

PROCEEDINGS

FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
SOCIETY OF CATHOLIC COLLEGE
TEACHERS OF SACRED DOCTRINE

1955

PROCEEDINGS
FIRST ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
SOCIETY OF CATHOLIC COLLEGE TEACHERS
OF SACRED DOCTRINE

APRIL 11-13, 1955

Editor:
REVEREND URBAN VOLL, O.P.

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY
DUNBARTON COLLEGE OF HOLY CROSS
WASHINGTON 8, D.C.
1956

3 79SC XL
03/94 53-110-00

2387 

Nihil Obstat:

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P., S.T.D.

Censor Deputatus

Imprimatur:

✠ PATRICK A. O'BOYLE

Archbishop of Washington

December 9, 1955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST NATIONAL MEETING Trinity College, Washington, D.C.	
<i>Monday, April eleventh</i>	
ADDRESS OF WELCOME _____	5
Reverend Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., President	
<i>Tuesday, April twelfth</i>	
Morning Session	
<i>Chairman:</i> Reverend Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D. Trinity College, Washington, D.C.	
<i>Topic:</i> CURRICULUM PRINCIPLES OF THE COLLEGE COURSE IN SACRED DOCTRINE	
A. FROM CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS TO CHRIST IN THE CHURCH _____	10
Reverend Gerard S. Sloyan, Ph.D. Catholic University of America	
B. THE THOMISTIC APPROACH IN COLLEGE THEOLOGY ...	26
Reverend Thomas C. Donlan, O.P., S.T.D. Dominican College of St. Rose Dubuque, Iowa	
C. THE HISTORICAL SCRIPTURAL APPROACH IN COLLEGE THEOLOGY _____	34
Reverend John J. Fernan, S.J., S.T.L. Le Moyne College Syracuse, New York	
<i>Note:</i> Open discussion from the floor followed. This report was incorporated however into the afternoon report.	
Afternoon Session	
<i>Chairman:</i> Reverend Edward E. Finn, S.J., S.T.L. Saint Louis University	
A. Discussion of Father Sloyan's Paper	24
Recorder: Brother B. Albert, F.S.C., M.A. De La Salle College Washington, D.C.	
B. Discussion of Father Donlan's Paper	29
Recorder: Reverend Urban Voll, O.P., S.T.L. Trinity College Washington, D.C.	
C. Discussion of Father Fernan's Paper	42
Recorder: Reverend Bernard Murray, S.J., S.T.L. Canisius College Buffalo, New York	
<i>Note:</i> An evening session which discussed further explorations of the possibilities and problems involved in the applica- tion of each curriculum principle, since it involved only in- formal seminars, was not recorded.	

Wednesday, April thirteenth

PAGE

Morning Session

Chairman: Brother Alban of Mary, F.S.C., Ph.D.
Manhattan College, New York

Topic: THE PROBLEM OF TRAINING TEACHERS OF
THEOLOGY AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL 49
Mother Marie Therese, O.S.U., M.A.
College of New Rochelle

A. THE PROBLEM AS IT CONCERNS THE RELIGIOUS TEACH-
ING BROTHER 65
Brother Celestine Luke, F.S.C., S.T.L.
De La Salle College
Washington, D.C.

B. THE PROBLEM AS IT CONCERNS THE PRIEST-PROFESSOR 70
Reverend John Harvey, O.S.F.S., S.T.D.
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
Washington, D.C.

Discussion:

Recorder: Sister M. Charles Borromeo, C.S.C., Ph.D. 75
Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana

Afternoon Session

Chairman: Reverend Eugene Gallagher, S.J., S.T.L.
Georgetown University

Topic: PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS CONCERN-
ING ADJUSTMENT OF THE COLLEGE CURRI-
CULUM IN SACRED DOCTRINE FOR STUDENTS
WITH INADEQUATE RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Note: Since the discussion by the delegates was informal, it was
not recorded.

BUSINESS MEETING AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Report of National Secretary 83

Report of National Treasurer 85

Report of Committee on Resolutions 86

Report of Committee on Nominations 88

APPENDIX

History of the Society 90

Constitution 93

Delegates to the First Annual Convention 100

Membership of the Society as of April 13, 1955 104

Regional Chairmen 112



FIRST ANNUAL MEETING
TRINITY COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.
APRIL 11-13, 1955

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

FIRST NATIONAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY

First of all I should like to extend to you all a very warm welcome to the first national meeting of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine. All of us who have been working in this movement have been enormously encouraged and warmed by your response to our invitation and for that response and enthusiasm we are more than grateful and feel ourselves fully repaid.

Our thanks are also due to His Excellency, the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, the Archbishop of Washington, by whose permission and under whose patronage this meeting is being held. He had hoped to be able to offer our opening Mass tomorrow morning but was prevented by other business.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the administration of Trinity College for extending their facilities to us and for their generous cooperation in planning this meeting.

And speaking of gratitude, may I say that I personally am deeply indebted to the officers of the Society and to the Board of Directors for their happy willingness to give of both time and patience to our many meetings during the year. I am especially indebted to Sister Rose Eileen, C.S.C. and to Brother Luke, F.S.C. who have poured energy and effort into our organizational efforts. As you yourselves are aware, the kind of physical drudgery involved in our organizational work is inconceivable at the salaries we are paying! It could only have its source in a deep devotion to and a belief in the objectives of our Society. A special word of tribute is due to Sister Rose Eileen who not only kept the innumerable details of the national office in effective control but had the patience and the charity to keep the President in personal relation with the details which—as any one who deals with the President knows—is a major task in itself.

The envelope which you received as you registered contains a summary report on the regional questionnaires concerning the actual courses being taught in Sacred Doctrine in the various

colleges. We look upon this as the first in a series of informational studies which will assist the membership in their work. This particular report should, I think, prove extremely valuable in getting an over-all picture of what is being done and to some extent how it is being done. It suggests a number of fruitful possibilities for further study in this field and underlines a number of our common problems—all of which brings me to the main purpose of tonight's address—a statement of the function of this society in the light of the past year's experience and looking to the future in the light of this experience.

First of all, I think it is evident that a Society such as this draws its energy and vitality from the ideal which gave it birth. That ideal it seems to me is nothing else than the effective transmission of the content and motivations of Christian revelation into the educational formation of the Catholic college student. But if this ideal is to be actualized then we must be abidingly aware that like every other educational vision it will be the work of many hands. It must be the joint labor of a large body of Catholic teachers who are personally conscious that each of them is a coadjutor of God's redemptive purposes. Only if in unity of mind and spirit we channel our human resources and energies into the service of this Christian teaching vocation will the ideal that first brought us together begin to be clothed with reality.

Because this movement is essentially a free, cooperative effort and calls for mutual and continuing assistance, then I think it is necessary at this point to re-affirm and make explicit what has been present in our thoughts from the very beginning. It is not our intention nor purpose to set ourselves up as a kind of accrediting agency passing judgment on various individual programs in Sacred Doctrine. We certainly do not have any authority for such a function and we have neither the ambition nor the desire to take to ourselves such a function. The standardization of textbooks, principles, courses, hours is not envisaged in any way as a part of our work. Personally, I feel, that the pointing of this Society in such a direction would render sterile its true possibilities as a common meeting place where the teachers of Sacred Doctrine can deal with their field as teachers and co-workers in a saving enterprise. This does not mean, however, that we should abandon or avoid all attempts to formulate standards. Rather it looks to formulating standards that are the

result of mutual experience and discussion and take their authority from their common acceptance by the members as inescapable necessities of sound and effective teaching in our common field. For the permanent standards that this Society should seek to raise are those that live in the mind of the teacher. Indeed, a society such as this, if it is to be properly effective, by its very nature as a mutual effort, should transmit to its members a vital conviction of the sacred dignity and eternal importance of being ministers of the word of God in the classrooms. The work we do makes us wielders of the sword of the Spirit in a way in which no other subject or discipline can compare. In our classes in Sacred Doctrine each of us, under God, is dealing directly with the truths of salvation and therefore the eternal destinies of our students. Thus the seriousness with which this Society looks upon its objectives is the first and essential step whereby its members become conscious of the dignity and the eternal consequences of this work.

Moreover, the high calling that is ours and the direct relation that it bears to the power of God unto salvation carries with it another consequence containing deep implications. It demands unequivocally that the only service worthy of our subject is a service on the level of excellence. Accordingly our Society has no choice but to emphasize, through the thousand paths of mutual cooperation, the ideal and reality of the excellence that befits our particular teaching vocation—an ideal of true Catholic professional competence—a competence that is worthy of the divine service of which we are the living instrument and chosen witnesses. In the great classical phrase, it is a competence that is “built foursquare without flaw in hand and foot and mind.”

Specifically such a sense of Christian craftsmanship could well be the starting point for remedying a problem that is apparent in the results of our questionnaire—the supply of textbooks. For here we have brought into one society a large reservoir of teaching experience that can be tapped by an individual member planning or writing a textbook. Through the medium of the membership he can cross check his own experience and elaborate on his own findings. Those who have already published texts can turn here for a large body of constructive criticism and aid

in developing answers to enlarging needs in new editions and printings.

Again the common purpose which unites us should open the way to many opportunities for developing teacher formation opportunities. The exploration of needs and opportunities in this field we are beginning during this meeting, but the full work remains to be done and here again we have an organization that offers innumerable channels through which our Catholic resources and manpower can be brought to bear upon this much needed development.

Then too, there is the whole area of the interrelation of the courses in Sacred Doctrine with the rest of the college program. Obviously, this problem must remain on many levels a local problem to be met individually by the individual college. But surely in a society composed primarily of teachers there is a true possibility of finding a basic pattern whereby the body of revealed truth may enter into a true marriage with the facts of our complex educational structure. Controlled and careful experiment, a variety of efforts in many situations must be brought together to serve this end. Willingness to submit our particular efforts to critical analysis, readiness to use the work and experience of others, and evaluating all in the light of the true purpose of Catholic education, these constitute a fundamental exigency here. It is my hope that honest and extensive discussion through the media made available by this society might well be, in the providence of God, the beginning of this much needed pattern in our educational efforts. For the object of a Catholic education is determined by the fact that there is a real and necessary relation between educational formation and the revealed truths on man's destiny. It is this truth which determines the whole character of Catholic education and its methods of training the student for life. For a Catholic education even in fitting a student for a particular calling must always postulate the over-all purpose of fitting him to live the truly human life intended by God. Since, however, the distinctive mark of human life is the life of reason, the consequent object of education, and I would hold the primary object, is the training of the intellect to receive the truths he must know to achieve his purpose. Correct thinking must proceed correct acting; otherwise, even if the acts be good, they are ineffective and in the long run will suc-

cumb to incorrect patterns of thought. Without right ideas and sound understanding on such things as man and his destiny, God and society, there is no integral thought on vital problems. And without integrated thought there may be knowledge but not education. "It is necessary," writes Pius XI, "that all teaching, and the whole organization of the school, and teachers, syllabus and textbooks in every branch be regulated by the Christian spirit so that religion may truly be the foundation and crown of the youth's entire training; and this in every grade of school, not only the elementary, but the intermediate and higher institutions of learning as well".

Such, then, are a few of the possibilities which, in the light of this year's experience, I believe to be within our power of accomplishment. They are not, I would say, a matter of the immediate future but rather a part of the concrete planning that should inform the common efforts of this society on both the national and regional levels. But above all it is my belief that the wellspring of all this must be the ever growing realization on the part of each of us of the immense responsibility and the correlative Christian joy involved in being a teacher of Sacred Doctrine. For this is not just a profession but a rich and central and abiding Catholic vocation. For a teacher of Sacred Doctrine is not only a living channel whereby our Christian heritage is transmitted but a fashioner and maker of souls. Into his or her hands has been placed a tremendous and awesome power—to mark the lives of men and women in terms of their eternal destiny. But to be effective this power must be informed by an enthusiasm for the subject and its place in the whole Christian program. And I am convinced that the ability to convey this enthusiasm is the basic difference between dull and interesting classes. This enthusiasm will not supply for technique nor is it a substitute for training and knowledge in our field. These are demanded at the highest level if we take our vocation seriously—a true enthusiasm will not be satisfied with less. But the imparting of life and force to our teaching must rest on enthusiasm that springs from conviction, is controlled by intelligence, marked by competence, blessed by patience and never loses sight of the fact that as Dante writes, "the blessedness of this life consists in the proper exercise of man's power".

THE REVEREND EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.,
Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

FROM CHRIST IN THE GOSPEL TO CHRIST IN THE CHURCH

When Father Burke invited me here this morning, I had previously seen the proposed program, and my heart did not soar at the seeing. I told him so. I indicated that I thought an infant organization might do better to stress those things which its members do commonly than those which they do differently. It seemed to me that our earliest discussion ought to center around those persons who come to Catholic colleges and in what frames of mind; what the relation ought to be between doctrine-study and that worship-life to which it is contributory during the college years in which the study is being carried on; what is the mentality of those in ecclesiastical and religious authority with regard to doctrine teachers, of Catholic college administrators with regard to doctrine study, beyond the general pious hope that the work should be done well.

Father Burke assured me that all these things would likely come up, but that he was only falling in with the expressed desires of the many members who wished to discuss curriculum first. He said he did not think that this would serve as a principle of division so much as of ultimate unification.

Being antecedently disposed to agree with his judgments on things, I then said that it would be a pleasure to come just so long as I would not have to misrepresent myself or serve as standard-bearer for any views I do not hold. I wanted to be here, yet did not wish to convey the notion that the Catholic University of America undergraduate schools had any approach to the teaching of doctrine entirely special to them. That is why I selected the title that I did. It is true that Monsignor John M. Cooper's series of textbooks, which many connect with the University at the college level, were pioneer works. But we will act more reasonably if we praise them as a glorious achievement of a former day than if we as a University take any special credit for them as a solution to today's problems.

