if they would investigate the Sitz im Leben of these narratives before they began making theological conclusions about the narratives.⁷⁴

⁷³"If we grant, as it seems we must, that (the author of Genesis 2-3) has used material from diverse sources, we must also grant that he has assimilated this material and fused it into one account which is his own. The material from the sources has lost its distinct identity, and shows traces only where the assimilation, because of the nature of the material, is imperfect. This implies that the Paradise story, in its present form, did not exist before its composition by the author of the account of Genesis; and we do no more than justice to the genius of the author if we accept this implication."
Ibid., pp. 557-58.

⁷⁴"Probably a study of the meaning of the story (of Paradise and the fall) in its original historical and cultural Sitz im Leben will contribute little to the necessities of modern theological discussion; at the same time there is no antinomy between the meaning which we suppose the ancient Israelites perceived in this narrative and the meaning which it has come to have in modern theology. Exegesis itself is a sufficient justification for recalling -- or rather attempting to reconstruct -- this meaning, in the hope that a clearer understanding of the historical, cultural, and literary background of the passage will deepen our appreciation of its content and enable us to draw from it a fund of truth which is not irrelevant for Catholic doctrine and Catholic life in the modern world."
Ibid., p. 572.

Though McKenzie said he did not want to imply an uncritical acceptance of Gunkel's opinions,⁷⁵ still, he did not specify any major fault of Gunkel, and in most respects, carefully followed the lines indicated by the German.⁷⁶

Gunkel's explanation of history and of folklore is of interest for this thesis. Although Gunkel's ideas cannot be appropriated altogether to describe the type of history in the New Testament, proper application of the Kleinliteratur notion of Dibelius and Bultmann, both pupils of Gunkel, can be coupled with the notions of folklore and of tradition to clarify somewhat the historical traditions of the primitive Christian communities. Gunkel's ideas on history and folklore help clarify why his former critical pupils dismissed literal or positivist history from the New Testament tradition.

McKenzie presented six criteria whereby Gunkel had distinguished folklore from history. 1) History arises only within cultures that write; folklore arises among peoples that express traditions orally, and these oral traditions undergo constant change, variation, and adaptation. 2) Folklore limits itself to personal and family stories whereas history relates important events of public interest. 3) History depends on first-hand evidence, whereas folklore supplies details by using imagination and by appropriating material. 4) Folklore narrates impossible details such as the number of animals in the ark and the details of the

⁷⁵"This general summary of Gunkel's opinions is not intended to imply an uncritical acceptance of them."
Ibid., p. 548.

⁷⁶Ibid.

creation, for example, plants' having been created before stars.

5) Comparative literature aids the scholar to define more exactly what folklore and historical forms are. 6) History is prose whereas folklore is poetry. Poetic elements allow a narrator to recount an event by supplying more freely imaginative, inventive details.⁷⁷

Admittedly, what Gunkel describes does not coincide exactly with the material found in the gospels. His criteria are not fully verified. For example, his first point was that folklore develops only among peoples who do not write; however, the primitive Christian communities were of a Kleinliteratur or infra-literary culture. Again, the early Christian traditions, both in age and in time of development, differed from the traditions preserved in the Jewish sagas. This time differential, stressed emphatically by Laurence J. McGinley, merits consideration.⁷⁸ But this time differential does not erase the fact that the earliest Christian traditions did develop by oral tradition and followed the laws of oral tradition. Thus, we should expect that Gunkel's list of characteristics of oral tradition occurred where Christian oral tradition occurred. For example, we should expect primitive Christian embellishment to the Christian oral tradition since new situations would have given rise to the need of embellishments to convey better the significance of the event which the Christians wished to narrate.

In 1958 Carroll Stuhlmueller wrote a paradoxical article dealing with the influence of oral tradition in the development of the Old

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 544-46.

⁷⁸See Chapter Two, pp. 27-28.

Testament.⁷⁹ Certain sections of his article present a seemingly watered-down, antiseptic explanation of oral tradition. Other sections of the article, however, indicate a good knowledge of certain form critical notions.

StuhlmueLLer's article is paradoxical because of the distinctions he made between oral tradition and Christian tradition, between ideas and expression of ideas. For example, he said that Christian tradition, composed of supernatural truths, did not deal with fixed literary forms of these ideas.⁸⁰ Did he mean that the forms are subject to revision? He certainly could not have meant that supernatural truths (revelation, that is) are not conveyed by means of language. Was he advocating merely that doctrine develops as human insight into the Christian faith deepens?

Somehow oral tradition and Christian tradition are strikingly different in their makeup according to StuhlmueLLer. The difference does

⁷⁹StuhlmueLLer did graduate studies in theology and in scripture in 1951-52 at Catholic University in Washington, D.C.. From 1952-54 he studied scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute. From 1954-58 he taught scripture at his congregation's scholasticate in Chicago; from 1955-58 he taught scripture at Viatorian Seminary in Evanston, Illinois. Since 1958 he has been teaching scripture at the Passionist Fathers Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVI (1964), p. 65.

⁸⁰"It is evident that Christian tradition deals with supernatural truths rather than with the literary expression of these ideas. Except for certain technical phrases or official pronouncements, there is no fixed literary form, and only a few of these phrases can be traced back in their exact wording to apostolic origin." Carroll StuhlmueLLer, "The Influence of Oral Tradition upon Exegesis and the Senses of Scripture," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (July, 1958), p. 381.

not lie in their media but in their content.⁸¹ But then what was the Christian oral tradition proclaiming if not the message of the gospel, which is the foundation for the entire Christian tradition? What are these untouchable "ideas" StuhlmueLLer places such emphasis upon? Where do they arise for Christian tradition? Can StuhlmueLLer say what these ideas express, or would that be beyond the range of human language? If he cannot express these "supernatural truths", how does he know that they are in the Christian tradition?

Two pages in a 1958 Catholic Biblical Quarterly survey of periodicals covered the historicity of the Gospels. The survey mentioned eight articles, whose German and American authors dealt with form criticism, philology, and scriptural themes in order to isolate the historical element in the New Testament. David Stanley was one of the eight authors mentioned.⁸²

John McKenzie contributed an important study of the hermeneutic problems of Roman Catholic exegetes. The article lucidly and candidly set forth the significance of understanding literary forms in scripture. He made allusions to the Roman Catholic attitudes of suspicion toward form criticism. The fact that he was writing in a distinguished scholarly scripture journal, one which infrequently published the work of Catholics,

⁸¹"...oral tradition was different from Christian tradition, for the former was working not with ideas alone as also with the literary form in which those ideas were cast."

Ibid.

⁸²Alphonsus T. Benson, "Survey of Periodicals," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct., 1958), pp. 527-28.

The article by Stanley is "Balaam's Ass, or a Problem in New Testament Hermeneutics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Jan., 1958), pp. 50-56, discussed in Chapter Four, pp. 133-36.

underlines the importance of McKenzie's study.

McKenzie began by referring to Divino Afflante Spiritu.⁸³ The importance of the encyclical for McKenzie is obvious.⁸⁴ He regretted that the encyclical had scarcely been implemented, and with embarrassment he commented upon the absence of any scientific and scholarly exegetical contribution from American Catholics.⁸⁵ However, he singled out the work of David Stanley as an exception to an otherwise dismal American Catholic scene in scripture research.⁸⁶

McKenzie sketched the battle lines which were drawn in many Catholic quarters to defend the historical quality of the Bible. He judged them to be misplaced because the very nature of the history under defense could only be blurred by a neglect of, if not an outright attack upon, literary forms conveying the history.⁸⁷

⁸³"Any discussion of contemporary Catholic exegesis must begin from the publication in 1943 of Divino Afflante Spiritu, the encyclical letter of Pope Pius XII on the promotion of biblical studies."

John L. McKenzie, "Problems of Hermeneutics in Roman Catholic Exegesis," Journal of Biblical Literature LXXVII (Sept., 1958), p. 197.

⁸⁴Cf. articles and reviews by McKenzie already presented in Chapter Three.

⁸⁵"I am inclined to believe that any statement of the unity of the Old Testament and New Testament before much solid exegetical and theological work is done in each of them is likely to be premature. Simplification is wonderful, but it often comes at too high a price."

McKenzie, op. cit., p. 203.

⁸⁶"The articles of D.M. Stanley, principally in Theological Studies and Catholic Biblical Quarterly, are superb examples of the exploration of New Testament theological themes."

Ibid.

⁸⁷"The revolt against historicism and the demand for a biblical theology in the Protestant churches has had a parallel in the Catholic Church. Here there was no revolt against historicism, because there never had been any historicism against which to revolt. But

McKenzie considered the sensus plenior theory and replied probably unintentionally, to Thomas E. Clarke's critique of The Two-Edged Sword. Clarke had objected that McKenzie did not do justice to the spiritual sense of Scripture, taking this as "typical of fuller sense."⁸⁸

As did many other exegetes, McKenzie feared that sensus plenior readmitted Origen's allegorical views of Scripture. Although adherents of "the fuller sense" of Scripture claim to work only within the literal sense, their critics intuit an inevitable departure from the genuine meaning of Scripture because sensus plenior encourages looking for themes not intended by the Scriptural author. All controls

there was a stout affirmation of the 'historical character' of the Bible without any attention whatever to the study of literary forms. The purely defensive and almost entirely controversial scholarship of the era of the seige mentality had by 1943 proved its sterility beyond all question."

Ibid., p. 200.

⁸⁸"One other important aspect should be noted with a question mark. The spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament, Fr. McKenzie is convinced, is not to be sought in the revival of the 'spiritual sense' so dear to patristic exegesis....The brevity with which this subject must be treated in The Two-Edged Sword has resulted in something less than perfect justice for a position which has engaged the favor not merely of patrologists and liturgists but of many renowned exegetes. These see no opposition between the scientific pursuit of the literal sense and the search [also scientific, but of a higher, and therefore less 'controllable,' order] for the total meaning of the divine word in its total context, which is the totality of Scripture. To favor a typical or fuller sense is not, as the author would seem to suggest, to flee from the literal sense or reduce the Old Testament to a shadow. Admittedly, the sensus plenior remains shrouded in obscurity; but is this not a call for the same patience to which we are rightly exhorted where difficult historical and philological questions are involved?"

Thomas E. Clarke, Theological Studies XVIII (April, 1957), pp. 103-4.

depart from sensus plenior investigation, and a person is able to find what he desires to find rather than ascertain what the author intended to proclaim.⁸⁹ A scholar can ascertain what the author intended to proclaim only by determining the literary forms which he employed.

The attitude toward form criticism of Joseph Clifford Fenton, long-time editor of American Ecclesiastical Review and rigid opponent of modern theology, can be inferred by considering a question-answer column in Volume 140 of his magazine. Fenton questioned whether some Catholic Scripture scholars had fallen victim to erroneous Scripture methods which weaken the Bible's historical character. This short question-answer column merely served as a prelude to the full onslaught to be directed against liberal Scripture scholars by Fenton in 1961-63.⁹⁰

⁸⁹"...the theory (of sensus plenior), like the theory of the spiritual sense, seems to involve the danger of removing all control from the investigation of the genuine meaning of the Bible. It does not suppose that the investigation of the fuller sense is independent of the investigation of the literal sense; on the contrary, the defenders of the theory, after considerable discussion and with some disagreement in detail, now generally classify the fuller sense as a part of the genuine literal meaning, although it is not the meaning of the writer. The adjective 'fuller' refers to the fuller literal meaning. To critics of the theory this signifies that the fully developed theme is already implicitly but literally expressed in earlier documents and they find it hard to distinguish this principle from the allegorism of Origen. The investigation of the literal sense has always meant the investigation of the mind of the writer of the passage; should it come to mean anything else one does not know how the literal sense is to be ascertained. Critics of the theory fear that the theory introduces a charismatic element into exegesis which is distressing to one who is conscious of the possession of no charisma." Ibid., p. 202.

⁹⁰See Chapter Five, pp. 170-76 and pp. 178-89.

Francis J. Connell, who did not belong to the Catholic Biblical Association of America, handled Fenton's question. He admitted he had no competence to answer this question, but he felt entitled to indicate the guidelines which all Catholic scholars must follow.⁹¹

Before beginning an attack upon Scripture scholars, Connell assured everyone that the Church encourages scholarship.⁹² Reactionary members of the Church use such opening remarks almost ritually as a prelude to any dirge sung about scientific advances in Catholic and non-Catholic scholarship.⁹³

These critics of scholarship never question whether truth can be seen from different perspectives. A Scripture scholar, for example, who does not uphold the view of history of these critics will be accused of having strayed from the guidelines of the Church. Although these critics give lip service to the notion of a development in doctrinal understanding, they always seem to doubt that doctrine can be developing in their own time and day.

⁹¹"As to the particular problems that are being discussed among scripture scholars so widely nowadays I am not qualified to give an answer in detail. However, I believe that I am entitled to make some general remarks, especially as regards the methods that all Catholic scholars are expected to follow in their research."

Francis J. Connell, American Ecclesiastical Review CXL (Jan., 1959), pg. 34.

⁹²"In the first place, genuine scholarship is always encouraged by the Church."

Ibid.

⁹³Another example of this dirge mentality can be found in Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi's famous address at Marquette University in 1961.

See Chapter Five, pp. 173-75.

After some short digressions, Connell eventually got to the point at hand. The problem, he said, centered around the interpretation of literary forms, which was encouraged by Pope Pius XII.⁹⁴ Connell feared that some scholars simply were blind to Church tradition and were applying literary form interpretation with no regard for Church teachings.⁹⁵

Connell answered Fenton's question so generally that he offered us little insight. He identified no Scripture scholars who had strayed from the guidelines of the Church. He did not identify what things they had said which the Church expressly does not believe. The trick of unspecified accusations and of sweeping generalities is one of the favorite tactics of these opponents of liberal scholarship. Because the trick merely clouds the issue and lacks precise reasoning, it must be exposed.

⁹⁴ The chief problems discussed by our scripture scholars, it seems, center about the historical significance of the sacred writings, in view of the fact that the sacred writers, in accord with the custom of the times, made some use of metaphors and other figures of speech in describing historical occurrences." Ibid., p. 35.

⁹⁵ "At the same time, every Catholic scholar, whatever may be the special field of the sacred sciences to which he devotes himself, must bear in mind that he is bound to adhere to the declarations and the traditions of the Catholic Church..... Certainly, all scripture scholars should bear in mind this admonition of the Vicar of Christ and regulate their views most exactly by the norms laid down by the Church, the divinely established guardian of Christian truth. Neither should they disregard the common teaching of Catholic theologians on any point when that teaching has been proposed constantly with the knowledge of the teaching Church." Ibid., pp. 35-36.

Connell ended nostalgically with a remark concerning the religious attitudes which scholars should cultivate.⁹⁶ He had as little of practical value to offer in this regard as he had in the body of his article. However, we can gather from this article that Joseph Clifford Fenton had become frightened by some Scripture scholars and that they should have been forewarned to prepare for an all-out attack against them.

The final articles for their study of the fifties appeared in Catholic Biblical Quarterly. The four authors saw form criticism to be an invaluable tool, not an anti-Catholic barrage, and they handled lucidly New Testament themes constantly between the lines of previous work in the 1950's.

Roger Mercurio⁹⁷ wrote the first article on "A Baptismal Motif in the Gospel Narratives of the Burial." In studying the different burial accounts, Mercurio worked with the notions of a developing kerygma and of a developing tradition. He mentioned that the primitive

⁹⁶"I believe, also, that it is opportune to remind Catholic scholars of their duty to join to their research prayer for divine guidance. It is true, we do not hold that by prayer alone a scholar will be assured of special divine guidance in the pursuit of his studies. But prayer will obtain gifts of grace....An occasional hour before the Blessed Sacrament will help him more in his studies than many hours of painstaking research."

Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁷Mercurio did graduate studies in theology and Scripture at Catholic University in Washington from 1945-47. He studied scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1948-49. In 1947-48 he taught Old Testament at the Passionist House of Studies in Chicago, and from 1949-59 he taught New Testament at his congregation's Louisville House of Studies. The Passionists appointed him rector of the Louisville House in 1959, where he remained until being appointed rector of Mother of Good Council Seminary in Warrenton, Mo., in 1962.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVI (1964), p. 51.

Christians had early in their history developed formulas which were worked into expanded traditions.⁹⁸ Such a process of development occurred, he explained, precisely because of various Sitz im Leben influences, such as Jewish attacks on the burial kerygma.⁹⁹

The development of the Gospel tradition was one of Mercurio's major points. Early preachers and teachers, he explained, compiled blocks of oral tradition in such a way that similar narratives naturally began to share details. Such development easily affected final literary forms inserted into the Gospel accounts by the evangelists.¹⁰⁰ Obviously, in addition to form criticism, Mercurio employed many other literary aids, such as source criticism.

⁹⁸"Such formularies, which have become stereotyped through constant usage, point to an early origin. We are justified in assigning them to the primitive kerygma. Various factors were at work, clothing these early formularies with more specific details."

Roger Mercurio, "A Baptismal Motif in the Gospel Narratives of the Burial," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (Jan., 1959), pp.40-41.

⁹⁹"It was especially under the impact of Jewish attacks against the resurrection that the burial traditions expanded. As the charges of the Jews grew bolder, Christian preachers had to strengthen their position by further testimonies. In this way other reliable traditions were added to the original burial kerygma." Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁰⁰"Such would be the Palestinian catechism as Matthew wrote it in the fifth or sixth decade of the first century. Such a schematic account would lend itself to further development. Around it other traditions of equal reliability could readily center. Before long the Jerusalem community was recalling and relating other incidents of the burial that had not entered into the 'official' schema of Matthew....In various centers of the Church Christians were repeating the story of the Lord's burial. Apologetic interests, as well as personal love for Jesus, prompted them to preserve the testimonies of eyewitnesses. When our evangelists decided to write their gospels, they had at hand a wealth of reliable information on the burial that they could readily fit into the outline of Mg, impressing upon it their own theological purposes." Ibid., p. 43.

After studying the burial pericopes in different New Testament writings, Mercurio concluded that the baptismal motif originated in the primitive Christian communities, which he termed a theological Sitz im Leben; this Sitz im Leben ecclesiae influenced the evangelists.¹⁰¹ Mercurio's conclusion modifies the creative community idea. He reached this modification precisely by employing form criticism. Mercurio thus was far removed from the company of Catholics attacking form criticism in the 1940's and 1950's. Mercurio's emphasis on Sitz im Leben and on Kerygma development does not lend itself to the historical understanding held by these men.

Richard G. Philbin, a Jesuit at Weston College in Massachusetts, wrote the second article. His article summarized the hermeneutical attitudes of some modern Protestant biblical scholars. His major concern was the question of history, especially historical skepticism or defeatism, among certain form critics. He agreed with

¹⁰¹"The baptismal-burial motif was part of the doctrinal milieu of the early Church. It was precisely in such a doctrinal milieu -- a theological Sitz im Leben -- that the gospels were composed....If such a theme were part of the spiritual and doctrinal atmosphere of the early Church at the middle of the first century, should we not expect the inspired writers to be influenced by the theme in writing the burial narratives? When we remember that they have written not only the kerygma but also the didache of the primitive Church, when we recall that so many other passages in their gospels have been motivated by doctrinal considerations, when finally we bear in mind that they could readily have learnt this doctrine personally, then indeed have we not every right to look for such motivation in the burial pericopes? Should we be surprised to discover that in relating this incident they chose those details that would illustrate the current baptismal-burial motif?"

Ibid., p. 47.

R.A.F. MacKenzie's distinction that form criticism is a tool, not a doctrine, and he accepted other scholars' admonitions that certain philosophical presuppositions are not inherent to form criticism.¹⁰²

Vincent T. O'Keefe, whose article we shall discuss immediately following Philbin's, agreed in the main with Philbin's principles and major arguments.

Philbin first discussed Joachim Jeremias, a modern Protestant scholar who has insisted strongly that the Gospel narratives are not merely imaginary fabrications and that the Gospels' ground-work is an historical event, namely, the man Jesus of Nazareth.¹⁰³ Jeremias has agreed with Bultmann that the Gospels are products of faith, completely editorialized and reworked, with abundant mythological

¹⁰²"A survey of the opinions of a number of outstanding Protestant scholars and exegetes, will show, I think, that historical defeatism in a form critical context, is rather an assumption than a conclusion, or at least that is by no means a generally accepted or necessary conclusion."

Richard G. Philbin, "Some Modern Protestant Attitudes towards Hermeneutics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (April, 1959), p. 117.

¹⁰³"...the sources demand that we continually return to the historical Jesus. 'Every verse of the Gospels tells us that the origin of Christianity is not the Kerygma, but an historical event, to wit, the appearance of the Man Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and His message.' Jeremias admits the fact that the Gospels are not biographies in the Greek sense of the word, and yet holds that there has been gross exaggeration on this point. 'It is not as though it were all the product of imagination.'"

Ibid., p. 119.

overtones.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, fearing Docetism and subjective modernizing of Jesus,¹⁰⁵ Jeremias has proclaimed that form criticism offers a major safeguard against these dangers. Philbin singled out Jeremias' assertion about form criticism because it demonstrated that form criticism is not responsible for historical defeatism.¹⁰⁶ Historical defeatism is the product of ideological inclinations of certain scholars whether they be form critics or not.

Vincent Taylor, the second modern Protestant coming under Philbin's scrutiny, has expressed trust in the testimony about the historical event Jesus of Nazareth, namely, a man who demonstrated

¹⁰⁴"We know (Jesus) only from the Gospels which are not biographies but confessions of faith. 'They contain a great deal of secondary material which has been much subjected to editorial activity, and many legends (one need only refer to the miracle stories).' From all of this we must draw the full consequences, 'namely, that we can only know Jesus clad in the garb of myth.'" Ibid., pp. 118-19.

¹⁰⁵"Jeremias sums up his reaction to the theological position outlined by first admitting that he sees in it much positive content. But he continues, 'Nevertheless, I see very grave dangers in this theological position. They are these: we are in danger of surrendering the affirmation, "the Word became flesh" and of abandoning the salvation-history, God's activity in the Man Jesus of Nazareth and in His message, we are in danger of approaching Docetism, where Christ became an idea'.... What is true is that the sources are incapable of showing that Jesus was simply a Jewish political messiah, or simply a moralist, or simply a Jewish prophet, or simply a social reformer.... Jeremias lists five ramparts, as he calls them, which protect us against such subjective modernizing of Jesus.'" Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁰⁶"It is significant for this paper that the second defence he offers is form-criticism. The essential significance of form-criticism 'lies in the fact that it has enabled us to remove a Hellenistic layer which had over-laid an earlier Palestinian tradition.'" Ibid.

that he was God's Son.¹⁰⁷ Employing form criticism and yet rejecting David Hume's axiom that miracles cannot be demonstrated by any testimony, Taylor exposed Hume's axiom to be a premise unnecessary to form critical principles.¹⁰⁸

Philbin stressed that Taylor had grappled with the historical skepticism proclaimed by some form critics as firmly established. Ideological presuppositions regarding what is acceptable evidence in the Gospels led some form critics to rule out actual Gospel testimony.¹⁰⁹ Of course Philbin was not maintaining that eyewitness testimony in the Gospels substitutes for a faith decision. No eyewitness testimony can guarantee or establish that a man is truly God. The

¹⁰⁷"Here we have an eminent critic repeatedly recurring to the idea of testimony, the testimony of eyewitnesses, and asserting that what we have is sufficient to establish the thesis that Jesus of Nazareth testified that He was the Son of God." Ibid., p.121

¹⁰⁸"Moreover, he raises the question of the relative value of testimony concerning more or less incredible personalities or events. Taylor recognizes the same sort of necessary proportion of testimony to event that David Hume first noted two centuries ago, but where Hume would accept no testimony as sufficient to establish the event of a miracle, Taylor finds the testimony of the Gospels enough to establish belief in a divine-human personality." Ibid., pp. 121-22.

¹⁰⁹"The mere antecedent existence of such an assumption (namely, no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle) renders suspect the claim that form-critical historical defeatism is the effect of scientific induction. The principle itself could have an influx into radical form-critical thought inasmuch as form-criticism can be taken as an attempt to explain the phenomenon of pseudo-testimony on the part of the earliest Church. Thus radical form-criticism might never examine the possibility that the phenomenon is not seeming testimony but actual testimony, simply because it has not examined its own presuppositions." Ibid., p. 128.

guarantee is in the hearer's faith in a Gospel narrative told precisely in faith context. The Gospels give no proof in the normal sense of that term; they offer no self-evident demonstration but rather demand a decision. Form criticism never in itself questions the testimony of the Gospels nor calls it pseudo. Form criticism, however, does highlight the faith context through which such testimony has been preserved. Because Philbin saw faith as an essential constituent of any Gospel testimony, his appeal to eyewitness is more than apologetic fundamentalism.¹¹⁰

To drive home the significance of testimony in the Gospels, Philbin referred to such outstanding scholars as J. N. D. Kelly, C. H. Dodd, and T. W. Manson. The kerygmatic harmony between such divergent personalities as Peter and Paul, mentioned by T. W. Manson, indicated to Philbin that the Gospels contain historical accuracy. This harmony indicated that the scholar can get behind the life of the early Church to the events being proclaimed by the early Church. For this reason, having strictly adhered to the Scriptural evidence, Philbin stressed that form criticism cannot continue to ignore the testimony in the New Testament by stopping at the Sitz im Leben ecclesiae. He concluded that the new quest of the historical Jesus was not doomed

¹¹⁰In this regard see Chapter Five, pp. 241-42, for Quesnell's explanation of the kerygma's demand for faith.

from the start as the adherents of oral tradition have claimed.¹¹¹ However, he certainly did not deny that the Gospels' reworked testimony, while retaining its historical roots, had seen great changes in detail as well as in intention in order to meet new community needs. There seems no way for Philbin to guarantee the original intention and supply lost details. These problems make unclear the historical quest Philbin was recommending.

Vincent T. O'Keefe wrote the third article for our consideration.¹¹² He drew on much that had been said regarding form criticism, and he handled certain themes with insight. He coupled remarks on the creative community theme to statements about the historical quality of the narratives. O'Keefe thus contributed further testimony that the Gospels

¹¹¹"Whatever Dodd's original intention was, his work on the kerygma is far more than an obsolete bridge over a chasm that form-criticism has shown was not really there. J.N.D. Kelly in his classical work Early Christian Creeds brings out the fact that Dodd's work and the work of others who pursued the same vein, has revitalized a position once thought of as the refuge of the ultra-conservative. "Even a casual acquaintance with Dodd's book The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments will convince one that T.W. Manson's appraisal of the relationship between Dodd's work and form-criticism is far more....than that suggested by Stendhal....If Manson's and Kelly's judgment of the significance of Dodd's achievement is correct, then form-criticism cannot long continue to ignore the element of testimony in the New Testament, by claiming that the mind of the early Church is an insuperable barrier. As far as our survey of Protestant hermeneutical opinion is concerned, it is apparent that Manson, since he holds the Gospels and Epistles to be historical documents concerning Jesus, also holds that the historical defeatism of some form-critics is an assumption rather than a conclusion of their form-critical method. Moreover, he is able to point to C.H. Dodd's actual work as confirmatory evidence." Ibid., pp. 122-24.

¹¹²O'Keefe did graduate studies in theology at Gregorian University from 1952-54 and in Scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute during the same years. Upon his return to the United States in 1954, O'Keefe taught New Testament at Woodstock College until his appointment as rector of Fordham. Later he was appointed as the American Assistant to Pedro Arrupe, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus.

contain a certain type of history other than positivist.

He explicitly acknowledged that form criticism is the chief method for studying the original forms of the Gospels. However, he admitted that form criticism cannot investigate every influence upon the formation of the Gospel tradition. Its positive contribution toward understanding the Gospels did not remove the need for other methods.¹¹³ O'Keefe's understanding of a modified creative community notion demands careful consideration. He acknowledged cultic Sitz im Leben affected much of the Gospel narratives. The Gospels developed in situations of worship within the primitive communities. The overall Stiz im Leben was the living community, whose responses to particular questions and needs became reflected in a reworked tradition.¹¹⁴ Roger Mercurio's reference

¹¹³"The task of exploring the tradition in its original condition is undertaken chiefly by the method that is known as form criticism. It is not an alternative to literary and historical criticism, nor a method to supersede all others. But it does seem that it has a positive contribution to make to our understanding of the origins and development of the gospel-tradition and, consequently, of the Gospels themselves, provided that its limitations are frankly recognized."

Vincent T. O'Keefe, "Towards Understanding the Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (April, 1959), p. 176.

"Form criticism alone will not give us the full history and meaning of the gospel tradition and its history. It does, however, provide real light. Our appreciation of the Gospels is increased by viewing the earlier forms and stages from which they emerged, and the influences that marked their growth. Our knowledge of Christ is helped since we can see him in the lives, thoughts, and desires of men throughout the formative period before the final form in the Gospels."

Ibid., p. 182.

¹¹⁴(The) cultic aspect of the Gospels is not to be neglected. If we were to speak of the history of the tradition rather than the history of the forms, and if we were to speak of the primitive Church instead of the theology of the community (Gemeindetheologie, with all the overtones this word has), this method would be ecclesiastical and very Catholic. Rightly understood, it would be an attempt to enlighten the Gospels from their place of origin in the Church. This place in the living Church would be what is meant by the famous Sitz im Leben. This would be to understand the Gospels as the books of the

to the Christian community as a "theological Sitz im Leben" is simply a slightly different description of the same reality.¹¹⁵ The historical basis for these particular community responses remained. That is, response to the risen Christ first known as the Jesus of Nazareth undergirds all Sitz im Leben.¹¹⁶

O'Keefe stressed that the Gospels are a certain type of history and that they cannot be approached from any historical viewpoint other than their own.¹¹⁷ For example, he maintained that the Gospels answer only the questions which they ask,¹¹⁸ and thus their faith context, with its Sitz im Leben implications, must always be kept in

Church."

Ibid., p. 180.

¹¹⁵See p. 96 and fn. 101.

¹¹⁶"John 20:30...indicates that the choice was not determined by an historical principle but rather a theological one....Yet, the author shows in his Gospel that the purpose is to narrate the events of the historical Jesus and at the same time show their relation to the Church."

Ibid., p. 181.

"The gospel tradition is a living tradition, and the early Church did not bear witness to the deeds of Jesus or repeat his words without attempting to interpret them. This is not to say that the Church created the material out of which the Gospels were composed. The historical nature of the material refutes this idea."

Ibid., p. 182.

¹¹⁷"The gospel is first and foremost historical. Its testimony, its proclamation rest upon what happened in Palestine in the beginning of our era....(But) a so-called 'purely historical' treatment of the Gospels will mean a very imperfect, incomplete and at times distorted view of them."

Ibid., p. 187.

¹¹⁸"(A 'purely historical' treatment of the Gospels) can result in asking questions which these documents cannot answer to our satisfaction and which they were not intended to answer."

Ibid.

mind.¹¹⁹ Finally, O'Keefe stated, many problems in Gospel studies arise because of an anachronism on the part of those students who expect the Gospels to present an historical account similar to what twentieth century documents and interviews present.¹²⁰

O'Keefe's remarks are at times reminiscent of Philbin's criticism. O'Keefe traced certain conclusions made by some form critics to presuppositions regarding the supernatural. He said that such conclusions take the scholar outside his historical-critical procedure.¹²¹ His remarks on historicity, on doctrinaire judgments against form criticism, and on the formative process which developed the oral tradition link him with statements of R. A. F. MacKenzie and with remarks of John McKenzie in his review of Vincent Taylor's The Gospel

119" The Gospels are not books of history in the modern, strict, vigorous sense of the term. The Evangelists were not concerned with writing a life of Jesus, nor with assembling documents for those who would undertake this task later on. They put together religious testimonies meant to answer the needs of the first Christian communities. Their narrative is fragmentary, made up of disparate pieces and is episodic. The presentation of facts is not disinterested. Facts and doctrines are linked intrinsically. The Gospels were written ex fide ad fidem."
Ibid.

120" Difficulties that arise because of viewing the Gospels as a verbatim report of the words of Christ should be recognized as due to a modern mentality that is not the mentality of those who produced the Gospels."
Ibid., pp. 187-88.

121" Conclusions that are radical in their historical skepticism have been proposed by some form critics. But these are not so much the result of an historical-critical process as they are of presuppositions regarding the supernatural and of dogmatic judgments on the consciousness and person of Jesus."
Ibid., p. 182.

according to Mark.¹²²

The fourth article to be considered was written by Raymond Orlett.¹²³ It stemmed from the same sort of considerations which led Roger Mercurio to study the burial pericopes. Orlett wished to determine what influence the liturgy of the primitive community exerted upon the development of the Emmaus narrative. Orlett separated different literary forms in the accounts of the risen Lord's appearances,¹²⁴ and stressed that each account does not serve the same purpose.¹²⁵

¹²²[See pp. 63-65 of this chapter].

¹²³Orlett's background includes graduate studies in theology and Scripture at Catholic University in 1953-54. He also studied at the Pontifical Biblical Institute from 1955-57. In 1954-55 he taught Scripture at the Seminary of Our Lady of the Fields in Glendale, Ohio, where he returned when he completed his studies in Rome.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), p. 56.

¹²⁴ Raymond Orlett, "An Influence of the Early Liturgy upon the Emmaus Account," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (April, 1959), pp. 212-14.

¹²⁵"The purpose of such accounts as these two (Emmaus and the appearance to Mary Magdalen) is quite different from that of the accounts of the appearances to the Apostles. These favored ones are not leaders of the Christian community. They have no official position. They are rather the faithful followers of Jesus. They are to be an example to the Christian. They are troubled and do not understand why Jesus seems to be gone from them but they have not entirely abandoned him. And when Jesus manifests himself, their longing turns to an expression of love. The purpose of these accounts is to give a more profound explanation of how Jesus can be present though not visible."

Ibid., p. 214.

By isolating literary forms and asking what function each form served, Orlett determined that the form of both the Emmaus account (Luke 24:13-35) and the appearance to Mary Magdalene (John 20:1-18) served didache needs.¹²⁶

¹²⁶"Jacques Dupont calls these two accounts l'histoire émouvante, ou édifiante. We can see that it is a literary form distinct from the others found among the appearance accounts. It is a literary form that would hardly find use in Apostolic Preaching (kerygma) but which would serve admirably in Apostolic Teaching (didache). For the Apostolic Teaching was directed to the believer and had as its purpose to instill a deeper understanding of the Christian life and its practices. That is precisely the object of these two accounts."
Ibid., pp. 214-15.

The significance of the fifties for American Catholic biblical criticism is difficult to overestimate. This period is truly the beginning for scientific research in Scripture by American Catholics. In this period American Catholic exegetes began a scientific renewal of their work.

Men such as Raymond Brown, Roderick MacKenzie, and David Stanley joined John McKenzie and others to present form criticism lucidly. They countered the widespread, irrational opposition to form criticism. They modified certain aspects of form criticism as they employed the method. For example, modified notions of "creative community" gradually corrected earlier abuses which had led to wholesale discarding of the method in most Catholic circles.

Although opposition to form criticism and its exponents were still discernible in the late fifties, the opposition most often took on muffled tones. In most cases scholars at least guardedly accepted the method as a proven tool in Scripture research.

The new exegetes began to explain what sort of history is contained in the New Testament. Although arguments on behalf of a positive history recorded in the Gospels could still be heard near the end of the fifties, the careful work of men such as Stanley, McKenzie, and Brown had helped to reorientate historical questions in many circles.

Chapter Four
"David Stanley"

This chapter considers the valuable contribution of a single man, David Stanley, to the Scriptural study done in American Catholic circles. Stanley's years of residence at the State University of Iowa testify that he has not restricted himself to Catholics; these years also testify that Stanley's scholarship is respected outside of Catholic circles. However, Stanley has played the instrumental role in furthering the scientific study of Scripture among American Catholics.¹

This chapter will show in detail that Stanley honestly confronted and clarified all of the major themes delineated in previous chapters.

¹David Stanley's background includes graduate studies in theology at St. Louis University in 1948 and in Scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1949. He received his doctorate in Scripture in 1951, for which he wrote the critically respected study Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology. From 1952-61 Stanley taught Scripture at the Jesuit seminary in Toronto, and from 1953-55 at Les Facultes theologique et philosophique des Peres Jesuites in Montreal. He was an associate professor at the State University of Iowa from February 1961 to February 1964, while also teaching at Regis College in Willowdale, Ontario. At present he is at Willowdale. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly", XXVI (April, 1964), p. 65.