Monsignor Cooper was extremely good to me in life, but strangely I never heard him speak on the subject of religion teaching. It was always scholarly method or anthropology. Both in uni-

versity lectures and in private conversations, those were the topics which happily brought me in touch with him. After he was dead I taught for a year using his Volume I, and I came to realize the meaning of a quip of an old colleague of his: "Any eighth grade child can understand the large print, and there aren't three theologians in America who would care to take their stand on all the questions in the small print." Monsignor Cooper had, it seems to me, two special gifts to recommend him in this field: a fine insight into the kind of young man who was attending Catholic colleges of the 20's and 30's, and a first-class ideal of research. In a sense, the picture in neither case is notably altered. Yet in a deeper sense, both have changed sufficiently to tell against his overall effectiveness in our decade. College populations are more sophisticated nowadays, more heterogeneous, and if they happen to have been listening in high school, more broadly educated, but not by school only. They still need to be sent to reference works but to newer and fresher ones than Cooper suggested. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and the old *American Ecclesiastical Review* articles make no concessions whatever to collegiate ignorance of the vocabulary and method of theology, and these two coupled with pamphlets no longer available serve as Cooper's chief sources. Rightly or wrongly, college students think that a textbook should itself be a source work and they do not respect one that is not, regardless of what intellectual treasure-trove it may direct them to.

There was this about John M. Cooper, though. He knew that if you weren't really talking to student populations, it was an indifferent matter how important or well-ordered those things were that you happened to be telling them. This basic fact of college life many teachers learned from him. It is still there to be learned in his four textbooks.

About Monsignor William Russell: his influence on certain college teachers was immense. Similarly he was the one moving experience of thousands of men and women, as they looked back on their college religion courses. But he was a specialist, both in the college and in the graduate school. He taught the earthly life of Christ, nothing else, largely to juniors in the third year of the Cooper sequence. He had a Christocentric approach to religion teaching in this sense: that no matter what he taught, it always sounded like the Gospel. If he had to pinch-hit for an

ill instructor, say in a course on Christian morality, and learned that justice and rights were under discussion, Aertnys-Damen and Prümmer would just have to sit on the sidelines. The students were going to hear about Levi, the ex-extortioner, about settling up with your brother before you gave your gift at the altar, and Judas whose chief imperfection was that he was a thief. A course on marriage would hear about Nazareth and Peter's mother-in-law. You may be scandalized at the imprecision of his thinking, but he thought that what was good enough for the Son of Man was good enough for him. His whole attempt was terribly basic, even modest. From the fact that his enthusiasm for the Master was infectious, the efforts of all the department members became Christ-centered. In following traditional theological sequences and treatments, as we were all doing except we happened to be teaching the gospels, we became conscious of any succession of class days when we had failed to relate Catholic doctrine to that Person who gave rise to it all.

I explained to Father Burke that it is probably truer to the facts to call Father Fernan's sequence Christocentric than so to denominate ours. He kept saying that there is a widespread general impression, chiefly the result of Monsignor Russell's writings, that there is some special *Geist* differentiating our departmental efforts, and he thought that the plan deserved a hearing. I answered that since we followed neither the Thomist sequence nor the Le Moyne plan, at least that much about it was distinctive with reference to this morning's discussion. Besides, I might be able to serve here as spokesman for what is happening in perhaps half the colleges of the country, with variations. New England and Maryland Province Jesuits, the Holy Cross Fathers at Notre Dame, and many colleges conducted by sisters should find in my remarks a point of departure for their own contributions, if only to find merit in the departure.

In our Department of Religious Education we teach undifferentiated Catholic students two hours weekly for four years. Exceptions are comprised only of religious brother and seminarian undergraduates who do not take such courses. Religious sisters among the undergraduates are few, other than those who study nursing. They normally do take college work in sacred doctrine. Two-year nursing candidates for degrees who arrive

possessing their R.N.'s study religion for two years as a degree requirement. Most often they opt for the freshman and the senior courses. Their overall seriousness renders them a joy to teach. Field work in their second year makes the imposing of a certain sequence on them a near impossibility. Five-year architecture students normally study doctrine as freshmen and sophomores; they do broken field running through the remaining four semesters of religion depending on the agony of current pressures from calculus, design, etc. Four-year nursing students take a year and a half of religion at the start, then leave the campus for a hospital where they pursue medical ethics in course. This is more properly Catholic morality with its sanction in revelation than a simply philosophic treatment. What I cannot approve is the doctrinal dosage at half strength of these young professional women, but then I have never had to argue with state and District nursing boards.

There are in almost every class section a few non-Catholics taking religion because they believe heartily in Christianity, Orthodox or Protestant, and do not wish to satisfy the four-semester natural religion requirement in a classroom with totally uninformed and sometimes resentful people. There are Latin Americans of every sort of background and present linguistic status. We do not have, as you sisters do, many Orientals of recent baptism and total inscrutability.

This student population follows a sequence of courses entitled *Learning Christ, Believing Christ, Living Christ, and Restoring All Things in Christ*. The titles may confuse registrars when they appear on transcripts, but they are a quite faithful description of what the courses are concerned with. The respective years have to do with the earthly life of Christ; the dogmas of faith in the usual order—the One God through to eschatology; Catholic moral conduct; and a refinement of that dogmatic-moral teaching which applies to the social order and family living. There is no basic confusion in the department about the triune nature of God. The course titles do not mean to imply that our Lord alone stalks every page or is the theme of every lecture. It is as simple as this: that Catholic faith is membership, new life in Him. Consequently, the step fundamental to an advanced study of faith is an exact knowledge of Him whom we follow, whose disciples we are. To learn what His teaching has de-

veloped into over the years, namely a conciliar and theological edifice, is the logical second step, and this knowledge is gained by believing Him when He reveals—first in His own Person while with us and later through that Church which is none other than Himself. The third move is in the direction of living the life revealed. Christian conduct is the achieving of likeness to Christ, for which it is required to know with exactness all that life in Him should mean, whether by command, counsel, theological opinion, or ecclesiastical law. This course is necessarily one in the exercise of the virtues; the minimum observance required is described when necessary. Last in order comes careful attention to those spheres wherein the great majority of lay students must work out their salvation. I speak, of course, of the temporal order with its demand for Christian solutions to political, economic and other social questions; and more specifically of the married state in which sole school of asceticism most students will be enrolled. The transmission of solid learnings about God's revelation through Christ and in the Spirit is a useless exercise unless aid is given to students to make precise application of these Mystery truths to their lives. One is free to say that if theological learning in depth has marked the previous courses no such contrived or obvious "application" is necessary. We respect his freedom, but do not ourselves run the risk of leaving this huge task of integration to youthful powers. Those who say "We cover that matter in ethics and sociology," we must accuse of failing to grasp what is meant by the profound Christianization of all human institutions. It is no secret that persons of thorough good will and even those in pursuit of perfection may, in today's turbulent world, harbor blindness or downright misconceptions when it comes to judging life situations practically. The need of such a terminal course as we offer is confirmed by the fact that many alumni volunteer that it gave point for them to all that went before.

It will be seen that the above sequence is a highly traditional dogmatic-moral synthesis which proceeds from a careful knowledge of Christ in His role of Revealer and Brother. It hopes to be positive, non-polemical, and contributory to progress in perfection. None of those goals renders it emotion-prone or non-theological. In all departments where there are numerous instructors, a card of clear-cut course offerings is the best guar-

antee of that homogeneous and progressive knowledge that can lead to wisdom. When three, eight or eighteen men can be brought around to approve a special pedagogic approach or, better, develop one, there you have a fortunate department. Unsure of that possibility because of personnel changes and differences in temperament among us, we hold to the suitability for college purposes of those divisions among the sacred sciences which have long found favor. What we hope to do is acquire some of that *kerygmatic* spirit of Monsignors Cooper and Russell whereby theological instruction is made as fruitful as possible at the undergraduate level. At our best, we are heralds of the Message of Christ.

There is a conviction among us that the optimum presentation of the Christian message is in the form of classical theology (whether scholastic or more severely Thomistic) for a small and selected group of students. We have not succeeded as an undergraduate college is making that selection. Until we do, it seems wise to fit our program to the mentality and abilities of the far greater number. Monsignor Cooper's contribution of three decades ago was to play the prophet's role among fellow-educators. He was an active conscience reminding them to study the student, his problems and environment, and the problems and culture of his day. It is not quite so sure that Monsignor Cooper realized that the need of students then as now was for solidly theological teaching (and not by indirection).

While steady progress is being made toward meeting the need and away from simple exhortation, the necessity continues—indeed grows—for a better grasp by teachers of how dogma may be made to serve as a motivating force to virtue. There is no subordination here of divine truth to human action. God has revealed nothing about Himself for the sake of intellectual contemplation only. He has taken us into His confidence so as to achieve His further glory and our perfection. Study of the Christian Message is incumbent on believers that they may praise and love the more. College students need to probe such depths of revelation as they are individually able for the best ordering of their interior lives, that is, for growth in wonder and an increase of prayer and loving deeds. In other words, the content of revelation must be presented to them with a view to its optimum receptivity and their optimum response. It is too easy

to say, "A straight theological approach is best. Must you spoon-feed them forever?" That is a clear position, it is forthright, it sounds like the strongest vote of confidence one could make in college people. It also shirks several major problems of communication in a matter which is at least as much one of the heart as of the mind.

To sum up: an intimate knowledge of Christ is at the core of all faithful adherence to divine teaching; at the college level it should not be presumed on, by-passed, or made incidental learning. Once the task of knowing Him has been attempted (and it includes a defense of the documentary corpus from which His earthly career is known, an exploration of the dispensation which He fulfilled), a systematized study of His teaching as it has developed over twenty centuries seems obligatory. Lastly, the problems of the Church today, the challenge to members of Christ in today's unstable industrialized world must be identified and faced, at least in the discussion stage.

I should like to conclude by expressing the conviction that the best of classroom instruction can be neutralized by inadequate worship situations on the same campus (I speak of the Church's liturgy, not multiplied private pieties however publicly fostered). It can be defeated wholly by a prevailing absence of a spirit of charity.

This afternoon it is expected of us, I believe, to indicate briefly how the curriculum pattern we favor is to be put to use in the actual situations in which we find ourselves. After hearing Fathers Fernan and Donlan this morning I concluded that my presentation was not nearly theoretical enough (in that word's best sense) to satisfy the terms of the invitation. Having unburdened myself at 10 a.m. of all the sentiments proper to 2 p.m., I nonetheless proceed, both because there seems little else to do and because it is a pleasure to talk school with teachers out of school.

In a printed piece on the subject in last January's *Catholic Educational Review* I tried to summarize the various attitudes collegians have toward study in general and religion study in particular. May I summarize them even further here? The population of any given class section in religion is extremely varied. The fervent ex-G.I. is sitting next to the blasé nineteen year-old who is already drinking more beer than is good for him. The

love-struck female resents the contrived intrusion into her life between Sunday night and Friday afternoon, while a boy who hopes to be a chemist is spending much of his spare time working with a local Friendship House. They have had no religion study since Confirmation and are devout; they have had none since First Communion and are skeptical. They left Catholic high after sophomore year and know all about religion; they have just finished twelve years of religious schooling and are pleased now at the prospect of study in depth. Theoretical considerations attract them; theoretical considerations mystify and even annoy them. Discussion of religion must be down-to-earth, practical; it must be sublime; it must leave them undisturbed; it must be concerned only with them and their problem or else it does not qualify as religion.

Given the variety of student mentalities, the question of sectioning according to intelligence, background, and zeal for the things of God immediately arises. In the article referred to I favor such a division of students into a "major" and "minor" course, wholly without reference to secondary school performance or opportunities. This division into two groups is planned for the beginning of the second semester of freshman year. First semester instructors are to make the election, which is not to be thought of as absolutely fixed for the next three and one-half years. Needless to say, the whole college staff under its dean or deans must sanction such a course of action. The problem of scheduling undiversified sections is already sufficiently involved. This requires giving a privileged place to religion study, a thing which many educators publicly favor and privately do nothing about.

Failing the possibility of such differentiation (and it is proposed chiefly in the interest of the cheated top ten per cent), I think that the introductory course in gospel study meets the situation rather well. I admire those colleges which have the courage to begin a four-year sequence with the Old Testament. The story of salvation should begin at the beginning, and a chronological beginning seems to me more suited to young minds than an ontological. Our own system is to do the story of covenant and preparation by way of retrospect from the Gospels and Acts, surely a less satisfactory arrangement. The chief argument against a term on the Old Testament, however, is the im-

patience of the young, for whom the nourishment provided by patriarchs, Law and prophets is not quite enough. Many of them are confused intellectually and are in a whirlpool of emotion for those four months. The utter logicity of a certain sequence then ceases to be the thing of first importance. Admittedly the classroom is not equipped to meet every personal problem, but a widespread generalization which is seemingly valid should prevail in a matter so important as this. The correct conclusion that religion should have meaning for life may take an immature turn among the immature, but it should not be despised when we happen to be dealing with them. Also there is the fact that a good percentage of students will leave after one semester, either for poor scholarship or in bafflement or in anger. The intellectual-religious needs of these less favored transients must be given some special thought.

A course in the gospels has the advantage of being sufficiently fresh to the best prepared (through stress on the scientific scriptural element), and at the same time attractive to those with the least talent for abstract thought (by dint of the arresting personality of Christ in His life situations). The attack on the genuineness of the gospels as an historic record will reach the ears of thinking students soon, if questions have not privately risen in their minds already. This challenge is met by establishing early the character of the documents of primitive Christianity, both as trustworthy history and as inspired writing. There must also be adequate treatment of the nature and possibility of the miraculous. From the first lectures the essential note of the Church as authoritative in divine matters must be dealt with, since the four gospel accounts came into being only as reflective of the faith of that Church. This engagement with basic problems of apologetics and ecclesiology leaves many unmoved, especially those who have settled all such problems to their own satisfaction in high school. The others are gratified to see these questions, the subject perhaps of youthful skepticism or adult attack in their hearing, methodically examined. From the preparatory study about the gospels, the course moves rather quickly into the text itself. There is danger in over-proving to the point of dullness. Bible-reading proper is required before many students get the point of rationalist attack, or grasp the nature of the defense.

We have been using the Knox New Testament for the past few years, and Ricciotti's *Life of Christ* as a commentary. For a number of years before that it was Hartdegen's *Harmonized Version of the Gospels*. The fact that it did not contain the rest of the New Testament was the chief reason for its disappearance, though having to translate many Confraternity phrases into English had a little to do with it. I consider the absence of a harmonized scheme a real loss. It was a great help in conveying the synoptic question and an understanding of the Church's long familiarity with what students sometimes think is a personal discovery of "discrepancy." Ricciotti needs no praise from me for his skilled handling of geography, history, archeology and the rest. His commentary is not professedly theological. Sometimes his explanations or observations seem shallow to persons well versed in exegetical studies. Yet I know no over-all commentary I prefer—except perhaps Father Fernan's Volume I. This is a work of another order, however, being less explicit as to scholarly detail and interweaving apologetic and theological considerations as well; also, it concludes short of Christ's Passion, which tells against it in our scheme.

The main idea in our gospel study is to make Christ come alive for students, serving them in the same roles as He served His contemporaries: priest and redeemer chiefly, but also teacher (prophet), guide and sovereign master (king), companion, hero, friend. We have no hesitancy in trying—only trying, mind you—to make our Lord do in the classroom what He did in Palestine. It is true, of course, that the sacramental liturgy is the place where He achieves identical effects, but this takes place in proportion to the intensity with which He is known and thereby cleaved to. The classroom is eminently the place for that knowledge. What He said, all that He did in His land and among His people is the year's concern. Believers in the Church can not read his words except in a context of Catholic faith. Consequently the effort of the freshman year is twofold: to see what His speech and action could have meant when it fell on ears for the first time—Jewish ears, Pharisee-influenced; and to see what they mean in the light of the theological development His message has since undergone. All Catholic belief and practice has its starting-place in the life of Christ. That makes this freshman course one to which nothing Christian is entirely alien.

All human behavior, the gamut of temptation, of virtue, striving and sin, have their perfect archetypes somewhere in the gospel account. That is why every class period can give rise to some discussion of student concerns without any strain whatever.

"At the heart of this religious life," writes Joseph Huby, having described a union of love with God and His Christ, and a visible institution with officers, worship, rites, "there must always be the person of Christ; so that entering the Kingdom of God is the same thing as receiving Christ, following Him, cleaving to his person in the depths of one's soul and obeying His visible representatives whom he helps with his Spirit."

The sole reservation I have against the Life of Christ course as introductory to theological study is that it is thought to be familiar matter by many freshmen. In fact, however, most of them do not fully believe in His manhood or realize its instrumentality in the redemptive scheme. Also, the development of revelation within His public career is quite new to them. Nuance in His speech and action is a total revelation. Despite all this many discount what they may have heard before—parables, miracles, apologetic points—and on the strength of this can not be made to attend seriously to the history, interpretation and other elements that are entirely fresh.

In light of the urge I have to attempt a two-track college course, there follows below a tentative program for all to follow in the first semester. On the basis of interest and performance they would be separated, to study the gospels in the second term in a more compact form and at two levels of theological challenge. This hypothetical introductory semester would deal with ten large theological areas (an arbitrary figure) which are presumably of special student interest. Two classes would be devoted to each topic, in most cases three were felt necessary. The class pattern should be one of questioning assumptions and putting difficulties in full view. Many more matters should be raised as problematical than are immediately solved. The purposes of this approach are several. One is to sow seeds of confidence in students that the big questions are known as questions, not as matters to be answered in panic or haste before their mysteriousness is acknowledged. Another is to let students talk freely and pose the questions they will—often a departure from their previous religion study. Likewise they need to learn empiri-

cally that student-centered courses are not as satisfactory as they think them to be. The myth is not laid, normally, by the fiat of an imposed sequence of offerings. This method is proposed in place of the specified first course. Lastly, students need to be acquainted forcibly with the need they have as individuals for solid theological knowledge. The discussion will run thin and become an opinion-reef soon enough to satisfy most of them on this point. The areas will indicate why the best instructors in the department should be assigned to the work:

1. The reasons for Catholic colleges. Hazards to faith in other colleges vs. the narrowness engendered by an atmosphere where there is no challenge to religion. Apostolic spirit, and its lack, in Catholic colleges; in Newman clubs. Factors which weaken faith, in Catholic colleges.

2. The modern problem of the supremacy claimed for conscience in morals, religion. The matter of being of the Church, and not being. God's "fairness" in distributing the gift of Catholic faith.

3. Academic freedom for students, for faculty. Prohibitions on reading. Journalistic freedom in college. Student rights, obligations.

4. Cheating in academic work. Stealing library books. Seeming Catholic blind-spot in urban political life. Codes of honor.

5. Boy-girl relations, with a special view to the likelihood or unlikelihood of early marriage.

6. Drinking in college. Alcoholism. Dangers to health in college years (sleeping, eating, smoking patterns).

7. Contraception. Abortion. Moral obligations attendant on family-increase.

8. Morality and art: books, films, plays.

9. Mental health. Means to regain it, once threatened or lost.

10. Reasons proposed against belief in God and the supernatural. The problem of pain.

Now, that will immediately be seen to be mostly in the realm of conduct. Some will say that their students do not seem to have at least five of the areas as personal problems in any sense upon entering college; or again, that dates with young skeptics and non-Catholics (two quite distinct groups) require that mat-

ters 2. and 10. be settled definitely before there can be any progress on the other questions. I am not disturbed about the order of attack, however, or for the moment with the hierarchy of importance of the areas listed. I only point out that if a successful apologetic onslaught is envisioned by any hearer, then my plan disappears. Its chief purpose is to establish the *need* for systematic theological attack. Also, to give evidence that a climate of freedom exists. The solutions come later. Since hundreds of hours of student discussion will intervene in any case, there is little to fear if some big questions go temporarily begging for solutions.

* * *

In the dogmatic and moral years of study, our men have used the works of Canon George Smith and Hesburgh, Marmion and Howell, Trese, Roguet, Sheedy and Aelred Graham. His own class notes comprising a small textbook or enchiridion will be used by one instructor, *Mystici Corporis* or *Casti Connubii* by another. Cooper's volumes remain among us for some moral study. The point seems to be that the traditional theological tracts are the favored scheme, with the aid of such compressed philosophical groundwork as time allows. Students in our College of Arts and Sciences take six semesters of philosophy (metaphysics not required); engineers an introductory course for two semesters; some nurses ethics only, two semesters. We therefore do best to presume on no proximate preparedness in philosophy. This helps to keep students from confusing natural inquiry with divine revelation, and not accord the sanctions of the latter to the former. But it also places a heavy responsibility on instructors to beware the pitfalls of fideism, i.e., supernaturalism without cause. The time available for study seems to dictate a historical and liturgical approach to dogma. It puts a teacher on guard against speculating overly, in view of the incapacities of students. It also cheats those who long to speculate. (See proposed two-track system above).

The treatment of Christian morality is concerned more with the ascetic needs of laymen in pursuit of perfection than the needs of confessors. This makes a very stiff challenge for instructors because case-solving in moral theology is so neat and sure. I shall take no foolish position against the *absolute im-*

portance to students of a knowledge of law, conscience, circumstances affecting freedom, etc. I simply make the obvious point that the reason *why* Christians must attempt holiness ride high above the immediate *how* of the attempt. The latter is a snare, and it has won its victories from kindergarten through to graduate theological study. The unique character of Cooper's books and especially of Sheedy's at this late date establishes something or other, I think.

A final paragraph or two concerns the work of seniors in the social order and marriage: their attitudes toward the parish, money, job, the world, and romantic love. Cardinal Suhard's *The Church Today* is used as a text for one term; Canon Leclercq's *Marriage: A Great Sacrament*, much augmented, serves for the other. The major struggle is against apathy and unconsciously non-Christian positions. An instructor's intensity can be a sore trial for students convinced they have nothing to declare. It can be equally hard for the convinced senior to hear the obvious belabored so thoroughly. An amusing side-issue is the occasional annoyance of students who feel called to priesthood, religious life or (as some are convinced) the single life, at the fact that marriage is so dissected and praised. The ascetical implications of this union are still far from being grasped by the whole Body of Christ. I think there is little immediate danger among us of the pitfall the papacy has warned against of a false *mystique* of marriage. The dangers are still of neglect, and threaten to be for a long time to come.

In the social sphere, it is especially hard to share convictions with young persons whose precise handicap is that their experience of the social order is so limited. Much of their information is at third hand, their outlook built on vicarious living. Still, vicariously they must learn in lecture halls something of moral indignation at the wrong and courage to fight for the right. That requires a teacher who is much in touch with life, one whose views are not synthetic or lightly held. Ultimately it will be a question of life's catching up with the responses and the moral choices which were once declared good. The declaration will have force, however, only if life seems to have supplied it to the teller.

That should about do for this attempt of mine to be concrete while far from the classroom. I hope the classes are a little more

so. Try to realize that I have been only one person handicapped as we all are by attending his own classes only. Reporting accurately on the deeds of one's colleagues is a much harder matter than teaching.

¹ Joseph Huby, "Early Christianity in the Historical Setting," in J. Bivort de la Saudée, *God, Man and the Universe* (New York: Kenedy, 1953), p. 260.

REVEREND GERARD S. SLOYAN,
The Catholic University of America

DISCUSSION

Bro. Celestine Luke, De La Salle College: In your curriculum program, what is the role of the Church as the proximate source of revelation?

Fr. Sloyan: It is an incorrect notion to separate the role of Christ and His Church. This unity between Head and members is stressed in the freshman year when the parables of Christ concerning the kingdom are taught. Emphasis is placed upon Christ's developmental approach to this topic. There is also an emphasis placed upon those texts of the Gospel which specifically relate to the Church. Attention is also called to the identification of Christ with His Church as it existed in the minds of the early Church members and as expressed in the Acts of the Apostles. In the second year the doctrine of the Mystical Body is explained. We hope it is never forgotten in our classes that the Church is the proximate source of revelation. At least a month and a half is devoted to this topic.

Fr. Finn, S.J., St. Louis University: I presume, Father, that you would like to emphasize the point that the teacher in any course of Sacred Doctrine must be considered far more important than any text book.

Fr. Sloyan: That is absolutely correct.

Fr. Garvey, S.J., St. Peter's College: With regard to your suggestion of a discussion of personal problems, do you feel that this idea could be used in the other proposed systems?

Fr. Sloyan: I can see no reason why not.

Fr. Stanton, S.J., Holy Cross College: In place of the discussion of these practical topics as you propose, a questionnaire to learn the background and interest of each student could be used and then appropriate readings could be assigned. I also feel that a discussion of alcoholism is much more important than a

discussion on drink. It is really a case of the attitude of the professor vs. facts. The Yale statistics on alcoholism are more impressive than a professor's homilies. A whole semester is too long to spend on practical problems. A pamphlet rack can solve many of these difficulties.

Unidentified Sister: What has happened to your Christocentric scheme in the last three years of your program?

Fr. Sloyan: I assumed a consciousness of this stress on the part of the instructor when I listed the topics to be covered. And did Sister attend to my disclaimers about the existence of any such "scheme"?

Mother Marie Celeste, O.S.U., College of New Rochelle: What is the relationship between philosophy and religion in your program?

Fr. Sloyan: There can be no truly established relationship as far as the courses are concerned since there is no definite sequence of courses in philosophy classes which can be relied on in the case of all students. This is caused by the fact that the religion program includes students from every undergraduate school on the campus and course requirements in philosophy for these different schools vary.

Fr. Harvey, O.S.F.S., Dunbarton College: Is a practical situation more important than a plan? Too many practical problems could change a religion class into a consultation period. One could lose sight of the moral principle to be stressed in solving a given moral problem.

Fr. Sloyan: This is a common teaching pitfall. The teacher must guide the discussion.

Fr. Simonitsch, C.S.C., University of Notre Dame: We solve the "practical problems" issue by assigning a series of readings for each lecture topic. For example, the lectures on faith have Father O'Brien's *What's the Truth About Mixed Marriages?* Then we set aside a seminar period for discussion of any questions closely related to the topic already covered in the lectures.

Fr. Messemmer, S.J., Le Moyne College: I would like to add another practical topic to Father Sloyan's list: the notion of mystery. Too many high school graduates come to college with the notion that there are no more mysteries. They have solved them all.

Recorder: BROTHER B. ALBERT, F.S.C.
De La Salle College
Washington

THE THOMISTIC APPROACH IN COLLEGE THEOLOGY

The Officers of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine have kindly invited me to set forth this morning some of the basic principles that govern the courses in Theology in our colleges. This I shall strive to do as briefly as possible, and within the limits of the quarter-hour allocated to this portion of our meeting.

This entire matter has been discussed thoroughly in a variety of books and articles.¹ The points made here so briefly can be examined at length and in their full context in these sources.