Stanley and I corresponded by mail, and he wrote me a lengthy, personal, informative letter in which he enclosed material which has never been published. This material helps to clarify even further a number of points sketched in this thesis. I feel grateful to Stanley for his graciousness, and I hope my portrait of him is faithful.

The material used in this chapter comes from articles written over a twelve year span. In 1965 most of these articles were collected into a book, The Apostolic Church in the New Testament. Stanley hardly revised the articles for the book, but he did supply footnotes. The articles contain a number of points no longer tenable in the face of more recent scholarship, but it is important to realize that Stanley's articles made much of this scholarship possible. This collection of his work provides a first-hand account of a legacy given to Scripture studies over the years.

In 1954 Stanley published a study of the soteriological value of the Servant of Yahweh theme for the primitive Christians. He hinted that form criticism provides an important tool for investigating the history of this theme in the Christian communities.² The Gospels proclaim the communities' Servant theme in more knowledgeable,

²"When we turn to our four Gospels, we discover, as might be expected, a fuller elaboration of the Servant theology. What appears in the primitive sources as often no more than a passing reference emerges in the Synoptics and in St. John as a more completely assimilated doctrine. In the Synoptic tradition particularly, while each evangelist will add his own personal variation to the theme, there is observable a number of Servant episodes which form a common heritage. These will be noted in discussing the Gospel of St. Mark, which may in some respects be considered the literary parent of Greek-Matthew no less than of the third Gospel."

David Stanley, "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and Its Transposition by St. Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Oct., 1954), pp. 393-94.

elaborated fashion than has the oral tradition.³ These two statements supported those New Testament investigators who had postulated that the early Christian traditions about Jesus underwent the normal growth process common to any oral tradition.

Stanley used the Sitz im Leben theory in this article when asking and answering questions about the origin and purpose of the Servant of Yahweh theology. He explained that the Servant theme enabled the Christian teachers of the first century to answer rebuffs and dilemmas presented by their Jewish opponents.⁴

Stanley also considered whether the Gospels contain verbatim accounts of Christ's teaching. Although he made no direct reference to form criticism, he endorsed certain form critical findings about specific logia in the Gospels. Between the lines of his article one can

³

"The Synoptic tradition contains three predictions by Christ of His coming passion and resurrection -- The first reminds us of the Servant's rejection, sufferings and exaltation (Mk 8:31)....The second prophecy (Mk 9:31)...recalls Isaias 53:10. The final prediction (Mk 10:33) (is an appropriation of)...the Septuagintal version of Isaias 50:6...."

Ibid., pp.395-96.

"This verse of Mark's concerning the chalice (Mk 14:24) will appear with some slight alterations in Greek Matthew, Luke and Paul, but always with the unmistakable reference to the Servant. So too will the notion of the Covenant be repeated in each account, the re-establishment of which is considered by Isaias as the principal achievement of the Servant." (Isaias 42:6; 48:9)."

Ibid., p. 397.

⁴

"One reason for the popularity of the Servant theology with the preachers of Christianity to Jewish hearers can be found in the problem which, as the first half of Acts repeatedly testifies, confronted them continually: the difficulty of explaining the stumbling-block of Christ's passion and death. In the prophecies of the Suffering Servant they found proof beyond question that the humiliations borne by Jesus of Nazareth were 'according to the settled purpose and foreknowledge of God.'"

Ibid., p. 410.

read Sitz im Leben ecclesiae and Sitz im Evangelium; he clearly referred to these phenomena when discussing the history of certain Servant logia.⁵

At a panel concerned with methods of teaching Scripture, Stanley described his course on the Gospel of Matthew. He chose to teach Matthew's Gospel to Jesuit scholastics precisely because this Gospel enables the student to see the value of form criticism. The kerygmatic, didactic, and apologetic interests which so greatly influenced the formation of the Christian tradition, he explained, comprise the structure of this Gospel. Because form criticism is able to investigate these Gospel components, Matthew concretely illustrates the valuable tool

⁵"In the same chapter (Mt 5:39-40), there is a saying of Christ whose literary dependence upon Is 60:6-8 has been demonstrated by William Manson....If one accents Manson's view of the Isaian coloring of an authentic logion of Christ, then we have here an instance of the adaptation of the Servant theology, not, as in the examples previously studied, to the Christian soteriological teaching, but to parenetic purposes."

Ibid., pp. 398-99.

"...it was left to St. Matthew particularly to develop the characterization (of Christ as the Suffering Servant) and to apply it to the earthly life of Christ. Not that he was the only one to do so...., but it is in his Gospel first of all that we discover an application of the motif which comes, not from Christ's mouth, but from the Evangelist's own intuition. Such a development was only to have been expected, given the psychological approach of the first disciples to the mystery of Jesus of Nazareth. It was the teaching and the miracles of the public life which had formed their introduction to Him. When then, as was only natural, they turned in the course of their preaching for proofs of His Messianic vocation and examples of His doctrine in those wonderful years spent with Him in Galilee or Judea, they discovered a new application of the Servant theology."

Ibid., p. 411.

which form critics have devised.⁶

Stanley offered an insight into the Sitz im Leben creative community themes. In his opinion the Gospel tradition revealed that primitive Christians interpreted narratives to fit new situations.⁷

Stanley substantiated this theory by pointing to the parables, which, he said, the early communities obviously reinterpreted as they faced new situations.⁸

6" ...the artificiality of Matthew's arrangement...enables the student to perceive that the Gospel schema is, for the most part, arranged in a logical rather than a chronological order. He will thus be made aware of the apologetic interests, the liturgical influences, the parenetic and kerygmatic orientation which played an important role in the formation of the Gospel tradition and which require the attention of anyone (and especially of the Catholic priest) who seeks something more than a superficial knowledge of the Gospels. In other words, the First Gospel is an apt vehicle for a study of Form Criticism, a discipline which no seminarian can afford to neglect, not merely because of its timeliness at the present day but because of its insistence upon the value of tradition."

David Stanley, "Methods of Teaching Scripture -- Teaching Matthew's Gospel," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Jan., 1955), p. 45.

7"The discourses of Christ on the occasion of His sending the Twelve to preach the Gospel (ch.10) and parables (ch.13) were studied principally for the evidence they provide that the Apostolic Church was already at work interpreting, in the light of new situations which she had to face in the thirty-year period after the Master's death, the words and teaching of her Founder." Ibid., p. 47.

8"The explanation of the parables appended by Matthew, containing as they do a vocabulary characteristic of the Apostolic age which followed the Ascension and exhibiting a marked tendency towards a 'psychological' rather than an eschatological interpretation, would seem to indicate that we are dealing with an application of the parable-form to the situations in which the Apostolic Church found herself.

Ibid.

Because John A. McEvoy had categorically denied that the early Christians changed or reinterpreted any of the parables, his study of C. H. Dodd provides an interesting comparison with Stanley's discussion of how the communities handled the parables. The comparison also illustrates the shift toward form criticism occurring among American Catholics. McEvoy had written his article to expose form criticism on points which Stanley used to demonstrate the

The influence of oral tradition in the formation of the Gospels was a matter of disagreement among American Catholics. Those scholars who disliked form criticism argued against form criticism's understanding of oral tradition. The shift in American Catholic biblical studies is illustrated in part by a new look at oral tradition's influence. In his opening lectures Stanley's class discussed the influence of oral tradition, and during the course he drew his students' attention to individual sections which illustrated the use of oral sources.⁹

Stanley's next article investigated the influence of didache, one specific type of oral tradition, upon the literary form of the Gospel. His study was aimed at the Gospel form as a whole rather than at specific forms within it. It was another example of his gradual, careful ground breaking efforts to make the findings of form criticism acceptable.

Stanley acknowledged that critical investigations had firmly established the influence of kerygma upon the Gospel form.¹⁰

method's viability.
See Chapter Two, pp. 43-46.

⁹"Fr Patrick Cummins asked whether the question of the influence of oral tradition in the formation of the New Testament had been taught -- It was discussed in the introductory lectures and constant reference to it was made throughout the course where individual texts or pericopes provided an illustration of oral sources."
From the minutes of the discussion which followed Stanley's presentation, p. 50.

¹⁰"Modern Gospel-criticism has devoted a good deal of attention to this Apostolic preaching and has rightly seen it as a major factor in the determination of their genus litterarium. The Gospels retain many vestiges of the oral catechesis. They do not attempt to present a chronological account of the life of Christ and are in no proper sense biographical. Like the kerygma, they propose the various phases of Christ's salvific work."

David Stanley, "Didache as a Constitutive Element of the Gospel Form," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (April, 1955), p. 340.

In addition to studying the kerygmatic influences upon the Gospels, biblical criticism should concern itself, Stanley maintained, with the presence of didache, or Apostolic teaching, in the Gospel form.¹¹ Concern for the didache would bring into still sharper relief the faith orientation of the written Gospels.¹²

The faith orientation of the Gospels, determined by didache influences, demonstrated the concern of each evangelist to present

¹¹"While this kerygmatic character of the Gospels has been stressed, and with good reason, there is evidence also that the evangelical genre litteraire owes much to another influence, that of Apostolic teaching."

Ibid.

¹²"...the evangelists did not write primarily for a non-Christian public, but rather to give their Christian readers a deeper insight into the events heralded by the Apostolic preaching. Luke makes this clear in his dedicatory exordium: his declared purpose is 'to write an ordered account for you, most noble Theophilus, in order that you may perceive the authentic character of the oral instructions you received.' Luke sets out to arrange his material in such a way as to provide Theophilus, already a believer, with a profounder grasp of the truths of Christianity. The intention of the author of the fourth Gospel might seem, at first sight, to be different: 'these things have been written in order that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that through faith you may attain life in His Name.' (Jn 20:31). However, as Père Mollat points out, the evangelist is addressing Christians whose faith he wishes to deepen. 'Eternal life' for St. John means the full, experiential knowledge of the Father and the Son (Jn 17:3), which presupposes the teaching which he endeavors to impart in his Gospel."

Ibid., pp. 340-341.

not only the kerygma, but also its deepest meaning.¹³ The artificial construction of both the Synoptic Gospels and of the Johannine Gospel stemmed precisely from the desire to teach this deep meaning or inner sense of the kerygma.¹⁴

Stanley's study, therefore, highlighted two components of the Gospels, namely, kerygma and didache, which he attained by using the

¹³"What Jesus did...forms the basis of the Apostolic kerygma. What Jesus taught (understood by the Apostles in the light of Pentecost) forms the basis of the Apostolic teaching....the very form which the Gospels take is determined, to a large extent, by the evangelists' preoccupation with teaching the believer the inner sense of the substance of the kerygma."

Ibid., pp. 347-48

¹⁴"Matthew uses five discourses which he has carefully constructed as his method of commenting upon the meaning of the Kingdom of Heaven as it has come in Jesus Christ. Luke employs the travel-story to bring out the meaning of Jesus' death and resurrection, which he conceives as an exodos, a passing from this world to the Father (Lk 9:31). St. John sees in the Cross as well as in the glorification of Christ the doxa, the divine glory, the definitive revelation of the divinity of Jesus. Accordingly he portrays the actions and words of Christ as a series of minor Christophanies which prepare the believer for the final Christophany of Good Friday and Easter Sunday. Mark's Gospel is nearer the kerygma than any of the others. Still, as we have seen, his work also manifests the influence of the Apostolic teaching -- that of Peter, the chief of the Apostles. Mark seeks to give his reader the answer to the question 'Who is Jesus?' and he has accordingly presented the works of Jesus' public life and the events which form its climax as the revelation of the Mystery of the God-Man."
Ibid., p. 348.

tools of form criticism.¹⁵ There was not only the proclamation of the good news of Christ; there was also the attempt to teach the later church by means of stories about Jesus carefully chosen and adapted from the mass of oral tradition.¹⁶ This insight will become clearer as this chapter delves later into the emphasis which Stanley placed on the experience of Pentecost for the early Christians.¹⁷

In all of the articles which he wrote from 1955 onwards, Stanley exploited both kerygma and didache. The next three articles for consideration become more meaningful once the reader understands the importance of the kerygma and didache elements.

The Sitz im Leben notion played a strong role in Stanley's article about the early Christians' insights into themselves as the Church.¹⁸ By use of form criticism, Stanley determined the literary

¹⁵"Thus we may conclude that if, on the one hand, the preaching of the Apostles certainly played a major role in the creation of the evangelical genre litteraire, it is no less clear, on the other, that the teaching of Apostolic Church was also an essential factor in its emergence."

Ibid.

¹⁶"The kerygma has provided the basic blueprint for the Gospel-forms in the quadripartite plan which includes the major events from the appearance of the Baptist to the resurrection of Christ. To the didache however must be attributed the undeniable cachet personnel with which each of the four evangelists has impregnated the basic material so as to give his own characteristic version of the 'good news' of Jesus Christ."

Ibid.

¹⁷See for example pp. 133-36.

¹⁸"A re-examination of these (five Matthean) discourses in the light of Form Criticism reveals another source upon which Matthew had drawn: the experience of the Apostolic Church." David Stanley, "Kingdom to Church: the Structural Development of Apostolic Christianity in the New Testament," Theological Studies XVI (March, 1955), p.24.

scheme which Matthew employed to convey the new insights his community had reached about itself.¹⁹

As he had done in discussing his course on Matthew, Stanley pointed to certain parables within Matthew which illustrate Sitz im Leben reorientation.²⁰ Stanley did not fear that such reorientation by the early Christians jeopardized the truth of the Gospels. On the contrary, because such adaptations of Christian traditions greatly aid a person to learn how the early Christians advanced in their understanding of Jesus Christ, Stanley delighted in their presence.

Stanley demonstrated one such reinterpretation, namely, the early Church's kerygmatic transformation of Jesus' original message. By applying the notions of kerygma and didache, he showed how the early

¹⁹"Matthew has attempted in one volume what Luke has accomplished in two books: to show the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven as realized in the organization of the apostolic Church. He uses the literary scheme of presenting the preaching of Jesus in five great sermons primarily to expose the meaning of the passion and resurrection of Christ....A secondary purpose appears, however, in the references made in these same sermons to apostolic preaching of the Gospel: the heralding of the Kingdom of God as come definitively upon earth through the principal act of Christ's redemptive work is the principal means of organizing the Church."

Ibid.

²⁰"Three parables, which seem to reflect the organization of the Church at the time this Gospel was written, are inserted toward the end of the eschatological discourse. All three concern the eschatology of individuals, and thus provide a valuable insight into the Church's realization of the indefinite period of time during which she must exercise her mission before the Parousia of her Lord. (The parables are Mt 24:45-51; 25:1-13; 25:14-30)....By the time this Gospel was written, therefore, the death of individual Christians before the Parousia was an accepted fact. The doctrine which we saw stated by Paul concerning the unlimited delay of the Lord's second coming is now common to the whole Church."

Ibid., p. 27.

Church gradually came to understand that its identity and function were distinct from those of the earthly (or pre-resurrection) Jesus. Grounded on the passion death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the early Church by long process came to understand that the very preaching of Jesus had been transformed because of the resurrection. Stanley said the kerygma and didache elements witness to this gradual insight and to this transformation.²¹

Stanley's next two articles, each studying a different aspect of the Christian concept of salvation, formed a unit. The first article viewed the tradition as it developed in primitive Christian preaching. The second article looked at this tradition as it reached its final form in the Synoptic Gospels.

In his opening words of the first article, Stanley informed his readers that he intended to unearth the earliest message of the Gospel. Once he had isolated this earliest message, he proposed to evaluate it.²²

²¹"This deliberate foreshortening of historical perspective reveals a deep insight on the part of the evangelist. He has perceived that the kerygma of the apostolic Church is a continuation of Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom, although he is aware that the kerygma is centered upon the historical act of man's redemption by which the Kingdom is come upon earth, and is aimed at attracting new members to the community. In short, Matthew has seen that the organization of the Church is an integral part of the coming of the Kingdom."
Ibid., p. 25.

²²"The purpose of the present essay is to determine as exactly as the source at our command will permit the manner in which the apostolic community of Jerusalem arrived at a Christian doctrine of salvation, and to evaluate their initial formulation of it. This level of theological development may be best described as that of the primitive preaching."
David Stanley, "The Conception of Salvation in Primitive Christian Preaching," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (Oct., 1956), p. 231.

As had Joseph Lilly, Stanley stresses the historical element, but his stress on it stemmed from his literary perspective. Determined to protect the historical character of the doctrine of salvation, Lilly had made all the teaching about salvation come directly from Jesus. A gradual understanding of salvation did not come about through interpretation. Lilly flatly stated that Jesus taught all these doctrines explicitly.²³

Stanley certainly did not deny that salvation is grounded in the words and deeds of Jesus. But he maintained that the tradition which the Church has given us presents a dynamic, evolutionary doctrine of salvation. In short, the New Testament reveals that there were definite stages of insight into the event of salvation.²⁴ He maintained that the earliest stages of these insights paved the way for the insights of genius by which both John and Paul present salvation, that is, present Jesus Christ.²⁵

²³ See Chapter Two, pp. 47-49.

²⁴ "...the vagueness which frustrates any attempt to situate our period historically affects only the terminal point. Its origins, which are of paramount importance for the comprehension of the maturer phases of New Testament thought, can be narrowed down to the moment when the fundamental truth of the Christian revelation first flashed upon the minds of the apostles, namely, that Yahweh's long-promised salvation had become reality in Jesus Christ." Stanley, op.cit., p. 231.

²⁵ "It is moreover possible to discern with a fair degree of accuracy the lineaments of this somewhat rudimentary stage of Christian soteriology with its theological insights and modalities of expression which, however imperfect or lacunary, set the pattern that would be followed by the great Pauline and Johannine syntheses."

Ibid. :

However these earliest insights are valuable not merely as stepping-stones to the later developments of the tradition but also (and primarily) because they reveal the true historical, human groundings of the Christian tradition. The good news of Jesus Christ, said Stanley, can be appreciated fully only if we let it speak for itself in all of its stages. To ignore the earliest forms of the tradition is to reject the historical moorings of the Christian revelation.²⁶

This point makes evident what a reversal has taken place. American Catholics had made earlier statements against form criticism primarily to protect the historical foundations of Christianity. Now Stanley shows that to reject form criticism as a tool is to reject the chance to appreciate fully the historical characteristics of Christianity and ultimately to refuse to listen to God's word as He spoke it.

²⁶"The true value of these early doctrinal affirmations, however, lies much deeper than their function as a point of departure for subsequent, richer theological reflection. They have in the first place, a claim on our interest and reverence inasmuch as they pertain to the inspired literature of the New Testament. A more basic reason derives from the fact that Christianity is in essence an historical religion, possessing a revelation that is essentially involved with time and not merely a collection of theological propositions. Accordingly, the very development of doctrine within the various sacred writers attest is always greater than any formulation of it, however admirable or technically accurate. If we are to grasp the res Christiana as God intended we should grasp it, we cannot afford to neglect the temporal, the contingent, as well as the organic nature of the New Testament revelation. To select only what appears to be the most perfect form in which the various dogmas are set forth, while rejecting the cruder, more fragmentary, less apt enunciations of them, is to ignore the historical character of Christian revelation."
Ibid., pp.231-32.

The wholly new perspective on the historical nature of the Gospels is clearly illustrated in Stanley's article on the Synoptic synthesis of the concept of salvation. In order to retain links with the early Christian oral tradition and to evaluate the Synoptic advances over it, Stanley first set forth the earliest stages of the oral tradition. The catalysis of Pentecost directed the development of the tradition.²⁷

Stanley said that the literary genre of the Gospels is didache, which he carefully distinguished from the oral preaching of the primitive tradition. Didache has an interpretative faith-context which assigns deeper meanings to the events originally proclaimed in the oral preaching.²⁸

²⁷ Later, this chapter looks at other studies which highlight Pentecost's important position in Stanley's biblical theology. "...the first specifically Christian soteriology was the direct result of the revelation of the divine personality of the Holy Spirit, whose descent had inaugurated 'the last times' and had transformed the disciples into the messianic qahal of the new Israel, and of the disclosure of the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, whose enthronement at God's right hand, publicized by His sending of the Spirit, proved His identity 'as prince and savior in order to give repentance to Israel as well as remission of sins.' (Acts 5:31)"

David Stanley, "The Conception of Salvation in the Synoptic Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (Oct., 1956), p. 345.

See pp. 145-46.

²⁸ "When one attempts, as we propose to do in the present article, to assess the advance which the (Synoptic) Gospels...represent over the primitive salvation-doctrine, two fundamental points must be constantly borne in mind. In the first place, one is no longer dealing, immediately, with the oral preaching of the apostolic age, but with a literary genre, the written Gospel, which we have elsewhere termed didache, and which is distinguishable from the kerygma by two qualities. Firstly, these written accounts of the Christian history of salvation were aimed, not at the conversion of the non-Christian world, but at the Christian reading-public, already professing faith in Christ as the Kyrios, yet requiring further instruction in the meaning of the events of His earthly career which culminated in His sessio ad dexteram Patri. Secondly, the primary principle governing the selection, arrangement and mode of narrating the events and teaching of the Master was the interpretation, in function of the new found Christian faith, of the date of the kerygma." Ibid., pp. 345-46.

The position that looks for verbatim accounts of Jesus' teaching in the Gospels is untenable once the interpretative quality of the Gospel narratives is admitted. This didache characteristic shows that Synoptic discrepancies were fully intended by the authors of the Gospels, and were due to unique Sitz im Leben influences upon either early oral tradition or upon the evangelists themselves.²⁹

With this scholarly research Stanley clearly illustrated the data available for any study of the Synoptic tradition. For example, determining the data's historical position within the Synoptic tradition, aids exegetes seeking an obvious or a hidden redaction on the part of the evangelist. The literary insights of Stanley go far beyond the positivist, non-literary, and therefore often fallacious study of Gospel themes. Stanley went beyond the mere collation of frequently occurring words, under the heading of "Gospel themes." He showed that a Gospel theme is unintelligible, indeed unknown, apart from its evolution, and he demonstrated that the evolution of Gospel themes can be traced through such tools as Sitz im Leben techniques.

The data provided by the early traditions entered into the basic schema of each Synoptic Gospel. Each evangelist interpreted this data

²⁹"This interpretative function of the inspired writers must not be passed over in any proper evaluation of the stage of dogmatic development represented by the Synoptics. Such a disregard, in the case of some exegetes and theologians, led to a somewhat naive attitude towards what are termed the ipsissima verba Christi, as well as to the deplorably uncritical tendency to 'harmonize' the divergent Synoptic records of Jesus' words or miracles by ignoring or minimizing those discrepancies in detail which often represent the personal signature of the evangelist or constitute the easily recognizable hallmark of oral tradition."
Ibid., p. 346

only to portray the meaning of the salvation history proclaimed in the earlier traditions. Stanley thus refused to accept any crude or extreme understandings of the creative community notion, but exploited fully the valid insights of this notion.³⁰

Stanley concluded that Synoptic advances in understanding the salvation theme stemmed from the evangelists' interpretative use of the primitive traditions. These traditions illustrate that the early Christian preachers had had a momentous insight: Old Testament typology points to Jesus Christ.³¹ Because the evangelists' faith in the paschal mystery of Jesus led them to see the inner meaning of much that had

³⁰"The second major factor which should be operative in any judgment of the synoptic contribution to New Testament soteriology is the substantial dependence of each of the first three evangelists upon the primitive kerygma as regards the general schema which remains at the basis of his written work, as also upon oral traditions and earlier written evangelical 'essays.' However the evangelist may arrange, interpret, or narrate the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ, his theological presentation is subordinated to the facts, historical and metahistorical, of the sacred history which he is narrating. He may redistribute the various logia of Jesus by grouping them into discourses of his own construction, just as he may reconstruct the setting of incidents only sketchily transmitted to him by tradition. He does not however create these sermons or miracles out of whole cloth. The materials which he works upon are the data furnished him by apostolic eyewitnesses."

Ibid.

³¹"In the earlier period of theological thinking, mainly through the efforts of the Hellenistic element in the Jerusalem Church, the Old Testament history of salvation had been re-interpreted in function of the Christusgeschehen. The great discovery at this stage had been the typological significance of the great Old Testament figures and events, which were quickly pressed into service in presenting the kerygma to the Jews of Palestine."

Ibid., pp. 347-48.

For another example, see the study done by Stanley on the Suffering Servant theme, pp. 109-11 of this chapter.

been present in the Christian oral tradition but not yet exploited, they were able to use interpretatively the logia and deeds of Jesus and give even deeper meaning to the events of salvation.³²

Reflection on Stanley's article indicates what his historical perspective involved. He was saying that the history in the Gospels is an interpretative history, a faith-contextual history. And yet he was not saying that the Gospels are therefore untrue because the events reported did not happen exactly in the manner in which they have been proclaimed. Such an either/or position is a logical argument from a positivist view of historical writing. In the new historical view artificial events, even, do not mean that the Gospel narratives are untrue. The truth lies in the meaning of the good news which the Christians' faith in Christ led them to understand as real and authentic because the Christ is personally a reality.

Stanley provided a mine of information on the form critical method in a lecture on Rudolf Bultmann which he gave at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. He first presented the method as Bultmann had employed it. He lucidly explained Bultmann's divisions of traditional

³²"(The Synoptic) evangelists have learned to employ the sayings and deeds of Jesus during the Galilean ministry to shed light upon the mystery of His divinity, and conversely, to interpret these facts in function of His subsequent death and resurrection. Their awareness of the salvific significance of the events which climaxed Jesus' earthly mission provided the sacred writers with the key to the meaning of His miracles and to His teaching concerning the proximate advent of the Kingdom of God. They also found in the happenings of Jesus' earthly ministry an explanation for the experiences through which the apostolic Church of their day was passing. It is the fruit of such theological reflection which is enshrined in the Synoptic Gospels and which constitutes perhaps their most salient feature."

Ibid.

forms and the judgments which Bultmann had made about these forms. In one full page Stanley presented clearly the theories of Sitz im Leben, oral tradition, and creative community. He stressed that form criticism studies only forms and sees these forms as preservers of the history of the primitive Christian communities.³³ Stanley made clear that Bultmann sees in the Gospels only the faith of the primitive community, a faith grounded in the ministry of Jesus.³⁴

He quoted Divino Afflante Spiritu's words encouraging careful investigation into influences upon the biblical authors³⁵ and praised form criticism because it respects the early Church's tradition. By admitting the value of oral tradition, form criticism provides a common

³³David Stanley, "Rudolf Bultmann -- Lutheran New Testament Critic," The Voice of St. Mary's Seminary, April, 1957, pp. 12-13.

³⁴"(Tradition) begins with nothing, because what Jesus or the Apostles did is beyond scientific historical knowledge, and they did not originate the evangelical tradition. The Christian community, made of anonymous groups, created the literary forms or molds into which they poured their conception of the image of Jesus as a divine Person and the preexistent Son of God....However, Bultmann does admit that the Christian community owes its origin to Christ's work and that it has preserved in its literary forms many of His sayings, but he regards them as so transformed that only the faith of the early Church is manifested."
Ibid., p. 13.

³⁵"When a Catholic evaluates the form-criticism of Bultmann in New Testament studies and preaching, he can find a good deal to adapt, if he follows the positive approach of the Church to all scholarship for the sake of a clearer proclamation of the redemptive event by Christ....The Holy Father has urged the careful investigation of modern research which has helped 'to determine the peculiar character and circumstances of the sacred writer, the age in which he lived, the sources written or oral to which he had recourse and the forms of expression he employed."
Ibid.

ground for inter-faith discussion and biblical study.³⁶

However, Stanley criticized Bultmann for accepting sociological determinism.³⁷ But for Stanley this was only a problem in Bultmann's understanding of tradition and nothing inherent in form criticism. Nor is form criticism vitiated because Bultmann held an extreme view of the creative powers of a community.³⁸

Stanley appealed on the contrary to the conservative character of any tradition grounded in history.³⁹ He remarked that the Christian tradition differs from other traditions precisely because it is rooted

³⁶"In the first place we can be grateful to the form-critic of Bultmann's stature for having restored among non-Catholics ecclesial tradition's rightful place....Such an admission of the value of tradition rediscovered by the method of form-criticism provides a common basis of evangelical discussion for Catholics and non-Catholics."

Ibid., p. 14.

³⁷John Collins had made the same criticism against form criticism in 1941. See Chapter One, pp. 18-22.

³⁸No doubt Bultmann's idea of tradition contains much that is false because the nineteenth-century sociological thesis that the community as such is creative has been discredited by scholars of ancient and medieval literature."

Ibid., p. 14.

³⁹"The group or community is not creative; it is conservative because the communal organization as such simply preserves tradition which does contain history."

Ibid.

in history.⁴⁰

Stanley opted for the insights of Redaktionsgeschichte as a necessary correction to the mere editorial functions which Formgeschichte had imposed on the evangelists. Although he did not mention Redaktionsgeschichte by name, he clearly was presenting the evangelists as authors.⁴¹ The redaction criticism school has demonstrated that the evangelists did act as literary craftsmen.⁴²

Form criticism, Stanley pointed out, has clearly illustrated the faith-context of the written Gospels. Gospel characteristics uncovered

⁴⁰"The Christian tradition treats of concrete events that are historically linked to time and place, so that the evangelical tradition differs from other popular tradition."

Ibid.

Although Stanley's view of history differs from Laurence J. McGinley's, Stanley's remarks agree with McGinley's descriptions of the unique character of Christian traditions. McGinley discussed traits held in common by the Gospels and by popular and classical literature. To argue that the Gospel details of chronology and geography are generally fictitious and used to enhance interest, however, McGinley maintained, is methodologically false. The Christian Gospels form a unique class of history of literature. Laurence J. McGinley, "Form-criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," op. cit., p. 457.

⁴¹"The creation of popular history comes from definite personalities who are endowed with a creative ability above that of the ordinary members of the community. In the evangelical-tradition the personality of the leaders is known; men like Peter and John were eyewitnesses to the events, and upon their testimony the Gospel writers based their personal narratives, for they were not mere copyists."

Stanley, op. cit., p. 15.

⁴²Willi Marxsen's Book Der Evangelist Markus, which formally gave the movement its name, appeared only in 1954.

by form criticism, such as didache, greatly aid exegetical and thematic studies, he explained, because they show the purpose of the Gospel narratives.⁴³

Stanley emphasized that this evangelical faith-context sheds light on the type of history proclaimed in the Gospel. As he had explained in other writings, Stanley remarked that Gospel history is not our modern version of history. He quoted Pope Pius XII who saw that narrow views of historical reporting must be supplanted if the Gospel message is to be penetrated.⁴⁴

He credited the form critics for firmly establishing that the Gospels proclaim a salvation history. In other words, the didache reworked the kerygma to proclaim the inner meaning of the Christian tradition

⁴³"...the form-critic has established the fact that our Gospels were written primarily for believers. The nature of the Gospels is such that they were not aimed at unbelievers, but were composed by Christians to give other Christians a deeper understanding of their faith, to provide them with what the Vatican Council later called some understanding of the mysteries of Christianity." Ibid.

⁴⁴"The form-critic like Bultmann has also helped us to rediscover that, while the evangelists' works contain history, they do not intend to write history in our modern sense. Pius XII rises to remind the Catholic commentator of his duty in this matter, for he recommends the wise use of criticism to 'determine to what extent the manner of expression or the literary mode adopted by the sacred writer may lead to a correct and genuine interpretation; and let him be convinced that this part of his office cannot be neglected without serious detriment to Catholic exegesis.'" Ibid.

and to lead to deeper communion with Christ.⁴⁵

In his final remarks in this article Stanley described the value of the Sitz im Leben notion, which he called an explicitation that the Gospels, as documents of the Church, preserve the adaptations of the early Christian communities to specific situations. They preserve for us the history of the early Church as it grew in its awareness of the meaning of Christian identity.⁴⁶

⁴⁵"The form-critics have validly shown that the evangelists intend to write redemptive history of Jesus of Nazareth for the believer. This contribution is a positive gain in New Testament studies, for the historical documents known as the Gospels, 'the teaching', give testimony for the man of Christian faith which supplies him with some understanding into the meaning of faith in Christ. The preached Gospel, 'the kerygma', was directed to the pagan and Jew of the apostolic age, but the written Gospel is a testimony to the one who believes so that he may make acts of ever deepening faith in Christ the Kurios.
Ibid.

⁴⁶"Again, the form-critics' contribution that the Gospel image of Christ was not primarily biographical but written to serve the concrete wants of the Christian life, has a great deal of value. The Gospels were written primarily for the Church, its life and its mission. Certain incidents about and sayings of Jesus were preserved by the community and selected by the evangelists, who were in contact with the living tradition, because of the needs of the Church in its liturgy, preaching, sanctification, and controversy. For example, the events and sayings connected with the Last Supper and Christ's passion were preserved and described in great detail for their value in public worship. The importance of such critical analysis of the Gospels like Bultmann's in order to reconstruct the original place in living history, their primitive milieu, was pointed out years ago by the far-seeing Father Lagrange when he stated that the Gospels themselves contain indications of the manner in which they were composed and that this fact can be wisely and profitably employed in Catholic New Testament studies."
Ibid.

In a 1957 article written on the New Testament doctrine of baptism, Stanley explained that the New Testament authors strove to convey the deepest meaning of certain historical events. They looked upon their own Jewish Scriptures, namely, the Old Testament, as doing the same sort of historical proclamation. Thus the deepest significance of Jesus would have been missed if the New Testament authors had been worried about literal history. Embellishments to the Christian tradition occurred precisely because literal renderings invariably missed the major points of salvific interest in an event.⁴⁷

The New Testament authors saw that the deepest meaning of Jesus could be conveyed only by refashioning the words and deeds of Jesus.⁴⁸

⁴⁷"The characteristically modern question, 'What really happened in the crossing of the Red Sea, the capture of Jericho, the restoration after the Exile, etc.?', is alien to the mind of (the New Testament) writers. To their way of looking at the sacred past, what really happened is what God has deigned to announce to them in the Book. It is crucial for any appreciation of this long-forgotten viewpoint to recognize how justified the New Testament authors were in employing that religious-historical perspective which springs from a deep consciousness of the consistency of God's salvific action throughout the course of Hebrew and Christian history. Thanks to this insight, the prophets and inspired scribes of the New Testament were enabled to discern the full signification of Christ's redemptive activity."

David Stanley, "The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism," Theological Studies XVIII (June, 1957), p. 173.

⁴⁸In conjunction with the following text, a person must read footnote 21 from Stanley's article: "...the meaning of the Eucharist is sought in the life-giving Incarnation of the Son of God (vv.33-35), in Jesus' public ministry (vv. 38-40), in a reference to the words of institution and to Jesus' redemptive death: 'It is my flesh, given for the life of the world.' (v. 51)."

Ibid., p. 175

Fn. 21: "This refashioning of the logia of Jesus, as found in the Synoptic Gospels, is characteristic of John's manner. In the same discourse we find similar reference to the Synoptic accounts of Jesus' visit to Nazareth (Jn 6:42) and Peter's Caesarean profession (Jn 6:68-69)"

Ibid.

When a person understands that this refashioning occurred precisely as the faith of the New Testament authors deepened, how can he worry about the truth of the Gospels? The Gospels' truth, Stanley was demonstrating, lies in the faith-perspective of the reader, and can be uncovered only by such a perspective. The importance of Pentecost applies to the Twentieth-century person as much as it did to the Apostles. Without a Pentecost event in his life, no person can fathom the faith-message of the New Testament. Without a Pentecost event, he cannot surrender himself to the New Testament message. Pentecost becomes a type of prism whereby the Apostles and the later Christians see the cross as redemptive, as revelatory. Without this prism the deepest truth of the Gospels, their proclamation of God's revelation in Jesus of Nazareth, remains hidden, remains scandalous.

In his study of the baptismal theme, Stanley showed how vital a knowledge of the kerygmatic influence, unearthed by form criticism, can be in determining the relationship between Christian baptism and what we know about Jesus' message.⁴⁹

A great deal of Stanley's evaluation of the New Testament doctrine of baptism proceeded from an initial quest for the specific setting in life of the doctrine. By clarifying specific Sitz im Leben influences Stanley traced the appreciation which grew among New Testament Christians for their rite of baptism.