Like all men, Catholic students must act according to some supreme standard, in the light of some supreme and ultimate goal.² They must see all of their lives in the light of the goal. In other words, they must direct their lives according to some wisdom, to which all else is subordinated; they must “. . . put things in their right order and control them well.”³

One of the functions of Catholic education, and, in fact, the principal function, is to communicate the only true wisdom to its subjects. Catholic education strives to develop:

“. . . the supernatural man who thinks, judges and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished man of character.”⁴

As a means to this goal, Catholic education consists:

“. . . essentially in preparing man for what he must be and for what he must do here below in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created.”⁵

It is clear that the school alone does not produce this “supernatural man”, nor does it offer all the means essential for “preparing” man for his exalted destiny. But the school is among the means of preparing man for his supernatural perfection. In other words, there is a distinction between *schooling* and *education*.

The school has a proper and immediate end that distinguishes it from other educational agencies, and it employs distinctive

means for attaining this goal. The proper and immediate end of schooling is thus expressed by Pope Pius XI:

“Since however, the younger generations must be trained in the arts and sciences for the advantage and prosperity of civil society, and since the family of itself is unequal to this task, it was necessary to institute that social institution, the school.”⁶

The Holy Father points out most clearly that the training in the school (like the efforts of all educational agencies) must be carried out in an atmosphere that is thoroughly Christian, where the entire academic environment and all its instrumentalities are permeated with the spirit of Christian piety. This doctrine is simply an underscoring of the obvious truth that the distinctive function of the school is to habituate the minds of the students to truth in a Christian atmosphere. This goal is properly intellectual and academic. The school employs academic and intellectual means: teachers, the curriculum, texts, etc. These means are used to work a change that is primarily intellectual, to bring about the formation of permanent, dynamic habits.

Yet the school is more than an institution of learning, for we may be said to be learning all through life. The school is an academic institution; it is devoted to *orderly* learning. Throughout life, we learn things as they *happen* to come along; in school, we are supposed to learn things as they *should* occur.

Among the truths that must be learned in school, and which are indispensable to the acquisition of true wisdom, are the truths about God and about other things precisely in their relation to God. There are several ways in which these truths are communicated at different academic levels. The most perfect human means for communicating these truths is the divine wisdom of theology. In its best development, theology is Scholastic, i.e. written by Schoolmen for use in schools.⁷ It is a reasoned wisdom about God and about all other things precisely as they are viewed from the vantage-point of divine revelation. It is the function of theological wisdom to defend, to explain, and to apply the truths of revelation.

Scholastic theology is a God-centered wisdom. It develops the order of divine *things*. The consideration of God Himself is its beginning; the consideration of man as he journeys to God is its middle; the consideration of Christ, the God-man, the bridge

between man and God, is its end. Thus it fulfills the ancient concept of the perfectly circular movement of perfect science, returning to its own beginning, after exploring its material in the light of that beginning.⁸

Finally, it is important to note that this divine wisdom of theology can be communicated in differing degrees of profundity, in terms of the capacity of the students and of the immediate purpose which is envisioned. Always it remains essentially the same humanly communicable divine wisdom; any changes are accidental.

It is not the purpose of the college course in theology to ape the training of students for the priesthood or to train professional theologians. Rather do these courses aim at bringing the best academic expression of divine truth to the preparation of Catholic college students in the divine wisdom which befits their intellectual development and which the exigencies of their vocation require.

The school must prepare its students for their vocation by academic means and in the intellectual and artistic orders. This requires the presence of theology in the curriculum at the college level, if the task is to be accomplished best and most effectively. Through the divine wisdom of theology, students are equipped to make intelligent, supernaturally based judgments of their secular milieu; by it they are equipped to understand the supernatural goal to which that milieu should be directed; by it they come to learn the dogmatic, moral, and ascetical principles by which this change must be effected.

It is the vocation of Christians to become instruments for diffusing in the world the light of the Incarnation. That part of Catholic education which we call schooling must, first and foremost, prepare them to understand exactly what that vocation is, and precisely how it may be accomplished. If this vital understanding is to be organic rather than haphazard, academic rather than homiletic, then it must be centered in the divinely human wisdom of theology.

¹ A bibliography of pertinent material has been furnished to all who attended the Convention. The following should be added to provide a more complete presentation of the problems:

Donlan, Thomas C., *Theology and Education* (Wm. C. Brown C., Dubuque: 1952)

- Muniz, F. P., *The Work of Theology* (Thomist Press, Washington: 1953)
- Rock, Augustine, "Liturgy, Theology, and the Church of God", *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 128 (1953), pp. 426-437.
- ² *Summa*, I-II, q. 1, a. 6.
- ³ *Contra Gentiles*, I, cap. 1.
- ⁴ Pius XI, *On the Christian Education of Youth* (Official and Complete English Translation, N.C.W.C., Washington: 1936) p. 36.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- ⁷ *Summa*, Prologue to First Part.
- ⁸ cf. M. D. Chenu, O.P., "Le plan de la Somme Théologique de S. Thomas," *Revue Thomiste*, 45 (1939), pp. 101-107.

THE REVEREND THOMAS C. DONLAN, O.P.
 Dominican College of St. Rose of Lima
 Dubuque, Iowa

DISCUSSION

Fr. Burke, C.S.P., Trinity College, asked for a clarification of the distinction Father Donlan had made between schooling and education.

Fr. Donlan replied that the distinction between schooling and education is a distinction between the part and the whole. Different agencies are at work in the total process of education. It (education) as a total process may be roughly compared to the assembly line where different workers contribute acts to the total process. Schooling as a part of the total process is concerned with imparting habitual and unchanging convictions of mind. This is what makes the school a distinct and subordinate agent in the total process of education. The function of schooling is academic or what may be called scholastic. That is why scholastic theology which was designed by schoolmen for scholars in schools is the proper field of the Catholic school.

Fr. Roszay S.P., Georgetown Visitation Junior College, Washington, addressed a question on the education of the will in college religious instruction to Fr. Fernan. Fr. Burke asked Fr. Donlan for comment.

Fr. Donlan: I am just as tender about the accusation of angelism. Saint Thomas does not have in mind the divisions of theology, such as we often have, but a vision of the totality of revelation which is directed to knowledge which knowledge is often directed to activity. St. Thomas sees man himself not simply as a static reality but as a wayfarer, and he sees a Christian as a different kind of person than others. And precisely because he understands so well the subject with whom he is deal-

ing, St. Thomas is concerned with the whole man. In one of his *Opuscula* he speaks of sacred doctrine not only as a light to the mind but as a lamp to the feet. Sacred Doctrine is not only food for the intelligence, but food which nourishes the heart. We must remember the very nature of the person whom we are teaching. In those persons, love follows upon knowledge, for all admit the axiom that nothing is loved unless it is first known. The more perfectly a person knows something, then, the more his will may be persuaded to love it. This persuasion however is indirect, for the school is primarily an appeal to the mind, though the mind itself is a way to the heart. In this connection, we must remember the object which we are presenting to the student. That object is Revelation as God has given it. In the presentation of that object which we accept as God has given it we attempt an order, an order of beginning, middle and end. This is the perfect circle of contemplation which does not exclude the practical direction of life even though that is not its immediate purpose.

* * *

Bro. K. Basil, F.S.C., St. Mary's College, Winona: Supposing other agencies fail in their duties of education, can the school take over these functions?

Fr. Donlan: In an emergency such a thing would have to be done, although we must remember that the school is not a competitor to the home. In such an instance, the school is giving something which is owed in charity rather than in justice. The danger is that the school in attempting several things not its proper function will not perform its own properly. The story of the fellow with the chameleon is to the point. When his friend asked what happened to it, he said he put it on a brick and it turned red okay, and on a pool table the chameleon turned a respectable green, but when it was put on some scotch plaid, it just burst trying to make good.

* * *

Bro. Luke, F.S.C., De La Salle College, Washington, addressed his question to all the panelists. It would seem that all are agreed that college theology is not modeled on the seminary course. Nevertheless, there are certain features of the seminary curriculum which might will be imitated by the college. I refer especially to the course in fundamental theology, with its special emphasis on the role of the Church, which precedes the regular courses in theology.

Fr. Donlan replied that his answer was based on a series of questions he had put to college theology teachers. His answer

would be a definite yes, and in accord with that answer he had spent half of his first volume in the *Primers of Theology* on fundamental theology. That would cover about the first semester of the freshman year. Since Theology begins with a consideration of its own nature, it considers its sources. After some preliminary notions about religion, the notion of revelation must be investigated, together with the Church's magisterium as the means by which revelation is communicated to us. Thus the Church is considered at the very beginning of the Thomistic scheme as a source of theological wisdom, that is, in her role of teacher of divine truth. In the last year of College Theology according to the Thomistic synthesis, the same subject, the Church, must be treated from a different angle. Since the last year is devoted to Christ, we consider Christ not only in Himself but in His Mystical Body. It is the very nature of the Thomistic synthesis to use something here and now in reference to what has been demonstrated before. Thus a study of the Church is found at the foundation of Theology, and again in the study of its capstone, Christ, Who is, as man, our way to God.

* * *

Fr. Regan, O.S.A., Villanova University, questioned Fr. Donlan about his use of the word "attitudes". I do not wish to quibble, but will the intellectual appeal develop attitudes? It is the common experience of college Theology teachers to have good students with bad attitudes and bad students with good attitudes. I am a Thomist myself, so I am especially interested in the exact meaning you give to this word "attitudes". Do you mean something intellectual or something voluntaristic and emotional?

Fr. Donlan replied that now he knew what Monsignor Knox meant when he wrote his *Trials of a Translator*. What I really meant by attitudes is "habitus", but experience at other meetings led me to substitute intellectually convinced attitude for intellectual habit. Yes, you are right, when I spoke of a certain dynamic attitude, I was speaking of an intellectual habit.

* * *

Fr. Haran, S.J., Holy Cross College, Worcester, spoke about the importance of having, above all, a correct attitude towards the Church and its teaching authority.

Mother Hargrove, R.S.C.J. of Manhattanville College: "Do you consider fundamental theology essential or non-essential to the college theology curriculum?"

Fr. Donlan: "I would consider a compressed version essential."

Fr. Paulin, S.S.E., St. Michael's College: "Do you think that the college theology course should be different from the seminary course?"

Fr. Donlan: Yes. What we are attempting to do is to take the general framework and content of the *Summa* as far as the material taught is concerned. But it must be imparted to college students on their proper level with methods which are adapted to them."

Fr. Palmer, S.J., Woodstock College: "St. Thomas first lectured in Sacred Scripture and presupposed that his students knew it. Is it not true then, that students should be given the positive data of reading and the historic perspective first?"

Fr. Donlan: "St. Thomas did indeed lecture from Sacred Scripture first. But he found that method of imparting theological wisdom to be definitely unsatisfactory, as he says himself. That is why he wrote the *Summa*. Of course the *Summa* presupposes a knowledge of the content of Sacred Scripture. But any real penetration of the meaning of Sacred Scripture is hardly presupposed to the study of Thomism. In fact, one of the most difficult things in the world to interpret adequately is Sacred Scripture. In this group, for instance, there is probably a liberal sprinkling of Licentiates and even Doctors in Sacred Theology. But the *Prolyta* in Sacred Scripture is rather rare, and the result of long graduate study after the regular Theology course.

Fr. Palmer: "The question is, would a study of Sacred Scripture be essential to the study of theology on the college level?"

Fr. Donlan: "As Sacred Scripture is not the first seminary course, I do not think it is the first course in the college theology curriculum. I do think Sacred Scripture should be studied concomitantly with theology. Using the order of theology, in order to study the reality of revelation, Scripture will be constantly the first argument. Something like Vaughn's *Divine Armory* with the arrangement of pertinent Scripture texts according to the order of theology should be required reading."

Fr. Messemmer, S.J., Le Moyne College: "The Church has been emphasizing that the ordinary Christian should learn Sacred Scripture. Just when are Christians going to become acquainted with God's own word in Sacred Scripture?"

Fr. Donlan: "Everything said about Christians learning Scripture is not said univocally about the preparation of a Christian in school. You misunderstand me if you have me opposed to

the Scriptures. If you take the Scriptures out of theology, you are left with Aristotle and little else."

Fr. Haran, S.J.: "I feel that you are unduly restricting theology. You do not need Sacred Scripture for speculative theology but you do need it for positive theology. By positive theology I mean the study of where the truths the Catholic Church teaches are found. Even a theological synthesis goes to work on the *data fidei*. St. Thomas cannot be used today because of the later developments in doctrine. Think of the various questions on the Redemption and sacramental theology which have been settled since the time of St. Thomas. These cannot be presented out of Saint Thomas."

Fr. Donlan: "Let me repeat that the principal source of theology is the canonical Scriptures. You seem to put opposition not only there but even between Saint Thomas and the definitions of the Church. As a matter of history, many of the definitions you mention came from the labors of theologians like St. Thomas. Let me repeat that as I understand theology, there is no opposition between it and Sacred Scripture, or again between theology and the definitions of the Church."

Fr. Haran: "I do not imply opposition. I do say that the presence of something in the *Summa* is no guarantee. Each point must be enriched by definition. What I am saying is that the ever-living preaching of the Church is the principal source."

Recorder: THE REVEREND URBAN VOLL, O.P.
Trinity College
Washington

THE HISTORICAL, SCRIPTURAL APPROACH IN COLLEGE THEOLOGY

Origin of Le Moyne Course. Although the theology course which I am about to describe has come to be known as the "Le Moyne Plan", it owes its beginning and inspiration and over-all characteristics to Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., of Woodstock College. In view of this fact, and because so many people are asking: "What ever became of the 'Murray plan'?", I would like to give a very abbreviated account of how the Le Moyne Plan originated. In doing so, I ask your indulgence of the necessary personal references.

In the school year of 1941, Father Murray's plan was being taught in Freshman and Sophomore years at Georgetown College. Partial manuals, containing the general outlines of those years of the course, were being used, with the idea that they would be revised and eventually completed in the light of the experience gained from their actual use in the classroom. In that same year, I was sent to Woodstock to prepare under Father Murray's direction, the outlines of a manual to be used in Junior Year at Georgetown. This partial manual was put into use the following year but I was assigned to other work, having no contact with college theology for the next five years. Meanwhile, the upheavals of war prevented any further work on textbooks, though the actual four-year course was being taught, under many difficulties, at Georgetown College and Loyola College, Baltimore.

In 1946, I was assigned to teach theology at the new-born Le Moyne College in Syracuse. We introduced Father Murray's plan and the partial manuals then in existence. Each class lecture was typed out through the whole four-year course, each successive teacher generously adhering to the same syllabus and contributing his experience to the numerous conferences that were held in an attempt to evaluate content, method and student reactions.

In 1951, we were finally in a position to begin work of writing the complete text-books. Father Murray very generously gave permission to do what we would with what he had done, though

circumstances made it impossible to receive any further guidance from him. With what now seems like unbelievable temerity, I began again to teach First Year and, simultaneously, in the light of class-room experience and with immeasurable help from others who had taught the matter, to revise and complete the Freshman text-book. The same was done with the other successive years, the Fourth Year book being now on the press. Our main preoccupation was to get all of each year's matter between two covers. Now that this has been done, we feel that someone can re-write the books with a view to style and better adaptation to the mind of a college student.

In the light of these remarks, you can see the sense in which this course is, and is not, the "Le Moyne Plan". The substance of it, all that is new and good about the specific approach, belongs to Father Murray. The practical arrangements and adjustments, as well as the feeble expression of it, you can blame upon us.

In view of the fact that you are all familiar with the general outlines of the Le Moyne Plan and with Father Murray's articles on the finality of a College Theology Course, I can confine myself to some very brief remarks on the following characteristics of the course at Le Moyne.

1. *Scripture.* Our first aim is to give our students a detailed knowledge of the substance of the New Testament revelation as contained in the inspired writings. Since theology is not merely a philosophizing upon abstractions, it would seem imperative, even from the view-point of a strictly scientific approach, that the students be completely familiar with the source-book to which the Councils of the Church and all the writings of the speculative theologians so constantly refer. St. Thomas and all the great theologians and Fathers who preceded him, were saturated with knowledge of the historical data of positive revelation as the basis and motive of their intense speculative efforts. In Thomas' day, men were so full of appreciation of the concrete, multi-faceted reality of Christianity, that they were suffering acutely from indigestion; there was a crying need for an orderly, abstract, logical synthesis of this complexity, which St. Thomas supplied in his marvelous Summa.

At this point, I would like to emphasize the fact that I am all for this Summa in so far as it fills the need for which it is

intended. There is no question of its value in a seminary course or in the graduate courses of our colleges. In the under-graduate courses, too, the Summa can be adapted to the needs of the students, but it needs to be heavily implemented with the historical data of revelation. Christianity is not a philosophy, not an abstraction, but a *way of life*. Students must be filled with realization of the living, historical reality, its mysteriousness and its complexity, before they can appreciate or even feel the need of abstract, doctrinal formulae; they must be filled with the content that is to be summed up, before they can really appreciate the Summa.

The modern baby, at Baptism, is born into a real historical life and an inheritance of thousands of years of speculation upon its meaning. Before he comes to college, he is taught the essential doctrinal summary of this life in terms that have been chiseled out of centuries of controversy and speculation. Supposedly, when he comes to college, he has an understanding of the essential meaning of the substance of his faith. But now that he is ready for a deeper appreciation of the life which he has, he stands in great need of two things: 1) an understanding of the concrete reality in all of its overwhelming beauty and vital complexity; 2) an analysis and synthesis of that reality within the limits of his present mental powers.

Of these two essentials, it seems to me that the first is the one which, for beginners in theology, needs the more emphasis; the second element depends, for its value, upon the first. Already inclined to look upon Christianity as a system of abstract ideas, the student finds it difficult to appreciate terms which took centuries to define accurately, because his heart has never really ached with the mystery of the living Person of Christ or been baffled with the overwhelming complexity and richness of the life that came to men in the historical outpouring of the Holy Spirit. To plunge such a beginner into the depths of metaphysical abstractions, is like taking a biology student who has never seen a living tree at close hand or climbed its branches or sat in its shade or tasted its luscious fruit, and confining him to a museum, where his whole comprehension of the living reality must come from a series of dead leaves and branches, cut up and sealed away in air-tight cases with their scientific labels. The life which the student actually has in Christ, sets definite

limits to the validity of this comparison, but, even so, the Holy Spirit gave us a detailed, historical account of the Christ in whom we live and the Body in which we live, to help us know the reality in our own souls of which we have no direct consciousness. It would seem, then, that the historical, literary approach is to be preferred, not only because it is better adapted to the mentality of students who have yet to study philosophy, but because speculative theology depends for its validity and usefulness, upon the revealed, historical realities.

2. •*Order of Revelation.* At Le Moyne, we do not begin our course with a pre-conceived, logical unity to which we adapt the scriptural data. Rather, we follow the general sequence of the historical revelation and discover the logical unity which is in this sequence. Thus, the Gospels furnish the main literary content of the first two years and they reveal the Life as it is in Christ, the first year being concerned with Who Christ Is and second year with His Priestly Work. The Acts of the Apostles and the main Epistles of St. Paul are studied in third year and they reveal how fully Christ has communicated His Life to the Church. Finally, in fourth year, using the Epistle to the Romans as our scriptural text, we see this same Life of Christ communicated to the individual soul.

3. *Scholastic Theology.* One should not get the impression, however, that this literary approach involves only a haphazard treatment of dogma by way of scriptural exegesis. At fitting intervals in the study of the historical revelation, we pause to sum up the significance of the concrete reality in a full presentation and analysis of the Church's teaching on a given subject. These doctrinal interludes cover the main, traditional dogmatic tracts. In second year, for example, we begin with the chronological Gospel account of the Last Supper, Passion and Resurrection, which is followed by a doctrinal interlude on original justice, original sin and our re-birth in the sacrament of Baptism. There follows a full doctrinal treatment of the efficacy of the Cross under the aspects of sacrifice, redemption, satisfaction, which is followed by the inspired, literary presentation of the same doctrine in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Finally, there is a full doctrinal treatment of the nature, value and effects of the Mass, which is then studied in the literary form of the Liturgy.

4. *Organic unity.* Though we do formally teach the main

dogmatic tracts according to the scholastic method, these tracts are not completely isolated from historical circumstances and treated, according to logical sequence, in only one place. But there is a growth in treatment which follows the sequence of historical revelation. Let us take the doctrine of "grace" to illustrate the point.

In first year, as we follow from day to day the public life of our Lord, we examine in detail His own progressive revelation of the new life which He came to give. In second year, we continue to see all of our Lord's prophecies about the coming of the Holy Spirit and the general nature of the life which the Holy Spirit confers is summed up in the liturgy of Baptism. In third year, we see, in the Acts, the actual outpouring of the Holy Spirit; we taste and feel and smell, so to speak, the multitudinous aspects of the life of grace which is poured out upon the Church as a whole and upon the individuals who become Her members. The Epistles of St. Paul enrich the overwhelming revelation of this new life and rise up, gradually, to an ever fuller interpretation of its meaning. Finally, in fourth year, we come to the formal treatment of the doctrine of grace; first, Paul's classical summary of it in the Epistle to the Romans, then, the full scholastic treatment of actual grace, sanctifying grace, theological virtues, moral virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit.

This same type of organic unity works, also, in reverse. Thus, after the full revelation of the mystery of Christ, there is the formal treatment of Christology at the end of first year. But, then, this same doctrine is constantly reviewed in the other years in relation to other dogmas. Thus, in conjunction with the revelation of Christ's priestly work in second year, there is a continued revelation of Who He Is and its bearing upon the efficacy of His work. I need not tell you how, in third and fourth years, Paul's classical christological passages continue to high-light the mystery of Christ's Person as the Head of the Mystical Body and the source and exemplar of the divine life in human souls.

This type of unity makes it possible continually to review, with great effectiveness, the same essential doctrines. It is not a lifeless, monotonous repetition of the same abstract ideas in the same consecrated terms. The endless variety of concrete, historical circumstances gives continual freshness to the doc-

trine; the application of doctrinal principles to practical situations and problems gives an ever growing insight into the richness of the doctrine itself; thus dealing with the Three Divine Persons as a living reality in the power of the Holy Spirit, puts flesh and blood on definitions and divisions and proofs, which, are, otherwise, to a large extent, merely names. This type of organic unity is essential to a vital course in theology.

In conclusion, I would like to say that, in opposing the scriptural approach to the Thomistic approach, as presented by Father Donlan, I see no reason why either of these approaches should necessarily exclude the other. For the reasons already given, I think that the historical approach is essential for college students. (Incidentally, much needs to be said, in future meetings, about whether or how the patristic writings can be used to supplement the Apostolic traditions as summarized in Scripture.) But, as has been explained, we do rise up, in our course, from the data of positive revelation, to the interpretation of its significance as expressed in the Councils of the Church and the writings of speculative theologians. Why can't St. Thomas be adapted to these doctrinal interludes, so that, while his order is changed, his matter is taught in an historical, rather than a purely logical, setting? As it seems to me, the perfect college course must strike a suitable balance between 1) the primitive revelation as summarized in Scripture, 2) the subsequent tradition, and 3) the abstract formulation of significance. Doubtless we shall never come to a day when we all agree upon what the perfect balance is. But if we keep in mind that it is the balance which we seek, rather than the elimination of any one of these three elements, we may, while preserving our different emphases, influence one another toward a better union of these three elements in an effective college course.

THE LE MOYNE SYLLABUS

In order to save time for discussion, I shall simply list, without comment, the content of the Le Moyne syllabus and its division given below which was followed before the textbooks were completed. Now that the students have the texts much of the matter which had to be given in lectures may now be assigned for reading and class discussion. And, as the teacher sees fit, some matters may be relegated to home reading and

tests, thus leaving more time for class treatment of other elements of the syllabus. In general, we think it preferable to spend as much time as possible on the pertinent Scripture texts and dogmatic summaries, leaving the background and collateral matter, as much as possible, to home assignments.

FIRST YEAR

1. Introduction to the New Testament—seventeen classes.
The Origins of the Gospels.
Characteristic Features of each Gospel.
Credibility.
Inspiration.
2. Background to the Life of Christ—eight classes.
Outline of Jewish History.
Jewish World at the Time of Christ.
Political, Social, Religious Situation.
Messianic Hope and the Distortion of It.
Chronology and Outline of the Public Life.
3. The Life of Christ up to and exclusive of the Last Supper.—twenty-five classes.
4. Dogmatic Summary of Christology and Ecclesiology—four classes.
It must be remembered that this is merely a complete outline and summary of doctrinal points that the student has seen, point by point, in going through the Life of Christ.

SECOND YEAR

1. The Life of Christ—eighteen classes.
Last Supper, Passion, Death, Resurrection, Ascension.
Doctrinal summary of Eucharist as Sacrament and Sacrifice, from the Scriptural viewpoint.
2. Original Justice, Original Sin, Baptism—thirteen classes.
The liturgy of Baptism is studied as a prelude to the full doctrinal treatment of Baptism as the means whereby Justice is restored.
3. The Sacrifice of the Cross—eleven classes.
Pre-Christian Sacrifices.
Gentile.
Jewish.
Sacrifice of Christ.
Christ's Priesthood.
Christ's Sacrifice.
Vicarious Satisfaction.
Our Redemption.

- Epistle to the Hebrews.
- Superiority of Christ as Mediator.
- Superiority of Christ as Priest.
- Superiority of Christ's Sacrifice.
- Exhortation to Faith.
- 4 The Sacrifice of the Church.—thirteen classes.
 - The Facts of the Mass.
 - Protestant denials.
 - The teaching of Trent.
 - The Meaning of the Mass.
 - Nature of the Mass.
 - Participants in the Mass.
 - Effects of the Mass.
 - Value of the Mass.
 - The Liturgy of the Mass.

THIRD YEAR

1. The Church in the Acts of the Apostles—twenty-six classes.
 - With doctrinal interludes on:
 - Holy Orders.
 - Confirmation.
 - Councils of the Church.
2. The Church in the Epistles of St. Paul.—fifteen classes.
 - Galatians.
 - Thessalonians (2).
 - Corinthians (1st.).
 - Colossians.
 - Ephesians.
3. The Blessed Trinity—four classes.
4. The Mystical Body—six classes.
 - Encyclical of Pius XII.

FOURTH YEAR

1. Epistle to the Romans—fifteen classes.
2. The Life of Grace—twenty-four classes.
 - Actual grace.
 - Sanctifying Grace.
 - Infused Virtues.
 - Gifts and Fruits of Holy Spirit.
 - Beatitudes.
3. Asceticism—fifteen classes.
 - Nature of perfection.
 - Obligation of striving for perfection.
 - Characteristics of the Three Ways.
 - Methods of Prayer.
 - Mortification.

Examen, General and Particular.
Discernment of Spirits.
Plan of Life.

THE REVEREND JOHN FERNAN, S.J.,
Le Moyne College,
Syracuse

DISCUSSION

Fr. Rozsaly, S.P., Georgetown Visitation Junior College: You emphasized, Father, the intellectual aspects of the course in theology. But I also think that there should be great emphasis on the will, if these courses are to be effective. Would you discuss your course from the viewpoint of the will?