⁴⁹"A proof of how closely in the early preaching baptism was related to the Kingdom-theme is shown by the fact that it is only here (Jn 3:3ff), in the entire fourth Gospel, that the phrase, 'the Kingdom of God' occurs."

Ibid

Stanley's emphasis that the Kerygma did influence the collecting of tradition for a written Gospel is akin to the approach taken by Quentin Quesnell in his book This Good News. (See Chapter Five, pp-232-52)

Careful distinctions in the Gospels between baptism in Christ and the baptism performed by John the Baptist offered one example of the value of the Sitz im Leben theory; only this theory had unearthed these Gospel distinctions in their full import.⁵⁰

Stanley's modifications of the Sitz im Leben theory, what he later defined and explained as Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae and Sitz im Evangelium, were present in this article, if only between the lines. The next article for our discussion clarifies this matter.

Stanley concluded his research on baptism in the New Testament by noting again that the historical significance of Jesus was the foundation for the traditions of the Christian communities. He pointed out that the evolution of New Testament baptismal theology clearly indicates that the doctrine of baptism grew in meaning as the Christians grew in experience

⁵⁰"The doctrine of the two baptisms (John the Baptist's and Christ's) one provisory, the other definitive, messianic, eschatological, is very important in NT baptismal theology. It has, however, long been a question with the NT critics whether such a conception really went back to the Baptist or whether it was an invention of early Christian apologetic interests. There has been a tendency to regard the phrase 'in the Holy Spirit' (Mk 1:8; Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16) as put into John's mouth at a later period to prove the superiority of Christian Baptism over Johannine. Joseph Schmitt has shown by a careful study of texts appearing in the Dead Sea literature that there is a good possibility that these Synoptic logia, ascribed to John, are authentic."

Ibid., pp. 193-94

"The fourth Gospel also mentions the practice, by Jesus' disciples during the public ministry, of a baptismal rite, which was doubtless akin to John's baptism, possibly a sign of attachment to Jesus as a disciple. This much is certain: it was not the Christian sacrament.... Pere Lagrange remarks (that) the reason why the Evangelist goes to such lengths to correct (Jn 4:2) a possible false impression (Jn 3:22) that Jesus Himself performed this rite is precisely to avoid giving this baptism the character of the Christian sacrament."

Ibid., p. 200.

of the salvific mysteries of Christ.⁵¹

In a short article concerned with a hermeneutic problem which faces Scripture scholars since the appearance of Redaktionsgeschichte. Stanley explicated his modifications of the Sitz im Leben theory. Briefly stated, this hermeneutic problem deals with the recognized fact that Gospel narratives have theological overtones attached to them by the evangelists. In other words, the Gospels themselves contain reinterpretations of the original setting of many narratives.

The notion of faith-context is a guide to use in understanding Stanley's use of Sitz im Leben. With this notion as a guide, a person need not fear creating false problems or asking false questions due to hasty presumptions about the data at hand.

The whole problem of Sitz im Leben springs from modern man's curiosity to know what really happened.⁵² To other persons, such as the

⁵¹"Jesus' glorification, if by that term we understand the mysteries of His death, resurrection, ascension, enthronement as Kyrios, and the consequent sending of the Spirit to create His Kingdom, the Church, played a dominant role in shaping the symbolism of baptism. Indeed, as a passage in Acts (which, in the opinion of critics, comes from a primitive source) indicates the apostolic community firmly believed that her risen Master's promise of continual presence in her midst as Emmanuel (Mt. 28:20; cf also Mt. 1:23) was fulfilled in a dynamic way in the baptismal liturgy." Ibid., p. 214

⁵²"The application of Form Criticism nowadays to the New Testament as well as to the Old Testament by both Catholic and non-Catholic scholars has centered attention upon the Sitz im Leben or original 'setting in life' of various biblical recits. Such a pre-occupation is typical of the modern mind, which is intrigued with an insatiable curiosity to know 'what really happened.'" David Stanley, "Balaam's Ass, or A Problem in New Testament Hermeneutics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 20 (1958), p. 50.

evangelists, who were imbued with the Jewish Scriptures, "what really happened" was simply what was recorded in the Scriptures.⁵³

Because sociological settings are certainly manifest in the Gospels, Stanley assured everyone that the form critics are correct in looking for the sociological setting of the primitive Christian communities. He found that judicious application of the Sitz im Leben principle enabled man to appreciate even more fully the early life of the Christian communities.⁵⁴

Taking up the question of how to reconcile Scriptural inerrancy, a principle of the Catholic Church, with developing tradition,⁵⁵ Stanley

53

It may be well, at the very start, to remind ourselves that the problem we have just formulated (Sitz im Evangelium), like that of the Sitz im Leben, becomes a problem only from our modern and occidental point of view. The concern of today's Scripture student (at least, if he be a Catholic) to 'justify' the liberty which the inspired writer appears to have taken with the sources of his story, is quite as characteristic as is his curiosity about 'what really happened'. Accordingly, a first approximation towards a solution of our problem, the theological writing-up of Gospel incidents, is to recall that for the Evangelists 'what really happened' in Israel's history was simply what was recorded in 'the Scriptures' and that the question of Sitz im Leben never arose in their minds." Ibid., p. 51.

See also p. 130, fn. 47 of this chapter.

54

"We do not, of course, mean to belittle the fruitfulness of Form Criticism when thus employed as an heuristic method...In the New Testament, the re-assessment of the sources of the Gospels and Acts in terms of Sitz im Leben has disclosed a wealth of information about liturgical and governmental practices of the primitive Church, as well as the sociological, economic, and ethnological factors which influenced her development. More important still, it has shown us how the apostolic community's consciousness of the fundamental dogmas of her faith was quickened and deepened by the application to the problems of her daily living of the lessons imparted to her by her Master."

Ibid., p. 50

55

"...its 'setting in the Gospels' has endowed it with a theological dimension which, to say the least, was not immediately evident in its original form or setting. As a result, the Catholic exegete, anxious to maintain the sacred writer's inerrancy, is led to inquire what justification there can be for this theological writing-up of the event, for the new religious sense discovered in, or superimposed upon, the narrative by the evangelist. What

hoped to clarify questions both about historicity and about the Catholic position.⁵⁶ He referred to the faith-context which inspired and directed the composition of Mark's Gospel. Markan narratives were edited and re-written precisely because the Gospel of Mark was directed to believers. Mark wanted to introduce deeper dimensions of the Christian faith for persons who already believed in Christ.⁵⁷ The same evangelical process is evident in the other Synoptic Gospels and in the Johannine Gospel.⁵⁸

The faith-context supporting each Gospel had its source ultimately in the events of Pentecost. The deeper, broader understanding of Jesus which Pentecost initiated eventually resulted in didache -- those Gospel insights preserved and proclaimed in literary forms which the early

principle of hermeneutics does the inspired author employ in assigning a new function or meaning to certain episodes or sayings of Jesus?" Ibid., pp. 50-51.

⁵⁶"...the question we are asking...may be expected to throw some light upon the sacred writer's attitude towards 'the historical,' as well as upon what we mean by saying that our Gospels contain no error." Ibid., p. 51.

⁵⁷"We have an excellent illustration of the contrast between Sitz im Evangelium and Sitz im Leben in the remark of the centurion, reported in Mark 15:39, after he had witnessed the death of Jesus: ...'It is clear that this man was God's Son!' In the mouth of a pagan Roman, such a statement could only signify some sort of superstition for a man whose awe-inspiring death indicated that he was one of those divine heroes or supermen extolled in ancient mythology. And this actually appears to be the force of the remark from the form it takes in the third Gospel. It provides the Christian reader, enabled by the reading of Mark's Gospel to give a more profound answer to the question, 'Who is Jesus?' with a formula of faith in Christ's divinity, as the story of Jesus' life reaches its significant climax. What an unbelieving soldier could have meant was of no concern to the evangelist, if indeed the question ever occurred to him. For Mark, it appears to be enough that the assertion could bear the theological weight which, in his story, he intended it should have." Ibid., pp. 51-52.

⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 52-53.

Christians discovered did convey the significance of the life of the Incarnate Word.⁵⁹ Didache elements need never be lost in a consternation over what is factual history because the historical element of the Gospels always remains the foundation for the didache.⁶⁰ To explain Stanley's position in different words, factual history is not the perspective in question with didache because Pentecost, which cannot be bound to a positivist recounting of verifiable facts, presents the person with a new understanding of historical events.

Stanley's emphasis upon Pentecost produced some new agitation among American Catholics who feared his approach endangered the historical value of the Gospels. The editor of Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Edward F. Siegman, had responded to this agitation by pointing out the

⁵⁹"While it was Pentecost which had ultimately revealed to the apostolic community Christ's divinity and the personality of the Spirit, still Jesus' public ministry had served as introduction to the meaning of the Pentecostal revelation. Accordingly, it was only by underscoring this divine pedagogical purpose that Jesus' earthly career could be made intelligible to the faith of the Christian reader. The aim of the authors of our Gospels was didache, a deeper theological instruction intended to nourish the initial response of faith to the apostolic kerygma. Granted the didactic purpose of the evangelists and their insight into the Christophanic nature of the traditions about Jesus' earthly ministry, these inspired authors made use of their materials to present an account of Jesus' life which is not primarily 'Historical' (in our sense), but a theological interpretation." Ibid., p. 55.

⁶⁰"That the Gospel narratives contain much that is also 'historical' is easily demonstrable from the fact that the modern critics can still recover the original Sitz im Leben of so many of its narratives. That they necessarily remain didache, however, revealing the Person of Christ to the reader with faith, is equally clear from the new theological dimension which the evangelists so frequently add to them." Ibid.

emphasis placed on Pentecost by other Catholic exegetes.⁶¹ Catholic Biblical Quarterly decided on a project to clarify historical problems shared by many people and to present a perspective which solved these problems. The project had been initiated by a letter from a seminary professor, John Castelot, to Catholic Biblical Quarterly.⁶²

Castelot's letter was to have been published under the heading "The Historicity of the Gospels." He presented lucidly the widespread concern for the safety of the faith which many Catholics, faced with

⁶¹In his review of La Lecture Chretienne de la Bible by Dom Celestin Charlier, Siegman said, "Students who raise eyebrows over the emphasis placed by Fr. David Stanley on Pentecost in the development of revelation (e.g., in his prize-winning essay, 'Kingdom to Church: the Structural Development of Apostolic Christianity in the New Testament' Theological Studies XVI, (Mar. 1955) 1-29) may be surprised to find that Charlier thinks this approach basic to a Christian understanding of the New Testament." Edward F. Siegman, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XX (Oct. 1958), p. 571.

⁶²David Stanley brought this project to my attention. He sent a six page offprint and made the following comments about it.

"I have a little item however which will prove interesting for your project: a letter from Fr. John Castelot, SS with comments by the then CBQ Editor, E. Siegman. These half dozen pages were printed (as you see!) but never published in CBQ after a long series of arguments-discussions by several persons involved. It was agreed (by me) that the letter be published, and I should reply in the following issue. The whole project was scrapped mainly because one man felt this would "disturb" people.

I wish to make one point clear to you: Fr. Castelot very soon after revised his views and became a most open and liberal-minded Scripture man. I have only hesitated in sending you this because I should not offend him for the world! Actually I went down to St. John's Sem shortly after this and gave a lecture there, being introduced by Fr. Castelot who (to my astonishment) told the seminarians that (as they knew) he had made a complete volte-face. He is a very good friend of mine, and I only send this to you on condition that he be in no way criticized."

the results of form criticism and other scientific exegetical methods, had been at least privately enunciating.⁶³ His letter exhibited little of the crude understandings of history which we have encountered in other men.⁶⁴ He feared only that form criticism reduced the Gospels to pure subjectivism.⁶⁵ If Pentecost faith is the sole source for the early

⁶³ John J. Castelot completed his graduate studies in theology at Catholic University of America (1946-48), and he studied Scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute (1948-49). Before beginning his graduate work in theology, Castelot taught classics for three years at St. Joseph's College in Mountain View, California (1942-45). Upon his return from Rome he began teaching Scripture at St. John's Seminary in Plymouth, Michigan. His letter to the editors of Catholic Biblical Quarterly bears the Michigan address.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), p. 26.

⁶⁴ "Even though I am aware of the fact that the evangelists were not historians in the modern, or even in the classical sense, still I am afraid that the method under discussion threatens to knock the props from under even their own peculiar historical reliability."

John J. Castelot, a letter to the editors of Catholic Biblical Quarterly. (The offprint which Stanley provided contains no page numbering.)

⁶⁵ "We are all grateful for the emphasis placed by modern scholarship on the role of tradition in the formation of the Gospels and on the influence of the primitive Christian community along the same lines. But I hesitate to assign a positively creative role to the community, in such a way as to make the Gospels, for all practical purposes, little more than aetiological accounts of the primitive Christian faith."

Ibid.

"I frankly admire Fr. Stanley's scholarship, and undoubtedly the method he is exploiting has its uses, but is there no limit to these uses? Just where are we to draw the line? Unless we have some solid objective criteria, subjectivism can run amok."

Ibid.

Christian's act of faith, what are we to think of the ministry of Jesus, he asked.⁶⁶

Because opposition to form criticism could very well prove to be another case of Roman Catholic blindness to a valid method of science, Castelot hesitated to condemn this method.⁶⁷ But he wanted to know more

⁶⁶"(Fr. Stanley's) basic postulate, to which all else must apparently bend, seems to be a conviction that nothing much of any importance--aside from the external events of our Lord's career -- happened before Pentecost; that the apostles, for instance, had no inkling of the divinity of Christ before the descent of the Holy Spirit. He concludes from this that any passage in the Gospels which suggests such a belief is a retrospective reflection of the post-Pentecostal faith of the Christian community....The whole thing seems to involve a latent confusion between the virtue of faith and the material object of that faith. What is the origin of this faith which is 'reflected' in the Gospels?...If Christ's miracles, virtues, and teaching are motives of credibility for us of the present day, would they not have been the same for those who actually witnessed them? There is no gainsaying the fact that the apostles' intellectual and spiritual growth was a gradual process, so gradual, in fact, that our Lord Himself more than once expressed a divine impatience with their slowness to believe (He evidently expected them to!). His own self-revelation was likewise gradual, but from gradual to non-existent is a big step."

Ibid.

⁶⁷"What gives me pause, however, is the fact that publication of (Fr. Stanley's) article implies at least the editors, for whom I have the greatest respect, feel that what the author has to say is, in the main, acceptable. This makes me wonder whether I may not be simply behind the times and miserably out of step. Or am I?"

Ibid.

"I am uncomfortably reminded of a sentence from Divino Afflante Spiritu: 'Let all other children of the Church...avoid that somewhat indiscreet zeal which considers everything new to be for that reason a fit object for attack or suspicion.' I am reminded, too, of the Holy Father's plea that we discuss these matters with extreme charity. It is in a spirit of charity and (I hope) of humility that I submit these difficulties. I do not mean to be carpingly critical. It is rather that I am puzzled and not a little disturbed, and am honestly in search of some clarification in this matter. It is no secret that we have adopted many of the conclusions of the literary critics of the Pentateuch -- with the necessary modifications, of course -- conclusions which no respectable Catholic except Lagrange and a few others would have dared to touch with a ten-foot pole some years ago. Is history repeating itself? If so, I do not want to be left behind."

Ibid.

about form criticism lest he support an attack upon Christianity which could have been initially checked through careful examination of the method.⁶⁸

Castelot assured everyone that he had intended no personal attack upon Stanley or upon anyone else. He noted that Stanley's articles, which agreed in the main with the conclusions of several prominent scholars, had merely been the immediate occasion for his letter.⁶⁹

In his editorial reply to Castelot's letter, Edward Siegman concentrated on the theme of history. He intended solely to explicitate Stanley's efforts to define what type of history is present in the Gospels.

Siegman began his reply, however, with an appreciative comment to Castelot for his reasoned, carefully thought-out presentation. Siegman, well aware that Castelot had crystallized the problems shared by many other persons, saw a bountiful treasure to be gained by initiating a dialogue on the subjects which Castelot had raised.⁷⁰

⁶⁸"But neither should I care to hop on a band-wagon without being sure where it is heading. And I certainly do not want to upset my students by teaching them vague, unsettling hypotheses. On the other hand, I do want very much to keep them au courant."

Ibid.

⁶⁹"You may forward this letter to Fr. Stanley if you wish. I am sure he will understand the spirit in which it was written. This is not a personal attack on him; it is not intended as an attack on anyone. Several other eminent authors have written articles in the same general strain in many fine biblical periodicals. His articles are merely the immediate occasions for my query."

⁷⁰"I have evidence that the problem which (Fr. Castelot) so ably describes is shared by many other CBQ readers, and I hope that frank discussion of it from all angles in CBQ and other journals will be most rewarding. If this exchange of viewpoints is pursued with the scholarly objectivity, zeal for truth, honesty and charity that distinguish Fr. Castelot's letter, the results must be all to the good. The comments that follow are intended, therefore, not as an adequate reply, but merely as a request for further communication."

Edward F. Siegman, editorial comments to John J. Castelot's letter.

Castelot correctly assumed, Sigeman acknowledged, that as editor of Catholic Biblical Quarterly he agreed with Stanley's article. But, he hastened to add, mere publication in the quarterly should not automatically be inferred as total agreement with an article. Sigeman revealed that he had been thinking for some time along the same lines argued by Stanley, but he confessed he had been unable to express these ideas adequately in print.⁷¹

Interpretative history, eventful history, didache, is the major issue at hand, Sigeman stated, and he found Stanley an admirable teacher and defender of this thesis. Stanley grasped that the faith-context of Pentecost had eventually resulted in documents which unveiled the meaning of originally ambiguous occurrences. Stanley grasped that the significance of these occurrences had remained beyond the consciousness of men

⁷¹"The assumption that publication of a study in CBQ implies that the editor regards it 'in the main, acceptable' is justified in the case of Fr. Stanley's article, although the assumption is not universally valid....If anyone who heard Fr. Stanley's paper at the meeting at which it was first read objected to it, I am totally unaware of it. A number of the members of CBQ urged me to publish it as soon as possible. One seminary professor, who is quite cautious and conservative, told me that he intended to make the paper required reading. These reactions confirmed my own enthusiasm for the paper. It gave me the happy satisfied feeling of one who for a long time has been groping for the exact formulation of thesis, and then discovers a colleague with both the thesis and an unexpectedly skillful statement of it."

Ibid.

prior to the presence of the risen Christ's Spirit.⁷²

To indicate that the didache thesis had been garnered from New Testament evidence, and had not been merely the result of ivory tower speculation, Siegman pointed to the Gospel accounts of the activity of apostles before Pentecost. The apostles' fear and their desertion of Jesus, present us with a dilemma if prior to Pentecost they had firmly believed Jesus to be the Son of God.⁷³

Siegman briefly remarked on the long history of active Catholic opposition to form criticism. Such hostility arose mainly because the

⁷²"If Fr. Stanley holds that 'nothing much of any importance... happened before Pentecost,' he might find considerable support for this position in texts like Jn. 7:39; 15:26; 16:13-15. But I read Fr. Stanley's position as more nuanced; everything that happened before Easter received new light and meaning from the sight of the risen Lord. This, in turn, was deepened and perfected by the coming of the Holy Spirit."

Ibid.

"Certainly we emphasize the sincerity of the evangelists, their competence, their ability to check the reliability of the data they include in their Gospels. Much in Mark is narrated with the vividness and freshness of an eye witness report, as Vincent Taylor recently noted. But this does not mean that we dare ascribe to the evangelists our own mentality as far as history is concerned. They were not writing to prove a thesis or to preserve the memory of the Christ of whose constant presence they were vividly conscious. The books they wrote were to be read in Church; they wrote for Christians who had been previously convinced but who needed further instruction."

Ibid.

⁷³"I doubt that this interpretation of the facts (cf. fn. 72) excluded every earlier 'inkling' or intimation of Christ's divinity...On the other hand, and this point cannot be stressed sufficiently, it is the NT texts themselves that indicate the absence of the recognition of Christ's divinity before Easter. To recall only the clearest example: how can we explain the conduct of the apostles at the arrest of Christ, if they believed He was the Son of God?"

Ibid.

conclusions of some form critics had been taken to be inherent to the method itself.⁷⁴ Creative community exaggerations, for instance, had become a catch-all solution for some form critics when they were faced with any dilemma in the study of Scripture's literary forms.⁷⁵ Siegman knew that Stanley concurred with his objection.⁷⁶

To diffuse more light on the issue, Siegman appealed to C. H. Dodd's explanation of history. According to Siegman, Dodd claims history is never present without interpretation; many times an interpretation tells more about an occurrence than a straight chronicle could ever convey. Interpretation makes an "occurrence" into an "event." Thus for Dodd in many cases the "event" is the more important reality because people have begun to see the meaning lying within an ambiguous "occurrence."⁷⁷

⁷⁴"Fr. Castelot's uneasiness about form criticism is understandable and not unique among Catholic scholars. Only quite recently have Catholics recognized the contributions of form criticism and the necessity of dissociating it from the negative results of its first proponents."

Ibid.

⁷⁵"On the other hand, a welcome reaction has set in against the extreme position of a generation ago, specifically against the deus ex machina of the creative community."

Ibid.

⁷⁶"By all means, then, we reject a view of the Gospels which regards them as 'little more than aetiological accounts of the primitive Christian faith.' Fr. Stanley would be the first to protest against such a view of the Gospels."

Ibid.

⁷⁷"Dodd is no less convinced than we of the essential bond between history and Christianity....Professor Dodd, however, makes clear that we cannot have history without interpretation. History is not a mere chronicling of occurrences; it records the occurrence with an interpretation of its meaning, the event. In some cases the actual occurrence is less important than the event; there may be doubt about the exact nature of the former, but the latter emerges clear and sharply defined."

Ibid.

With such a view of history, Siegman could demonstrate that the historical nature, the historical foundation, of the Gospels was not endangered by scholars who insist that the text conveys interpretation. Siegman noted that this critical approach actually enhances the historical quality of the Gospels because this approach comprehends the significance of that history.⁷⁸ Thus, the interpretative view is really more objective than the hard fact positivist view of history because the interpretative view truly respects the Gospel attitude to "hard facts."

As the full meaning of the didache thesis begins to dawn on a person, he begins to realize that the Gospels would never have been written if interpretative history had been successfully opposed in the New Testament era. In fact, there would have been no kerygma, no oral tradition, no primitive Christian community, had hard fact positivists wielded the upper hand at Pentecost. There would have been no Pentecost. Jesus would have remained at best an obscure and remote figure rather than have become appreciated as Christ the Event for all men of faith.⁷⁹ In conclusion Siegman said that to accept the recent critical approach to the

⁷⁸"But while the several events narrated in the Gospels are in this respect on different levels, the narrative as a whole is clearly concerned with an historical episode which for those who lived through it, or for those who experienced it through close fellowship with them, bore a weight of meaning greater than could be attributed to any other event in history. It was for them the eschaton, the final absolute event, in which the Kingdom of God was revealed, and His purpose fulfilled."

Ibid.

⁷⁹ I immediately recalled John McKenzie's remarks about eyewitnesses and the Gospel narratives (see Chapter III, p. 64) when I read Siegman's remarks about the questionable character of usual apologetics. Siegman quoted Dodd as suspicious of any appeal to eyewitnesses in order to guarantee specific narratives in the Gospel tradition.

formation of the Gospels, is to accept the New Testament milieu.⁸⁰ To accept the recent critical approach to the formation of the Gospels is also to free oneself from doing mental contortions and gymnastics when confronted by Gospel narratives which are blatantly or subtly out of "positivist" order.⁸¹ Most important, to accept the recent critical approach to the formation of the Gospels is to free oneself to hear the message which the Gospels proclaim to men of faith.⁸²

Unfortunately the dialogue which Sigeman wished to initiate on this topic never did commence. Fears led someone to impede this dialogue lest discussion "disturb" people to face the truth. Perhaps the unfortunate and irrational attacks which liberal biblical scholars in the Church had to endure in the early 1960's could have been avoided had such communication been allowed to take place.

Perhaps Stanley's article on the historical nature of the Gospels is what would have appeared in Catholic Biblical Quarterly in response to John Castelot's letter. The article first appeared in a 1959 issue of Theological Studies and was revised by Stanley for inclusion in Christianity Divided, a collection of essays edited by Daniel Callahan and published by Sheed and Ward in 1961.

Both sources were used in researching "The Gospels as Salvation History," for this thesis.

⁸⁰"The whole tendency of recent criticism is rather to think of the Gospels as the deposit, or crystallization, of various aspects of a living and continuous tradition, embodied and expressed in the life of a community. This tradition is witnessed to by other New Testament documents."
Ibid

⁸¹"I have found this approach to the Gospels a stimulus to faith because it dispenses me from the necessity of various kinds of mental contortions in order to fit everything into place..."
Ibid.

⁸²"...this approach enables me instead of reading into the Gospel account to serenely read out of it what is really there."
Ibid.

Stanley initially alluded to the years of controversy and suspicion over the use of modern literary criticism in biblical studies. The chief issue in New Testament studies has become new perspectives on the historical quality of the Gospels. Even Catholics can study the Gospels more freely than ever before, he said. However, the Catholic exegetes' new freedom had not silenced fears in those Catholic circles which saw the ghost of Modernism in the new biblical criticism.⁸³ In 1961 these fears in American Catholic circles culminated in a severe attack upon liberal biblical studies, but when Stanley revised his article in 1960 he still referred to the fears as no more than whispers.⁸⁴

⁸³"For some time now, it appears, a new breeze has been blowing in the domain of Catholic biblical studies....and the breeze, for well over a decade has sprung up to revivify Catholic scholarly endeavor, has been felt in almost every branch of scriptural research. Biblical inspiration and inerrancy, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the 'prehistory' of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, all exemplify the type of question which has received quite new solutions. Among the problems that have undergone a reorientation in New Testament studies, that of the historical character of the Gospels has enjoyed a certain pre-eminence. Catholic exegetes are now permitted to voice opinions upon this difficult question which fifty, even twenty-five years ago would have caused considerable concern, if not explicit censure....(On) the part of some within the Church, there has largely been a reaction to many of the views (the professional student of Scripture) now feels free to express. The scripture scholar would be foolish to ignore the fact that a certain malaise has manifested itself on the part of some theologians. They are not quite so sure as their biblical colleagues that the effects of the twentieth century scriptural renaissance can be called progress. There are undoubtedly some who feel, even though perhaps they do not express their fears too openly, that the old ghost of Modernism..has staged a reappearance, this time as a poltergeist." David Stanley, "The Gospels as Salvation History." Christianity Divided, pp. 111-12.

⁸⁴"As John L. McKenzie recently observed, 'At the present writing, fifteen years after the publication of (Divino Afflante Spiritu), opposition to creative biblical scholarship speaks only in whispers, and it no longer inhibits original work which goes beyond commonly accepted theological opinion.'" Ibid., p. 112

See Chapter Three, pp.89-91, for a discussion of this article by McKenzie.

In Stanley's judgment the basis for much of these fears was an unwarranted fear of form criticism, which many persons hesitated to apply to the New Testament lest they jeopardize the historical nature of these documents.⁸⁵

Stanley conceded that certain hesitations over form criticism were reasonable since the method cannot handle documents from the Old Testament and from the New Testament in exactly the same fashion. He said, for example, that the time period of the New Testament's oral tradition was quite compressed when compared to that of Old Testament traditions. Also, he said, people claiming to be eyewitnesses could have been available to the evangelists.⁸⁶ On the whole, however, he said fears of form criticism stemmed from unfounded assumptions and false conclusions about what form criticism does to the New Testament narratives.⁸⁷

⁸⁵"And nowhere, I believe, is this uneasiness so strongly felt as it is with regard to the exegetes' new conception of what has always been known as the 'historicity' of the Gospels. Even some of those who have come to recognize the validity of certain principles of Form Criticism, let us say, when they are applied to the Old Testament, can scarcely repress a shudder when these same principles are allowed to operate in the study of the Gospels."

David Stanley, "The Conception of Our Gospels as Salvation History," Theological Studies, XX (Dec. 1959), p. 562.

⁸⁶"Let me say at once...that there is some reasonableness in this somewhat conservative reaction we are speaking of. It is only too obvious, for instance, that between the antiquity and folkloric character of many oral traditions incorporated in the Old Testament and the relatively short-lived and well-substantiated oral traditions forming the basis of the written Gospels, there is a vast and easily discernible difference. Anyone can surely see that there were no human eyewitnesses to the creation. By contrast, the Evangelists could have found a not inconsiderable number of serious-minded, sincere men to testify to the sayings and doings of Jesus of Nazareth."

⁸⁷"We do not wish to minimize this attitude of reserve which, though rarely vocal, is certainly present in some Catholic minds. It is based really upon a fear that, because certain long-established props have been pulled out from under the structure of Catholic apologetics by the new methods, the whole edifice is in danger of collapse."
Ibid., p. 563.

Stanley traced some of these fears back to Scripture scholars who were more iconoclastic than architectonic in their Scripture work. He accused some Catholic Scripture scholars of lacking rigorous scientific scholarship and not meeting the challenge of building a respectable biblical theology.⁸⁸

Stanley uncovered another villain just as guilty as were irresponsible exegetes in fostering unwarranted fears about form criticism. Biblical fundamentalism, had become entrenched in Catholic circles. The Church had first officially fought fundamentalism with Divino Afflante Spiritu's call for literary form interpretation and

⁸⁸"It is most regrettable that occasionally the Scripture scholar has, in the exuberance of experiencing his new-found freedom, displayed an entirely too negative attitude in approaching the question of the Gospels' historical character. I do not mean merely that some scholars have succumbed to the temptation to play the enfant terrible, shocking the genuine if ill-informed, piety of earnest Christians. I refer rather to the iconoclastic tendency occasionally displayed by biblical experts to devote themselves to the demolition of outmoded solutions to scriptural difficulties without sufficiently calling attention to the positive values found in the explanations which they seek to substitute for them. Not all New Testament critics have shouldered their new responsibility of developing a much-needed New Testament biblical theology."

Ibid.

John McKenzie had made a more sweeping accusation against non-scientific Scripture scholars. (See Chapter Three, p. 89).

its call for more than a superficial understanding of biblical narratives.⁸⁹

The encyclical's call for new studies of the religious purpose of biblical history provided Stanley the bridge whereby to link his investi-

⁸⁹ Still when we speak of the need of delicacy and prudence in promoting the new Catholic approach to Gospel criticism, we do not mean to suggest that the biblical scholar can take refuge in a conservatism which borders upon obscurantism.....I mean, of course, biblical fundamentalism.....John L. McKenzie had defined fundamentalism as 'the crass literal interpretation of the Bible without regard for literary forms and literary background.' Indeed, it consists essentially of a conscious and deliberate 'literal-mindedness' in accepting the affirmations of biblical writers without regard to the idiom, the context or the literary form through which they are expressed....In his encyclical of 1943...Pius XII 'unequivocally repudiated fundamentalism in Catholic exegesis.' This statement of John L. McKenzie requires some amplification, since the fundamentalist attitude had, over all too long a period, become firmly entrenched in Catholic thinking. And this was particularly true where the Gospels were concerned...Pius lays down two principles of paramount importance, which run directly counter to the fundamentalist position: 1) 'the supreme law of interpretation is that by which we discover and determine what the writer meant to say'; 2) there are only a very few texts of the Bible 'whose meaning has been declared by the Church's authority nor are those more numerous about which there is a unanimous opinion of the holy Fathers.'"

Christianity Divided, op. cit., pp. 113-16.

In 1961 Stanley presented a paper to the Catholic Biblical Association of America. The official report of that meeting says Stanley "discussed the meaning of Form Study, its principles and Papal Sanction, and concluded that to decry the study of literary forms in Gospel matters amounts to a refusal to discover what God is saying to man."

Geoffrey F. Wood, "Report of the Twenty-fourth General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America." Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (Oct. 1961). p. 467.

gation of the Gospel's historical character with official pronouncements of the Church.⁹⁰

Stanley digressed briefly into a description of the art of history writing. This digression enabled him to present even more sharply the fact that the Gospels are not the type of history which we normally confront. He emphasized that every historian dons an interpretative cloak when he sets out to record history.⁹¹

One feature of most historical writing, the concern for spatial and temporal delimitation, does not characterize the Gospels.⁹² Spatial and

⁹⁰"As regards the variety of historical writing to be found in the Bible, the interpreter must constantly bear in mind 'the special purpose, the religious purpose, of biblical history.' We shall return to a consideration of this remark when we discuss the special character of the Gospels as salvation history."

"The Conception of our Gospels as Salvation History," *op. cit.*, p. 568. Stanley's remarks about *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, which are in full agreement with remarks from other highly respected Catholic exegetes, indicate that it is impossible to gainsay the important position which this encyclical holds in Catholic Scripture studies. The statements coming out of Vatican II clinch this argument. See Chapter Five, pp. 222-31.

⁹¹"...the writing of history remains an art, involving as it inevitably does, the selection and interpretation in some literary form of the 'remembered past'....Dodd defines history 'as consisting of events which are of the nature of occurrences plus meaning.' If we accept Dodd's definition, it becomes clear that the task of selecting and interpreting the facts to be chronicled is an essential part of the historian's function."

Christianity Divided, *op. cit.*, p. 122

See Siegman's account of interpretative history on pp. 140-45 of this chapter.

⁹²"But before he selects and interprets the events about which he intends to write, the historian must satisfy himself as to their situation in space and time. 'When' and 'where' are two of the historian's most elementary queries....It is of considerable significance for any understanding of what is meant by the historical nature of the Gospels to be aware that the evangelists show a marked tendency to dissociate most of the episodes of Jesus' public life which they record from both time and place. While some explanation of this phenomenon will appear later in this essay, it must be noted here as one indication of the distance which separates the Gospels from modern historical writing. The evangelists' lack of interest in the specific geographical or chronological settings of many of their narratives unquestionably sets a limitation upon our attempts to prove these events 'historical' in the modern sense."

Ibid., pp. 123-24.

temporal inaccuracy in the Gospels, which should make usual apologists hesitate,⁹³ is symptomatic of the faith-context which enshrines the Gospel narratives.⁹⁴

Stanley distinguished biblical history from the modern approach to history by pointing to the Bible as salvation history. He described salvation history as the human response to God's personal revelation in the world of men.⁹⁵ Only a man or a community believing in this revelation could compose historical documents which convey this salvation history, that is, which proclaim this revelation.⁹⁶

⁹³"We might note as one consequence of this fact, that the historicity of the Gospels is not as simple as some apologetics manuals would lead us to think."

Ibid., p. 124

⁹⁴"(The evangelists') purpose was quite different from that of the modern historian. Their primary aim was to testify to the divine-human fact of God's intervention in human history which brought man salvation in Jesus Christ."

Ibid.

A concise presentation of the evangelists' spatial and temporal disinterest is given by Quentin Quesnell in This Good News, pp. 171-72. Quesnell is discussed in Chapter Five, pp. 232-52.

⁹⁵"What, then, is the biblical conception of history, and how do our Gospels differ from 'history' in the modern acceptance of the word? The biblical notion of history rests upon the belief that God has, in the past, revealed Himself in a special way within the cadre of human affairs. Through specific events, personalities, and human utterances, God has intervened in the world of man. From this point of view, it is clear that the intelligibility to be seen in the biblical narratives is essentially that of a divine, not a human, pattern. It is this viewpoint which distinguished all biblical history from the profane, or so-called scientific, history, and indeed constitutes its superiority vis-a-vis 'history' as we understand it today. It is best described as 'a Mystery', in the Pauline and Johannine sense, namely, God's revelation, in time, to men of his eternal plan for the world's salvation....(T)his genre of history, which we call salvation history or Heilsgeschichte, is the story of God's self-revelation to us; and its purpose is obviously very different from that modern scientific history which is written without reference to the divine point of view."

Ibid., pp. 124-25.

⁹⁶"...the fact that God has spoken to many by means of books written by human beings is an object of faith."

Ibid., p. 126.