Fr. Fernan: I can't help smiling at this question which follows so immediately upon my exposition. In previous conferences of this kind, I so emphasized the importance of presenting the unity and goodness, as well as the truth of Christianity, that I have been accused of anti-intellectualism, of trying to substitute a retreat for an academic discipline. Accordingly, today I soft-pedaled the motivating power of our course in an attempt to make it clear that the course is, none the less, academic. And now the very first question is: What about the will?

Consider for a moment what it means to live with the living Christ from day to day, as the Apostles did, considering His Person, not as a name, or an abstract idea or problem, but in the concrete circumstances which reveal His living Heart. In third year, the same concrete approach arouses intense affection for the Church as She is seen to live and speak and work in the power of the Holy Spirit. At every step the student sees the concrete richness and goodness of the life which the Church has to give, and Saint Paul, while penetrating to the depths of its meaning, presents it in his ecstatic rhetoric, throbbing with fear and hope and wonder and love. We conclude our course with the substantial outlines of ascetical theology. This decision was made, not so much because we thought the student should, logically, have arrived at an intense desire to maintain and increase his own participation in divine life, but from the actual experience that he did.

Brother Luke, F.S.C.: We are all agreed that the college course is not to be a reduplication of the seminary course. But have we lost a valuable thing in fundamental theology, i.e., the central role of the Church as the proximate source of revelation?

This is an immediate practical problem for students during and after college,—the role of the Church in the individual life.

Fr. Fernan: We give a full treatment of the Church. I can't conceive of a college course which puts more emphasis on the Church.

All through first year, along with Christ's revelation of Himself, we have His gradual establishment of the Kingdom and we see its juridical outlines in the mandate and powers conferred upon the Apostles. In the third year, we see in detail the revelation of the Church as a living organism and the *Mystici Corporis* shows the connection between the interior life flowing to the Church from Christ, the Head, and the external structure and function.

Some get the notion that we stress Scripture at the expense of tradition and the living voice of the Church. But we do not present Scripture as something to be contrasted with the authoritative teaching of the Church. Scripture gives us the original tradition; the New Testament was written under the direction and control of the Church; it epitomizes the original teaching of the Church and the Church alone can interpret its meaning. Why should the fact of its divine inspiration be a hindrance to presenting it as the voice of the Church?

Fr. Haran, S.J., Holy Cross College, Worcester, spoke at considerable length on the function of the Church's authority in the science of theology. He concluded by saying: "Scripture gives us the facts, but only the Church can tell us for certain what the scriptural text means, e.g., justification as explained by the Council of Trent."

Fr. M. Herron, T.O.R., College of Steubenville: Is there sufficient emphasis on moral principles in your course? Do you cover morality in the sense that St. Thomas does in parts I and II of the *Secunda Secundae*?

Fr. Fernan: We treat of fundamental moral principles in the place and manner that Christ and St. Paul treated them in the New Testament. We treat the nature of the Christian virtues along with the state of grace in fourth year. But we do not have a formal treatment of moral theology as such. In my opinion that should be integrated with the courses in general, special, and social ethics.

Fr. Shea, O.P., Dominican College, New Orleans: Did I understand you to say, Father, that the average college student is unable to grasp metaphysical ideas? They have rational faculties. Their average age is 19-23. When, if not now, will they ever be able to perform their specific operation as men? A

teacher who knows his matter can explain metaphysical principles in simple language. Why do you insist on selling the boy short, instead of teaching him the simple notions which his mind was made to grasp?

Fr. Fernan: Perhaps I have over-emphasized the difficulty of beginning with metaphysics in the teaching of theology. I did not mean to assert that the college boy is incapable of grasping metaphysics. But theology is concerned, not merely with abstract notions, but with a living, concrete, beautiful, and mysterious reality. The metaphysics will be meaningful and effective and needful, only in so far as the boy is filled with and impressed by the concrete reality. Hence, it is a question of emphasis. You want to spend all year in the abstract order of philosophical questions. I want to spend most of the year appraising the reality in its concrete, historical setting, and come in the end to a philosophical treatment of questions which are actually in the boy's mind as a result of his experience with the reality. And when I assert that some such process is needful to the boy, I do not mean to belittle him. I too find it needful to myself. And Christ evidently thought it needful for the men to whom He entrusted His Kingdom.

Fr. Arnold Thacik, O.S.B., St. Benedict's, Atchison: Is the sketchy outline of Old Testament history sufficient to understand the New Testament?

Fr. Fernan: It is inadequate, but it is the best we could do without sacrificing something more important. Our main purpose is to give the students some idea of the sequence of the Old Testament and the general function of the patriarchs, prophets, liturgy. This sketch is implemented by the constant references to the Old Testament in the Gospels and Epistles. We should remember, however, that eight classes cover a month's time, during which the student can do considerable reading in this field.

Fr. Weiss, D'Youville College: Are there any concrete signs that students are more inspired or motivated under your Le Moyne Plan than the old system?

Fr. Sellinger, S.J., Georgetown University: In the past two years I have met many Le Moyne graduates doing post-graduate work at Georgetown. It is characteristic of them that they rave about their course in theology as being their best at Le Moyne. There is a marked contrast between their reaction to the Le Moyne course and that of other students to other courses in other colleges.

Fr. Dwyer, S.J., Fordham University: Over a year ago, we introduced the Le Moyne Plan at Fordham. Early in this their second year, I called in 150 students for personal interviews on the results. My conclusion was this:

1. they expressed general satisfaction, which is in strong contrast to the reaction to our old apologetics course.
2. in a number of cases there was improvement in personal spiritual life which was attributed to the new course.

Bro. Luke, F.S.C.: Any new program engenders enthusiasm by its novelty. A thorough answer to this question would require much more information.

Fr. Messemer, S.J., LeMoyne College: I think it is too early to pass judgment on this question. We must wait and see what our graduates do by way of Christian living and leadership.

Fr. Shea, O.P., St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans: The question as proposed is unanswerable. To get an objective answer you would have to compare the same people who had taken two different systems of courses. The personal response of students depends a great deal upon their own native ability and the personality of the professor. Any good teacher can give innumerable examples of individuals who testify that they have been greatly inspired by his classes.

Fr. Urban Voll, O.P., Trinity College: Now that we have dismissed the question of student-reaction, it seems to me that the discussion might more profitably center on the other pole of education, the matter we are teaching. I think that all here are agreed that what we teach in Sacred Doctrine is Divine Revelation. The real differences between us is in the method of organizing the content of revelation. Father Fernan calls his system the historical, scriptural approach; Father Donlan, the Thomistic. I would suggest that these titles are misleading for surely Father Fernan intends the Scriptures to be used to attain to the reality the Scriptures contain, and I am certain that Father Donlan really is not interested so much in introducing his students to St. Thomas as he is to the realities which St. Thomas teaches. The real difference between the two approaches to the problem of teaching revelation is in the principle of organization. Father Fernan gives by the Scriptures what may be called a Christocentric approach; Father Donlan gives by the Summa what might be called a God-centered or Theocentric approach. In other words, the real point at issue is a question on which we might have a very profitable discussion. Is God or Christ the subject of theology? I'd like to start off the discussion by saying that the God-centered approach is the traditional one found in the creeds and catechisms.

Fr. Keating, S.J., Woodstock College: This introduces a question which has been debated for centuries, i.e. whether the Theocentric or Christocentric approach is preferable. I have been engaged for many months in studying this question on the graduate level. I find that it is an open question among theologians at the top level. Hence, I don't think that we are going to solve it this afternoon. If you want to discuss it, all right. But you should know what you are getting into, and should not assume that the Theocentric approach is the only valid one from a scientific viewpoint.

Fr. Arnold Thacik, O.S.B.: I am one of those rare people we heard mentioned a while back, someone with a degree in Scripture. From the Scriptural viewpoint, I would say that we could do no better than St. Paul who preached Christ and Him crucified.

Fr. Urban Voll, O.P.: I do not think our question can be solved so simply, that is, by bandying Scripture texts. But if you insist, I would take for my text the words of a teacher greater even than Saint Paul: "This is eternal life: that they may know Thee, the one true God and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent."

Fr. Stephen McCormack, O.P., Providence College: Obviously the question cannot be settled by the juxtaposition of Scripture texts. But our amusement should not overshadow the importance of the issue raised. If we are interested in the student, and his psychological reaction to the material presented, is it not true that the Christological approach may so impress him with the humanity of Christ that His divinity is forgotten?

Miss Furlong of St. Mary's College, Notre Dame: Someone said a few minutes ago that the question of the comparative value of the two approaches could be discussed only by someone who had had both systems. I happen to be in such an enviable position. I had the Christological approach from the Jesuits on an undergraduate level, and later, on a graduate level at St. Mary's, Notre Dame, the Dominican approach. The Dominicans' system seems to have everything in order; I must say the impression I got from the constant emphasis on Christ in my undergraduate courses was that the Father and the Holy Spirit, while mentioned, were somehow less important. In fact, I would say that those two Persons by emphasis almost seemed to be junior Members of the Firm.

Fr. Fernan: I do not think it possible to over-emphasize Christ The Father sent Christ and Christ draws attention to Himself, and the Holy Spirit is forever putting Christ's name upon our lips because Christ is the substantial image of the

Father, the only way we can know or come to the Father. Whatever magnifies Christ, magnifies Christ's Spirit and the Father, Whose Image Christ is.

Mother Hargrove of Manhattanville: Don't you eventually then have to use metaphysical notions to explain the hypostatic union?

Fr. Fernan: Yes.

Mother Hargrove: But you said that the students were incapable of metaphysics.

Fr. Fernan: It is a matter of emphasis. What I meant was that we do not spend the whole of a school year on an abstract treatment of metaphysical concepts. We use the empirical method to arrive at the metaphysical; the student, living with Christ, experiences the growing mystery of His Person and then, when he feels the need of a formula to express the mystery, we give it to him.

A Sister of St. Joseph: We can't do any better than follow Christ's method of teaching—which was a psychological approach. Our Lord very effectively taught the sublimest mysteries in such simple examples as the Vine and the Branches. Can't we do the same and perhaps add to His examples others taken from the twentieth century?

Fr. Fernan: We agree fully. But I would like to add one qualification. Metaphors lead easily to error and have often done so in the history of theology. Hence, the precise technical terms and definitions which have been chiseled out after centuries of toil are also of immense value. Hence while I think that we should begin with the concrete reality and the poetic expression of it, I think we should end with the scholastic terminology.

Fr. Fallon, O.P., Providence College: The audience which Christ addressed was specialized in the sense that it had its own difficulties. Do our college students have the same difficulties?

Fr. Fernan: We have the same human nature and concupiscence and weakness which affected the Jews' reaction to God and the supernatural.

Fr. Fallon: Yes, but there are pronounced differences, too. The Oriental background of the people, their education, their religious difficulties are far different from those which our college students encounter today. Yet you think we must teach and talk exactly as Christ did?

Fr. Fernan: No, but to understand His revelation we have to study His language. Then we can explain it in the language of the Church today.

Fr. Fallon: Will the result then be science or will it be information? I mean by that—will the students obtain that organized knowledge which is science or will they have only opinion and feeling?

Fr. Fernan: They will have science. I think you are assuming, Father, that there is but one principle, that of St. Thomas, according to which theological knowledge can be organized. I don't want to quarrel with you about this question. I am not attacking St. Thomas. But, on the other hand, I think you would find it difficult to prove that a Christocentric approach to the explanation of Christianity is unscientific.

Unidentified questioner: A student in chemistry is required to adapt himself not only to the doctrine but even to the terminology of the science he is learning. Why should we not do the same thing in theology? What good will it do to spoon-feed him with an abundance of concrete examples from Scripture?

Fr. Fernan: Earlier this afternoon we heard Father Donlan object to the scriptural approach on the grounds that it is much too difficult, as evidenced by the rarity of even a licentiate degree in Sacred Scripture. Now we hear that this approach is spoon-feeding. When I am hit from both sides like this, where is there for me to stand but where I am? My impression is that chemists and other scientists begin with facts and use doctrinal formulae to sum up what they find in the laboratory. It is precisely this approach I am advocating in theology.

Recorder: THE REVEREND BERNARD MURRAY, S.J.
Canisius College
Buffalo

THE PROBLEM OF TRAINING TEACHERS OF THEOLOGY ON THE COLLEGE LEVEL

The graduate training of those who are to teach theology to college students is a recent development in our country. The basic problems which arise may be limited to three questions:

1. What is the objective of the graduate training course?
2. What is the content of the graduate training course?
3. Who should teach the course in theology to college students?

Moreover, the historical background of the teaching of theology helps to pin-point the problem. I shall speak briefly of this aspect and then take up each of the three questions posed above.

The history of the teaching of theology has intimate bearing on the history of the Church. The science of theology is, to a large extent, the fruit of her efforts to teach, with the utmost precision, clarity, and vigor in face of errors both within and without, the truth confided to her by Our Lord and the success of Her efforts is determined partly by the society in which She is working. The great historical movements of western civilization fostered this teaching, and the queen of the sciences has actually flourished in this civilization. On the other hand, where later developments in this civilization, particularly during the last five centuries, circumscribed and then precluded the teaching of theology, the sacred science was forced to relinquish her place in the universities of Europe, and consequently, in much of European thought.

In our own country, born of Europe's ills and consequently Protestant in culture, these same forces, destructive of theological thought and a unified religious milieu, have been at work. It is in such a milieu that the Catholic school system came into being. This fact has not been without serious consequences to higher education; notably, the absence of theology, until recently, in the curriculum of Catholic colleges and universities. A secular mind has been in large measure the product of such a society and many of our Catholic people have in some degree developed this mind.