Didache, which is inherent to this salvation history context, is the primary intentionality behind the specific literary form of each Gospel. As he had explicitated in other articles, Stanley said here also that didache begins with faith and presupposes faith in order to deepen understanding of the faith commitment.⁹⁷ Thus, he concluded that only faith can guarantee the truth of salvation history; eyewitnesses do not make the Gospel testimony true for the person confronted by the evangelists' message.⁹⁸ Stanley did not belittle the presence of eyewitnesses testimony in the Gospels, but he refused to assign it a role which it was never intended to fulfill and which it is unable to fulfill.⁹⁹

Failure to grasp the semitic perspective of the Gospels can lead to hasty conclusions, Stanley warned. Because fundamentalism cannot be bothered with searching for the meaning which a biblical author intended, fundamentalism promotes superficial, hasty conclusions about literary form interpretation. One faulty conclusion is to judge that literary

⁹⁷"The evangelists do indeed propose, in the written accounts of Jesus' life upon earth, to give their reader a narrative that is based upon ocular testimony. It is of paramount importance, however, to appreciate the fact that they aim principally at writing salvation history, which entails testimony to something that lies beyond the competence of any eyewitnesses. They offer, that is, an insight into the meaning of the Mystery of Jesus Christ."

Ibid.

⁹⁸"Faith's guarantee that these writers have infallibly expressed the revelation of Jesus Christ as incarnate Son and universal redeemer is founded upon the supernatural fact of scriptural inspiration. Thus for an adequate comprehension of the evangelists' testimony we must realize that it possesses merely the authority of reliable eyewitnesses, but also the authority of God Himself."

Ibid.

"In the eyes of the evangelist, we of a later age are at no disadvantage in comparison with the disciples who saw and heard Jesus. We possess the unum necessarium, that perception of the salvific character of Jesus' earthly life through Christian faith which, if it reposes upon the apostles' eyewitness testimony, grasps, quite as accurately as they, the supernatural meaning of that life, which is beyond the reach of mere historical investigation."

Ibid., p. 128

⁹⁹Ibid.

form interpretation reduces the Gospel stories to total fabrication because it maintains that literary forms have artificial structures.¹⁰⁰

Stanley briefly considered the literary structure of Matthew in order to indicate the Gospel's message. His investigations of this Gospel had revealed the narratives point to a lack of ipsissima verba and to a tradition which saw change, adaptation, and clarification. This use of tradition exemplified concretely the teaching authority of the Church at work,¹⁰¹

Before undertaking a discussion of the evangelists' use of literary forms, Stanley again clarified the didache characteristic of the Gospels. To grasp the historical significance of the Gospels, he said

100 "...if we are to avoid the fundamentalistic mentality, we must be on our guard against the superficial conclusion that, because one may be led to admit that certain details in an evangelist's narrative (or even its general framework) are due to the literary form used or to his specific purpose, the whole story has been invented. Such a black-or-white attitude is simply the failure, on the part of a modern, Occidental mind, to comprehend the Semitic viewpoint evinced by the inspired author."
Ibid., p. 129

101 "Matthew's version of Jesus' public life is so constructed as to bring home to us the truth that, in his Galilean ministry -- particularly in his preaching (Matthew's chief interest is in the logia of Jesus, while the event is of importance mainly for the doctrinal message it contains) -- Jesus had begun to found that Church through which He will remain with us until the end of time....(T)he instruction in parables (Mt 13) discloses the mystery which is involved in the supernatural character of the Church....(T)he importance of recognizing that these explanations (which, in Matthew's Gospel, appear upon the lips of Jesus) are in their present form the creation of the apostolic Church, must not be lost sight of. They provide a most invaluable piece of evidence that the primitive Christian community was already doing what the Church has, in every age, claimed the right to do, namely, render explicit the doctrinal implication of her Master's teaching."
Ibid.

a person simply must realize that the Gospels describe events only to the man of faith.¹⁰²

Within the didache form, many literary forms may be employed. Our task is not to decide arbitrarily what literary forms are consonant with Scripture, but rather our task is to work with the message of Scripture as it presents itself.¹⁰³

Stanley argued that the artificial structure of the Gospel form should not produce mental contortionists who are at pains to reconcile history with the Gospel message. Neither should it produce skeptics who

¹⁰²"...the written Gospel, as we have stated earlier, was intended for readers already possessed of the Christian faith, to provide them with a more profound understanding of the mysteries of the faith. Thus it may be classified in a particular genre of that religious history of which the encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu speaks. Like the preaching, however, it attempts to express that reality which surpasses the limits of our time-space world and its experiences....To assess fully the evangelical genus litterarium (literary genre), we must attend above all to the dialogue between the inspired author and his Christian reader, to that witnessing to Christ which, as Paul characterizes it, is 'from faith to faith'. (Rom 1:17)....It is only when this fact is borne in mind that the historical character of the Gospels can be rightly evaluated."

Ibid., p. 137

¹⁰³"Incorporated under this specific literary type, the Gospel form, which we have called salvation history, we can discern many other literary forms whose study can aid us in grasping the meaning of the Gospels' historical character. At this point it may not be inopportune to recall Pius XII's insistence upon the very wide variety of historical literary forms found in the Bible, all of them perfectly consonant with the divine dignity and veracity. To decide how God should (or should not) have transmitted his revelation to us, without first putting ourselves to school to the inspired writers, is scarcely a reverent (or intelligent) approach to the scriptural Word. No sincere Christian should feel called upon to apologize for the divine choice of certain media of God's self-revelation."

Ibid.

Thus he completely rejected John J. Collins' a priori judgment that myths are incompatible with divine revelation. (See Chapter One, p.17)

disregard Gospel compatibility with history.

The fear that form criticism is absolutely iconoclastic is another dilemma confusing many persons. Stanley assured people that form criticism is only interested in deciphering more clearly the deepest meaning of the Gospels. He assured them that form criticism does not eventually lead to an attack upon the historical quality of the Gospels, and pointed out that this accusation really veils an unwarranted fear the Gospels' historical character is open to attack when scientific methods to understand the Bible are employed.¹⁰⁵

Although Stanley admitted that some Gospel logia still present the form and ideas of Jesus,¹⁰⁶ he agreed with other critics that on the whole each evangelist had employed oral traditions which had undergone revisions

¹⁰⁴"The problem posed by the presence of certain literary forms in the Gospels is in no sense to be regarded as one of reconciling the 'history' with the Christology. Once we grant the supreme truth of the Incarnation of the Son with all the consequences for human history which that fact involves, then the Christology is admittedly the history."

Ibid., p. 138/

Stanley brought up this same point in his review of C. K. Barrett's commentary on John's Gospel. (See Chapter Three, pp. 71-72).

¹⁰⁵

"Here we must also mention a question frequently put to the Catholic critic, when he is discussing the literary form of certain Gospel narratives, 'Where do you stop?!...We stop when we have been satisfied that we understand the words of the inspired writer, since then we have grasped the divine message contained in a particular biblical passage. In addition, we might draw attention here once again to the false implication contained in such a question, namely, that the attempt to understand the Bible by the use of literary criticism calls in question or destroys the historical character of the events recorded in the Bible."

Ibid., pp. 138-39

¹⁰⁶

"with regard to the saying and sermons of Jesus, there are undoubtedly certain logia which retain the very form and ideas of their author. These can often be determined quite accurately by a comparison of the varying forms in which a logion is represented in the evangelical tradition. The simplest and most obvious example, perhaps, is Mt. 5:40 which contains the insissima verba of Jesus."

Ibid., p. 140

and Gospel redaction.¹⁰⁷ By using Sitz im Leben Jesu and Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae and Sitz im Evangelium Stanley had been able to uncover much of the development affecting tradition and even to uncover the cultural milieu of a literary form in its final redaction.¹⁰⁸

All of Stanley's evidence supplied by literary form analysis and form criticism confirms even more solidly the assertion by Pius XII that the literature of the Gospels is religious in character. The Old Testament demonstrates the implications of such religious motivation in the appropriation of pagan myths and other literary forms. The New Testament demonstrates this religious motivation precisely in the didache which makes the Gospels be Gospels.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷"There are, however, discourses which the sacred writer himself has constructed from Jesus' utterances and sermons....There are parables which, in the course of oral tradition, have undergone a certain historicization."

Ibid.

¹⁰⁸"It is not implausible that three Matthean parables (the Steward, Mt. 24:45-51, the Virgins, Mt. 25:1-13, and the Talents, Mt. 25:14-30) reflect the ecclesiastical organization of the apostolic Church of the author's day, and represent respectively the hierarchical authorities, groups of consecrated women, and the body of the faithful."

Ibid., p. 141.

¹⁰⁹"...prescinding from divine inspiration, the pre-eminence of the Israelites in historical writing lies in the religious character of the history they wrote. Indeed, it is this quality which so sharply distinguishes the literature of Israel from that of her neighbor and explains the remarkable way in which the sacred writers, at least in the Old Testament, were able to take over literary forms and even myths from their pagan contemporaries and transform them into suitable media for the expression of divine revelation. With regard to evangelists, it is clear that while they were concerned with the historical and employed eyewitness accounts where these were available, they were always engaged upon their predominating purpose, the recording of the Good News of Jesus Christ, which is the supreme example of salvation history."

Ibid., pp. 141-42.

Stanley wrote other articles developing New Testament themes in fashion similar to that already illustrated. Didache played the key role in these articles also.¹¹⁰ Rather than a more detailed presen-

100 "In an article on Paul's conversion in Acts, Stanley studied the overall literary form, namely, a travel story, chosen by Luke to present the conversion. The importance of the Pentecost event for Luke's didache is clear since Luke presents the conversion as Paul's Pentecost experience.

David Stanley, "Paul's Conversion in Acts. Why the Three Accounts?," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Oct. 1953), pp. 315-38.

In a study of New Testament hymns, Stanley showed that they were liturgical and composed for the instruction of the community. Thus the hymns, which presupposed faith on the part of the singers, were similar to didache.

David Stanley, "Carmenque Christo Quasi Deo Dicere," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX, (Apr. 1958), 173-91.

In 1959 he investigated the liturgical influences upon the development of didache.

David Stanley, "Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI, (Jan. 1959), pp. 24-38.

In a study of Pauline allusions to the sayings of Jesus, Stanley indicated the change, adaptation, and development of the Christian traditions. He especially clarified that the logia of Jesus were handled in an interpretative manner.

David Stanley, "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII, (Jan. 1961), pp. 26-39.

His popular study of the Gospel of Mark included a schematization of the didache which the evangelist had followed. The schematization stressed that didache constitutes faith insights into the meaning of faith in Jesus Christ.

David Stanley, "Mark and Modern Apologetics," The Bible Today I (Oct. 1962), pp. 58-64.

In an article on the Church in the New Testament, he emphasized the faith-context of New Testament writings, stressed the theme of Pentecost, and discussed the influence each evangelist's understanding of didache had on his Gospel's understanding of the Church.

David Stanley, "Reflections on the Church in the New Testament," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXV, (July 1963), pp. 387-400.

Stanley's article on collegiality isolated individual sections of some Gospels, placed these sections in the context of their Gospel's overall literary form, and investigated what community influences were evident in these sections.

David Stanley, "The New Testament Basis for the Concept of Collegiality," Theological Studies XXV (June 1964), pp. 197-216.

tation of these articles, however, a conclusion highlighting Stanley's contributions to Scripture scholarship seems more in order. The other articles elaborate points already discussed in this thesis.

Stanley's contributions to the scientific renewal of biblical criticism are many. He saw his era as one demanding careful, prudent exposition of exegetical issues misunderstood in many Church circles. He saw that fundamentalism was the chief threat not only to biblical renewal but also to a deepening of the faith of many of his fellow Catholics.

Because of the circumstances of his time, Stanley explained issues such as form criticism, literary form interpretation, oral tradition, Sitz im Leben, and the historical nature of the Gospels' testimony about Jesus Christ. His clarification of the didache genre of the Gospels provided a new perspective whereby people could understand the format of the Gospels as a whole. His clarification of the Pentecost event for the early Christians provided a perspective whereby persons could understand the centrality of faith in the Gospels.

What had previously been arguments seemingly supporting the historical nature of the Gospels, Stanley showed to be correct in intention but oversimplified. Eyewitnesses, for example, had certainly been present and must have played a role in the formation of the Christian traditions, but their role had not been one of simple recounting of sequence of facts; their role had been one of interpretation, proclamation, and teaching about these facts. Their role had been one of forming these facts into a "salvation history."

Stanley chiefly handled the issue of history. He provided for Catholics a new historical perspective on the New Testament. Had the Catholic Biblical Quarterly project on "The Historicity of the Gospels" not been scrapped, the Church's understanding of history would have grown.

The open discussion encouraged by the project would certainly have helped overcome positivist simplifications about the New Testament.

Stanley's investigations of New Testament themes familiar to many Catholics deepened their appreciation for these themes. For example, his presentation of the New Testament notion of redemption differed from Joseph Lilly's presentation in 1947. The methods Stanley used partially account for this difference. Stanley's methods enabled him to show the historical development of the New Testament theme; Lilly had denied that any development was possible.

Stanley insisted that faith is a phenomenon of growth which expresses itself in deeper understandings of what is believed. Examples of these deeper understandings are to be found in the New Testament, and Stanley found them through his modifications of the Sitz im Leben theory. He pointed to the difference between Kerygma and didache as a further illustration of how people grew in understanding their Christian faith during New Testament times.

Stanley provided a bridge into the 1960's. The 1950's witnessed a shift in American Catholic views of Scripture. The 1960's would see some highly praised contributions from American Catholic Scripture scholars. Stanley's genius greatly helped transform the biblical studies undertaken by Catholics in America. Who else in America spoke as he did in the 1950's? Although other key figures, especially John McKenzie, were involved directly and deeply in this transformation of American Catholic biblical criticism, only Stanley almost systematically handled every argument which exegetes had to face. These arguments stretched beyond form criticism because they were rooted in a historical perspective on the Scriptures which modern scholarship has abandoned.

Chapter Five

"1960-1965"

Chapter Five considers six years, 1960-1965, in which the bitter fight over modern Scripture scholarship in the Catholic Church not only reached maximum proportions but also reached solution.. Chapter Five also considers some New Testament scholarship produced by American Catholics. Although not directly connected with the debate over the new exegesis, the works considered pre-eminently illustrate the growth of American Catholic biblical scholarship as a science.

From 1960-1965 some members of the Catholic Church attempted to discredit liberal Catholic biblical scholars. Misunderstandings, confusion, and fears led to this attempt to condemn the scientific renewal of biblical criticism. The battle reached the sessions of Vatican II, which finally championed the Catholic exegetes' use of scientific methods.

In America the attack began in 1961 and centered on the historicity theme. Eager to defend the historical element of the Gospels, certain Catholics argued in ignorance of the careful work of scholars such as David Stanley. To defend a fundamentalist position, the opponents of the new exegesis mainly argued that the Gospels are objective history. But a new emphasis in their attacks was that they argued less from supposed scientific techniques and conclusions than from respect for the Magisterium. There was the implication if not the explicit accusation, that the liberal biblical scholars had placed

themselves above the Church's teaching authority. And there was the concomitant implication that the opponents of liberal scholarship were loyal defenders of the faith, embattled Catholics preserving the integrity of the Catholic Church.

All the old arguments were now brought out again, but directed now against the work of fellow American Catholics. The issue at hand was really whether the Catholic Church was going to allow its exegetes effectively to implement Divino Afflante Spiritu or not. Renewal in Scripture scholarship had firmly taken hold in certain quarters of the Church. Would this reform cease because other Catholics insisted the Church's biblical studies needed no change?

However, 1960 opened with little hint of approaching problems. As an example, the first three articles of this decade definitely employed form criticism, but they gave no defense for employing such a proven method. From these articles a person would not suspect that a bitter struggle over Scripture was soon to ensue within the Catholic Church.

a) The Historicity Debate

1) A Deceptive Calm - 1960

In 1960 Myles M. Bourke wrote an article on the literary genre of Matthew's infancy narratives.¹ He was primarily concerned to determine the type of history proclaimed in these narratives; secondarily he wanted to establish what positive facts the narratives preserve.

¹Bourke's academic background includes graduate studies in theology at Catholic University in Washington, D.C., from 1942-46. He taught Scripture at St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers, New York, from 1947-50. In 1950-51 he studied Scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute and returned to St. Joseph's Seminary, where he teaches at present.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly" XXVI (1964), p. 23.

He approached his task from a literary criticism point of view; for example, he compared the Matthean narratives with similar texts and rabbinic material.

Bourke knew thoroughly the investigations being done by Stanley and other such scholars. His article has numerous allusions to form critical findings and to modifications given the method. He openly used both Dibelius and Bultmann for secondary sources.²

Bourke said that historical investigations of the infancy narratives may have to accept that only a very slight amount of this tradition records actual happenings.³ This conclusion is in harmony with Stanley's insistence that biblical scholars must determine the type of history preserved and proclaimed in the Gospels. Bourke insisted on determining the historical core of a narrative; Stanley insisted that the entire literary phenomenon known as a Gospel is salvation-history or didache.

Retrospect shows how Bourke's interest in the historicity of the infancy narratives helped set the stage for the coming attack on biblical studies. Although Bourke made no categorical statements that the narratives are purely, completely legendary, he said that certain elements are apparently legendary.⁴ He maintained that more extensive study of these narratives is required before the historic value

² Myles M. Bourke, "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (1960), p. 167.

³ Ibid., pp. 160-61.

See also fn 7, p. 161.

See also the discussion of John McKenzie's presentation of the infancy narratives on pp. 253-56 of this chapter.

⁴ "If it is a midrash, what can be said about an historical nucleus from which it has developed? No one would think that the question could be answered satisfactorily without extensive and detailed studies of the infancy narratives, which, to my knowledge, are yet to be made."

Ibid., p. 174

of other elements in the narratives can be determined.⁵ Bourke warned that the positivistic approach to the infancy narratives is unlikely to bear fruit.⁶ He concluded that the literary genus of these narratives, closely connected with the rabbinic narratives, indicates that Matthew 1-2 had gone through much amplification, edification, and aggrandizement.⁷ Therefore, rather than attempt to juggle with false problems of the historical, Bourke opted for modifications given to the Sitz im Leben theory.⁸ Opponents of modern Catholic biblical studies opposed all of these ideas vehemently.

Raymond Brown wrote the last two articles prior to the attack on the modern trends of the Catholic Church's Scripture scholars.⁹

⁵Ibid.

⁶"...I do not think that Ethelbert Stauffer's recent attempt to establish the historicity of the massacre will be found convincing by many."

Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸"Admittedly, the gospel presents Jesus' ministry, death and resurrection as events which really happened. But that the author of such a work might have introduced it by a midrash of deep theological insight, in which Jesus appears as the true Israel and the new Moses, (then containing the theme of the entire gospel), and in which the historical element is very slight seems to be a thoroughly probable hypothesis."

⁹Brown is an impeccable scholar with an impressive background, which includes an MA, two doctorates, and a licentiate in Scripture. He received his Master of Arts degree in philosophy from Catholic University in 1949. In 1955 St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore awarded him a doctorate in theology. From 1954-58 he studied Semitics at Johns Hopkins University and received his doctorate in 1958. He was awarded a research fellowship at Jerusalem's American School of Oriental Research for 1958-59. He earned the licentiate in Scripture in 1963 from the Pontifical Biblical Commission. His teaching career has included one year of teaching classics. In 1959 he began his present teaching position at St. Mary's Seminary, where he teaches Scripture.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), p. 23.

His first article was a short study of quotations by John the Baptist in the Gospel of John. Because the Sitz im Evangelium of these quotations is relatively clear,¹⁰ Brown investigated these sayings in their original setting. He called this original setting the "historical sense" of the quotations, and remarked that it could be called their Sitz im Leben if this term did not usually connote the meaning attached to narratives by the primitive Church.¹¹

Although Brown did not believe that the historical sense of these quotations is the same as their Gospel setting, he was even less willing to believe that the evangelist had completely fabricated them.¹² He maintained that the quotations are authentic, but that they were originally uttered with the misunderstanding that the one to follow John the Baptist would bring cataclysm.¹³ By use of the Sitz im Leben Jesu and Sitz im Evangelium notions, Brown sketched the significance of these prophecies and demonstrated how the Johannine evangelist had used them in a manner possible only to a person who had experienced Pentecost.

Brown's paring away textual accretions and uncovering textual omissions reveals his acceptance and use of methods which twenty years previously no American Catholic scholar had dared use openly. His conclusions indicate the progress American Catholic scholarship had made in

¹⁰Raymond Brown, "Three Quotations from John The Baptist in the Gospel of John," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (1960), p. 292.

¹¹"Our purpose here is to investigate what these three sayings meant to JBap., i.e., what they meant when they were first uttered (historical sense)." Ibid.

¹²Ibid., pp. 292-93.

¹³Ibid., p. 293.

relation to its past difficulties with the new scientific methods.¹⁴

His next article stemmed from historical investigations also. Brown want to compare the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions to determine similarities when both traditions recount apparently historical incidents.¹⁵

Brown chose four scenes from the Synoptic Gospels and showed that even granting the basic historicity of each scene would not eliminate all problems with Gospel historicity. Although historicity has traditionally been defended by appealing to eyewitnesses, Brown pointed out that the Gospel traditions themselves discount the presence of eyewitnesses at certain incidents.¹⁶ Brown questioned how a person is to determine the actual historicity of a narrative when each Gospel re-

¹⁴The following statement could not arise if Brown were inimical to modern criticism: "While Jesus did provoke a certain crisis of judgment among men, He did not visibly introduce a judgment of fire as John the Baptist anticipated, so there was a tendency for the words 'and fire' to disappear from the accounts of John the Baptist's words. The part about the holy spirit, however, was treated by the evangelists as a prophecy of the distribution of the Holy Spirit both at Pentecost and through Baptism."
Ibid., p. 295.

¹⁵Raymond Brown, "Incidents That Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (1961), p. 143.

¹⁶All three Synoptics agree that the disciples, even the closest ones fell asleep; and all the Synoptics place the scene at night. How then did they know what Jesus said and did? Of course, there is no impossibility involved: Jesus could have told the disciples what he said and did after the Resurrection (the disciples had no time alone with Him from the agony until his death). Yet, we must admit that this puts demands on the imagination, and that there is a difficulty in the Synoptic account. The Gospel, after all, is supposed to depend on eyewitness testimony (Acts 10:39), and where we have a scene not backed up by eyewitness account, we have a right to ask how this scene was composed."
Ibid., p. 145.
See also p. 153, "Problem B."

lates differing details.¹⁷ With these questions and examples he demonstrated that the problem of historicity is more complex than the usual naive proponents of historicity realize.

No one should conclude that Brown was attacking the historical nature of the Gospel tradition. He was trying to clarify what happened to traditional stories which are based on historical incidents. He was much too honest to smooth over or to overlook embarrassing discrepancies. (embarrassing only to fundamentalists?) His faith in the truth of the Gospels assured him that honest inquiry would benefit twentieth-century understanding of these documents. To unravel the seeming discrepancies of Gospel narratives, Stanley's Sitz im Evangelium is more fruitful than a fundamentalist adherence to the strictly objective historicity of all Gospel narratives.¹⁸

¹⁷"John's sequence of the events following Jesus' baptism does not parallel that of the Synoptic Gospels. In John, Jesus returns to Galilee a few days after the Baptism. In the Synoptic tradition he is driven into the desert to be tempted by Satan for forty days, and only when this is over does He return to Galilee."
Ibid., p. 152.

¹⁸"The accounts of Mk and Mt-Lk are not in total harmony. Mk simply reports the fact of the temptation. Mt-Lk presumably drawing on the common non-Markan source, describe the temptations. In this dramatic description, except for a shift of order in the three temptations, Mt and Lk agree closely. It is generally agreed that by placing the temptation at Jerusalem last (Mt has it in second place), Lk is favoring the theological motif of gradual progress toward Jerusalem which dominates the order of the Third Gospel... This is interesting for it shows a certain freedom in handling the details of the temptation to promote theological purpose."
Ibid.

(2) The attack against the New Exegesis

The hostilities broke open actually in Italy in 1960 in a seventy-page article in the magazine Divinitas.¹⁹ The article was an incredible attack upon modern biblical research. It singled out such magazines as Catholic Biblical Quarterly as suspect of heresy. The author, Monsignor Antonio Romeo, said that "in various Catholic exegetical circles throughout the whole world the edge of heresy is being grazed and sometimes there is thoroughgoing disbelief."²⁰

Although Romeo mainly confined himself to the biblical scene, he took time to mention Teilhard de Chardin as another suspect figure.²¹ David Stanley is an exegete singled out for attack by Romeo.²²

In much of his article Romeo claimed that Divino Afflante Spiritu had intended no change in the direction of Catholic biblical studies.²³ As Joseph Fitzmyer has shown, Romeo was disturbed that a group of exegetes had wholeheartedly accepted Pius XII's directives. By following his directives, the exegetes had espoused positions contrary to Romeo's own conservative views and, in Romeo's opinion, therefore contrary to

¹⁹A. Romeo, "L'Enciclica "Divino Afflante Spiritu" e le 'Opiniones Novae'", Divinitas IV (1960), pp. 387-456.

²⁰Cf. Joseph Fitzmyer, "A Recent Roman Scriptural Controversy," Theological Studies XXII (1961), p. 434. Fitzmyer's article includes a translation of much of the Romeo article.

²¹Ibid., p. 436.

See also Romeo, op. cit., p. 455, fn. 150.

²²Fitzmyer, op. cit. p. 436.

See also Romeo, op. cit., p. 444, fn. 130.

²³"The burden of the article is a denial that the Encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu is responsible for any new direction in Catholic exegesis, because such is impossible in an exegesis which is closely bound up with tradition."
Ibid., p. 432.

the magisterium.²⁴

Romeo examined the historicity question and accused M. Zerwick, a German Catholic exegete, professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, of denying the historicity of Mt. 16:16-18.²⁵

Romeo's unsubstantiated claims and exaggerated accusations prompted John McKenzie to describe his article as "the fullest exposition of the irrational in my generation."²⁶

The Pontifical Biblical Commission eventually thoroughly rejected Romeo's ideas and made clear that his article had not been an official Church pronouncement even though he is a highly-placed Church member.²⁷

Numerous Catholics breathed a sigh of relief when the Commission championed the Pontifical Biblical Institute, three of whose members Romeo had attacked. As one person, then a student at the Institute, mentioned to me, "For a while 'they' were breathing heavily down our necks."

In 1961 the Commission issued a monitum as a "caution" for Scriptural exegesis. We shall speak of this "caution" in detail shortly.

²⁴ "What disturbs (Romeo) is...the existence of a group of exegetes who seem to be pushing the Catholic interpretation of the Bible in a direction with which he does not agree".

Ibid., p. 434.

"The 'new' exegesis is rather opposed to the directives of the magisterium and constitutes a danger for the faith which has been handed down to us, not to mention its pernicious effect on young clerics who come to Rome for their education and formation." (Translated by Fitzmyer from Romeo, op. cit.)

²⁵ Ibid., p. 435

²⁶ From the interview with John McKenzie, May 24, 1967.

²⁷ "Finally, a letter was sent by Athanasius Miller, OSB, the Secretary of the Pontifical Commission, in the name of all the Consultors of the Commission who had assembled in the Vatican on March 5, 1961, to the Rector of the Biblical Institute, deprecating the attacks of Msgr. Romeo (mentioned by name) and reaffirming publicly their unshakable solidarity with the Biblical Institute."

Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 438.

Because the Commission repudiated Romeo's charges, it is at least certain that the monitum cannot be taken as advocating Romeo's attack against liberal exegesis.²⁸

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly carried an anonymous three paragraph article on the Romeo affair entitled "The Close of a Controversy." The reaction of the quarterly's editors confirms the gravity of Romeo's attack and the relief with which his repudiation was greeted.

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly saw Romeo clearly illustrating the difficulty many persons have had in accepting the far-reaching provisions of Divino Afflante Spiritu.²⁹ The editors hoped that the Romeo controversy at least made dramatically clear the need many persons have to inform themselves of the scientific methods and principles developed in Scripture studies.³⁰

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly rejoiced that the rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Ernest Vogt, SJ, had been named by Pope John XXIII as a consultant of the Theological Commission for the approaching ecumenical council, Vatican II.³¹ Vogt's presence on this commission availed little at first as can be seen from the one-sided, irrelevant, triumphalist first drafts that the Theological Commission submitted to the Council Fathers.³²

The Divinitas article influenced an American Catholic campaign against modern biblical studies, and it encouraged Joseph Clifford Fenton,

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 442-44

²⁹ "In retrospect the affair illustrates the difficulty that many people have had in accepting the principles laid down in the Divino Afflante Spiritu by the late Pius XII..." "The Close of a Controversy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (1961), p. 269.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² (See pp. 223-27 of this chapter).

editor of American Ecclesiastical Review to press to the hilt his campaign against liberal scholarship. Linking Fenton to his description of Romeo, John McKenzie told me "Fenton is just as irrational though not as full."

American Ecclesiastical Review began its onslaught in 1961 with four articles.³³ Two of the articles were written by a relatively unknown American priest who had studied at the Pontifical Biblical Institute. The other two were written respectively by Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini and by Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, then Apostolic Delegate to the United States. Thus in his campaign against liberal Catholic exegetes, Fenton had strong support from two highly influential Church officials.

The American priest who wrote two of Fenton's articles is Gerald T. Kennedy, an Oblate from Washington, D.C.³⁴ Kennedy considerably changed his attitudes toward modern scholarship after he wrote his articles. Father Kennedy contacted this author in a lengthy, informative, warm letter, which later is reproduced verbatim.³⁵

In his first article Kennedy called for prudence when handling biblical issues. The issues he had in mind were inerrancy, literary forms, and historicity. His article was, on the whole, mild.

³³In any review of this episode from American Ecclesiastical Review, it is important to remember the question and answer column of Francis J. Connell discussed in Chapter Three. (See pp. 99-101) Connell's column indicates that the attack on the 1960's was no accidental or sudden uprising but rather had been long brewing. Romeo's article became for Fenton a catalyst, his personal "stamp of official approval."

³⁴Kennedy did graduate studies at Catholic University and received three graduate degrees: an MA in education for work done between 1945-46; a licentiate in theology in 1948 and a doctorate in 1951. The Pontifical Institute awarded Kennedy a licentiate in Scripture in 1953. His teaching career includes courses in religious education in 1946-47 and from 1955-59; courses in Hebrew and catechetics at Oblate College, Washington, D.C., from 1947-51; a classics course at Oblate Juniorate in Newburgh, New York, in 1951-52; and Scripture and Hebrew at Washington's Oblate College from 1953 to his appointment in 1965 as pastor of St. Patrick Church in Fayetteville, North Carolina.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), p. 41.

³⁵(See pp. 196-98.)

His presentation of the inerrancy issue had overtones that strict form criticism leads to a betrayal of the inerrancy principle.³⁶ His handling of the literary form and historicity issues is more to the point, however, and introduces the tack of the coming articles from American Ecclesiastical Review.

Kennedy handled the literary form question innocuously. After giving a general description of literary form usage, he drew no conclusions other than that the same truth can be conveyed in separate epochs by different literary forms.³⁷ He closed his section on literary forms with a very positive note by stating that he looked forward to greater precision in literary form analysis and thus to better understanding of Scripture.³⁸ This positive, mild handling of literary forms hardly prepared the way for his second article's jarring treatment of literary forms. Perhaps Kennedy simply did not explain himself clearly in the second article. He may have assumed that others held his position on matters which actually needed, but did not receive, illustration.

In handling the historicity issue Kennedy indicated that the Scripture student should be interested in the truth related by a specific literary device (for example, the infancy narratives), and then assured

³⁶Gerald T. Kennedy, "Scripture Revisited: A Second Look at the Matter," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (1961), p. 5.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 5-7 for the entire treatment given by Kennedy to literary forms.

³⁸Ibid., p. 9.

everyone that New Testament literary devices relate strict, historic fact.³⁹

Kennedy chose a 1905 response of the Biblical Commission as a norm for determining the historicity of the Scriptures.⁴⁰ We are to presume the historical accuracy of biblical narratives unless the biblical author used literary forms "other than that of strict history", that is, only if he used "parables" or allegories.⁴¹ Thus Kennedy is looking to literary forms in order to determine an author's meaning, but he is deciding beforehand what literary forms the author must employ.

³⁹"...artificiality of form does not derogate from the historical reality involved. The divine prediction of the birth of a child, the incidents surrounding his birth, the dangers to which the child was exposed, the giving of a name significative of his office or function in life, the completion of the work given him to accomplish and his subsequent death in friendship with the creator are a common literary framework for the biographies of the servants of God. When the same framework is used to relate the story of the God-man one need not be surprised. It was the most natural medium at the disposal of men steeped in a biblical tradition and the most apposite literary form for a provident Holy Spirit to use as a vehicle of inspiration. The wonder is that he should have used it at all. Let those who fear that modern scriptural studies are tearing the Bible to tatters be assured that there was an annunciation, a nativity, a visit by the Magi, a flight into Egypt and return to Nazareth just as surely as there was a wedding feast in Cana, a multiplication of the loaves and fishes and a sacrifice on Calvary."

Ibid.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 10.

⁴¹"Evidently, if an author adopting historical form can be shown not to intend to compose actual history, then he must be interpreted in a different light. He must be allowed a certain freedom in the presentation of his material....Von Hummelauer, Lagrange, Prat and other Catholic writers...did not want to undermine the historical notions which had been presented prior to their day, but they did desire to demonstrate the possibility of forms other than that of strict history. The (1905) decree makes it clear that the principle is admissible but it circumscribes it with the proper restrictions ("parabolam, allegoriam"). Thus one cannot accept the principle as a general guiding norm for historical passages without qualification. The presumption therefore is in favor of the historical character of the historical books. The author must be presumed to have intended to write facts as facts. The exception rests in establishing the conditions related."

Ibid., pp. 10-11.

Kennedy's article became the groundwork for the attacks which Fenton was to direct against exegetes such as McKenzie and Stanley. The following issues of American Ecclesiastical Review made Kennedy's first article itself seem like practically the calm before the storm; he had to prepare the scene so that more caustic remarks would appear justified.

Kennedy spent more than half of his fourteen page article on historicity; this theme became the rallying point for all sorties against liberal scholarship.

Archbishop Vagnozzi's article was a reprint of his address to the graduating classes of Marquette University in 1961. His subject matter was strange for such an occasion, and the address indicated the growing anxiety with which conservatives were viewing liberal activities in the Church. Coupled with Ruffini's article printed a few months later, Vagnozzi's address proved even more conclusively that liberal biblical studies had become a mounting problem, indeed a threat, for many members of the Church.

Vagnozzi's audience could have been forewarned that an attack on scholarship was about to take place: He opened with the ritual assurances that the Church had never hindered any intellectual achievements.⁴² He digressed shortly into the strict compatibility between Catholic faith and human reason, and then arrived at his subject matter: the maverick attitude of some Catholic intellectuals who do not await guidance nor obey

⁴²"During these long centuries, the Church has always encouraged all intellectual achievements."
Egidio Vagnozzi, "Thoughts on the Catholic Intellectual," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (1961), p. 73.

directives issued by Vagnozzi or by the Holy Office.⁴³

Vagnozzi first complained about the attitude taken by some Scripture scholars toward Scriptural historicity.⁴⁴ He implied that such exegetes were imprudent, disloyal, and untraditional.⁴⁵ He disclaimed any ability to judge the personal orthodoxy of these liberal exegetes, but his impartiality at a heresy trial would have been difficult to imagine.⁴⁶

The remainder of Vagnozzi's address denounced the liturgical movement.

He closed his remarks with assurance that the Church trusts and respects true intellectuals. He implied that the exegetes and litur-

⁴³ "Wherefore, nobody who evaluates the history of human thought properly can say that there is any contradiction between faith in the supernatural and a true and genuine intellectuality. There will, of course, be some intellectuals who will disagree with this statement, who will consider that the adherence which the Catholic Faith demands from human intelligence will not permit the human mind freely to develop scientific progress and artistic achievement....I wish to allude today to some of the dangers facing the Catholic intellectual when confronted with the modern, massive opposition of secularism and naturalism... May I say that more than with the attitude of the secularist intellectuals, I am concerned with the uneasiness and preoccupation of some Catholic intellectuals..."
Ibid., p. 74.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 75.

⁴⁵ "We expect of every Catholic scholar the humility to submit to the authority of the Church and loyally and unreservedly to accept from it the final word concerning what must be accepted and believed as Catholic doctrine....Furthermore, if, on the one hand, the effort to reach an understanding with non-Catholic Biblical scholars is worthy of consideration; on the other, we could not ignore the large number of non-Catholics who believe today, as much as many of the Catholic faithful do, in the traditional concept of the historicity of Holy Scripture."
Ibid., pp. 75-76

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 76.

gists who disagreed with him were proud and adverse to submitting to the directives of the Catholic Church.⁴⁷

Fenton continued his magazine's attack by including Cardinal Ruffini's brief article on literary forms and modern Scripture studies.

In his introduction Ruffini called Divino Afflante Spiritu to his side. In the body of his article he proceeded to deny the bases of Pius XII's directives; he even denied the bases of much that had prompted Pius XII to issue the encyclical. Of course, his denials did not mention the encyclical directly.

Although Pius XII explicitly had directed Catholic biblical scholars to probe literary forms carefully, Ruffini claimed that the Church had always known and taught the true literary genres of Scripture.⁴⁸ He contradicted point by point, Pius XII's express directives to perfect different sciences that would enrich our knowledge of oriental cultures and thereby contribute to our understanding of Scripture. Ruffini characterized such investigations as not only worthless for biblical

⁴⁷"The complaint has been voiced more than once that in high ecclesiastical circles the intellectual is often underestimated and also mistrusted. The question is whether we are confronted with true and genuine intellectuals -- who are inspired by a sincere love of truth, humbly disposed to submit to God's Revelation and the authority of His Church -- or whether we are confronted with intellectuals who believe, first of all, in the absolute supremacy and unlimited freedom of human reason, a reason which has shown itself so often fallacious and subject to error."
Ibid., p. 77.

⁴⁸"How can you claim that the Church, Mater et Magistra, to whom it pertains to judge the true sense of Sacred Scripture -- (as we have sworn many times before the altar) -- has, for nineteen centuries, presented the Divine Book to her children without knowing its literary genre, which is the key to exact interpretation?"
Ernesto Ruffini, "Literary Genres and Working Hypotheses in Recent Biblical Studies," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (1961), p. 363.

understanding but even as implicitly heretical.⁴⁹

Scholars who have plunged into the investigations called for by Pius XII have admitted the extremely tentative and hypothetical nature of their findings. However, Ruffini castigated these men for their "working hypotheses." He saw behind their tentative approaches a thinly-veiled attack on the strict historicity of the Gospels.⁵⁰

Ruffini closed his article with an appeal to these scholars to realize that their present position was not honest but rather proud and disobedient. He warned them that their investigations could only lead them to lose their Christian faith.⁵¹

In 1961 the Pontifical Biblical Commission issued a monitum or "caution," which began by praising the progress of contemporary biblical studies.⁵² It cautioned that certain views which deprecate the true

⁴⁹"Such an absurdity gets worse when one bears in mind that not a few of the above mentioned hypercritics not only advance new application of the theory of literary genres to the inspired Books, but leave a definitive clarification of them to the future, that is when the manner of speaking and of writing used by the ancients, especially the Orientals, will become better known through the study of history, archaeology, ethnology, and the other sciences....Some, realizing the enormous difficulty of harmonizing such doctrine, which we would call revolutionary, with the voice of conscience and the instructions of the ecclesiastical authority, have begun to appeal to the method used legitimately in physics and natural sciences; that of the working hypotheses."
Ibid., pp. 363-64.

⁵⁰"But to speak of working hypotheses, which are, in our case concealed negations of the historicity, with reference for example to the Annunciation of the Archangel Gabriel to the Blessed Virgin Mary and to the promise of the Primacy to Saint Peter which they represent as imitations of pre-existing patterns or as later elaborations of Christian thought, is to overturn Catholic exegesis and is an heretical attempt against the truths, ever held -- beginning from the first Fathers of the Church -- as corresponding to historical realities."
Ibid., p. 364.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 365.

⁵²"In the midst of the fine progress of biblical studies...."
Rome and the Study of Scripture, p. 174.

177
historical character of the Bible were in circulation. The monitum said these views even questioned the words and actions of Jesus.⁵³ It did not condemn any specific exegete or exegetical method, but rather issued a pastoral call for prudence.⁵⁴

Joseph Fitzmyer gave some illuminating opinions on the matter. He stressed that modern biblical studies were praised, not condemned, in the monitum.⁵⁵ He showed it deplored only extreme views and opinions which caricatured and misrepresented solid exegesis.⁵⁶ When coupled with the monitum's appeal to literary genres, Fitzmyer's insight shows that the solid exegetes such as McKenzie and Stanley were not being viewed suspiciously by the Church officials.

⁵³"...some opinions and affirmations are circulating here and there which call into question the genuine historical and objective truth of Sacred Scripture -- not only of the Old Testament...but also of the New Testament, even with regard to the words and actions of Jesus Christ."
Ibid.

⁵⁴See this chapter, p. 221 for the Pontifical Biblical Commission's lifting any ban on preaching to the faithful the findings of form criticism.

⁵⁵"A Recent Roman Scriptural Controversy," op. cit., p. 443

⁵⁶"It would be an error to equate modern biblical studies, which are praised in the first clause, with the circulating 'views and opinions'. The caricatures and popularizations of the serious study are far more responsible for the pastoral problem than solid exegetical work itself."
Ibid.

Fitzmyer also pointed out that the monitum's phrase "the proper historical and objective truth of Sacred Scripture," recognized that biblical truth is encased in definite literary forms. The phrase assuredly ruled out fundamentalism.⁵⁷

Fitzmyer concluded that the monitum spoke to everyone writing on biblical matters.⁵⁸ The monitum's universality ("everyone") applied to Fenton as well as anyone else. Imprudence can take many forms.

Gerald Kennedy's second article in American Ecclesiastical Review discussed the monitum. He implied that the appearance of the monitum proved that Romeo's Divinitas article had been well-timed and in harmony with official Church teaching.⁵⁹

Kennedy eventually narrowed down his article on the monitum to a discussion of historicity and an indictment of literary form interpretation. He began by analyzing the broader meaning which he found in monitum.

⁵⁷"It would likewise be an error to isolate the expression germana veritas historica et objectiva Scripturae Sacrae and argue that the Holy Office is advocating a fundamentalistic approach to the Bible. In using this expression, it has not said that germana veritas is to be identified with fundamentalistic literalness. The word germana ('germane, proper') is obviously an attempt on the part of the Holy Office to express its recognition of the character of the truth involved in Scripture and to allow for its formulation according to the various literary genres employed by the sacred writers....It is but a brief formulation of what Pius XII wrote about the genres in Divino Afflante Spiritu. The excesses which call such a truth into question are the object of the Holy Office's warning."
Ibid., pp. 443-44.

⁵⁸"...there is no reason to look on the monitum as an attempt to change the 'new direction' in biblical studies. It is a warning to all to treat the subject of the Scriptures with the prudence and reverence required and to respect the usual sources of the Church's teaching authority."
Ibid., p. 444.

⁵⁹In fact, the monitum did not even implicitly endorse Romeo. In fact, the Pontifical Biblical Commission had explicitly repudiated Romeo's article in Divinitas. See pp. 168 of this chapter.

He found it to be an evident disciplinary measure directed to exegetes revelling in novelty,⁶⁰ because they had not carefully studied dogmatic theology.⁶¹ Numerous exegetes have muttered they would not face so many unfounded suspicious if dogmatic theologians were required to study Scripture carefully.

Kennedy assured his readers that Scripture difficulties with the Holy Office had arisen because some exegetes were ignoring and contradicting bishops. Only the vain and foolish would refuse to follow all of his bishop's judgments, Kennedy remarked. Because some exegetes had strayed from collaboration with their bishops in the presentation of the faith, he expected further episcopal disciplinary action against recalcitrant Catholic Scripture scholars.⁶²

⁶⁰"Undoubtedly many will interpret the monitum as a slap on the wrist to those who tend to stray too far to the left in the search of innovation and novelty. The monitum was certainly that....." Gerald T. Kennedy, "The Holy Office Monitum on the Teaching of Scripture," American Ecclesiastic Review CXLV (1961), p. 145.

⁶¹"The monitum has proved again that the biblical scholar will be only as proficient in Sacred Scripture as he is proficient in dogmatic theology."
Ibid.

⁶²"At this time one should look to fundamentals for the purpose of reorientation. We would suggest the rereading of the discourses to the bishops by Pope Pius XII on May 31 and November 2, 1954. The Holy Father outlined therein the magisterial, priestly and governing functions of the bishops. Once these truths are set in order, a theologian by profession or a teacher by occupation will find his proper place in the scheme of expounding truth and realize that his office is that of cooperator or collaborator with the hierarchy....The recent monitum has sounded a warning note that some have started to stray from the path and need to reorientate themselves and their thinking....Those who are mishandling the Scriptures should be given fair warning that they are treading on dangerous ground. For some a monitum is never sufficient and stronger action must be taken. The Church through the bishops will employ its diligence in such extreme cases and bring offenders to task. Perhaps the monitum will perform its function and separate sheep from goats."
Ibid., pp. 146-48.

Kennedy accused erroneous applications of form criticism of leading to the views which denied "the genuine historical and objective truth of Sacred Scripture."⁶³

Because concern for literary forms was a disguised villain within Scripture studies,⁶⁴ he restricted literary form analysis to the position of last recourse: we are to use literary form analysis when all other methods of investigation had proved worthless.⁶⁵ It is unclear what Kennedy understood a literary form to be. He implied that scholars used the theory of literary forms as a devious way to disguise their views. As if to say that literary forms are seldom encountered in Scripture, he maintained that literary form investigation had little application in exegesis.⁶⁶

Kennedy initiated a dispute within the pages of American Ecclesiastical Review, which occasioned letters to the editor and editorial comments in Commonweal.

⁶³"These opinions and judgments flow from erroneous concepts of form criticism and historical method and their nefarious application to the sacred text."
Ibid., p. 148.

⁶⁴"The preoccupation with literary form has been the bane of traditional scholars."
Ibid.

⁶⁵"The literary form method of interpreting Scripture, while helpful, is subtly dangerous and should be used almost as an exception to the rule."
Ibid.

⁶⁶"People generally say what they think and write what they want to convey. Scripture scholars might keep this in mind when reading the text and look to a literary form when the rules of logic and literary interpretation indicate that a literary form might be employed. The appeal to form on any occasion can be a subterfuge for lack of thought and proper diligence."
Ibid., pp. 148-49.

William Moran⁶⁷ took up the debate within American Ecclesiastical Review, by dissenting from Kennedy's interpretation of the monitum. He made three points against Kennedy. 1) Kennedy distorted the monitum; 2) Kennedy gravely offended many Catholic exegetes; 3) Kennedy contradicted the magisterium's explicit teaching.⁶⁸

Kennedy distorted the monitum both by insinuating that it accused exegetes of being proud and obstinate and by asserting that it embodied ominous tidings for liberal exegesis.⁶⁹ Moran observed that the monitum praised contemporary exegetes rather than attacked them.⁷⁰ It corrected abuses tersely, but generally.⁷¹

To appraise the monitum as a "slap on the wrist" to novelty-seeking exegetes not only distorted the monitum but also seriously offended exe-

⁶⁷ Moran is an American Jesuit who earned a doctorate in Semitics at Johns Hopkins University in 1950 and a licentiate in Scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1958. Moran had the notable distinction of becoming a member of the Institute's Scripture faculty in 1958. He is currently teaching Akkadian at Harvard. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly" XXVI (1964), p. 52

⁶⁸ William L. Moran, "Father Kennedy's Exegesis of the Holy Office Monitum," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLVI (1962), p. 174.

⁶⁹ "The distortion consists not least in the insinuation of Father Kennedy....(who) even foresees that the Monitum will not suffice, "for some a monitum is never sufficient and stronger action must be taken."

Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 174-75.

⁷¹ "What is certain is that there have been some abuses; these the Holy Office corrects. What is also certain is that there is not the slightest hint in the Monitum that it might be addressing proud and dangerously rebellious subjects. Obedience and loyalty are taken for granted, as they should be."

Ibid., p. 175.

getes by questioning their genuine desire to study the Scriptures.⁷²

Moran challenged Kennedy to justify his accusation that the monitum had singled out frivolous and unscholarly exegetical methods.⁷³

It is utter nonsense to maintain that literary form analysis applies only to exceptional cases.⁷⁴ Any educated man's insinuations that literary forms could be absent from literature left Moran incredulous. Kennedy's advice to look for literary forms only when the author's meaning is obscure boiled down to the following: Writers who wish to convey what they think avoid literary forms whereas writers who wish to be obscure employ literary forms.⁷⁵

Moran observed that the monitum echoed Pius XII's teaching on literary forms. By denying unquestionably the directives of Divino Afflante Spiritu in the interpretation of literary forms, Kennedy thereby distorted the intentions of the monitum.⁷⁶

⁷²"(Kennedy) goes perhaps even farther when he tells us that the Monitum was "a slap on the wrist to those who tend to stray too far to the left in the search of innovation and novelty.' That some exegetes have strayed is one thing, that they did so in the search of innovation and novelty is quite another. The first is compatible with the most sincere dedication to the truth, the second is at best unspeakable frivolity and at worst the sheerest pride."
Ibid., pp. 175-76.

⁷³Ibid., p. 176.

⁷⁴See pp.202-03 of this chapter and footnotes 117-19.

⁷⁵"...(Kennedy) makes a highly original contribution to literary criticism: the distinction between those people who say what they think and write what they want to convey (and therefore do not use a literary form) and those people who have other intentions (and therefore use a literary form)!"
Moran, op. cit., p. 177.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 177-79.

Moran concluded his article by appealing for a cessation to hostilities and misunderstandings. He expressed confidence that all would honor this appeal.⁷⁷

Kennedy replied to Moran in the same issue of American Ecclesiastical Review. He based his defense on the fact that the monitum had been prompted by abuses. He placed much more emphasis than had Moran upon the disciplinary nature of the monitum.⁷⁸ In his letter of April 2, 1968, Kennedy said "Moran considered the monitum a tempest in a teapot," whereas he did not.⁷⁹

Kennedy was specifically indignant about two matters which he said Moran had misrepresented. 1) His accusations about Scriptural exegetes' unorthodoxy; 2) His understanding of literary forms.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 179-80

⁷⁸ "We deny emphatically that our article on the Monitum was either intentionally or objectively a distortion of the Monitum. We interpreted it according to our lights and the conviction born of serious reflection upon matters which have been of more than mild concern to many theologians. It was not without reason that many scripturists expected some word of caution from the Holy See which does not warn its sons unless serious circumstances demand it. Members of the Roman Congregations are not in the habit of ringing false alarms. While Father Moran might feel that the writer should not become excited about scattered brush fires, he should recognize that there must have been at least an appreciable amount of smoke in the air. Father Moran spent little time explaining the reasons for the Monitum....It was not a distortion on our part to suggest that there were very serious reasons for the issuance of the Monitum. It remains the writer's contention that the Monitum was an unusually strong directive because of its implications....We would not dismiss the matter lightly with the assertion that 'what is certain is that there have been some abuses; these the Holy Office corrects.'" Gerald T. Kennedy, "A Reply to Father Moran," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLVI (1962), pp. 181-82.

⁷⁹ See p. 197 of this chapter.

Kennedy argued that his "monitum" article had clearly not indicted all Scripture scholars. A perusal of this article would indicate he had indicted only "some" exegetes.⁸⁰

Kennedy retorted to Moran that he took for granted that all men know writing necessarily involves using literary forms. "Why state the obvious?" had been his thinking. He had restricted literary form investigation to exceptional cases because he believed most of Scripture's forms so correspond to our own that they do not need special investigation.⁸¹ But David Stanley's investigations of the Gospels had shown them to be "salvation-history," not the historical books which funda-

⁸⁰ "In the two citations from our Monitum article we underscored the word 'some'. According to common usage the word 'some' has the following meanings: '1. A certain; one, now, always a certain unknown or unspecified; as, some person knocked. 2. That is of an unspecified but appreciable nor not inconsiderable quantity, amount, extent, degree, etc. 3. Being one, a part, or an unspecified number of the class, group, etc., named or implied; as, some gems are hard. 4. About; more or less; as, some two or three persons.'....The reference to intellectual mavericks cited by Father Moran was lifted from its historical context and applied by him to the entire field of scripturists on the assumption that it was our insinuation."
Ibid., p. 187.

⁸¹ "In the section of our article in which we referred to literary forms perhaps we took for granted primary postulates. In reading Father Moran's criticism we reacted like the man who is asked to prove the existence of the agent, the principles of contradiction and identity, and the aptitude of the mind to know. When we stated that the literary form method of interpretation was to be used by way of exception, we had in mind that the exception arose in the case of the sacred author's use of a form having no literary correspondence whatsoever with our own customary modes of expression or communicating with one another. Confusion naturally arises when one considers 'literary forms' as mysterious products proper to antiquity. It is impossible to communicate in writing any idea without the use of a literary form."
Ibid., pp. 187-88.

mentalist Catholics believed them to be. And literary form analysis has shown that in several features the Hebrew Scriptures are unique. Furthermore, Kennedy's notion is most certainly contrary to the mind of Divino Afflante Spiritu, which appealed for literary form investigation in more than exceptional cases.

Kennedy was certainly correct to suspect anyone who advocated literary form analysis as a panacea for Scriptural difficulties.⁸² However, neither Moran nor any other scholar attacked by American Ecclesiastical Review advocated literary form investigation as the sole method for studying Scripture. But neither did they relegate literary form investigation to nearly total disuse.⁸³

Joseph Clifford Fenton contributed an article of his own to the debate. He brought into his article many of the principles he saw being subtly attacked by the liberals. His article prompted a sharp rebuttal from Commonweal.

Fenton feigned surprise that Moran could end his article with any conciliatory note after such pointed accusations against Kennedy's "grave" errors. Conciliation would be uncalled for if Moran were correct; the person in error has no rights seemed to be Fenton's line of thought.⁸⁴

⁸²"We think that Father Moran would agree that by clothing the concepts of 'literary form' in terms of the exotic and relating it to an era whose literature is surrounded at least in part with a measure of obscurity contributes to the notion that all scriptural problems can be solved by the use of the literary form method of interpretation. Such a concept undoubtedly leads to the abuse of the method and its employment as a magic wand for the evanescence of the most complex biblical problems." Ibid., p. 188.

⁸³See pp. 216-17 of this chapter.

⁸⁴Joseph Clifford Fenton, "Father Moran's Prediction," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLVI (1962), pp. 192-93.

Although Moran had accused Kennedy of error, he had not thereby said that understanding or reconciliation had been forever forfeited.

Fenton unaccountably based the Moran-Kennedy disagreement upon Moran's supposed suggestion that theology needed to be treated as a science.⁸⁵ Moran did not once even insinuate that the origins of the problem lay in Fenton's "scientific" bed. Moran was concerned with the dangers threatening open biblical studies should misrepresentations of the monitum gain the upperhand.

Fenton drew up battle-lines and delineated positions so that his readers could clearly distinguish the combatants. Fenton and his allies mainly defended strict acceptance of the Gospels and of the Acts of the Apostles as historical accounts relating actual happenings precisely as they occurred. According to Fenton there can be no explanations, no understanding of the New Testament which is not fundamentalistic.⁸⁶

⁸⁵"The differences, the antagonism, and the estrangements now apparent among those interested in sacred theology have come into being precisely because some have failed to treat sacred theology as a science. And the end of this situation, an end predicted and, it would seem, desired by Father Moran, will not be achieved until such treatment is accorded to the science of sacred theology."
Ibid., p. 194.

⁸⁶"In this country and throughout the Catholic world there exists a numerous and fairly articulate group convinced that the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles are genuine and objectively accurate and historical documents, which can be used as such legitimately in the science of apologetics. These individuals insist that they have reason to hold and to teach that the events set forth in these books took place in the very way in which they are described in these works. They hold that the words and the deeds attributed to Our Lord were actually uttered and performed by Him. In particular they affirm that the contents of the first two chapters of the Gospel according to St. Matthew and the first two chapters of the Gospel according to St. Luke are objectively accurate historical writing."
Ibid., pp. 194-95.

He linked his historicity position to his views of the Church, its membership, and its role in the world.⁸⁷

Fenton pointed to Moran's remarks as evidence of the camaraderie of the liberal exegetes. He assured his readers that exegetes considered an attack upon an individual exegete or group of exegetes as an attack upon them all. Liberal exegetes, he said, had for some time given themselves up to vehement denunciations and railing accusations against "the

⁸⁷"As a group these theologians, whom Father Moran regards as separated from the men of his own camp by a temporary misunderstanding, have taught and defended other theses not immediately concerned with the science of apologetics and with the biblical field. Thus they have argued in favor of the explanation of the dogma that there is no salvation outside of the Catholic Church in line with the official interpretation of that dogma, contained in the Holy Office letter Suprema haec sacra. Likewise, and again in the field of ecclesiology, they have defended the official teaching on membership in the true Church, as taught in the encyclical Mystici Corporis Christi, to the effect that all and only the baptized people who profess the true faith, who are not schismatici, and who have not been expelled from the Church through the fullness of excommunication, are members of the one supernatural kingdom of God on earth which is the Catholic Church. Furthermore they teach that not only every individual person, but every civil society as well, must be considered as objectively obliged to pay the debt of acknowledgement or worship to God according to the rite of the one and only true religion. Ibid., pp. 195-96.

enemy."⁸⁸ He then proceeded to smear the exegetes with the all-purpose label of Modernism, even though he cited no specific error to substantiate his charge.⁸⁹

Fenton accused the biblical "esprit de corps" of being the root of the liberal-conservative estrangement in exegesis and biblical theology. This group's defensiveness had attempted to create the image of conser-

⁸⁸"Both in the fields of ecclesiology and of apologetics (here especially with reference to their assertion of the genuine and objective historical accuracy of the accounts in the historical books of the New Testament) these men have encountered opposition. But from one group of individuals in particular, those who claim to be and to speak for 'scholars' in the field of biblical studies, that opposition has taken the form of violent manifestations of personal hostility rather than of anything resembling scientific discussion. All too frequently these men (and these are the men who side with Father Moran and against Father Kennedy) have attempted to make their point by heaping invective on the men whose teachings are displeasing to them. All too frequently they have worked to discredit and to harm their opponents....This situation is unfortunate, but it is also quite understandable. More than any other workers in the field of sacred theology, the students of biblical science have a strong esprit de corps. As a result there has been a tendency for some individuals to set themselves up in and around this group and to work, not as students of biblical theology, but rather as publicity men for a kind of biblical party. More or less consciously these people strive, not for an investigation of the scriptures, but to form and to glamorize in the public mind a kind of 'image' of the scripture scholar....What is most pertinent with regard to the matter raised in Father Moran's paper is the fact that, in this image presented by the biblical publicity men, the world of scripture scholarship is represented as so unified and interdependent that any contradiction of a statement which could be attributed to some member of this community is made to appear as an attack on all scripture scholarship and on all scripture scholars."
Ibid., p. 196.

⁸⁹"All that is necessary to draw an attack by these public relations men for the association of biblical scholars is to deny some error in the scriptural field, especially when that error happens to be one taught by some of the original Modernists. When such a denial is made, the propagandists of the 'cause' will not fail to berate their victim and to accuse him of implying that some of their precious company have been guilty of holding Modernist doctrines."
Ibid., pp. 196-97.

vatives running to Rome to inform on the liberals.⁹⁰

Fenton lauded Kennedy for presenting the monitum lucidly and objectively,⁹¹ and then proceeded to infer from the monitum matters which would assist in a refutation of Moran. Although he actually only repeated Kennedy, Fenton's inferences carried import because of his close links with the Holy Office, namely, with Egidio Vagnozzi and Cardinal Ruffini. Fenton's explanations lent an ominous tone to his inferences. He stopped only after accusing some unidentified exegetes with intentionally disobeying the magisterium.⁹²

Commonweal latched onto a phrase from Fenton's article and headlined an April 20, 1962, editorial "Biblical Drum Beaters?". Commonweal mentioned the muffled but growing theological debate over biblical studies and briefly recounted the positions of the opponents before presenting its own analysis of the situation.⁹³

⁹⁰"Now to anyone who will examine the existing situation objectively, it is quite obvious that the 'estrangement' spoken of by Father Moran is caused almost entirely by these publicity workers or drum beaters in the service of 'the scripture scholars.' One very important aspect of the image that these people are trying to create is that of the worker in the field of biblical theology as bedevilled by criticism and delation on the part of a group of conservative scholars, who are represented as having strong influence with some members of the Church's hierarchy. It is quite obvious that this impression has absolutely no foundation in reality."
Ibid., p. 197.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 199.

⁹²Ibid., pp. 199-201.

⁹³"Biblical Drum Beaters?", Commonweal LXXVI (1961), p. 77.

The Commonweal editors placed American Ecclesiastical Review, which the Catholic Biblical Association of America had formally censured, at the center of the current problem.⁹⁴ Commonweal admitted that this storm-filled debate presented no easy object for analysis. It saw the debate as symptomatic of the growing unease and defensiveness among America's

⁹⁴ Ibid.

In an earlier editorial Commonweal had said, "In our country, an indication of where the generality of the scholars stand was vividly illustrated by a resolution passed by the 24th annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association held recently in Cincinnati. Singling out the American Ecclesiastical Review for special censure, the resolution condemned those who, without offering specific evidence, called into question the ability and integrity of the Biblical scholars."

"Bell, Book, and Candle." Commonweal LXXV (1961), p. 61.

Geoffrey F. Wood, Recording Secretary for the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, mentions nothing of the censure or the resolution.

Geoffrey F. Wood, "Report of the Twenty-fourth General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (1961), pp. 465-72.

At the 1969 General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, Quentin Quesnell presented a motion urging due process be adopted and implemented by the United States bishops in all cases of theological dispute. Due process includes the right to be judged by one's colleagues according to the principles of one's science; it also includes freedom from punishment or threat of punishment for holding or teaching what is commonly and publicly taught by other Catholic theologians. One indication that such procedures were needed was the fact that in 1961 Cardinal O'Boyle of Washington, D. C. ordered the Catholic Biblical Quarterly to remove from the public record the Catholic Biblical Association censure of American Ecclesiastical Review. As the Ordinary of Washington, D. C., O'Boyle had the right to censor Catholic Biblical Quarterly.

Thomas E. Crane, "Report of the Thirty-second General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXXI (October, 1969), p. 519.

conservative Catholic theologians, especially the dogmatic theologians.⁹⁵

Roland Murphy, editor of Catholic Biblical Quarterly after Edward Siegman, wrote a letter to Commonweal to agree with its editorial and to proffer some of his own views. Murphy wished the American public to realize that biblical scholars were in debate only with certain theologians and that, on the whole, communications between exegetes and theologians had continued fruitfully. He wondered whether the term "debate" applied in a case that saw so many unsubstantiated charges and gross

95.

"Like most such disputes, it is by no means easy to sort out the issues. What appears evident from the March American Ecclesiastical Review is that for the anxious theologians, the Biblical debate merely dramatizes a whole host of other worries on their part. In particular, the editor, Monsignor Joseph Clifford Fenton, obliquely weds the erring Scripture scholar to those who do not believe that the Church has the duty to seek for itself a favored place in civil society."

"Biblical Drum Beaters?", op. cit., p. 77.

insinuations being flung at the exegetes. ⁹⁶

⁹⁶"To the editors: It is difficult not to agree completely with your April 20 editorial on Biblical Drum Beaters. But I do not think that this 'full-fledged theological debate' is a sign 'that American theology is coming of age.' This is not a debate between American Catholic biblical scholars and American theologians; it is between Catholic biblical scholars and certain theologians who are correctly described as 'unsympathetic' and 'suspicious.' As a matter of fact, the American Ecclesiastical Review is by no means representative of the School of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America itself. For the most part, the biblical scholars have cordial relations with their fellow theologians and have combined with them in mutual discussion of biblical topics in the annual and regional meetings of the Catholic Theological Society. This steady bridge-building appears also on the international scene in the efforts of German theologians at their meeting in Wurzburg last fall, where the relationship between Scripture and Dogma was explored on a high, scholarly level....Finally it is hardly a debate, as the March American Ecclesiastical Review demonstrates. One can hardly debate imputations and accusations that are made without evidence."

Roland Murphy, Commonweal LXXVI (1961), p. 281.

Three years later John McKenzie reiterated Murphy and forecast the development of serious problems should the dissension over biblical criticism lead to a suppression of scholarly freedom. "Catholic exegetes, while they move towards a greater consensus with Protestant exegetes, are drifting away from the theological positions held in some Catholic circles. Perhaps the word 'position' is too flattering here; we are often puzzled by the problem of how to deal with irrational prejudice and tribal attitudes. I observe that we have had more genuine theological dialogue with Protestants than we have with some segments of Catholic theological opinion. The phenomenon will probably become more disturbing before it ceases to attract attention. The rift does not seem to be growing -- if anything, it is narrowing; but it is still there, and every now and then one is astonished to notice how wide and deep it is....It is no secret, although no one to my knowledge has published it, that the encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu has never been entirely received within the Church... The same Bible is still a point of division between Catholic theologians and Catholic exegetes. This is the paradox of the present situation; and we exegetes cannot expect others to resolve the situation for us. The resolution could take the form of a power play which will interdict the most important factor in contemporary biblical interpretation, the free study of biblical questions and the unimpeded discussion of the problems of learning by scholars. Should such an unfortunate development occur, we shall see no more either of the ecumenical movement or of the biblical movement in our generation."

Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVI (1964), pp. 414-15.

James Solari⁹⁷ wrote Commonweal an enlightening letter on the historicity debate. With a balanced presentation he carefully delineated the goals of each side in this argument.

Because he found the first half of the twentieth century sterile of Catholic theological progress, Solari greeted the present theological ferment. He hoped the debate would initiate dialogue and open confrontation, but he viewed with concern the name calling, ad hominem argumentation, and stereotyping being practiced by both sides.⁹⁸

Sincere love for the Church should be seen as the primary motivation of each side in the debate. Humility in the face of sound argumentation was needed on both sides, and this humility could grow only out of a recognition that each person has but partial consciousness of the truth.⁹⁹

⁹⁷Solari received licentiates in Scripture and theology from the Pontifical Biblical Institute and Sant'Anselmo respectively. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVI (1964), p. 64.

⁹⁸"...since the Modernist crisis of fifty years ago theologians have spoken in whispers on points of disagreement. The ferment that we now experience is something desirable, even necessary, for real progress in science is rarely forthcoming if all engaged in the discussion are in agreement. What is unfortunate is the glib use of labels, epithets and a variety of arguments ad hominem to carry one's point and silence the opponents. But again this is a human weakness and probably will never be totally excluded from controversy. Still, the vital factor must be a genuine understanding and appraisal of the objective evidence presented; for this there can be no substitute." James K. Solari, Commonweal LXXVII (1962), pp. 54-55.

⁹⁹"It is to be presupposed that the biblical exegete as also the dogmatic theologian are motivated by a love of truth and the Church. Both have to cultivate the attitude of humility in the presence of truth and acknowledge it wherever it is found. They must recognize that a love of truth does not imply a monopoly of it nor guarantee a penetrating grasp of its meaning. Each must be aware of his respective competency and limitations, for each has a definite contribution to make and one without the other would be hampered in his investigation and the science of theology impeded." Ibid., p. 55.

Solari pointed out that the historical nature of the Gospels was an old problem in Church circles. However, the twentieth-century's encounter with the problem had given it new formulation, which contemporary theological research had not fully investigated. Church authorities, Solari remarked, had left theologians free to do their research in the matter, but had cautioned against "imprudent novelty."¹⁰⁰

Few Catholics object to dogmatic theology's overall right to assay conclusions, according to Solari. The problems arise when dogmatic theologians concretely begin to act on this principle.¹⁰¹ Solari pointed out that although exegetes can unfortunately become deaf to dogmatic theology, dogmatic theologians can make what is only traditional de facto infallible. Both attitudes may impair Christian consciousness: the former through "undermining of the faith" and the latter through "placing us in inextricable contradiction."¹⁰²

100, "...the problems of the historicity of the Bible and in particular the Gospel narratives...is by no means a new question but its modern formulation has aroused much doubt and misgiving among certain quarters of Catholics. The Magisterium of the Church has deemed it opportune to remind scholars of the general teaching of the Church regarding the point and to caution against imprudent novelty. But the question remains open to further theological research."

Ibid.

101

The historicity debate is a clear example of the problem.

102

"It is the prerogative of dogmatic theology, the highest science, to assay the validity of conclusions of exegesis. Few demur at this level of principle. But the matter becomes complex when we descend to its concrete application. If there exists a danger that the exegetes might ignore theological verities in their work, there is likewise peril that the theologians will elevate to reality what is only a traditional theological approach. An error by the first may lead to an undermining of the Faith, while that of the second can place us in inextricable contradiction."

Ibid.

Solari wished some dogmatic theologians understood that certain views of history are inadequate norms for judging exegetical conclusions about the history proclaimed in the New Testament.¹⁰³ Christian faith is not forfeit if a person accepts a less strict historical understanding of the New Testament, Solari remarked, although some dogmatic theologians, as "defenders of the faith," continue to oppose the "new historicity" consciousness.¹⁰⁴

Solari explained contemporary biblical investigations, such as the role of oral tradition, the influence of liturgy on the formation of the New Testament, and the setting in life of the primitive communities. He explained the role of the evangelists in constructing the Gospels, and he demonstrated why literary form analysis is vitally important for Scripture research. He assured his readers that none of these investigations intended to deny the history within the Gospels; all of the investigations were rather a sincere, scholarly attempt to

¹⁰³"There are theologians today who approach the (problem of the Bible's historicity) with an a priori definition of history. This norm is applied to the Scriptures and is used to evaluate the conclusions of recent biblical investigations. Often, however, this concept is not sufficiently nuanced and does not satisfy the exigencies of the New Testament texts themselves."

Ibid.

¹⁰⁴"The underlying anxiety of these theologians seems to be that if we once concede that a given passage is in some sense not strictly historical, the whole Gospel witness is thereby placed in jeopardy. And since dogma, indeed the structure of Faith itself, rests solidly on the New Testament, it too is in danger of being swept away. But this is not the case."

Ibid.

determine what type of history was written by the first Christians.¹⁰⁵

Solari stated that exegetes welcome the Church's evaluation of their work and only request that such evaluation be done objectively, with scholarly tools and methods.¹⁰⁶

In a lengthy informative letter dated April 2, 1968, Kennedy reassessed for this author the entire debate over the monitum. His letter, which appears verbatim, casts some light on the theological battle waged in 1961-65. According to Kennedy's remarks about Catholic University, the struggle appears to have been institutional as well as ideological and personal.

Thanks for your kindness in writing. I am indeed grateful.

This afternoon I perused my Scriptural notes for the first time in two and one half years. Since September of 1965 I have been pastor of (Saint Patrick Church in Fayetteville, North Carolina).

The controversy about which you write was twofold: ideological and personal. Few Scripture men strongly disagreed regarding form criticism, the study of

¹⁰⁵ "What the biblical theologians wish to determine is precisely how and in what manner the Gospels are historical. They are concerned with the role of oral tradition, the influence of the liturgy, and the concrete apologetic needs of the early communities in the formation of the Gospels as we now have them. They seek to discern the freedom that the inspired authors and redactors enjoyed in composing their work. And they insist upon the importance of identifying the literary form to which the particular text belongs and in which framework it must be interpreted.... That the salvific events in the New Testament actually took place is nowhere called into question and is not the issue at stake. Rather it is the refinement of our understanding of what God, through the human writers, actually intended to tell us about these events. Thus, e.g., the historical character of the parable of the Good Samaritan should not be equated simply with the visit of the Magi, the words of institution of the Eucharist, of the resurrection testimony."

Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

which was strongly promoted by Divino Afflante Spiritu. Controversy arose over labeling, oversimplification and popularization of the problem. I wanted opinion labeled opinion. I wrote the commentary on the monitum because opinion was taken for fact and fact for opinion. I did not argue against the principles of form criticism which were well established. I taught them for years at CUA (Catholic University of America) and at Oblate College. My own ideas were sharpened by the controversy and I learned that one cannot presume that what seems clear in his own mind is as clearly understood by others. I should have cited more examples.