The theological movement in our country and indeed in the world today is a vigorous sign of the Church's reaction against such forces. What is distinctive of today's theological movement is the fact that the laity, male and female, as well as the clergy, are included in it. A culminating point in the movement was reached last year, when in the eternal City itself there was established for women under the title of "Regina Mundi" the Roman Institute of Sacred Sciences. Besides this practical approbation of the theological movement, the Church has also made official guiding pronouncements on the subject of theology for the laity.

As recently as last spring, Our Holy Father Pope Pius XII made such a pronouncement in his address to the numerous cardinals, archbishops, and bishops assembled in Rome for the canonization of Blessed Pius X. His Holiness used the occasion to remind the hierarchy of the all-embracing teaching authority of the Church, and after praising the work of teaching on the part of the laity in the Church, he added a note of warning:

Recently what is called "lay theology" has sprung up and spread to various places, and a new class of "lay theologians" has emerged, which claims to be *sui juris*. . . .¹

Our Holy Father continued:

Nevertheless, it is necessary to maintain to the contrary that there never has been, there is not now, and there never will be in the Church a legitimate teaching authority of the laity withdrawn by God from the authority, guidance, and watchfulness of the sacred teaching authority. . . .²

His Holiness concluded his address by saying:

Far be it from Us by this admonition to turn away from a deeper study and dissemination of sacred doctrine those men, of whatsoever class or group, who are inspired to it by such a noble zeal.³

These last words, we, loyal children of the Church, hope may be applied in a special way to the group gathered here today. I shall repeat them:

Far be it from Us by this admonition to turn away from a deeper study and dissemination of sacred doctrine

those men, of whatsoever class or group, who are inspired to it by such a noble zeal.³

Last year in our own country, we saw the formation of the National Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine. The Society is the climax of more than twenty years' effort on the part of educators to improve the teaching of Sacred Doctrine on the college level. These years of effort have been praiseworthy and have been recognized as such abroad in the English *Clergy Review* in which the following comment was made in the course of a review of the Reverend Thomas Donlan, O.P.'s *Theology and Education*:

One of the more encouraging features in the intellectual life of the United States is the work being done by the Catholic clergy and Religious in the field of education. . . . Not so well known, but no less worthy of attention, is the large number of publications devoted to discussion of Catholic Educational Philosophy, and of the problem of education at adult levels. Fr. Donlan's book is written in the latter context and faced a problem which has become a major issue for American Catholic educators; the question of the method and content of religious teaching for undergraduate and graduate students in Catholic Universities and Liberal Arts Colleges.⁴

So much for the historical background to the teaching of theology which, as stated above, helps to pin-point today's problem of training teachers of theology on the college level.

THE OBJECTIVE OF THE COURSE

The Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine is an academic organization. It is therefore the academic or scholastic problem which I wish to present at this point. In turning to the problem itself—that of training teachers on the college level, I will discuss or consider the first factor: What is the objective of graduate training for these teachers? To attempt to answer this question, new and unexplored, I propose another: What is the finality of the undergraduate course in theology? It seems from several articles that have been written in the United States during the last fifteen years by eminent theologians of the country that the social apostolate of the Church is the end of the undergraduate course of theology. The late

Reverend Walter Farrell, O.P., who was one of the pioneers in this movement in our country and who made such a noteworthy contribution to it, after stating the primary end of theology to be the acquisition of wisdom said:

Surely there are a variety of purposes to which theology can be put. . . . The purposes of the divine wisdom are as varied as the life and needs of man: thus, it can be dedicated to the magisterium, as it is in the seminary presentation; to a social apostolate, . . .⁵

This opinion is shared by the Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., who stated as early as 1939 at the National Catholic Alumni Federation meeting held in New York, that:

The nature and extent of each one's participation in the apostolate depend on his particular abilities, his surroundings, the special needs of the time, and above all the plan of activity laid down by the hierarchy. Naturally, those who have received a higher Catholic education are expected to participate more extensively in the propagation of religious truth than are those who have not had this privilege. Accordingly there rests on our Catholic Colleges the grave obligation of providing their students with an adequate knowledge of their religion. . . . In other words, our Catholic colleges must have a course of theology.⁶

Five years later, in an article which appeared in *Theological Studies*, the Reverend John C. Murray, S.J., stated the two principles he deemed essential for building a course of theology for the laity, namely, that:

. . . theology is an essentially ecclesiastical science; it is social in its function—it exists for the benefit of the life of the Church, for the building up of her body. . . . The second principle is that the service to be rendered to the Church by priest and layman is quite different; there is an essential difference between the two ranks, and each has its own function in the Church, its own life. . . . [The principle] suggests the conclusion that a theology for laymen will have its own proper finality, quite different from the finality of the course given to the cleric. It must be related to the function of the layman in the Church, and (be it noted) to this function as it has been defined with new clarity and completeness in our present age.⁷

These statements are the opinions of three outstanding theologians in our country; and, as you know represent three different religious orders. To the question, what is the finality of the undergraduate course, the answer then is the social apostolate of the Church. This social apostolate, the end of the teaching of theology on the undergraduate level, is, of course, the mind of the Church regarding the function of the laity in the universal Church.

For nearly one hundred years now the Church, in the person of the Popes, has been urging the laity to participate in her apostolate. This movement began with Pius IX, who appealed to the Christian world in 1877 when he called upon "the zeal of all Catholics so that each of them, considering the cause of the Church to be his own, should unite himself to the others and give them a cordial support."⁸ Again he commanded them "by the authority of the same God and our Saviour, that they devote their zeal and effort to drive away these errors from the Church and to make ready the way for the light of immaculate faith."⁹ The call to the faithful has been repeated since then in all the succeeding pontificates, until our own day when Our Holy Father has frequently pleaded with the laity in numerous documents to participate in the social or lay apostolate.

The lay apostolate means the restoration in Christ of all things in the temporal order. This is, of course, an immense task in a secularized world, but this end is not the work of theology alone, any more than the end of Catholic Education is the work for the school alone. Other factors enter into this work; factors that do not belong primarily to an academic institution. Theological formation of the intellect must be imparted in an atmosphere nourished by the liturgy, the liturgy understood in the sense of the *Mediator Dei*. Catholic Action and the liturgical movement together with the teaching of theology are all aspects of one movement, namely the work of the Church in the modern world. Our hope is to form holy apostles, made strong by full participation in the richness of faith and the field of social action.

The discussion of the finality of the undergraduate course brings us now to the consideration of the finality of the undergraduate course in theology. It has occurred to me that the course of study for teachers should not be planned only with a

view to the finality of the undergraduate course. The teacher must have the broad vision, the complete vision that is intrinsic to theology, the vision not simply of the social apostolate but of all things in terms of God. This vision is wisdom, theological wisdom. Having it the teacher can bring it to bear on the work of the social apostolate for which the students are being prepared. But he himself must see the social apostolate in a larger context, as part of the total apostolate of the Church, and this is possible only where the formation in theology has had in view the acquisition of the full theological habit of wisdom.

Is there then any relationship at all between the undergraduate course in theology and the graduate training course? I would answer this in the affirmative, since fundamentally the content in the two courses is the same. Theology on every level concerns itself with the same eternal truths of salvation, the truths which Our Lord Jesus Christ came to teach in their fullness, truths centered on the gospel, the glad tidings of Redemption. Our work as educators is to communicate these truths scientifically to American college students in the twentieth century.

THE CONTENT OF THE COURSE

What then is the content of the graduate training course? A few remarks here on the content of the undergraduate course—what it should not be and what it should be—will help, I believe, to clarify what is to be the basis of the content of the graduate training course.

What the content of the course on the undergraduate level should not be.

In the same articles mentioned above, and others, one point emerges as a basis for building the content of the college course, namely, that the content of the college course is to differ from that of the seminary course. This difference is not, however, exactly stated by the various authors. In 1939, the Reverend Gerald B. Phelan, then president of the Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto, Canada, stated:

. . . the course of theology designed for students on the college level would, of necessity, be less detailed than the theological courses in a seminary, where priests are given the technical training required for the discharge of the sacred ministry.¹⁰

In the article mentioned above, the Reverend John C. Murray, S.J. stated that he agreed with M. Maritain that theological instruction given to the layman should remain thoroughly distinct from that given in religious seminaries.¹¹ In 1947, at the Catholic University Workshop on the Philosophy of Catholic Higher Education, the Reverend Eugene Burke, C.S.P., our distinguished president, in speaking of the character of the undergraduate course, stated: "Nor is it to be concluded from this that the same course given to seminarians is to be taught on the college level."¹² The Reverend Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J., in *Theological Studies*, stated that the seminary course is not and should not be the model for the college course.¹³ The late Reverend Walter Farrell, O.P., stated that there should be variance in the presentation of theology on college, graduate and seminary levels, but that the content, order and method of theology must remain substantially the same.¹⁴

These distinguished theologians representing different religious orders and communities in the country agree at least that the college course in theology is to differ from the seminary course.

What the content of the course on the undergraduate level should be.

What the content of the course in theology on the undergraduate level should be has already been discussed at length in yesterday's meeting. Although there may still remain divergences in belief and practice on this matter, the curriculum of the very few and relatively recently established schools for graduate study in theology seems to indicate the unanimous belief that the content of the graduate course should be similar or comparable to that of the seminary course. Since the graduate training course is a new demand to supply a new need, there is comparatively little source material for the study of this problem.

Much of what follows in this paper is based on a questionnaire which I sent to obtain objective data concerning the problem of training teachers of theology on the college level. Two questionnaires were sent: one to 31 Catholic universities of the country and one to 136 Catholic colleges. 29 out of 31 universities and 109 out of 136 colleges answered my request. The response to both was more than encouraging and evidences a real interest in the problem before us today.

CONTENT OF COURSE

School of Sacred Theology <i>Catholic University:</i> 5 years' study—S.T.D. 4 years' study—S.T.L. (From Announcements)	School of Sacred Theology <i>St. Mary's—Notre Dame:</i> 2 years' and 3 summers' study—Ph.D. in Religion (From Bulletin)	Graduate School of Theology Science— <i>Regina Mundi</i> Roman Institute of Sacred Rome: 3 years' study—(As yet do not know if degree will be given) (From 1st year Syllabus)
<hr/> Fundamental Dogma Moral Scripture Church History Christian Archaeology Canon Law Hebrew Greek Liturgy Ascetics Oriental Theology Christian Sources <hr/> Homiletics Pastoral Ecclesiastical Latin Special Elective Subjects Scholastic Disputations	<hr/> Fundamental Dogmatic Theology Moral Theology Old Testament New Testament Church History <hr/> Hebrew or Greek <hr/> Spiritual Theology <hr/> <hr/> Papal Encyclicals <hr/> <hr/> Electives <hr/>	<hr/> Philosophy Fundamental Theology <hr/> Moral Theology Holy Scripture Church History Archaeology Canon Law <hr/> Liturgy Spiritual Theology <hr/> Missiology <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

From the above tabulation of the three main types of schools offering graduate courses in theology, you may easily see how closely they are patterned on the course offered in the seminary.

In the School of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University, the content of the doctorate course for non-clerics is exactly the same as that offered for seminarians and priests; that of the licentiate course is likewise the same, except that candidates for this degree are excused from the course of Sacred Eloquence.

In the School of Sacred Theology in St. Mary's, Notre Dame, the content of the doctorate course is almost identical with the content of the seminary course of the Catholic University. In fact, St. Mary's bulletin comments: "It provides instruction comparable to that received by the students in the seminary. Certain topics which concern the priest primarily or exclusively have been omitted or curtailed."¹⁵ In Rome, the syllabus for Regina

Mundi,¹⁶ the most recently established of such schools, is more like that of St. Mary's. All are based on the seminary course and can justify the finality of the graduate training course, which is to acquire the wisdom of theology.

Since the seminary course and the graduate training course differ in finality—the seminarian preparing for the sacred ministry, the graduate students for teaching on the college level—we should expect some variations in the prescribed courses but at the same time variations which are only accidental. If the social or lay apostolate is to be the end of the undergraduate course in theology, must not the graduate course take specific means to prepare the teachers directly for it? St. Mary's offers a year's study of the social encyclicals; Regina Mundi offers a course in liturgy and missiology. In fact, on the occasion of the opening of Regina Mundi, Our Holy Father expressed his hope, namely:

that the new institution will bear valuable fruit in giving the Religious a more complete formation and one better adapted to present needs, and in the deepening of religious culture, particularly for those who have the noble mission of educating youth in the faith and practice of the Christian life.¹⁷

WHO SHOULD TEACH

It goes without saying that intellectual ability is essential for the teacher of theology, but it ought to be characterized by a power of penetration and association so that the candidate will not only learn to know the great truths of faith, but be able to make a synthesis of them, to see the relationship of one doctrine to another and to the whole. This is the fruit of long and serious study; it takes time. It is also the work of the Holy Spirit—the fruit of prayer as well as the gift of God. It is wisdom.

Solid formation in the spiritual life likewise is essential for the teacher of theology. For an educator, there is need, however, not only of being formed properly in the spiritual life, but of having such an intellectual and warm appreciation of it that one is able to communicate it in some way to youth. Our young people need to see Christianity for what it is, the glad tidings; they need to see the dynamism of the truths they are taught, lived in the lives of the men and women who teach them these

truths. Scholars in the field of theology today are voicing their opinions on the relation of theology to holiness and they do not hesitate to remind us that in the past the great doctors of the Church were also the great saints of the Church.¹⁸

The ability to communicate knowledge to another is, of course, of the first importance in the work of teaching. It is one thing to know one's subject; it is quite another thing to be able to teach it. Pedagogical training is a basic element in the problem of training teachers, and it would seem essential to require such training for them. By pedagogy I mean the *how* of the teaching of theology on the college level. It concerns the method to be used in the classroom, techniques, presentation, testing, etc. It is the method of teaching and not lecturing. As a matter of fact, the question can be raised, is such pedagogical training required for college teaching in other subjects? The answer is that there is no pedagogical training required of college teachers; the degree, masterate or doctorate, qualifies the college teacher. This is admittedly a weakness of college teaching. Teaching communities give to their members during their years of formation pedagogical training which can prove invaluable in the teaching of theology. Another problem arises in the question of choosing candidates for the graduate course, namely, how can ability to teach be discerned? Should the candidate teach before being sent on for specialization? This is not always possible.