The personal aspects of the controversy were by far the stronger. I was drawn into the vortex of a struggle between members of the Religious Education Department, the Sacred Theology-Semitic Language Department, and the Editors of the American Ecclesiastical Review. The control of the Religious Education Department and the publication of the American Ecclesiastical Review and its editorial policies were heated topics at the Catholic University of America. Members of both departments refused to comment on the monitum. I became the target when I wrote the commentary which served to intensify the efforts on both sides. At the ... meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association Msgr. Fenton, Fr. F. Connell CSSR and I were censured by the Catholic Biblical Association. Fr. John McKenzie, SJ, of Loyola, Chicago, and Msgr. Skehan were opposed by Msgr. Fenton and John L. Murphy. Within a few months attention was turned toward the deliberation of the Council. Fr. McKenzie, SJ wrote an article on the pastoral impact of Scriptural studies and both progressives and traditionalists became patient with one another.

Presently, I am out of touch with formal Scriptural studies and cannot judge the first article in view of present findings.

The weakness of the monitum article was in presuming we were on the same wave length regarding literary forms. Unknowingly and unwittingly I implied-- or my readers inferred--literary forms were something exotic. I did not intend that. The remainder of the article was simply literary paraphrase of the monitum. I should also have used pastoral examples. The controversy with Fr. Moran blew up suddenly. Fr. Moran considered the monitum a tempest in a teapot. I did not. I was not ghost hunting nor McCarthying. The evidence was there despite Cardinal Ottaviani and scholars' appreciation of him.

I do not know how I would now react if placed in similar circumstances. I was unable then to realize the personality difficulties of two strong groups of men and the danger of championing a cause designed to caution theological or Scriptural excesses. The controversy strengthened my appreciation of the work of Laurentin on Luke 1-2, and made me more precise.

Frankly I feel honored that you wrote, if only to find myself a footnote in your work.

(3) Further Clarification of the Type of History in the Gospels.

Bruce Vawter¹⁰⁷ contributed some fine scholarship when he delineated the concept of history which modern scholars have proposed best represents the intentions of the evangelists. He carefully traced the growth of this new approach, the false trails now abandoned, and the established landmarks. Vawter primarily wished to disassociate skepticism from the historical understanding adopted by the liberal Catholic exegetes.

Vawter explained that concern over the present biblical investigations of historicity usually stems from mistaking the new studies to be a furthering of nineteenth century rationalism. Contemporary historical criticism is illustrated clearly by Vincent Taylor's emphasis that

¹⁰⁷ Vawter received a licentiate in theology from the Angelicum in 1950 and one in Scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1952. He earned the Institute's doctorate in Scripture in 1957. He taught Scripture at Kenrick Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri from 1952-56 and at St. Thomas Seminary in Denver from 1958-62. In 1962 he returned to his Scripture post at Kenrick, which he fills at present. Vawter was the 1962 President of the Catholic Biblical Society of America, and he has been a book-review editor for Catholic Biblical Quarterly. "Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), p. 67

the Gospel of Mark is deeply, essentially rooted in historical events.^{108.}

Vawter made clear that Albert Schweitzer's work on the nineteenth century historical investigations into the life of Jesus had killed historicism and fundamentalism; he also made clear that Catholic exegetes do not mourn their death.¹⁰⁹ With historicism and fundamentalism gladly abandoned, Catholic exegetes firmly believe that they scientifically study the writings of a faith rooted in history; these exegetes are free to study what type of history the major documents of this faith proclaim.¹¹⁰

Outward rejection of nineteenth century historicism does not necessarily include an inward rejection of the premises of historicism. Biblical students can still endanger biblical history if they unwittingly are guided by historicism's positivistic premises. The evangelists were never guided by these premises. Since they were not so guided, biblical scholars need to appreciate the historical viewpoint of the evangelists. The danger remains, however, that due to twenti-

¹⁰⁸"The historical criticism that truly represents present-day scholarship in no way resembles the historicism in the nineteenth century. This was made quite clear in 1952 with the appearance of Vincent Taylor's commentary on Mark's Gospel, the first full-scale commentary on Mark in English since the preceding half-century. Taylor devoted some twenty pages to a discussion of the Gospel's historical value...." Bruce Vawter, "The Historical Theology of the Gospels." The Homiletic and Pastoral Review LXII (1962), p. 683.

¹⁰⁹Ibid.

¹¹⁰"...historical criticism is now in the safe hands of firm believers in historical religion. Study of this kind gives no reasonable cause to fear that historical research can ever again become so unscientific as to treat the story of Jesus, written down within the living memory of its eye and ear witnesses, as if it were a legend of centuries past that had been told by troubadours. With the exceptions that I have already noted, present-day critics accord to the Gospels the serious historical consideration that they deserve." Ibid., p. 684.

eth century outlooks, scholars unwittingly impose on the Gospels prerequisites which even the scholars consciously admit cannot be accounted for among these first century authors.¹¹¹

Vawter emphasized that the Gospels proclaim God's revelation and can breathe only in an atmosphere of history.¹¹² Then he made the move which essentially separates contemporary exegetes from opponents of the new historicity -- he distinguished between his-

¹¹¹"...there is a much more subtle danger that historicism still holds for us than might appear from the relatively few thoroughgoing skeptics who can be encountered in today's world of New Testament scholarship. The danger is that we may have rejected the historicist conclusions without completely rejecting the premises as well. The nineteenth-century criticism had as its working principle a principle that was as gratuitous as it was arrogant, that no history was worthy of the name that did not conform to the norms of modern scientific historiography, that is, it was not history unless it was a disinterested attempt to reconstruct the past statistically, isolating the bare event....'as it actually was' from any interpretation of the event on the historian's part. Since this was not the conception of history it found in the Bible, it felt free to dispense with biblical history. The apologist for biblical history rightly rejected this conclusion, but not always for the right reasons. At least on the popular level, our apologetic has sometimes tried to sustain the illusion that the biblical author did write with a modern historical perspective in view. What is worse, we have to some extent been conditioned to approach the Bible from an historical viewpoint that the biblical authors never shared, with the result that we have seriously misunderstood what biblical history is all about."
Ibid., pp. 684-85.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 685.

torical and historic, between event and occurrence.¹¹³ People who cannot follow him in this move fail to understand what the exegetes are doing. People who cannot follow Vawter in this move fail to understand what the historical theology of the Gospels entails.

Vawter pointed out that a historical religion has no roots in either fideism or in rationalism. The proclamation can be answered properly only with belief -- intelligent belief. The kerygma presents the hearer with the need for decision.¹¹⁴

To draw out the implications of the historical nature of the Christian proclamation, Vawter confronted the proof-text apologetics which has dominated many Christian thinkers. Naturally, to tangle with apologetical premises meant to rankle historical positivists who do not accept the distinction between historical and historic.¹¹⁵

¹¹³"To follow this argument further we need to make a modern distinction that has given separate terms to conceptions that once did not need them. I refer to the distinction...between...'historic' and 'historical'....What is historic is statistical history, the verifiable past. It is historic, for example, as it is recorded in the Annales of Cornelius Tacitus (or in the Gospels, for that matter), that Jesus Christ was put to death by the procurator Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius Caesar. What is historical is an event that lives in its effects, that has transcendent and perennial significance. It is historical that for us men and for our salvation, Jesus Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried. Three men were crucified on Golgotha of a Friday afternoon. All three deaths were historic, but only one is historical. Though the events of salvation are, for anyone who accepts the traditional Christian Gospel, both historic and historical, it is evidently with the historical rather than with the historic event that Christianity is primarily engaged.
Ibid., p. 686.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 686-87.

¹¹⁵See Fenton's frequent references to apologetics, pp. 186-88, footnotes 86-88.

Vawter pointed to the liturgy and asked his readers whether this primary method of Christian education verified an historic fact or proclaimed the significance of an historical event.¹¹⁶

Although the evangelists can and do disagree on details, Vawter assured everyone that New Testament research has affirmed the evangelists' agreement on the historical events which Jesus Christ inaugurated. His point was simple but extremely important: The evangelists chose different frameworks in order to convey deeper insights into the one faith experience they shared, namely, Jesus Christ.¹¹⁷

Because the Gospels' theological purposes are centered in the historical, Vawter showed that their truth is independent of historic dis-

116"...the concern of the Gospels and of Christianity itself with history has always been and must be primarily with the historical mystery rather than with the statistical fact....Must we not confess that the resurrection of Christ, for example, has figured in our thinking rather exclusively as an historic event -- as a miracle of apologetical import or simply as a momentous detail in the earthly career of Christ -- rather than as a central mystery of faith that is to be believed?.... In the preface of the Easter Mass the Church bids us to praise our Lord 'qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit et vitam resurgendo reparavit'; and in the collect we pray: 'O God, who this day by your only-begotten Son, having conquered death, have reopened for us the gate to eternity...' These prayers, paraphrases of such passages as Rom 4:25 and 1 Cor 15:45, recognize the authentic historical moment of the resurrection in a way that our popular preaching and teaching and even our post-Reformation theology itself, have not always done. All this we have obviously missed if we have gone to the Gospels seeking only the verification of an historic fact."
Ibid., pp. 687-88.

117"As to the historical event, therefore, the New Testament authors are at one. When we attempt to reconstruct the historic details, however, we evidently find that their testimony is more ambiguous, simply because these details were not their primary concern, any more than it was their primary concern to give us an exact chronology of our Lord's life. This was not their idea of history."
Ibid., p. 689.

crepancies. The didache was not intended to convert, but was meant for persons who had decided for the kerygma. Vawter explained that the contemporary understanding of Gospel history, didache history, has arisen precisely because of literary form investigations into the New Testament.¹¹⁸ This contemporary understanding allows the Gospel texts to speak for themselves by allowing them to be their specific literary forms.¹¹⁹ In short, such understanding allows the Gospels to proclaim their message of good news. In modern jargon, this historical/historic understanding allows the Gospels to do their thing.

Vawter found no difficulty with the cautions of the monitum, which was concerned to protect Christians unprepared for Higher Criticism. The monitum did not order a halt to historicity investigations by Catholic biblical scholars nor even express disapproval of these investigations. Until someone developed a truthful and prudent popularization of biblical historicity for non-scholars, the monitum merely restricted work on the concept to scholarly circles. In their commentaries on the monitum some persons had failed to see this plain fact.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸Ibid., pp. 689-90.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 690.

¹²⁰"The prudence and caution enjoined by the Holy Office, however, are conditions for continued study and publication, not for inactivity. The monitum did not disapprove, alter, or suppress any existing trend in Catholic biblical interpretation -- a fact that seems to have escaped the attention of some who commented on it."

Ibid.

(See pp.212-17 of this chapter for an instruction from the Pontifical Biblical Commission, which Joseph Fitzmyer says opens the door for "new opinions which can be so explained to the faithful.")
Fitzmyer's statement is on p.217-of this chapter.

The monitum's restrictions did not minimize concern for the historic element of the Gospels, but rather acknowledged unequivocally the central importance of their historical element.¹²¹

A number of articles in the 1962 volume of Catholic Biblical Quarterly pressed forward the "historical/historic" distinction, though not expressly in these words. Catholic proponents of scientific exegesis realized that progress for Catholic Scripture scholarship depended upon clarifying the distinction for all concerned. To make the distinction clear, varied approaches were employed.

Jerome Quinn, prompted by the monitum's call for an understanding of the Church Fathers' teaching on biblical historicity, wrote an article on John Chrysostom's view of the history in the Synoptic Gospels. He was certain that the current debate on historicity would benefit from Chrysostom's insights.¹²² Quinn's careful study of this early Church Father refuted the accusations that the liberal exegetes were novelty-seekers, innovators, and tradition breakers. Quinn showed

¹²¹Ibid., pp. 690-91.

¹²²"On June 20, 1961, a monitum of the Holy Office encouraged those who examine the question related to the precise nature of the history contained in the Gospel narratives, to keep before their eyes the teaching of the Fathers of the Church on this matter. In accordance with that admonition this note will proffer the teaching of Saint John Chrysostom on the apparent discrepancies of the evangelists, for from that flinty problem a light can be struck which reveals the intention of the sacred authors and illuminates the nature of the inspired salvation-history which they composed."

Jerome D. Quinn, "Saint John Chrysostom on History in the synoptics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIV (1962), p. 140.

Quinn did graduate studies in theology at the Angelicum in 1958-59 and at Gregorian University, where he received a licentiate in 1959. He received the licentiate in Scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1961. He has taught Hebrew and Scripture at St. Paul Seminary since 1961.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly," XXVI (1964), p. 59.

that Chrysostom himself adopted a literary perspective akin to that of twentieth century biblical scholars.

Chrysostom, who had been troubled by discrepancies in the Gospel accounts, explained them as products of literary style. Quinn was amazed at Chrysostom's emphasis on literary forms and at his insights into the theological purposes which would lead to discrepancies in detail. Chrysostom had adamantly defended the evangelists' historical agreement on, for example, the reality of the incarnation, Jesus' miracle-working, the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension. Within this historical agreement the evangelists had accomplished their variant purposes.¹²³

Raymond Brown furnished a study of Johannine historicity in which he employed redactional findings in recent Johannine and Synoptic research to demonstrate that John's Gospel provides much more factual history than centuries of thought have realized.¹²⁴ His implicit and important argument was: most people agree that John's Gospel is theological, at the expense of history. However, John's overall outlook is no different from the Synoptics', because all four Gospels present

¹²³Quinn, op. cit., pp. 141-47.

¹²⁴"If, then, some of the differences between the (Johannine and Synoptic) traditions are not as sharp as might first seem, the chronology of the frequent trips to Jerusalem in John, and the three Passovers of John, implying at least a two years ministry, seem difficult to reconcile with the one trip to Jerusalem in the Synoptic ministry, a ministry that seems to endure at most one year. It is here that a knowledge of the literary form of the Synoptics comes to our aid: they are giving us the simplified chronological and typological outline of the ministry as presented in the early kerygma, and not a detailed history. Therefore, it is perfectly possible that John's more detailed indications are historical."
Raymond Brown, "The Problem of Historicity in John," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIV (1962), p. 4.

theological interpretations which are rooted in actual events.¹²⁵ Brown's implication for the historicity debate is that the historicity theme takes on a new horizon due to these New Testament facts which reveal the precise concern each evangelist had with "accurate" historical reporting. Accurate historical reporting depicted the history of the world in the religious context of the Christ event.

In 1961 Raymond Brown delivered a paper on "Our New Approach to the Bible", which Guide published in late 1962. Brown later remarked that the paper was delivered at a time of mortal danger to the biblical movement.¹²⁶

To placate persons distressed with the new trends in Catholic biblical studies, Brown showed that there are no anti-traditional or anti-historical trends in these scientific studies. He said these new studies confirm that the Church is immersed in history and that it is able to be all things to all people, because it has tremendous adaptive abilities. In short, he found that the biblical movement's response to the immense increase of scientific knowledge affirmed the validity and significance of the Christian faith.¹²⁷

¹²⁵"The independence of the Johannine tradition means not only that John's stories are not quilt creations from Synoptic patches, but also that where they narrate the same stories, John has as much claim to be studied as have the Synoptics....While this view naturally opposes that of the critics and their minimal estimate of Johannine historicity, it also opposes a view common to many Catholics who, in treating the Synoptic Gospels as histories, have assumed that the only way to explain (away) John was to assume that the author theologized events. But if, as we have insisted, each evangelist is a theologian, we must take the author of John just as seriously as the rest, even in the narratives common to all; and we must make due allowance for the theological purpose of each Gospel."

Ibid., p. 7.

¹²⁶Raymond Brown, "Our New Approach to the Bible," New Testament Essays, p. 15.

¹²⁷Ibid., pp. 3-4.

Brown catalogued and explained a number of the important achievements that have fed into the new biblical movement over the past 100 years. He listed linguistic discoveries (for example, cuneiform and the Dead Sea scrolls), historical discoveries (for example, Egyptian records from the Hyksos period), and archaeological discoveries (for example, Megiddo).¹²⁸

Open use of these scientific achievements had to await the encouragement of Divino Afflante Spiritu because fears of Modernism had been attached to scientific biblical studies. Brown insisted that the encyclical be seen for what it is, namely, the redirection and radical change of Catholic biblical studies.¹²⁹

Brown considered the conservatives' heavy-handed use of the 1961 monitum completely unjustified. He noted that the monitum neither indicted the progressive trend in Catholic biblical scholarship nor sanctioned a return to the nineteenth century, positivist view of history held by the opponents of the biblical movement.¹³⁰

Despite similar historical understandings of the New Testament, scholars not only arrive at different conclusions about the history of these books but also make sophisticated critiques of each other's historical conclusions. Raymond Brown demonstrated this fact in a perceptive article on post-Bultmannian trends in Scripture. The primary issue of his Church's debate over the biblical movement, namely, the new historical understanding of Scripture, predominates the post-Bultmannian movement.

¹²⁸ Ibid., pp. 5-11

¹²⁹ Ibid., pp. 11-12

¹³⁰ Ibid., pp. 13-15

Brown first considered the doctrinaire judgments being unjustly made against form criticism. Many persons' problems really concern Bultmann's call to demythologize, which, Brown said, these people have confused with form criticism. People further complicate the issue by identifying technical form criticism with Divino Afflante Spiritu's mandate for uncovering literary forms.¹³¹

Brown exhorted people to read Bultmann carefully lest they misunderstand what he truly says. Brown observed that very often Bultmann's position is severely caricatured in efforts to refute the man.¹³² He confessed that such caricaturing of Bultmann has seriously taxed Catholic exegetes, by diverting their energies into self-defensive postures, and by preventing them from exercising open inquiry.¹³³ He remarked that recent Scripture movements that transcended Bultmannian dilemmas had gone practically unnoticed by American Catholic biblical scholars forced to defend what Divino Afflante Spiritu had guaranteed twenty years previously.¹³⁴

¹³¹"It is unfortunate that in the last two years much of the creative energy of Catholic New Testament scholarship has been consumed in defending its own orthodoxy against the implication that Catholic exegesis has gone Bultmannian. We say 'unfortunate' for two reasons. First, many Catholics who have read little, if anything, of Bultmann himself confuse his demythologizing (which is what they really object to) with form criticism which is not peculiar to Bultmann at all; and then they compound confusion by identifying technical form criticism with the principle of literary form or genre, a principle mandatory in Catholic exegesis since Divino Afflante Spiritu." Raymond Brown, "After Bultmann What? -- An introduction to the Post-Bultmannians," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVI (1964), p. 1.

¹³²Ibid., pp. 1-3.

¹³³"But there is a second and more important reason why the diversion of the energy of Catholic exegetes into apologia is unfortunate. It has stopped us or, at least, delayed us from doing our duty of keeping abreast with current non-Catholic exegetical trends." Ibid., p. 3.

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 4.

The post-Bultmannians expressed more interest in uncovering the historical Jesus than in any other investigation. Brown noted that this new quest is usually traced to a paper given in 1953 by a former pupil of Bultmann, Ernst Käsemann.¹³⁵

Brown cautioned that the people of the new quest carefully distinguish their investigation from the nineteenth century quest demolished by Albert Schweitzer. Not only do the new quest scholars accept the form critical position that the Gospels are kerygma, not biography, but also they hold a different concept of history than the nineteenth century positivist view, Brown said.¹³⁶

Because the historical views of the new quest could clarify the historicity dilemma within some Catholic circles, Brown proffered a short, carefully planned study of this new quest perspective.

Such historians as Dilthey and Collingwood emphasized an existential attitude in historical investigations. (They exhorted the historian to immerse himself in the event.) The new quest men, taking their cue from them, believe that meaning is the chief factor to be discovered amid facts, causes and externals. The new quest scholars view the New Testament as event-proclaiming or kerygma precisely

¹³⁵"The first and perhaps most characteristic trend is an interest in the 'historical Jesus'....The beginnings of the 'new quest' can be traced to Ernst Käsemann's 1953 address to Bultmann's former students -- an address entitled, 'The problem of the Historical Jesus.'"

Ibid., pp. 5-6

¹³⁶"James M. Robinson stresses that this quest has little in common with the old nineteenth century quest. Now there is a frank recognition that the sources are not coldly factual, biographical reports, but kerygma which tells us how the primitive Church believed in and preached Jesus as the Lord....Besides differing from the old quest in its treatment of the sources, the new quest also differs on its concept of history. In its objectivity, history is not placed on a par with natural sciences, nor is it history defended by Ernst Troeltsch."

Ibid., p. 7

because this literature wishes to proclaim the event of redemption.¹³⁷
 For the new quest, to encounter the person of Jesus in the Kerygma,
 that is, to immerse oneself in the kerygmatic event, greatly surpasses
 in importance any statistical details which the Gospels might furnish
 about Jesus.¹³⁸

After summarizing the criteria which the post-Bultmannians use in
 their new quest,¹³⁹ Brown noted their emphasis upon faith: faith alone
 guarantees the kerygma since phenomenology can prove nothing about an
 essentially eventful occurrence such as redemption.¹⁴⁰

Brown's first problem with the new quest resulted from its posi-
 tion on faith. He admitted that nothing can substitute for faith, and
 he expressed relief that the post-Bultmannians accepted "intelli-
 gible" faith.¹⁴¹ However, Brown questioned whether post-Bultmannian
 faith did not inevitably bypass the kerygma by appealing to the possi-

¹³⁷"In the new quest we encounter an existential approach to his-
 tory stemming from Wilhelm Dilthey and R. G. Collingwood. This history
 treats of facts and causes and of the externals of events, but it is
 even more interested in what Collingwood calls the 'inside' of events...
 Not a clinical observation of what happened but an existential rela-
 tion between the historian and the event is called for. This leads to
 self-understanding on the part of the historian...This type of histor-
 ical research can view the kerygma (what Jesus meant to the primitive
 Church) and its appeal (what Jesus should mean for us) much more
 sympathetically than could the scientific historiography of the 19th
 century."

Ibid., pp. 7-8

¹³⁸"This encounter with Jesus' person is for the post-Bultmannians
 of more religious value than if we really knew how many years he lived,
 how long his public ministry."

Ibid., p. 9

¹³⁹

Ibid., pp. 9-10

¹⁴⁰"Thus, the new quest has proved for the post-Bultmanians all that
 it can: not necessarily that the kerygma is true (which lies beyond proof
 and is in the realm of faith) but that the kerygma is faithful to Jesus."

Ibid., pp. 10-11.

¹⁴¹

Ibid., p. 20

bility of making an authentic human response to Jesus outside of the Church's proclamation.¹⁴² Brown's question stemmed from one of the criteria established by the post-Bultmannians, namely, non-kerygmatic material can be isolated from the Gospel to gain an understanding of the authentic Jesus.¹⁴³

Implicitly basing himself on the faith-transformation which Pentecost involved, Brown asked further questions of the new quest men. He asked them whether they saw the resurrection experience essential for the apostles' faith in Jesus.¹⁴⁴ He also seriously questioned the new quest's explanation of the resurrection as far as Jesus was concerned. He certainly agreed that resurrection meant a new existence for Jesus, but Brown saw unacceptable nuances in the new quest's answer to "What?" this resurrection existence included.¹⁴⁵

The hitherto meager results of the new quest disappointed Brown. As three reasons for these meager results, Brown offered the new quest's existentialist preoccupations, methodological hindrances, and neglect of the Gospel of John because of a historical prejudice.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴²"...does the new quest justify a faith in Jesus which would bypass the kerygma? The revelancy of the via historica to faith is a problem that seems to be disturbing the post-Bultmannians themselves....Robinson tells us that in the two ways, history and kerygma, the selfhood of Jesus is equally available to us as a possible understanding of our own existence. What would this mean in terms of faith? Would a faith in the historical Jesus disclosed by this new existentialistic historical method be rich enough to be characterized as divine faith, so that one could have a divine faith in Jesus independent of the Church's proclamation?"
Ibid., pp. 20-21.

¹⁴³Ibid., pp. 9-10.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 22-23.

¹⁴⁵Ibid.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 24-29.

See also Avery Dulles, "Jesus as the Christ,"

Thought XXXIX, (Fall, 1964), pp. 359-80 for another study along the same lines.

4) Rome Discusses the Gospels and History

Without suggesting that American Catholic developments but mime directives and decisions issued from Rome, this author sees the importance of discussing the Pontifical Biblical Commission's declaration about the Gospels and history. This statement from an official teaching body of the Church shows conclusively that the direction of the new biblical criticism in the American Catholic Church was in line with the entire Catholic Church's push for renewal.

In 1964 the Pontifical Biblical Commissions issued a lengthy instruction on the historical truth of the Gospels.¹⁴⁷ This document detailed the principles which should guide the Catholic exegete as he studies the Gospels. The 1964 document discussed form criticism explicitly and declared the Magisterium's alliance with the Church's modern biblical movement.¹⁴⁸

The 1964 document removed from the repertoire of the opponents of the new exegesis any possible allusions to the 1961 monitum. An offi-

¹⁴⁷Prior to the instruction from the Biblical Commission, Myles M. Bourke wrote an article on historicity and the Gospels. This time differential is significant because it illustrates that Bourke, a fine representative of American Catholic exegesis, had always been faithful to the Magisterium. For example, Bourke had been advocating the same understanding of form criticism and of redaction criticism which the instruction made official. Furthermore, contrary to various general allegations, against the new scientific exegesis in American Catholic circles, Bourke demonstrated the agreement that had always existed between the Magisterium and these circles. Myles M. Bourke, "The Historicity of the Gospels," Thought XXXIX (1964), pp. 37-56.

¹⁴⁸Cf. P. G. Duncker, "Biblical Criticism," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXV (1963), pp. 22-33. Duncker, an American Dominican, is Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. His article, which supports the renewal occurring in Scripture scholarship, illustrates the position of the new exegesis, in its discussion of issues such as form criticism, literary form investigation, and the monitum. On each issue the American Catholic biblical renewal is in agreement with Duncker.

cial ecclesiastical document openly supported the men and movement they attacked. They could now only look to the Council and attempt on the Council floor to argue their fundamentalistic views into an official Council decree. Such a prospect must have appeared gloomy with the 1964 instruction before their eyes.

The instruction encouraged Scripture students not to lose heart when tackling complex Scripture problems.¹⁴⁹ It praised those biblical men who were responding to Divino Afflante Spiritu's call for open, scholarly, scientific work.¹⁵⁰ The many writings questioning the truth of the words and deeds proclaimed in the Gospels made open, scholarly, scientific exegesis sorely needed today. To insure scholarly investigation of the Gospels, the Commission gave definite exegetical guidelines to follow.¹⁵¹ While proceeding to study the Commission's guidelines the reader should note the confidence which the Commission placed in that nemesis of the reactionaries, namely, in "the new exegetes."

The first guideline said that exegetes must strictly adhere to the new scientific methods encouraged by Divino Afflante Spiritu in 1943. The Commission singled out the investigation of literary forms as mandatory for fruitful exegesis. It also extended Pius XII's encouragement to study oriental culture and explicitated the need to investigate the New Testament milieu, especially that of the early Christians.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹"Instruction Concerning the Historical Truth of the Gospels," translated by Joseph Fitzmyer, Theological Studies XXV (1964), p. 402.

¹⁵⁰"It is a source of great joy that there are found today, to meet the needs of our times, faithful sons of the Church in great numbers who are experts in biblical matters. They are following the exhortations of the Supreme Pontiffs and are dedicating themselves wholeheartedly and untiringly to this serious and arduous task."
Ibid.

¹⁵¹Ibid., pp. 402-3.

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 403.

When the Commission discussed form criticism, it carefully distinguished between form criticism itself and objectionable premises of some of the form critics. Among these objectionable premises, it listed the rejection of a supernatural order, a dichotomy between historical truth and faith, and extreme views of the creative power of the primitive Christian communities.¹⁵³ However, by countenancing form criticism and avoiding doctrinaire judgments which had been customarily passed on form criticism, the Commission paved the way for undisguised form critical usage by those American Catholic exegetes who had previously found it necessary to cloak their use of the method.

The Commission discussed the stages in the formation of the Gospel tradition. Form criticism made possible most of our knowledge of these stages.

The first stage leading into the Gospel tradition was the ministry of Jesus. The Commission clearly stated that Jesus was a man of his times influenced by the thought patterns and manners of expression of his times. Without explicitating the point, the Commission said that the deeds of Jesus' life were understood by the early Christians as signs of salvation.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³"As occasion warrants, the interpreter may examine what reasonable elements are contained in the 'Form-Critical method' that can be used for a fuller understanding of the Gospels. But let him be wary, because scarcely admissible philosophical and theological principles have come to be mixed with this method, which not uncommonly have vitiated the method itself as well as the conclusions in the literary area." Ibid

¹⁵⁴"When the Lord was orally explaining His doctrine, He followed the modes of reasoning and of exposition which were in vogue at the time. He accommodated Himself to the mentality of His listeners and saw to it that what He taught was firmly impressed on the mind and easily remembered by the disciples. These men understood the miracles and other events of the life of Jesus correctly, as deeds performed or designed that men might believe in Christ through them, and embrace with faith the doctrine of salvation."

Ibid., p. 404.

The apostolic preaching crystallized in Acts was the second stage leading into the Gospel tradition. The Commission affirmed that this apostolic preaching began with the apostles' Pentecost experience, which afforded the vision to see the historical within the ministry of Jesus. The apostles' new vision enabled them to interpret the words and deeds of Jesus to meet the situations of those listening to their preaching. To understand this apostolic interpretation, a person must isolate and investigate the literary forms familiar to the apostles and other preachers.¹⁵⁵

The final stage in the process of the Gospels' formation was the didache work of the evangelists. In its explanation of didache the Commission championed implicitly David Stanley's diligent work on the topic. Not only did specific situations influence the evangelist in his composition of the tradition, but, the Commission remarked, because of the didache element, Gospel narratives can be understood only by uncovering the purpose of the narrative in the whole Gospel. Didache helps to

¹⁵⁵"The apostles proclaimed above all the death and resurrection of the Lord, as they bore witness to Jesus. They faithfully explained His life and words, while taking into account in their method of preaching the circumstances in which their listeners found themselves.. ..There is no reason to deny that the apostles passed on to their listeners what was really said and done by the Lord with that fuller understanding which they enjoyed, having been instructed by the glorious events of the Christ and taught by the light of the Spirit of Truth.... they too interpreted his words and deeds according to the needs of their listeners....But these modes of speaking with which the preachers proclaimed Christ must be distinguished and (properly) assessed: catecheses, stories, testimonia, hymns, doxologies, prayers - and other literary forms of this sort which were in Sacred Scripture and were accustomed to be used by men of that time."
Ibid., pp. 404-5.

explain Gospel discrepancies as actually an individual Gospel's theological proclamation of the risen Lord.¹⁵⁶ Because the meaning and purpose of each evangelist can be established only by literary analysis, responsible exegesis concentrates on the literary origins of the Gospels and it keeps their faith-purpose foremost in mind.¹⁵⁷

The Commission encouraged freedom for scholarly investigation of many important, unsettled areas in Scripture, which it did not specify. It called for faithfulness to the magisterium in the investigations, and it recalled that the principles of inerrancy and of inspiration remain

¹⁵⁶"This primitive instruction, which was at first passed on by word of mouth and then in writing - for it soon happened that many tried 'to compile a narrative of things' which concerned the Lord Jesus - was committed to writing by the sacred authors in four Gospels for the benefit of the churches, with a method suited to the peculiar purpose which each (author) set for himself. From the many things handed down they selected some things, reduced others to synthesis, (still) others they explicated as they kept in mind the situation of the churches. With every (possible) means they sought that their readers might become aware of the reliability of those words by which they had been instructed. Indeed, from what they had received the sacred writers above all selected the things which were suited to the various situations of the faithful and to the purpose which they had in mind, and adapted their narration of them to the same situations and purpose. Since the meaning of a statement also depends on the sequence, the Evangelists, in passing on the words and deeds of our Saviour, explained these now in one context, now in another, depending on (their) usefulness to the readers. Consequently, let the exegete seek out the meaning intended by the Evangelist in narrating a saying or deed in a certain way or in placing it in a certain context. For the truth of the story is not at all affected by the fact that the Evangelist relate the words and deeds of the Lord in a different order, and express his sayings not literally but differently, while preserving (their) sense."

Ibid., p. 405

¹⁵⁷"Unless the exegete pays attention to all these things which pertain to the origin and composition of the Gospels and makes proper use of all the laudable achievements of recent research, he will not fulfill his task of probing into what the sacred writers intended and what they really said. From the results of the new investigations it is apparent that the doctrine and the life of Jesus were not simply reported for the sole purpose of being remembered, but were 'preached' so as to offer the Church a basis of faith and of morals. The interpreter (then), by tirelessly scrutinizing the testimony of the Evangelists, will be able to illustrate more profoundly the perennial theological value of the Gospels and bring out clearly how necessary and important the Church's interpretation is.

Ibid., p. 406.

magisterial teachings.¹⁵⁸

The instruction concluded by giving directions to specific groups such as seminary teachers, biblical associations, and publishers. It called upon these groups to employ their skills with scholarship, prudence and faithfulness to the Pontifical Biblical Commission.¹⁵⁹

Joseph Fitzmyer discerningly analyzed the Commission's instruction in an article in Theological Studies. He noted that the instruction officially investigated form criticism and explicitly recognized the value of the method.¹⁶⁰ Careful reading of the instruction revealed the Commission's interest to sketch with broad strokes the nature of Gospel truth rather than to assert simply that the Gospels record history.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 406-8

¹⁶⁰ "Though (the document) catalogues in some detail questionable presuppositions of many Form Critics, this is done to clear the way to a recognition of the value of the method of Form Criticism itself. The document will go down in history as the first official statement which openly countenances the method itself and frankly admits the distinction of the three stages of tradition in the Gospel material which has emerged from a Form-Critical study of the Gospels."

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Biblical Commission's Instructions on the Historical Truth of the Gospel." Theological Studies XXV (1964), p. 387.

¹⁶¹ "A close analysis of the text reveals that the most important word in the title is not the adjective historica - which might have been one's initial impression - but the preposition de. Significantly, par. III, which states the problem, omits the word 'historical'...In the light of the rest of the document the omission seems intentional and therefore significant. In fact, though historica veritas appears in the title of the Instruction, it is used only once in the text of the document, and that in a sentence in which is decried a certain philosophical or theological presupposition of the Form-Critical method to which no Catholic exegete would subscribe anyway. In none of the positive directives does the phrase historica veritas reappear. It is evident, therefore, that the Biblical Commission is far more interested in sketching with broad lines the character of the Gospel truth than in just reasserting that the Gospels are historical." Ibid., pp. 387-8.

Fitzmyer said that the paragraphs addressed to exegetes contained the Commission's most important directions. He emphasized that only these paragraphs contained directives of a definitely doctrinal nature.¹⁶²

The fifth paragraph carefully avoided any doctrinaire judgment of form criticism. Although this paragraph rejected certain positions held by some form critics, Fitzmyer clarified that no Catholic exegete accepted these positions anyway.¹⁶³ Highlighting the Commission's recommendation for a modified Sitz im Leben, namely the three stages of the Gospel tradition, Fitzmyer emphasized that this distinction enables the exegete to evaluate "the nature of Gospel testimony, the religious life of the early Churches, and the sense and value of tradition."¹⁶⁴

Fitzmyer explicitated the precision gained after the early form critics' Sitz im Leben was distinguished into Sitz im Leben Jesu, Sitz im Evangelium.¹⁶⁵ These form critical distinctions, adopted by the Commission, have become the exegetical tools enabling a person to isolate the three stages comprising the Gospel tradition.

The Commission consciously avoided insisting that the Gospels record the first stage of the tradition. Such an official Church view contained profound implications for Catholics opposed to the new exegesis on the

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 389.

¹⁶³"Par. V) clearly distinguishes what the Commission calls the 'reasonable elements' (sana elementa) in the method itself from its questionable 'philosophical and theological principles.'...This is not the place to explain in detail the method of its defective presuppositions. One should rather note that the six specific 'principles' listed in the Instruction are rejected by Catholic exegetes."
Ibid., p. 390.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 391 cf. also fn. 13, p. 391.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 391-2.

grounds that the Gospels preserve the ipsissima verba of Jesus.¹⁶⁶

To substantiate his inference of the Commission's position on the ipsissima verba, Fitzmyer analyzed its handling of the second stage of the tradition. The Commission affirmed that this stage was the first proclamation of the activity of Jesus. However, the Commission chose Acts 10:36-41, which contains no words of Jesus, to exemplify this proclamation.¹⁶⁷ This explanation contained implications for Catholics who call upon eyewitnesses to Jesus' ministry in order to discredit form criticism. Acts 10:36-41, a speech attributed to Peter, gives but a bare outline of the ministry of Jesus in addition to containing no sayings of Jesus.

The Commission mentioned that the apostles used the literary forms of their times. This admission left no doubt in Fitzmyer's mind that the Commission had advocated form critical investigation of the second stage of the tradition. He found the Commission's singling out of certain literary forms in Scripture to be of critical importance. However, he found even more consequential the fact that the Commission acknowledged

¹⁶⁶"It is the stage of the ipsissima verba Jesu, and for Christians it has always seemed to be the stage of the greatest importance. What Christ Himself really said would seem to be more important than what the early Church passed on as His teaching or what the Evangelists report as His sayings. And yet, it is noteworthy that the Biblical Commission does not insist in any way that what we have in the Gospels is a record of this first stage of the tradition."
Ibid., p. 393. cf also p. 401.

¹⁶⁷"The second stage of the tradition is dealt with in par. VIII. The emphasis is once again on the testimony of the apostles and the accommodations which they made in their message to the needs of those to whom they preached. Even when the Commission says that the apostles after the resurrection 'faithfully explained His life and words,' it appeals significantly to none of the Gospels, but to one of the speeches of Peter in Acts (10:36-41)...But it is noteworthy that there are no 'words' of Jesus quoted in Peter's speech; and yet such a speech is regarded as a faithful explanation of Jesus' life and word.' This is an important nuance that should not be missed."
Ibid., p. 393.

that other unspecified literary forms are present in Scripture. Parables, midrash, and miracle stories immediately came to Fitzmyer's mind.¹⁶⁸

Familiarity with Redaktionsgeschichte influenced the Commission's understanding of the type of history or truth being proclaimed by the evangelists. This truth can only be specified as the truth of the Gospel, a specific manner of explicating truth.¹⁶⁹ This position accepts the distinction between historical and historic and approves David Stanley's work of clarifying the type of history contained in the Gospels. By emphasizing the faith-structure of the Gospels, the Commission had

¹⁶⁸"This paragraph ends with the mention of the various modes of speaking which the apostles used in their ministry and preaching.. Because they had to speak to 'Greeks and barbarians, the wise and the foolish,' such contact and influence naturally caused an adaptation of the message they were proclaiming. It is made clear that the 'literary forms' employed in such adaptation must be distinguished and properly assessed....this leaves no doubt that the Commission has in mind the use of the Form-Critical method. However, the forms which are mentioned specifically ('catecheses, stories, testimonia, hymns, doxologies, prayers') are indeed found in the New Testament, but it is another question whether they are all used in the Gospels, at least in any abundance. However, the point is made that various literary forms did develop in this stage of the Christian tradition, and that the student of the Gospels must distinguish them and assess them. But still more important is the admission by the Commission that there are other forms not specifically mentioned...such as were used by men of that time. As far as the Gospels are concerned, one thinks readily of genealogies, parables, miracle stories, midrash, etc."
Ibid., p. 394.

¹⁶⁹"...after...an exhortation to the exegete to seek out the Evangelist's meaning...the Commission makes a statement about the 'truth' involved in such a process of redaction...the Commission speaks of 'truth' only, and does not specify it as 'historical truth.' One might wonder what it would mean if the word 'historical' were to be understood here, after such an admission of the redactional work of the Evangelists. But if one were to ask, 'Well, then, if it is not a question of historical truth, of what kind is it?' the answer would have to be, 'of the Gospel truth.'
Ibid., p. 395.

rejected fundamentalism and the positivist view of history.¹⁷⁰

Because modern Gospel studies cannot ignore form criticism, the Commission had clearly directed seminary professors to cope with the method. Fitzmyer pointed out that the Commission had spoken of literary criticism as a tool and not as an end in itself.¹⁷¹

Further evidence that the Commission considered sane use of form criticism and its findings solidly established can be found in its remarks to preachers. Because the findings of form criticism have been substantiated, the Commission assured preachers that they could explain these findings to the faithful.¹⁷² The label of "innovator" used against the new exegetes by their reactionary opponents was herein removed from the reactionaries' arsenal insofar as the historicity debate was concerned.

The instruction has raised certain questions. Its near silence on the Synoptic problem made some of its statements appear naive or oversimplified. Protestant exegetes question how anyone can address himself to the historical value of the Gospel tradition without taking some position on the Synoptic problem. Fitzmyer suggested that the Commission avoided specific directives in this matter in order to insure that open

¹⁷⁰ "Then comes this significant statement: 'From the results of the new investigations it is apparent that the doctrine and life of Jesus were not simply reported for the sole purpose of being remembered, but were "preached" so as to offer the Church a basis of faith and of morals..' The Commission implies, then, that the Gospel truth is not something which is tied up with any fundamentalistic literalness." Ibid., pp. 395-6.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 397.

¹⁷² "If we are correct in our estimate of this Instruction, then the recognition which the Biblical Commission gives to literary forms, and especially to the sane use of the Form-Critical method in Gospel interpretation, would put interpretations solidly established by this method among 'new opinions which can be so explained to the faithful.'" Ibid.

debate would continue among the Catholics working on the problem.¹⁷³

To highlight the instruction's significance, Fitzmyer placed it in its historical context, namely, the strife within the Catholic Church over modern Scripture scholarship. The Commission had checked the attempts to enforce fundamentalism upon Catholic exegesis. The instruction insured that Vatican II's revised schema on revelation would be handled differently than had the first schema,¹⁷⁴ which the Council had rejected due to that schema's attack upon scientific exegesis and insistence on two sources of revelation.

b) Vatican II Champions the New Exegesis

The reason for discussing Vatican II in this thesis about American Catholic biblical scholarship stem from the same understanding which prompted a discussion of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's instruction on the historical truth of the Gospels. As members of a universal Church in process of development, the American Catholic Church has contributed to that process. The new trends of its scientific biblical criticism contributed to the whole Church's push for scientific renewal of exegesis. Divino Afflante Spiritu began the push, and Vatican II reaffirmed the biblical renewal in all of the Catholic Church.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 399.

¹⁷⁴ "The significance of this Instruction of the Biblical Commission at the present time is best realized when one considers the events which have been taking place within Roman Catholic circles. We are not referring directly to the strife between Lateran University and the Pontifical Biblical Institute, which was unfortunate because it obscured the issue of the Church's attitude toward this important biblical problem. We have in mind the mixed reactions which have been reported all over the world to the new trends in modern Catholic biblical studies, and how attempts were made in conservative ecclesiastical circles (at Rome and elsewhere) to commit the Catholic interpretation of the Gospel narrative to a fundamentalistic view of things."

Ibid., p. 398.
CF. also fn. 19, pp. 398-99.

The first session of the Council saw the phenomenal rise of the liberals. In many cases this phenomenon expressed itself in the demand for a total rethinking and recasting of the schemas presented for discussion. The initial schema of revelation went this route.

The first meetings of the Council had already shown that the struggle to renew Scripture scholarship had reached the Council floor. Xavier Rynne's first book provides a fascinating review of the struggle which ensued over the schema on revelation.¹⁷⁵

A Council press bulletin reported three opinions voiced over the schema. Some Fathers demanded it be entirely rewritten, others defended it and wanted it to be discussed in its specific sections and others wanted the project tabled.¹⁷⁶

The major dissension concerned the first schema's insistence on two sources of revelation, Scripture and Tradition, rather than on one source with two manifestations. The progressive Fathers insisted that only the Word of God is the source of revelation.¹⁷⁷

Among various other objections to the schema were its "too rigid declaration of truth," its length and repetition, and its professorial tone. Some Fathers objected that it presented as established some teaching still being debated among different schools of theology.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁵Council Day Book also documents the struggle, but with less flair than Rynne. It provides a good means for measuring Rynne's accuracy in reporting.

¹⁷⁶Council Day Book, Vatican II, Session 1, p. 77.

¹⁷⁷"Cardinal Lienart rose at once to lead the opposition. 'This schema,' he said, 'does not please me. It is not adequate to the matter it purports to deal with, namely Scripture and tradition. There are not and never have been two sources of revelation. There is only one fount of revelation -- the Word of God, the good news announced by the prophets and revealed by Christ. The Word of God is the unique source of revelation.'"
Xavier Rynne, Letters from Vatican City, p. 143.

¹⁷⁸Council Day Book, op. cit., p. 83.

The schema was simply too narrow and rigid.¹⁷⁹

The first draft shunted the scientific movement in biblical studies and summarily placed the new exegetes and their right to free inquiry under suspicion and attack.¹⁸⁰ Fears of Modernism and wishes to denounce error formed the tenor of the schema.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹"Those wanting to throw the project out and start afresh argue that as now proposed it smacks too much of the classroom, that its terms are excessively abstruse and are in danger of making the truth incomprehensible to the separated brothers,' that some of its statements are too rigid, that it does not take enough account of the growth of dogma and is therefore not mature enough from a theological point of view, and that it overlooks problems of salvation 'prior to Revelation'...and gives little encouragement to scientific research in theology and Scriptural studies."

Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁸⁰"The Canadian cardinal, Paul Emile Leger, not only proposed the scrapping of the document, but went on to make a plea for freedom and tolerance within the world of Catholic scholarship, defending biblical scholars in particular who are opening up new paths of investigation."

Ibid., p. 145.

"(Cardinal Bea) pointed out the many references in the schema to the Scripture scholar; yet there was only one favorable mention -- all the rest were held suspect."

Ibid., p. 149.

"...Monsignor Battaglia...labelled the arguments against the schema 'fallacies and inanities.' He attacked the Biblical Institute and the whole development of modern theology."

Ibid., p. 154.

¹⁸¹"The conservative Bishop Farer of Catanzaro, Italy, said that he was afraid of a resurgence of Modernism. The Council of Trent had warned against those who 'twist the Scriptures' and Vatican Council I had asserted that dangerous innovators must be 'coerced' and errors driven out, as Pius X had done when he condemned this heresy."

Ibid., p. 153.

"Bishop Charue of Namur, Belgium, put his finger on the real difficulty with the Ottaviani approach. Calling attention to the fact that all the Belgian and French bishops were against the schema, he attacked the necessity of going over the condemnation of Modernism. There are other errors, he insisted, that are just as dangerous. 'It is not up to the Council to do the work of the Holy Office, of theologians,' he said, 'but it is up to the Council not to sit for another Galileo incident!'"

Ibid., p. 158.

It extended the attacks which Romeo had made against the Pontifical Biblical Institute.¹⁸² If the initial draft on revelation had been accepted, its defenders would have censured and perhaps eventually curtailed the exciting biblical movement underway in the Catholic Church.

The Boston Pilot noted in a feature article that suspicions against the new theology were a guideline for many members of the Council's preparatory commissions. Suspicion of the biblical movement was especially prevalent in these commissions, The Pilot informed its public.¹⁸³

In order to explain more clearly why the draft on revelation was so unacceptable, Cardinal Doepfner outlined on the Council floor the structure of the preparatory commission which had written the document. The initial draft had been authored by a school of thought which opposed the new directions being called for and taken by most of the Church.¹⁸⁴

Michael Novak has called this school of thought a "school of fear" and the proponents of "non-historical orthodoxy."¹⁸⁵ Pope John XXIII him-

¹⁸²"Rumors had it that at one of the last meetings of the Central Preparatory Commission, in May or June, Cardinal Leger had spoken out equally sharply in favor of biblical scholars, denouncing the attacks made on the Biblical Institute and deploring the obscurantist attitudes toward Scriptural studies manifested by the Lateran University." Ibid., pp. 150-51.

¹⁸³"(Some Council members are) convinced that the Church is threatened from within by erroneous doctrines -- in biblical scholarship for example -- so serious as to require formal clarification by the Council so as to avert heresy alongside of these errors." Robert A. Graham, "Council Considers Contrasting Concepts," The Pilot, Nov. 24, 1962, p. 1.

¹⁸⁴Rynne, op. cit., p. 155.

¹⁸⁵Michael Novak, The Open Church, pp. 52-71.

self termed these men his "prophets of gloom."¹⁸⁶ These were the men of the Lateran, fiercely opposed to the Pontifical Biblical Institute, and represented supremely in the Divinitas article by Romeo.

Cardinal Ottaviani, the head of the preparatory commission, denied that his commission opposed Church renewal.¹⁸⁷ However, another Cardinal abruptly accused Ottaviani of lying, and a member of Ottaviano's commission provided evidence to substantiate the charge.¹⁸⁸

Doepfner's accusations against Ottaviani and the procedures of Ottaviani's commission clarify what happened to Ernest Vogt, the Pontifical Biblical Institute's Rector appointed to assist in drawing up the initial

¹⁸⁶"In the daily exercise of our pastoral office, we sometimes have to listen, much to our regret, to voices of persons who, though burning with zeal, are not endowed with too much sense of discretion or measure. In these modern times they can see nothing but prevarication and ruin. They say that our era, in comparison with past eras, is getting worse, and they behave as though they had learned nothing from history, which is, none the less, the teacher of life. They behave as though at the time of former Councils everything was a full triumph for the Christian idea and life and for proper religious liberty.

"We feel we must disagree with these prophets of gloom, who are always forecasting disaster, as though the end of the world were at hand."

"Pope John's Opening Speech to the Council," The Documents of Vatican II, p. 712.

¹⁸⁷"It is not true that this schema was made in my name....In the Commission those matters in the schema that were the subject of discussion or disagreement were put to a vote. It was normal for the opinion of the minority then to be excluded. The members of this Commission came from various countries, from different universities. It is not true that only one opinion or one school of thought was represented."

Rynne, op. cit., p. 157.

Council Day Book reports that "Those defending the proposal replied that it had been prepared by theologians of recognized outstanding ability and had been passed in its final form by the Council's Central Preparatory Commission, many of whose members were cardinals."

Council Day Book, op. cit., p. 83,

¹⁸⁸"It's hardly worth repeating that His Eminence is not telling the truth. All the world knows it."

Rynne, op. cit., p. 157.

draft on revelation. The reactionaries from the Lateran simply maneuvered and manipulated in order to nullify the efforts of this progressive biblical scholar.¹⁸⁹

The progressives' defense of the new biblical movement led to an astonishing victory for exegesis four years later at the Council. Pope John laid the groundwork for this victory when he appointed another commission to write a new draft on revelation. This commission was jointly headed by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bea and included Cardinal Meyer of Chicago.¹⁹⁰

As noted above, the Council's debates on revelation centered on different notions of tradition. The liberal majority stressed that the Word of God -- or the Christ event -- is the source of all revelation. The conservative minority clung to its notion of two sources of revelation -- Scripture and tradition. By the third session, a new schema on revelation had been drafted and presented to the Council Fathers for discussion.

In the debates over the new schema the conservatives exaggerated the issue of infallibility. They refused to accept any additions to the Church's knowledge of the Bible because, they said, any additions would deny outright the Church's infallible understanding of revelation. They also continued attacking modern biblical studies.

The liberal majority stressed that the Church must employ modern

¹⁸⁹"Even in the preparatory stages of the Council, it became generally known, opponents were skillfully maneuvered out of their places at Commission meetings, threatened with reprisals, and votes taken when they were absent."

Ibid.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 166.
Council Day Book, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

research to deepen its understanding of revelation. Cardinals Leger and Landazurri-Ricketts accused the conservatives of preventing the faithful from coming to a full appreciation of the Gospels. They called for acceptance of the dynamic element in revelation and for acknowledgement of the fallible elements which convey revelation.¹⁹¹

A French bishop reminded the Council that the early Church Fathers identified revelation with the apostolic tradition. His arguments stressed both the Pentecostal consciousness of the early Church and the presence of oral traditions.¹⁹²

Cardinal Ruffini renewed his attack upon the study of literary forms and on liberal Scripture scholarship. He told the Council that literary form interpretation tantamountly asserted that hitherto the Church had misunderstood the Bible. Through these arguments Ruffini, normally a champion of papal authority, merely confirmed his refusal to honor Pope Pius XII's encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu.¹⁹³

Cardinal Meyer of Chicago initiated the discussion on inspiration of Scripture. Pointing out the conservatives' static understanding of Scripture, Meyer remarked that the Word of God is a personal communication desirous of human response and not a series of logical truths and propositions. He aligned himself with Cardinal Keenig, who earlier had called

¹⁹¹Xavier Rynne, The Third Session, pp. 38-39.

¹⁹²Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁹³Ibid., p. 43.

"Cardinal Ruffini objected to what he called the exaggerated degree of freedom given Catholic Biblical scholars in the text and said he disagreed that the Church is only now learning about literary forms and the role they play in the way Scripture was written. He said it would be an exaggeration to think that the sacred books have not been understood up to now."

Council Day Book, Vatican II, Session 3, p. 97.

for a frank admission of the human deficiencies and limitations which were involved in the transmission of the Scriptures.¹⁹⁴

A bishop from India called upon the Council Fathers to acknowledge that the biblical authors did not always convey exactly what God intended.¹⁹⁵ However, his speech was followed by an Italian bishop's condemnation of "present-day exegesis," which he said was emptying the Gospels of all historical meaning. The Italian referred to the monitum for support.¹⁹⁶

Bishop Maloney of Louisville, Kentucky, answered the Italian's charges with a defense of literary form interpretation. He cited both St. Augustine and St. Jerome as Church Fathers who understood the need for interpreting literary forms.¹⁹⁷

An Irish bishop expressed concern that the historicity of the Gospels was gravely endangered. Deploring the use of literary form interpretation, he linked a defense of Ireland to the need for condemning literary form investigation.¹⁹⁸

The debate on the schema was closed on October 6, 1964, but not before an Italian bishop rose for a last reactionary plea. He maintained the Council would prove a great disappointment if it did not "condemn the dangers threatening the Church from the form-history interpretation of the Scriptures."¹⁹⁹ This final plea further attests to the distance

¹⁹⁴The Third Session, op. cit., pp. 44-45.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 45-46.

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁹⁷Ibid.

¹⁹⁸Ibid., p. 47

¹⁹⁹Ibid.

separating the conservatives from "the mind of the Pope and the Church, as well as (from) modern biblical studies, regarding not merely the subject of Tradition but the nature of the Bible itself."²⁰⁰

Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, overwhelmingly approved by the Council Fathers, officially endorsed and encouraged the exegetes who championed scientific renewal of biblical criticism. For example, the document's section on the New Testament incorporated much of the 1964 instruction on the historical truth of the Gospels; the 1964 document had begun by warmly praising and encouraging the scientific steps being taken by Catholic exegetes.²⁰¹ In two compact sentences on the formation of the Gospels, Vatican II approved the work of the New Testament exegetes who had long been held suspect and forced to write circumspectly.²⁰² Furthermore, Vatican II explicitly encouraged biblical scholars to continue the work they had "so well begun."²⁰³

²⁰⁰Ibid., p. 47.

²⁰¹See Chapter Five, p. 213 especially fn. 150.

²⁰²"The sacred authors wrote the four Gospels, selecting some things from the many which had been handed on by word of mouth or in writing, reducing some of them to a synthesis, explicating some things in view of the situation of the churches, and preserving the form of proclamation, but always in such fashion that they told us the honest truth about Jesus. For their intention in writing was that either from their own memory and recollections, or from the witnesses of those who themselves 'from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word' we might know 'the truth' concerning those matters about which we have been instructed." Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, article 19, The Documents of Vatican II, p. 124.
emphasis added See p. 216, fn. 156.

²⁰³"This sacred Synod encourages the sons of the Church who are biblical scholars to continue energetically with the work they have so well begun, with a constant renewal of vigor and with loyalty to the mind of the Church."
Ibid., article 23, p. 126.

The document called upon exegetes to investigate the intention of the Bible's human authors.²⁰⁴ It explicitly instructed exegetes to use literary form interpretation and left no doubt that investigation with Sitz im Leben tools proves useful in biblical criticism.²⁰⁵

In strong contrast to conservative claims that the Church has always understood the Bible perfectly, the document encouraged exegetes to aid the Church to mature in its Scriptural understanding. The Council Fathers admitted that the Church must investigate revelation openly if the Church is to mature in judgment and remain a faithful vehicle for the proclamation of this revelation.²⁰⁶

c) The New Exegesis in Book Form

The debate over biblical criticism did not prevent American Catholic exegetes from completing projects. This thesis presents two examples of such scholarship because the dissension over biblical criticism involved the fruits of new exegetical research as well as views of Gospel historicity. Furthermore, having stated throughout this thesis that American Catholic biblical criticism changed direction after the publication of Divino Afflante Spiritu, this author wants to finish his thesis by presenting some pre-eminent examples of this change. The works chosen are This Good News by Quentin Quesnell and Dictionary of the Bible by John McKenzie.

²⁰⁴Ibid., article 12, p. 120.

²⁰⁵Ibid.

²⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 120-21.

1) Quentin Quesnell's This Good News

Quesnell's book is deceptively simple, without footnotes or bibliography. The style seemed directed to a non-scholarly audience. However, a careful reading brought to light the book's well-planned framework and also brought to light Quesnell's cognizance of the immense field of New Testament scholarship.²⁰⁷

Technical terms such as form criticism, Sitz im Leben, and redaction criticism never appear in This Good News. Quesnell's language remained consistently traditional, non-argumentative and non-alarmist. Well aware of the fierce struggle going on over biblical studies in the Catholic Church, Quesnell wished to make a significant contribution toward not only ending the dissension but also toward removing the underlying causes for the hostilities. The sub-title he gave his book, "An Introduction to the Catholic Theology of the New Testament," expressed a concern which runs throughout his whole book: Quesnell desired to make the most modern and exact biblical scholarship seem not only a perfectly normal development of Catholic theology but also its most solid support. The significance of such an achievement is apparent. Quesnell demonstrated to open-minded but hesitant critics of the biblical movement that dogmatic and biblical theology, when pursued carefully and thoroughly, were allies in the task of clarifying Christian faith.

²⁰⁷Quesnell is an American Jesuit, has a doctorate in scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute (from which he graduated summa cum laude), and is a member of the graduate faculty at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

"Supplement to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly", XXX (April, 1968), p. 68. This Good News has two editions and several printings. The first edition is from 1964, the second from 1967. Bruce Publishing Company did not change dates on the second edition, in spite of the considerable difference in pagination.

Quesnell's book is based entirely on one of the fruits of Bultmann's form critical scholarship, namely, the centrality of the kerygma in the New Testament. This Good News was an explicitation, first by sections and then as a whole, of the kerygma which influenced the writing of the Gospels. Quesnell evinced a deep familiarity with form criticism, redaction criticism and the directives of Divino Afflante Spiritu.

After presenting Peter's speech in Acts 2:16-39 in his second chapter, Quesnell alluded to the presence of literary forms within this outline of the kerygma and suggested we need to familiarize ourselves with the milieu of the first century Jews.²⁰⁸ His remarks were fully in accord with the call to biblical scholarship given by Pius XII in 1943.

In the fourth chapter of his book Quesnell listed several of the earliest New Testament records of the apostolic preaching. He did so in order to glean from them their common elements and in order to present clearly the essentials of the kerygma which directed the apostles and the evangelists in their proclamation of the gospel message.

Quesnell isolated four elements for consideration. First, he presented the kerygma's testimony to a witnessed fact, namely, Jesus, a man marked by God, had been rejected and killed. Second, he showed the kerygma's testimony about this fact, namely, God intended to redeem men in this occurrence. Third, he presented the kerygma's call to all men, namely, repent, believe, and be baptized in response to this occurrence. Fourth, he isolated the kerygma's promise of God's gift to those who do

²⁰⁸"The sermon is recorded only in outline. But even on the day the whole talk was first delivered it was not directed to twentieth-century hearers. There is nothing surprising in the fact that it does not produce an immediate and clear effect on us today as it stands. It is directed to Jewish listeners to another age, who lived and acted, thought and prayed against a cultural background very different from our own. The sermon did successfully answer to their background and to their needs and expectations."

Quentin Quesnell, This Good News, p. 13

respond in faith, namely, the Holy Spirit.

Quesnell pointed out that the apostolic preachers did not theologize on this kerygma. What they proclaimed was Christ's death and resurrection as the foundation for all further Christian decisions.²¹⁰

For several chapters Quesnell discussed different elements of the gospel message. In chapters thirteen and fourteen he gathered all of this material for a discussion of the literary phenomenon known as a Gospel.

None of the Gospels omit any essential element of the kerygma, for these elements are what a Gospel is.²¹¹ The central point of the kerygma, namely, the passion and the resurrection, which Quesnell called our salvific event, remains therefore the central point of the Gospels.²¹²

The kerygma alone is the basic witness to the reliability, to the historicity, of the Gospels. The framework which determines the truth of the four Gospels is their faithful proclamation of the historical

²⁰⁹Ibid., pp. 44-48.

²¹⁰"They do not stop to theologize on the point. But they do communicate to their hearers the fact that Christ's death and resurrection are the foundation of everything that comes afterward. It is Christ as having died and risen that one must believe. And it is because one gains some insight into the fact that the Christ, God's chosen, God's only Son, was crucified and rose that one repents and changes in mind and heart. It is allegiance to a living Messiah, who died as the crucified one, which a man proclaims in accepting baptism in his name.

"And from repentance, faith, and baptism -- grounded as there are in Christ's act -- they announce there will come to the individual those good things he most wants and has need of: forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Spirit, the path to life, salvation from a perverse generation, the promises."

Ibid., pp. 48-49.

²¹¹Ibid., pp. 158

²¹²Ibid

events which transpired in Jesus, the Christ.²¹³ In Quesnell's judgment the Gospel's kerygmatic proclamation of a historical event which really did happen is their most important element.²¹⁴

The second element of a Gospel is born from the first. Once early Christians had experienced the risen Christ, they proceeded to view Jesus' earthly life in a Pentecost perspective.²¹⁵ They subsumed each element of Jesus' life under Kerygma in order that people could more fully understand the significance of these disparate elements.²¹⁶

The third element of a written Gospel is the individual framework chosen by each evangelist. Quesnell's understanding of redaction criticism and of didache is evident here. Although exegetes do not fully agree upon the organizing principle (or principles) behind each Gospel, they do agree that each Gospel contains this third element. They also agree that the theological framework of each Gospel is an element distinct from the kerygma's basic testimony to Jesus' death and resurrection.²¹⁷

²¹³"The first step in understanding the gospels and seeing what they really are is to realize that their aim is to proclaim, to spell out clearly this message, this basic lineup of facts which they, the writer or the apostle on whom he based himself, had seen and was willing to bear witness to unto death if necessary. And this is the first element too in judging the 'historicity', and 'reliability', etc. of the gospel accounts."
Ibid., p. 159.

²¹⁴"...(the gospels) do intend to bear historical witness to something that happened, something which they know and affirm is a fact -- the death and resurrection of Jesus. This is the very point of their being written in the first place. This is the most important and central fact about what a gospel is. The supreme application of the modern critical principle of determining the literary genre of any given piece of writing before judging its historical value is soundly made here by recognizing that the gospel, a gospel, is first of all and above all a witness to the fact that this good news is true."
Ibid., p. 161.

²¹⁵Ibid., p. 161.

²¹⁶"So each of these little accounts or sayings or discourses has its own point and message, which flows from or lead to the gospel as such, the kerygma, the communication of which in its fullness is the point of the gospels as a whole."
Ibid., p. 165.

²¹⁷Ibid., pp. 166-67.

Because the fourth element of a written Gospel is beyond scientific control and perhaps undiscoverable, Quesnell merely referred to it as the divine plan guiding the evangelists in their presentation of the kerygma.²¹⁸

In chapter fourteen of This Good News Quesnell applied his previous findings to the Gospel of Mark in order to clarify how a Gospel with a definite perspective could remain within the kerygma. He organized this chapter around the first three elements of every written Gospel.

While summarizing Mark's framework for the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, Quesnell reiterated that these events are the essence of the kerygma, and constitute the first element of every Gospel.²¹⁹

The second element to look for in Mark is his explanation of these salvific events. Mark's theologizing contains explanations "given in and through the Lord's own words and actions" to edify the faith-conscious-

²¹⁸"There is a fourth (element), but it is out of our hands, and perhaps undiscoverable. That is the divine intention in arranging things just this way, in seeing that these four aspects should complement one another in just the way God intended for the good of future ages. Not, to be sure, to give men every biographical detail they would desire about the life of Jesus -- far from that. But to see that they could get, by continual meditation on the Gospels in the Church, a full basic picture of all that is implied in this good news."

Ibid., p. 167

²¹⁹Ibid., pp. 168-70

ness of the early Christian believers.²²⁰ Quesnell alluded to eyewitness testimony and to first century conditions which affected the formation of these units of the Markan tradition.²²¹

Quesnell discussed Mark 7:24-30 at length in order to demonstrate how this story was used by the Church and by the evangelists to explain Christ.²²² After showing the story's function in the Church and in the

²²⁰"The second element in the composition of a gospel is, we have said (pp. 161-66), the explanation of what the death and resurrection of the Messiah mean for us. It contains the explanation of suffering, persecution, sacrifice, and of love and service, and shows that they necessarily flow from a right interpretation of what happens to Jesus. There will also be an account of how the Church results from Jesus' acts and is men's way of participating in them. And from this will be shown to result other basic changes in the God-man relationship -- consequences for the liturgical life, changed attitudes toward the laws and traditions of Israel, a new understanding of the Old Testament. There will be explanations of the reality of redemption itself: conquest of sin, of disease, of all powers outside of God and opposed to God. There will be, moreover, 'dogmatic' teachings, which the good news presupposes and which give it its value and meaning: the Trinity, the Incarnation, the need of redemption.

"All of these explanations and lessons will be given in and through the Lord's own words and actions...."

Ibid., pp. 170-71.

²²¹"All of these explanations and lessons will be given in and through the Lord's own words and actions, as these were remembered by those who had known him personally, and as they were applied to the needs of the Church by the Church's own leaders and teachers in their active tradition of teaching and preaching."

Ibid., p. 171.

²²²Ibid., pp. 171-74.

Gospel, he presented Mark 7:31-37 as Mark's explanation of the preceding narrative.²²³

There are several other aspects of Mark's explanation of redemption. Each of Mark's stories is a separate unit amplifying the essential teaching about Jesus, namely, his passion, death, and resurrection for man's salvation.²²⁴

Mark's plan is varied and has therefore given birth to exegetical disagreement concerning it. Quesnell presented four different attempts which have been made to reconstruct the theological plan of this Gospel.²²⁵

Chapter fourteen of This Good News closes with Quesnell's insistence that the Gospels are rooted in historical events experienced by early Christians. The Gospels depend entirely on the reality of Jesus, who has become the Christ. The Gospel frameworks arose only because of

²²³"Between the two feedings occurred the incident of the Syro-phoenician woman of Tyre and Sidon. It was a remembrance of Jesus preserved in the Christian preaching and teaching. But it was preserved not for the journey itself -- of which nothing is said; nor for his stay in Tyre -- which is not described; nor to describe a particularly striking miracle -- for he had cast out hundreds of demons. It was preserved for the sake of the remark about first the Jews, then the Gentiles. "For that remark," Jesus says to the woman, "you may go home. The demon is driven out." Ibid., pp. 174-75.

²²⁴Ibid., pp. 175-77.

²²⁵Ibid., pp. 185-88.

a faith in a real Person in whom something significant for all men had definitely happened.²²⁶

Quesnell's book has been warmly received in many circles throughout the world. A Dutch translation appeared in 1969, (Patmos Press, Dusseldorf); Japanese and Spanish translations are now in process. An article

226, "After stressing so much the doctrinal material in the four Gospels, is it perhaps necessary to remind ourselves again of the Gospels' other, more obvious side? Of how the Gospels are truly, and by the deliberate intention of their authors, also portraits of Christ? They draw a consistent picture of the most extraordinary personality the world has ever known. That it is a living picture, a plausible picture, an appealing picture needs no demonstration here. All those who have known and read the Gospels can testify to that. That it is an historical picture is ultimately the only possible explanation of the life that breathes it, of its internal consistency, and of its transcendental quality -- the fact that it is simply beyond the creative power of human literary imagination, just as it has proved through the centuries to be beyond the power of human literary imitation. The examples we have seen must not then leave us with the impression that the Gospels were concatenations of conundrums under the superficial guise of a life of Christ, for we must remember that according to the very theological intentions of the authors such a fake Gospel made no sense. For the Christian theology they wanted to present was not a matter of abstract theories and propositions, which could then be illustrated by little stories and examples. The Christian theology they were presenting, the same one we have studied in earlier chapters on the apostolic preaching, was a theology which depended completely on the reality of that one life. It was a theology which grew out of faith in a real Person, and faith that something had really happened to him, and faith that that something was God's message for the redemption of all mankind.

"The Gospels are explaining that message, they are describing that happening, and they are presenting that Person. The best and perhaps the only fully convincing argument that they intended to present Him as real and living, as He actually was and as they had known Him, is ultimately to pick up the Gospels and read them and meet Him there somewhere."

Ibid., pp. 190-91

in the English journal Scripture by George MacRae pointed out the basic shift it made in the conception of New Testament theology (as compared to the classic presentation of Joseph Bonsirven in his Theology of the New Testament). Pierre Benoit reviewed it in Revue Biblique, and Rudolf Schnackenburg in Biblische Zeitschrift.²²⁷

Quesnell gave this author access to his personal file of comments received on This Good News, and from this file three comments were selected for inclusion in this thesis. In addition to the following three items, Quesnell received letters from many theologians who praised him for his lucid, concise, progressive presentation of a very complex area of research.

In a series of letters between Quesnell and Jan Lambrecht, SJ, a Dutch theologian, a Dutch translation of This Good News was proposed by Lambrecht. Peter Fransen, excellent sacramental theologian in Holland, warmly backed the proposal. As Quesnell said to Lambrecht, it is an honor for an English-writing theologian to be translated into Dutch.

John McKenzie made This Good News his recommendation in the 1965 Thomas More Catholic Book Annual. He called the book "one of the most exciting books to appear in 1964," and he praised Quesnell for having made a splendid contribution to help Christians realize the New Testament remains contemporary. He said Quesnell's scholarship contributed significantly to possibilities for renewal in the Catholic Church.

C. H. Dodd, the remarkable New Testament scholar from England, wrote Quesnell a lengthy, warm letter on August 2, 1965, and praised

²²⁷ cf. George MacRae "New Testament Theology - Some Problems and Principles," Scripture XVI (October, 1964), pp. 97-106. Pierre Benoit, Revue Biblique LXXI (October, 1964), pp. 631-32. Quesnell mentioned the Schnackenburg review to me, but I could not locate any particulars about the review.

Quesnell for his book. He said that careful reading had pleasantly indicated to him that Quesnell and he agreed almost everywhere. Dodd said he fully accepted Quesnell's "view that the Gospel is appropriated not only through theology but by 'living in the Church.'" And Dodd frankly said This Good News gave him heart that the gap dividing Christians was being bridged. He told Quesnell he hoped the book had many readers because they would gain certain enlightenment.

For his students Quesnell drew up a list of twenty-six propositions being taught in his book. He addressed four other propositions solely to himself.²²⁸

Propositions 1-26 explicitate the kerygma or naturally develop from it. The first proposition identifies the kerygma as the essence of Christianity. The second expands the first and proclaims the kerygma as the basic message in every book of the New Testament. Number three states that the kerygma is the divine revelation par excellence as well as the

²²⁸ Besides providing a copy of all these propositions, he enclosed some personal comments on them.

The list of thirty was made by me for my own satisfaction in 1965, when I noticed how no reviewer seemed disturbed by the radical theology I knew was in it. I had indeed intended it to go down sweetly and smoothly for ordinary Christians; had even hoped the same for dogmatic theologians; but was honestly surprised when the only note of protest came from the ever-vigilant Francis L. Filas in one diocesan newspaper. So to clarify the facts for myself, I sat down and listed the speculative doctrine the book was really teaching. I kept the list a secret till 1967, then tried it gingerly on one class of doctoral students. Theology had become so liberal by that time it obviously did them no harm, so since then I have given the theses to other classes too. But note -- that's only 1-26. The last four remain strictly addressed to myself. You should present them as my own comments on why I used such an indirect approach; not really as theses 27-30. (For, notice, they do not contain "the doctrine taught in TGN").

object of belief which makes a person a Christian.²²⁹

Proposition four makes Christ's death and resurrection the definitive vehicle of revelation and of the insights into the events of Jesus' life.²³⁰

Proposition five defines the kerygma as the only revelation of supernatural truth which men have been directly and explicitly given. Revelation demands human decision and not speculation when it confronts men.²³¹

Response to the kerygma is grounded in human experiences seen in the faith-consciousness of death-resurrection, "of accepted salvation-through-suffering out of love," and death is the chief human experience directly confronting men with the pervasive challenge of the kerygma.²³³

²²⁹ "The essence of Christianity is the kerygma: Christ suffered and died and rose from the dead, and this is our salvation." Quentin Quesnell, "The Doctrine Taught in This Good News", #1. "This is the basic message which all the books of the New Testament are either affirming or explaining or applying."
Ibid., #2

"The kerygma is the divine revelation par excellence. And the kerygma is the object of belief which makes the Christian."
Ibid., #3.

²³⁰ "This revelation came in the actual fact of the death and resurrection of Christ, and in the insight into that fact, which the small band of his immediate followers received."
Ibid., #4

²³¹ "The only revelation of supernatural truth we have been directly and explicitly given is the kerygma, and that not in order that we may speculate about it, but in order that we may live it."
Ibid., #5

²³² "The 'and this is our salvation' part of the kerygma is a call and a challenge. To him who accepts and believes, it becomes the door to a new way of life. This way of life consists in consciously living according to the revealed plan of death-resurrection, of accepted salvation-through-suffering out of love."
Ibid., #6.

²³³ "This new way of life is the offered salvation. Its greatest climax and test comes in the face of death."
Ibid., #7

Distinctively Christian morality is inferred from the kerygma, where-
 as all other morality is either rethought in kerygmatic perspective or
 accepted as part of the current thought-world.²³⁴

Dogmatic affirmations and speculations which are means of effectively
 proclaiming the kerygma in particular situations. Quesnell listed the fel-
 lowship of all men in Christ and the image of God as Father, Son and Holy
 Spirit among these dogmatic affirmations in the New Testament.²³⁵

As the form critics have affirmed, Jesus did not teach the kerygma.
 Jesus could have taught the kerygma only implicitly.²³⁶ The Christian
 preachers who fashioned the kerygma gained insight through it into the
 Old Testament.²³⁷ And the evangelists, who refashioned the kerygma, wrote
 their Gospels with faith intentions, based upon the factual event recorded

²³⁴"All the morality of the New testament which is distinctively
 Christian is an immediate illation from the kerygma and is either pre-
 sented as such or is presupposed to be such."

Ibid., #8.

"All other morality is either accepted without reflection as part of the
 given real world or is rethought in terms of the kerygma."

Ibid., #9.

²³⁵"All 'dogmatic' affirmations and speculations which are distinct-
 ively Christian -- that Christ is the Son of God, that God is Father, Son,
 and Holy Spirit, that Christ led the demons in triumph, that all men fell
 in Adam, so they are super-abundantly redeemed in Christ, that he is the
 propitiation for our sins, that all men are one in Him, etc., etc., --
 all these are, in the New Testament, illations from the kerygma or ways
 of presenting the kerygma to particular audiences: that is, of explain-
 ing what it might mean that 'this is our salvation.'"

Ibid., #10.

²³⁶"This revelation -- the kerygma, the essence of Christianity was
 not taught by Jesus and could not have been taught by him except impli-
 citly."

Ibid., #11.

²³⁷"This special insight into certain special facts and their mean-
 ing was at once a key to the meaning of the Old Testament as well: it
 too outlined the same basic divine plan of salvation, to which the death
 and resurrection of Christ finally gave perfect expression."

Ibid., #11a.

in passion-resurrection narratives.²³⁸ These notions are precise reformulations of Sitz im Leben Jesu, Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae, Sitz im Evangelium.

To proclaim the kerygma effectively was the overriding concern which influenced the early Church in its selection, reinterpretation, and adaptation of remembered words and deeds from Jesus' ministry. However, Quesnell cautions people not to search the Gospels for individual words or deeds which positively occurred in Jesus' ministry. Historical uncertainty does not affect Christian credibility, however, because the foundation of a Christian's belief is not scientific proof offered in the Gospels, but rather the kerygma.²³⁹ To my knowledge no other American Catholic exegete has more explicitly, indeed radically, maintained that the Gospels are faith documents rooted in historical experiences.

²³⁸"The gospels were written to teach the kerygma as the basis for an act of faith, as the basis for a way of life, and -- above all in the passion-resurrection narratives -- as a fact."

Ibid., #11b.

"The gospels contain words of Jesus and acts of Jesus as the Church remembered them: which means of course according to the ordinary laws of human memory, laws of selectivity, adaptation, reinterpretation, etc. And even the facts and words presented in the gospels are not presented for their own sake, but in order to preach and explain the kerygma. The gospels do not allow us -- with any existing methodology -- to know with certainty individual events or words from the life of Jesus. This does not matter, for: the foundation of our belief is not 'the fact that the gospels as historical records show Jesus claimed to be a divine messenger and Son of God, and then proved his claim with miracles and prophecies.'"

Ibid., #11c.

²³⁹"The foundation of our belief is that men who had known him and placed in him their hopes as God's messenger for the salvation of Israel, saw him instead rejected and crucified, and then afterwards, seeing him risen, came to understand that his rejection, crucifixion, and resurrection were God's message to the world for the world's salvation. Our belief is founded then on the fact of Jesus' crucifixion, their testimony to the fact of his resurrection, and their preaching of their insight into these two facts as a God-given revelation to the world."

Ibid., #12.

Seven propositions draw out the implications in Quesnell's view of the Church as the vehicle for presenting the kerygma throughout history. Behind his view of the Church stands the centrality of the kerygma, which at least implicitly the Church has always defended or explained. This kerygmatic function involves the work of the Church's speculative theologians and of the Magisterium. Quesnell maintains that on the whole neither group has served the kerygma with conscious intent to carry out this function.²⁴⁰

²⁴⁰"The Church exists to present the kerygma to each succeeding generation and to all levels of culture and intelligence in each individual generation in the most meaningful manner possible."

Ibid., #13.

"The bulk of the Church dogmas are historical, not logical, conclusions from the kerygma. That is, at various times in history, various teachings and/or movements were rejected by the Church because she instinctively felt they would, if accepted and allowed to develop within her, do harm to the presentation of the kerygma which is her mission. The bulk of the Church's dogmas are formulations of those rejections, and therefore, as a whole, these dogmas contain not a logical and complete explanation of the kerygma, but the sum of the contradictories of teachings which in the history of the Church have (sometimes theoretically, sometimes practically) seriously and publicly threatened the kerygma or its transmission."

Ibid., #14.

"The variations of Church teaching and practice from age to age are only a means of better and more effectively or universally presenting the kerygma."

Ibid., #15.

"The function of speculative theology is to support the kerygma -- refuting those who attack it or threaten it in every age, explaining it anew to the ever new point of view with the new problems, philosophies, wants and interests, etc., of each succeeding age. Its function is not the deducing of truths about God, etc., from a body of propositions. 'The deposit of faith' is not a body of propositions, but simply the kerygma."

Ibid., #16.

"This function includes explaining how the accumulation of dogmas and teachings of speculative theology of the past served -- each in its own age -- this basic purpose of the Church's teaching."

Ibid., #17.

"Thus the picture of speculative theology as a science (the model is usually mathematics) which aims to penetrate deeper and deeper into the meaning of a body of revealed truths and draw from them by reasoning new truths is an off-center picture. When speculative theology does accomplish that sort of thing it is only per accidens, and as a result of or as a support of her work in the defense and explanation of the one kerygma."

Ibid., #17a.

240 (Cont'd)

"The Church's theologians and (formally taken) Magisterium need not have been conscious of this as their function in order to be really performing it in the varied situations of succeeding ages. In fact, for the most part, they clearly were not conscious of it. They thought they were transmitting 'objective truth' in a series of propositions passed on from their ancestors. But in reality they were answering the doubts of succeeding ages about the kerygma and, in the process, constantly modifying the Church's formulations of her teaching in words."

Ibid., #18.

The sacraments, the major signs of the Church, inherently apply the kerygma to fundamental human experiences. The sacraments' redemptive power, grounded in the death and resurrection of Christ, depends upon men's responding to the kerygmatic call.²⁴¹

Quesnell depicts Teilhard de Chardin's view of man and Christianity's place in it as not only correct but also as "identical with that taught by the New Testament."²⁴²

He afford Bernard Lonergan more specific treatment than he does Chardin. For Quesnell, Lonergan has produced the most satisfactory method yet to explain apparently contradictory phenomena in the New Testament and in Christianity.²⁴³ Quesnell concretely used this Lonergan method in the tenth chapter of This Good News.

Lonergan's analysis of faith and his presentation of the need for an historical institution to preserve and proclaim that faith "is the satis-

²⁴¹"The sacraments are essentially applications of the kerygma to the key situations of human living. Man finds salvation in them only insofar as he accepts the kerygma."
Ibid., #19.

²⁴²"Teilhard de Chardin's interpretation of man's situation and man's future and the place of Christianity in it, -- an optimistic analysis, where Christianity through love gives the motive force necessary to the building of a better world -- is correct and identical with that taught by the New Testament."
Ibid., #20.

²⁴³"Lonergan's analysis of succeeding higher syntheses can and should be applied to explain the apparently contradictory phenomena in the New Testament and in Christianity: that is, the already/not-yet phenomena."
Ibid., #21.

factory speculative justification of the Kerygma and the Church."²⁴⁴

The kerygma's proclamation that our salvation comes in Christ's death and resurrection needs no reference to Adam and Eve.²⁴⁵ The significance and efficacy of redemption does not stand or fall with the "existence" of mythical characters.

Quesnell considers Rudolf Bultmann the major figure in twentieth century New Testament study. He argues that the best of Bultmann's biblical theology tends to confirm the value of Catholic Christianity "for all those who still put faith in the Scriptures as the Word of God."²⁴⁶

Quesnell insists that the theses of his book are in perfect conformity with traditional Catholicism as it has developed over the years. This Good News ignores false problems to avoid fruitless, argumentative distractions, and the plain orthodoxy of the book affords a new look at

²⁴⁴"Lonergan's analysis of faith and of the reason for it as God's chosen method of salvation and of its connection with an institution to preserve it and continually represent it and make it living and available for all is the satisfactory speculative justification of the kerygma and the Church."
Ibid., #22.

²⁴⁵"Redemption -- 'this is our salvation' -- can be perfectly well and adequately explained without ever once referring to the legend of Adam and Eve."
Ibid., #23.

²⁴⁶"The most radical modern biblical theology (Bultmann) is -- when taken at its best -- not only quite compatible with Catholic Christianity, but is actually a powerful argument for Catholic Christianity as over against any other kind for all those who still put faith in the Scriptures as the word of God."
Ibid., #24.

mostly old insights which had long been obscured by false problems.²⁴⁷

Four propositions explain the theses of This Good News, or, as Quesnell phrased his intention, explain "the truth taught in the method used."

Most theologians have not used the propositions of This Good News. However, Quesnell chose his indirect method lest he alienate the very men he wanted to convert. He chose to speak only in the words of the Gospel and to present his views calmly, unobtrusively, and yet uncompromisingly. He consciously avoided disclosing the frailty, the unreality, of certain formulations by Christian theologians, and he trusted that reflection on his book would indicate to many persons their need to re-

²⁴⁷"All of the above propositions are perfectly orthodox. They are even in conformity with the most tradition Catholicism -- taken as a whole -- though often not in actual conformity with currently traditional 'theology' (that is, attempts to express Catholicism in words.)"

Ibid., #25.

"So conformable are they with real, lived, traditional Catholicism and so reconcilable with even traditional 'theology' that a book which presented them as truly and clearly Catholic in sensu ajente, that is, in straight-forward positive exposition without pointing out the false problems and fears that have hitherto kept many from seeing them -- such a book would be accepted without question as a perfectly orthodox document. It might surprise just a bit in that it would include under the title 'theology of the New Testament' so much material which is normally considered moral or ascetic, but it would in no way scandalize. And its dogmatic teaching (the propositions listed above) when seen in their right proportion and balance with history, with biblical research, with the life of the Church, would in no way scandalize. The emperor would say: 'Oh, I just had them throw together and brush up a bit these few old rags.' And everyone would sagely nod and say, 'The emperor really looks very nice today in his comfortable old clothes.'"

Ibid., #26.

think their "dream world of their own creating." ²⁴⁸

If Quesnell had clearly presented his views as exclusive, he would have been required to refute all other theories. Exclusivism would not only alienate men whom he wants to listen to him, but it would also very likely make these men look for a weak spot in his position. Irrelevant arguments would result as men would concentrate on a minor fault rather than on the major truth of Quesnell's position. ²⁴⁹

²⁴⁸"On most of the above points, the theologians qua theologians have been living in a dream world of their own creating. Consequently, merely to throw these other truths at them would make them feel the world is tumbling down. They would resist, attack. The solution is to fit these truths into the real world in which even the theologians live, and show that as men -- believing, practicing Catholics -- they actually hold a world view which is completely explained in the light of these truths here presented, and indeed obviously explained better than with their fantastic imaginative formulations. And the solution adopted in TGN at least is then not to add even a summary at the end which points out how all this diverges from the ordinary jargon, but rather to leave them to think about it."
Ibid., #27.

²⁴⁹"TGN often uses sensu ajente, where what I really mean is closer to an exclusive sense -- thus and not otherwise. Why? Can this be justified? Yes. For the sensu ajente is presentation, and a presentation which does not go beyond the evidence. An exclusive affirmation would have to be supported by an explicit refutation of all opposite theories. Since however, those theories have been in practice, in the minds of theologians and those taught by them, the only way of viewing the teaching of the Church, an attack on them would seem to be an attack on the central teaching. This is a process that has been gone through thousands of times in the history of dogma. Such an apparent attack on Church teaching is then met by the concerted effort and calling forth of all the loyalties to the Church for what she is. Every comma out of place in my presentation becomes the object for scrutiny and challenge. And in a very short time the discussion gets way off the point, and to support my central true theory I find myself defending some small aberration which I have used in explaining it and end up condemned as a heretic for the fool aberration while what I was really trying to say is forgotten. "The other technique -- that of Aquinas -- is to think the whole field of theology through in the light of the new insights and then present them in a general defense of the entire field, tying them and all theology together so firmly they can never again be wrenched apart. Don't worry about people's seeing the novelty of what you've discovered. Worry about their seeing and accepting the truth of it."
Ibid., #28.

Quesnell is confident that his book offers a complete, adequate, and exclusive explanation for all the Christian phenomena. A reasonable, coherent, affirmative explanation of all relevant questions and reasonable objections affords the one true answer. But, to have broadcast this as his understanding of his book would only have cast shadows rather than light on the matter. He is confident that all understanding men will recognize the truth in his approach. He has had no intention to condemn all other views as totally wrong; rather, he sees them as unconsciously incomplete and narrow.²⁵⁰

Dilemmas and impasses in speculative theology arise mainly when speculative theologians stray from the kerygma. These men can rectify their positions by returning to the kerygma as the locale for all revealed divine goodness and truth.²⁵¹

²⁵⁰"But having stated that all is only sensu ajente, I go on to give a complete and adequate explanation of all the phenomena. This is equivalently to say: beginning with sensu ajente, we have reached sensu exclusivo. For if sensu ajente goes on affirmatively and positively explaining the whole reasonable and coherently and answering all relevant objections, then it has -- by ordinary scientific norms of economy of explanation -- given the one true answer, besides which there is not other. All understanding men will see this -- sooner or later. Why point it out now? It would only cause trouble, shed no real further light, distract from the main issue -- which is whether this explanation is right and adequate, not whether and why the previous ones were wrong. (That I'll explain later -- and as a matter of fact, by my whole theory, they were not positively wrong -- just incomplete and narrow without realizing it.)"

Ibid., #28a.

²⁵¹"Speculative theology can only break a lot of its dilemmas by admitting finally that its subject matter is thoroughly religious, charged, of faith. The kerygma is directed to action. -- That does not mean that the theologian will speculate less. He will speculate more -- but about the whole broad field in which the kerygma is to be reduced to action. And he will speculate more about divine truth and goodness -- but as revealed in the kerygma -- as a message to mankind -- not in an imaginary 'in itself' about which he knows nothing."

Ibid., #29.

This Good News is intended to reform theology by leading theologians to the riches which the kerygma has always offered but which have been nearly totally ignored. The kerygma is the root of the first Christian theology. If theologians refocus on kerygmatic material, they will appreciate the full reality of the Church, which is present in the world to proclaim the kerygma faithfully and meaningfully to all men.²⁵²

2) John McKenzie's Dictionary of the Bible

In 1957 John McKenzie had abhorred the lack of scientific, scholarly achievement from American Catholic exegetes. With his dictionary quietly underway in 1957, McKenzie shows that he did not merely carp about the embarrassing lack of scientific exegesis in the American Catholic Church. He industriously was working for nearly ten years to rectify the situation, and with Dictionary of the Bible became one of the first to contri-

²⁵²"From another point of view, the book is a reform of theology. It points out that theology has not been exploiting the treasures at its disposal. Thinking itself limited by nature to studying and expanding revealed propositions, it has become to many an impasse which could have been avoided. What it should have been doing was trying to express in scientific and propositional form the full reality of the Church. The answers to theology's antinomies were always present -- somewhere in the real life of the Church.

"The book shows that when one returns to the root of theology -- the New Testament's attempt to express the basic insight of the kerygma in meaningful form for its own age -- one finds that theology does have this broader scope. The book shows that when that material is exploited today, the antinomies disappear."

Exploiting that material means taking for subject of several chapters material ordinarily relegated to the ascetical-mystical life of the Church. Seen for what it really is, this material is precisely that towards which the kerygma tends, and is, along with the kerygma itself, the real constant in all ages of the Church. The speculative, dogmatic, theoretical background material on the other hand, the cosmic pictures -- whether in the natural or supernatural order -- are the variables from age to age."

Ibid., #30.

bute a distinctive piece of scholarship.²⁵³

Dictionary of the Bible has received acclaim as an achievement of monumental scholarship. Nearly all reviewers praised McKenzie's methodology, in particular his critical source analysis, his hermeneutics, and his use of archaeology. One man called the book "the outstanding event of the year in Catholic biblical publishing."²⁵⁴

It would prove futile to attempt a summary of McKenzie's dictionary. This thesis discusses his section on the Infancy Gospels since it illustrates the change which had entered American Catholic biblical criticism. For example, there is no effort to prove or disprove the historical objectivity of the Infancy accounts. Furthermore, McKenzie makes ample use of scientific methods.

²⁵³A passing note of interest is McKenzie's bibliography in which he accepts This Good News, in spite of its popular format, as belonging among the basic reference works for New Testament study. John McKenzie, Dictionary of the Bible, p. XIII.

"...thoroughly abreast of modern scholarship...more a matter for congratulation than review...There is not likely to be a rival to the McKenzie Dictionary for some years to come."
Times Literary Supplement, March 3, 1966, p. 177.

"...one can only marvel at the depth, breadth, and accuracy of the scholarship involved in this massive achievement. Clear also is the degree to which modern critical studies have influenced the methodology of current Catholic scholarship, apparent particularly in critical source analysis and in hermeneutical method, yet within the dogmatic framework of the Catholic Church. The heavy dependence on archaeological research and interest in a theological understanding of the Biblical materials brings this dictionary into the mainstream of current Biblical studies, and will make it useful for both the layman and professional student, whatever his theological persuasion."
Vernon Ritter, Library Journal XC (1965), p. 5400.

²⁵⁴"...the outstanding event of the year in Catholic biblical publishing."
Walter M. Abbott, America CXIII (1965), p. 720.

McKenzie's study of the similarities and dissimilarities of the Infancy Gospels shows that only the basic elements of Jesus' birth at Bethlehem and Mary's virginal conception are common to Matthew and Luke.²⁵⁵ The theological motif of each evangelist makes it difficult to conflate these narratives.²⁵⁶

Differing themes as well as differing details discount the belief that Matthew and Luke had the same sources available when they composed their Infancy Gospels. Although the language indicated the original source for each must have been Semitic, the Infancy Gospels themselves discount any eyewitness employed as a source by the evangelists.²⁵⁷

The features of the Infancy Gospels have led scholars to conclude that the early Church knew very little if anything about Jesus' infancy and childhood. As Mark 6:1-6 shows, Jesus impressed no one in his infancy and childhood as the Messiah. Rather than biographical accounts, the Infancy Gospels were theological expansions by the early Church

²⁵⁵Dictionary of the Bible, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

²⁵⁶"In other respects the difference at times raise a difficulty in combining them. Luke not only knows nothing of the episode of Herod, and the Magi and the flight to Egypt, but it is nearly impossible to combine these events with his account. Luke also has nothing of the problem of Joseph. Matthew has none of the temple incidents which Luke relates and again it is difficult to combine them with his narrative. Matthew seems to know of no residence at Nazareth before the return from Egypt."

Ibid.

²⁵⁷"It is hardly possible that Matthew and Luke have drawn from a common source. In addition to the differences noted above, the infancy narrative of Matthew is colored by tragedy and sorrow, while the account of Luke has a spirit of joy. The language in both Matthew and Luke demands a Semitic original for each; this is particularly evident in Luke, where the style differs sharply from the rest of the Gospel. There is nothing in the text to suggest that the material comes from a firsthand witness of the events. In Matthew Joseph is the prominent figure, in Luke Mary and the other women predominate; but an attribution of the material to these is not warranted."

Ibid.

applied to its memory of Jesus' ministry. These expansions resulted from reflection on the kerygma and from application of the kerygma to the Old Testament. In short, the Infancy Gospels were intended as prologues announcing the main character in the drama of man's salvation.²⁵⁸

With scanty material about Jesus' infancy and childhood, Matthew and Luke used midrash as the literary form for the Infancy Gospels. However, they do not differ in principle from the rest of the Gospels; the Infancy Gospels were intended to present the risen Lord to the believers; they were intended to present who Jesus really is. They differ from the other Gospel narratives only because the other narrative had offered the evangelists richer traditional material from which to compose their books.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁸"These features of the Infancy Gospels, together with the absence of the infancy elsewhere in the New Testament have led modern scholars to suppose that the primitive Church possessed little or no living memory of the infancy and childhood of Jesus. This implies that no messianic features were obvious in His infancy and childhood, a supposition which is easily made, since such features leave no echo in the accounts of His public life. The Infancy Gospels, which apparently arose only in certain areas of the bare data contained in the memory of the early life of Jesus by the use of the Old Testament and of the developed belief in His divine sonship and His Messiahship. Thus the infancy narratives are proclamations of His supernatural origin and character and anticipation of the revelation of Him as Messiah and Lord of both Jews and Gentiles. In Matthew the revelation meets with profound hostility; Luke does not exhibit this element. In both Matthew and Luke the infancy anticipates the passion and death of Jesus."

Ibid.

²⁵⁹"Such freedom in handling the material is in harmony with the purpose of the Gospels as a proclamation of faith, and with the characteristic literary feature of the Gospels by which they adapt the traditions to the belief of the Church which they set forth. Where material concerning the public life of Jesus was more abundant and the living memory of His person and words was more vivid, the Gospels do not employ a midrashic type of composition. But the composition of the Infancy Gospels does not differ in principle from the composition of the rest of the Gospels; they are intended to present the real Jesus as He was known by the Church, and differ from the rest of the Gospels only in that the material which was available was more scanty."

Ibid., pp. 387-88.

The Infancy Gospels remain therefore what the early Church intended. They witness the Christian faith. The dimension of the kerygma enables one to see that these narratives proclaim the person, character, and mission of Jesus, and that all of these are rooted in history.²⁶⁰

McKenzie's conclusions spring from the same exegetical principles advocated by Divino Afflante Spiritu, David Stanley, and Raymond Brown.²⁶¹ When applied specifically to long-cherished, pious, fundamentalist opinions, his conclusions become problematic for people uncertain of his underlying exegetical principles. When reading McKenzie's account of the Infancy Narratives, fundamentalists certainly see their faith in jeopardy, but readiness to listen to McKenzie's Scriptural explanation would prevent them from declaring war on the liberals. Seldom do fundamentalists listen, however, if they listen at all. McKenzie, a member of the school of liberal, scientific exegesis, and the fundamentalists seem separated by value systems. They illustrate a generation gap within the Church. Converts to the new generation appear seldom, and unfortunately, understanding minds and hearts appear just as seldom.

²⁶⁰"Complete historical skepticism concerning the infancy and childhood of Jesus is unjustified; the difference between Matthew-Luke and the apocryphal gospels is sufficient evidence of the restraint which was exercised in the composition of these narratives. The nature of the material likewise does not permit an uncritical acceptance of all features of these narratives as equally historical; as theological expansions they are intelligible, and in Christian tradition and cult have been of primary importance in forming the popular idea of the person, character, and mission of Jesus. This is precisely the purpose for which the Church composed them; and historical criticism, practiced with due reservations, does not alter this conception of Jesus nor remove any of the value of the Infancy Gospels as witnesses of the Christian faith."

Ibid., p. 388.

²⁶¹For example, a major exegetical principle underlying McKenzie's work is to determine the form and function of different units in the Gospels.

271

Bibliography

- bott, Walter M. America CXIII (Dec. 4, 1965) 720.
- ell, Book, and Candle," Commonweal LXXV (Oct. 13, 1961), 61.
- noit, Pierre. Revue Biblique LXXI (Oct. 1964), 631-32.
- nson, Alphonsus T. "Survey of Periodicals," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct. 1958), 527-28.
- iblical Drum Beaters," Commonweal LXXVI (Apr. 20, 1962), 77.
- erberg, R. P. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Oct. 1953), 382.
- urke, Myles M. "The Historicity of the Gospels," Thought XXXIX (Sept. 1964), 37-56.
- _____. "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (April, 1960), 160-75.
- own, Raymond E. "After Bultmann, What? -- An Introduction to the Post-Bultmannians," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVI (Jan. 1964) 1-30.
- _____. "Incidents That Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (Apr. 1961), 143-60.
- _____. "Our New Approach to the Bible," New Testament Essays. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965.
- _____. "The Problem of Historicity in John," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIV (Jan. 1962), 1-14.
- _____. "Three Quotations from John the Baptist in the Gospel of John," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (July, 1960), 292-98.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Jan. 1954), 108.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Oct. 1955), 525.
- stelot, John J. "The Historicity of the Gospels," (Unpublished.)
- arke, Thomas E. Theological Studies XVIII (Apr. 1957), 102.
- he Close of a Controversy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (July, 1961), 269.
- llins, John J. "Form Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels," Theological Studies II (Dec. 1941), 388-400.
- nnell, Francis J. American Ecclesiastical Review CXL (Jan. 1959), 34-36.
- ouncil Day Book. Vatican II, Session 1. Washington, D.C.,: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965.
- ouncil Day Book, Vatican II, Session 3. Washington, D.C.,: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965.

- ane, Thomas E. "Report of the Thirty-second General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXXI (Oct. 1969), 514-32
- vino Afflante Spiritu. Rome and the Study of Scripture. St. Meinrad, Indiana: Grail Publications, 1962.
- uments of Vatican II. New York: The American Press, 1966.
- lon, Stephen F. "The Form Critic, the Gospels and Saint Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly VI (Apr. 1944), 159-79; (Oct. 1944) 306-25.
- rd, William A. Catholic Biblical Quarterly IX (Jan. 1948), 107.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIII (Jan. 1950), 107
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIII (July, 1951), 233.
- lles, Avery "Jesus as the Christ." Thought XXXIX (Fall, 1964), 359-80.
- ncker, P. G. "Biblical Criticism," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXV (Jan. 1963), 22-33.
- nton, Joseph Clifford "Father Moran's Prediction," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLVI (Mar. 1962), 192-201.
- itzmyer, Joseph "The Biblical Commission's Instruction on the Historical Truth of the Gospels," Theological Studies XXV (Sept. 1964), 386-408.
- _____. "A Recent Roman Scriptural Controversy," Theological Studies XXII (Sept. 1961), 426-44.
- echter, Paul "Original Sequence of Apocalypse 20-22," Theological Studies X (Dec. 1949), 485-521.
- _____. "The Role of Memory in the Making of the Apocalypse," Theological Studies IX (Sept. 1948), 419-52.
- _____. "Semitic Literary Forms in the Apocalypse and their Import," Theological Studies VIII (Dec. 1917), 547-73.
- raham, Robert A. "Council Considers Contrasting Concepts," The Pilot, (Nov. 24, 1962), 1.
- ennedy, Gerald T. "The Holy Office Monitum on the Teaching of Scripture," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (Sept. 1961), 145-51.
- _____. "A Reply to Father Moran," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLVI (Mar. 1962), 181-91.
- _____. "Scripture Revisited: A Second Look at the Matter," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (July 1961), 1-14.
- ugelman, Richard Catholic Biblical Quarterly VII (July 1945), 370 .
- ummel, W. G. Introduction to the New Testament. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1966.

- gault, Andre. "An Application of the Form-Critique Method to the Anointings in Galilee and Bethany," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Apr. 1954), 131-45.
- vie, Jean. The Bible, Word of God in Words of Men. New York: P. J. Kennedy, 1962.
- lly, Joseph L. "The Idea of Redemption in the Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly IX (July, 1947), 255-61.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly VII (July 1945), 255.
- McKenzie, R.A.F. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Jan. 1954), 57.
- McRae, George "New Testament Theology -- Some Problems and Principles" Scripture XVI (Oct. 1964), 97-106.
- Evoy, John A. "Realized Eschatology and the Kingdom Parables," Catholic Biblical Quarterly IX (Oct. 1947) 329-57.
- _____. "The Thesis of Realized Eschatology. A Study in Form Criticism," Catholic Biblical Quarterly V (Oct. 1943), 396-407.
- Garry, William. "The 'New' Approach to Gospel Study," Thought XI (June, 1936), 86-106.
- Hinley, Laurence J. "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," Theological Studies II (Nov. 1941), 451-80.
- _____. "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," Theological Studies III (Jan. 1942), 47-68; (June 1942), 203-30.
- _____. "Hellenic Analogies and the Typical Healing Narratives," Theological Studies IV (Jan. 1943), 53-99.
- _____. Theological Studies VII (Dec. 1946), 594-5.
- _____. Theological Studies VIII (June, 1947), 311.
- Kenzie, John. "Authority and Power in the New Testament," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVI (Oct. 1964), 413-22.
- _____. Dictionary of the Bible. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965.
- _____. "Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3," Theological Studies XV (Dec. 1954), 541-72.
- _____. "Problems of Hermeneutics in Roman Catholic Exegesis," Journal of Biblical Literature LXXVII (Sept. 1958), 197-204.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (July, 1954), 255-56.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct. 1958), 576.
- _____. Theological Studies XI (Sept. 1950), 439-40.
- _____. Theological Studies XIV (May 1953), 300-03.

- Kenzie, John. Theological Studies XVIII (Jan 1957), 104
 _____ . Theological Studies XXVII (May 1966), 266-67.
- ngan, Edward A. Catholic Biblical Quarterly II (Apr. 1940), 188.
- reurie, Roger. "A Baptismal Motif in the Gospel Narratives of the Burial,"
Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (Jan. 1959), 39-54.
- ran, William L. "Father Kennedy's Exegesis of the Holy Office Monitum,"
American Ecclesiastical Review CXLVI (Mar 1962), 174-80.
- urphy, Roland. Commonweal LXXVI (June 8, 1962), 281.
- surille, Herbert A. Theological Studies XVI (Mar. 1955), 133.
- ewton, William L. "The Last Half-Century in Biblical Scholarship," America LXX
 (Nov 13, 1943), 152-54.
- ovak, Michael. The Open Church. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.
- Brien, Elmer. "Theological Trends of 1953," Thought XXIV (1954), 117-38.
- Keefe, Vincent T. "Towards Understanding the Gospels," Catholic Biblical
 Quarterly XXI (Apr 1959), 171-89.
 _____ . Theological Studies XIX (Sept 1958), 417.
- llett, Raymond "An Influence of the Early Liturgy upon the Emmaus Account,"
Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (Apr 1959), 212-19.
- airce, Francis X. "Form Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels," Ecclesiastical
 Review, XCIII (July 1935), 85-97.
 _____ . "The Problem of Jesus," Ecclesiastical Review XC (Jan 1934), 88-99.
- hilbin, Richard. "Some Modern Protestant Attitudes towards Hermeneutics,"
Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (Apr 1959) 115-35.
- ontifical Biblical Commission. "Instruction Concerning the Historical Truth
 of the Gospels," translated by Joseph Fitzmyer, Theological Studies XXV
 (Sept 1964), 402-8.
 _____ . "Monitum" Rome and the Study of Scripture. St. Meinrad, Indiana:
 Grail Publications, 1962
- uesnell, Quentin. "The Doctrine Taught in This Good News, plus four other
 propositions," (unpublished).
 _____ . This Good News Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1964.
- uinn, Jerome D. "St. Chrysostom on History in the Synoptics," Catholic Biblical
 Quarterly XXIV (Apr 1962), 140-47.
- itter, Vernon. Library Journal XC (Dec 15, 1965), 5400.

- meo, Antonio. "L'Enciclica 'Divine Afflante Spiritu' e le 'Opiniones Novae'," Divinitas IV (1960), 387-456.
- affini, Ernesto. "Literary Genres and Working Hypotheses in Recent Biblical Studies," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (Dec 1961), 362-65.
- rne, Xavier. Letters from Vatican City. New York: Farrar, Straus and Company, 1963.
- _____. The Third Session Farrar, Straus, and Company, 1964.
- legman, Edward F. "The Historicity of the Gospels," (unpublished).
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct. 1958), 571.
- _____. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Oct. 1958), 576.
- Sheehan, Patrick W. Catholic Biblical Quarterly III (July 1941), 370.
- olari, James K. Commonweal LXXVII (Nov. 2, 1962), 154-55.
- Sanley, David. "Balaam's Ass, or a Problem in New Testament Hermeneutics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Jan. 1958), 50-56.
- _____. "Carmenque Christe Quasi Deo Dicere," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (Apr 1958), 173-91.
- _____. "The Conception of Our Gospels as Salvation-History," Theological Studies XX (Dec 1959), 561-89.
- _____. "The Conception of Salvation in Primitive Christian Preaching," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (July 1956), 231-54.
- _____. "The Conception of Salvation in the Synoptic Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (Oct. 1956), 345-63.
- _____. "Didache as a Constitutive Element of the Gospel Form," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Apr 1955), 336-48.
- _____. "The Gospels as Salvation-History," Christianity Divided. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- _____. "Kingdom to Church: the Structural Development of Apostolic Christianity in the New Testament," Theological Studies XVI (Mar 1955), 1-29.
- _____. "Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (Jan 1959), 24-38.
- _____. "Mark and Modern Apologetics," The Bible Today (Oct 1962), 58-64.
- _____. "Methods of Teaching Scripture -- Teaching Matthew's Gospel," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Jan 1953), 35-53.
- _____. "The New Testament Basis for the Concept of Collegiality," Theological Studies XXV (June 1964), 197-216.
- _____. "The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism," Theological Studies XVIII (June 1957), 169-215.

anley, David. "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII, (Jan 1961), 26-39.

. "Paul's Conversion in Acts," The Apostolic Church in the New Testament. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1966.

. "Reflections on the Church in the New Testament," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXV (July 1963), 387-400.

. "Rudolf Bultmann -- Lutheran New Testament Critics," The Voice of Saint Mary's Seminary, (April 1957, 12ff.

. "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology and Its Transposition by St. Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVI (Oct 1954), 385-425.

. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Oct 1953), 393.

. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVII (Oct 1955), 655.

. Theological Studies XVII (Mar 1956), 250

einmueller, John. Catholic Biblical Quarterly VII (Jan 1945), 126.

uhlmueller, Carroll. "The Influence of Oral Tradition upon Exegesis and the Senses of Scripture," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XX (July 1958), 299-326.

Times Literary Supplement, (March 3, 1966), 177.

agnozzi, Egidio. "Thoughts on the Catholic Intellectual," American Ecclesiastical Review CXLV (Aug 1961), 73-79.

awter, Bruce. "The Historical Theology of the Gospels," (May 1962), 681-91.
Homiletic and Pastoral Review LXII

lsker, James. Catholic Biblical Quarterly XV (Jan 1953, 96.

eisengoff, John P. Catholic Biblical Quarterly LII (Jul 1948), 370.

ood, Geoffrey F. "Report of the Twenty-Fourth General Meeting of the Catholic Association of America," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXIII (Oct 1961), 465-72.