After these preliminary requisites for the teacher of theology, namely, the intellectual ability, the spiritual formation, the pedagogical training, I will consider the problem of training teachers of theology on the college level according to the different categories of teacher to be trained: clerical or non-clerical. I shall speak first of clerics.

Priests staff the theology departments of our colleges for the most part; the questionnaire verified this. Is there any further training needed by the priest teaching theology on the college level, trained as he is in the seminary where the Church herself has stated the requirements for admission thereto, and has drawn up the course of study to be followed in accordance with the end of the priest's ministry? According to the data obtained from the questionnaire, a fair number of priests have had advanced study. However, on the subject of the necessity of further

training, the opinions of priests vary. Some hold that there is no need for it; others are anxious to learn where it may be obtained. If the end of the undergraduate course which they will have to teach is training for the social or lay apostolate, it seems to me that further training is essential.

The second category of teachers of theology on the college level are non-clerics, that is, brothers, sisters, lay men and women. Brothers and laymen may qualify for the doctorate in Sacred Theology in the School of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University; they may also qualify for the licentiate. Although not a university, St. Mary's, Notre Dame, has a school of Sacred Theology offering a doctorate of philosophy in religion to sisters and laywomen. The course at the Catholic University requires at least five years of study for the doctorate and four years of study for the licentiate. The degree conferred on the candidates, whether cleric or non-cleric, differs essentially from the degrees obtained elsewhere since it includes a doctorate and licentiate in Sacred Theology. The course at St. Mary's for women requires two years and three summers. The degree conferred on the candidate is a doctorate of philosophy in religion but not in theology. Even though nuns teach theology in about one-third of the Catholic Colleges of our country, there is no place in the country which gives them a doctorate degree in theology. Laymen can receive a doctorate or licentiate in Sacred Theology; religious women cannot.

Besides these two schools which offer the higher degrees of doctorate and licentiate, there are many schools offering some kind of master's degree. There are five universities that offer the master's degree in theology: St. Bonaventure's, Creighton, St. John's, Brooklyn, Marquette, and Notre Dame. The requirements for the degree, Master of Arts in Theology, conferred by these five universities vary; the number of semester hours in theology and related subjects required for the degree range from 14 to 42 semester hours; some universities require a thesis, some do not; some require a reading knowledge of Latin, some do not; some permit minors, some do not. All courses are given in the summer session with the exception of one university at which the courses are given during the scholastic year.

Besides these five universities granting a master of arts degree in theology, there are others, e.g. St. Mary's, Notre Dame,

which gives a Master of Arts in religion with a major in Sacred Scripture and Providence College, which confers a master of arts degree in religious education or guidance. Still others such as Fordham University grant a master of science degree in religious education.

We have seen, then, that for the Master's Degree, whether in theology, religion, religious education, or religious guidance, there are differences of requirements for the same degree as well as several degrees for the same amount of study or even less. This fact appears as a weakness of higher Catholic education. No matter who confers the degree, can the degree, whatever its name, be representative of a standard course of instruction?

Besides brothers and sisters, there are lay faculty members engaged in the theological departments of five colleges in the country. The fact is significant of our times. Statistics show that probably in the future we shall depend more and more on them. Therefore, proper training of this group of teachers should be envisaged. This phase of the problem of training teachers of theology on the college level should be considered in the light of the increased enrollment in colleges and universities during the next twenty years.

According to a statement in the January issue of the current year, in *Higher Education*, the monthly publication of the United States Department of Education, last fall's enrollments in colleges and universities was the largest in the nation's history.¹⁹

Another statement, in *Time*, discussing the same problem, comments:

Between 1900 and 1950, the population of the U.S. doubled; in the last 20 years the birth rate has shot up 88%, hitting 3,900,000 in 1953. If the same percentage of young people go to college by 1970 as at present (about 30%), enrollments will jump 75% to 4,219,047. Should the college percentage increase to 40%, enrollments might soar to well over 5,000,000.²⁰

The Reverend Thurston Davis, S.J., in an article in *America* entitled "Are Too Many Going to College?", stated:

Competent prognosticators think that by 1970 enrollment will probably have rocketed beyond 5 million. This is based on the fact that our present figure of 7,967,556

men and women of college age will jump to an estimated 13,609,831 by 1970.²¹

According to these statistics many more trained teachers of theology will be needed. There is a further aspect of this problem which ought to be faced. With the increased birth rate will arise a need, above all, for more priests in the ministry. What the increase in priestly vocations will be no one knows; one thing, however, seems probable as a result of this increase, namely, that more of the teaching of theology, especially in women's colleges, will have to be done by women, religious and lay. There are other implications which follow from this increased enrollment, but since they do not touch directly on the problem they will not be discussed.

Before concluding this study on the problem of training teachers of theology on the college level, it may be helpful to consider the student. You are teachers; you know the type of students who come to American Catholic colleges. At one extreme there are those who have had twelve years of Catholic school education; at the other are those who had had twelve years of public school education. Both groups and even those within each group have varying degrees of religious knowledge. Then there are those who have been in both types of schools and are more or less well informed about their faith. Again some come from good Catholic homes, some from worldly homes, some from broken homes. All are the children of our American civilization who have nonetheless chosen Catholic colleges in which to be educated and if asked the reason for their choice the vast majority would give the faith as their answer. Experience has taught me that there is interest and even enthusiasm among students for theology.

It was interesting to note some remarks on the questionnaire, remarks which were not sought for specifically, but were welcomed, because they flow from the experience of others:

. . . they (the priests) are very successful in presenting the material. Our experience is that they are vitally interested in their classes and bring much zeal and persistent efforts to the task that their students profit greatly from the priests' profound knowledge of theology.

Another states: "Both students and faculty have the greatest praise for the fine work they (the priests) are accomplishing in

their theology courses.” And still another—this time a priest: “The intellectual development of the students (girls) taking the full course is remarkable.”

In a recent issue of *Lumen Vitae*, in an article on the teaching of theology on the college level in our own country, one paragraph reads:

How does one explain the fact that the median average of religion marks is usually higher than that of all other subjects combined? How explain college students passing around to their family and friends a scholarly but readable Life of Christ, with the earnest exhortation to read it? How explain that 60% of talk in college dormitory rooms is on religion? How explain that hundreds of college students have openly declared their religion course to be the best of all, even in the academic sense? How explain that young men leaving college are dedicating themselves more than ever before to becoming Catholic leaders in their community and walk of life?²²

Is there any country in the world today that has the opportunity that is ours to form their youth, both male and female, during the formative years of college age? The Catholic college as it is organized in the United States is, I believe, a unique creation in the Church's educational system. We have the opportunity to make a profound contribution to America, which is “thirsting for the spiritual.”

Reverend Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J. stated in the conclusion of his recent work *Sacra Doctrina*:

I am confident that with the true appreciation of sacred theology as Christian wisdom, theology will be restored to its position of eminence in *all* our Catholic universities. The term *Catholic education* which is only the modern translation of the term *sacred doctrine* will then come to signify in our modern world the fullness of the reality it is intended to cover. Theology will no longer be regarded as something properly for clerical students and yet condescendingly offered to the laity under such baiting titles as “Theology for the Layman”. . . . The Christian wisdom of sacred theology is not only something to which all men have a right. They have the duty to pursue it since in this wisdom is found the order of *all things whatsoever* to their final end, and through this wisdom is achieved that peace

and tranquility of order which is above all understanding.²³

To conclude, I will summarize what has been presented thus far and offer some possible suggestions:

1. The objective of the graduate course is the acquiring of the wisdom of theology, first for the teacher's own personal integration and secondly, to possess the knowledge necessary to communicate it to students on the undergraduate level whose function in the Church is to participate as laymen and laywomen in the apostolate of the hierarchy.

2. The content of the graduate course, therefore, based as it is on the seminary course, must also include courses on the liturgy and social teaching of the Church. Moreover, training in pedagogy must be given to achieve the special and difficult end of the undergraduate course.

3. We need degrees in theology; our Catholic universities must supply this need by providing first: more schools of sacred theology and second: more full-time schools and full-time programs for non-clerics.

4. Degrees in theology are just beginning to be granted in this country. We need to have uniformity of requirements or uniformity of degrees conferred for equal courses of study.

5. In the secular order of studies accrediting agencies have spurred us to staff our schools with doctors and masters and to exact a minimum number of quality and quantity credit hours from our students before honoring them with a degree from our institutions. In the same way for the faculty of theology, we need something comparable to an accrediting agency which will make like demands of us. Who is to unify requirements for degrees? Who is to draw up requirements for teaching theology on the college level? Who is to require doctoral degrees in the departments of theology?

We need to make serious resolutions and unite our forces to find the solution for those grave problems in order to strengthen higher Catholic education in our own country.

Obviously much thought and planning has gone into the organization of schools and departments of Sacred Theology during the past ten years, and these efforts are now beginning to bear fruit. There is, however, still much to be done in our vast country. Fundamentally it is a question of facing the needs of

our times and of our country in the light of the teaching of the Church so as to make the adaptations necessary to teach theology on the graduate and undergraduate level to the laity.

¹ Pope Pius XII, "The Teaching Authority of the Church," *The Pope Speaks*, Vol. I, (The Second Quarter 1954), 157.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ "Theology and Education" reviewed by G. J. S., *The Clergy Review*, Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., Vol. XXXVIII, No. 11, (November 1952), 193.

⁵ The Reverend Walter Farrell, O.P., "Argument for Teaching Theology in Catholic Colleges," *The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, Vol. XLIII, No. 1, (August 1946), 239.

⁶ Reverend Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., "Theology in Catholic Colleges as an Aid to the Lay Apostolate," *Man and Modern Secularism*, National Catholic Alumni Federation, (1940) 145.

⁷ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman," *Theological Studies*, Vol. V, No. 1, (March 1944) 43.

⁸ Pope Pius IX, "Letter to the 4th Italian Congress, Sept. 24, 1877, as quoted in *Program of Action*, Part I, Grailville, Loveland, Ohio, (October 27, 1946) 42.

⁹ Pope Pius IX, "Council of Vatican" as quoted in *Program of Action*, Part I, Grailville, Loveland, Ohio, (October 27, 1946) 42.

¹⁰ Reverend Gerald B. Phelan, "Theology in the Curriculum of Catholic College and University," *Man and Modern Secularism*, National Catholic Alumni Federation, (1940) 134.

¹¹ *op. cit.*, p. 46.

¹² Roy J. Deferrari, *The Philosophy of Catholic Higher Education*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., (1948), "The Content and Methodology of the College Religion Program," by Reverend Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., 167.

¹³ Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J., "Reflections on the Relation between Philosophy and Theology," *Theological Studies*, Vol. XIV, No. 4, (December 1953) 549.

¹⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 243.

¹⁵ Bulletin of St. Mary's College, School of Sacred Theology, (1954-1956), 12.

¹⁶ Romanum Scientiarum Institutum, "Regina Mundi," *First Year Syllabus*: English Section, (1954-1955), 3.

¹⁷ Institutum "Regina Mundi," N.I., (1954), 1.

¹⁸ H. von Balthasar, "Théologie et Sainteté," *Dieu Vivant*, du present cahier numero 12 (1948), 15.

¹⁹ William A. Jaracz, "1954 Fall College Enrollment," *Higher Education*, Vol. XI, No. 5 (January 1955), 61.

²⁰ "The Big Wave," Reprinted from *Time*, *The Weekly Newsmagazine*, (February 21, 1955).

²¹ Thurston N. Davis, S.J., "Are Too Many Going to College?" *America*, Vol. 92, no. 5, (October 30, 1954), 121-123.

²² Richard Rousseau, S.J., "Theology for the Layman in American Jesuit Colleges," *Lumen Vitae*, Volume IX, No. 2, (1954), 291.

²³ Gerald F. Van Ackeren, S.J., *Sacra Doctrina, The Subject of the First Question of the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Romae, (1952), Officium Libri Catholici—Catholic Book Agency, 120.

MOTHER MARIE THERESE, O.S.U.,
College of New Rochelle

THE PROBLEM OF TRAINING COLLEGE TEACHERS OF THEOLOGY AS IT CONCERNS THE RELIGIOUS TEACHING BROTHER

If I understand correctly the instructions issued by the planning committee concerning this panel, it would seem to be my task to make some remarks by way of amplification of the points that have been so well developed by Mother Therese in her excellent paper. More specifically, I have been asked to discuss this problem as it concerns the colleges conducted by the congregations of teaching brothers. I trust, however, that this specific orientation of my remarks will not deprive them entirely of significance for all the members of the Society, religious and secular, clerical and lay, and I might add in the words of St. Paul, male and female.

It seems to me most important to establish, in the first place, some principle or norm by which to judge the selection and training of religious brothers, or anyone else for that matter, for assignment to college courses in Sacred Doctrine. Such a principle or norm can be found, I think, in our practice with regard to the training of teachers for the other advanced disciplines that are taught in our colleges.

For many decades, now, religious brothers, to say nothing of priests and sisters, have been selected and trained on the most advanced levels in subject fields ranging all the way from sociology and philosophy to atomic physics, from oriental archeology to advanced sewage disposal. No elaborate panel discussions were needed to ascertain the proper training for college teachers in these fields. After careful selection, those chosen for these assignments were sent off to the best, or more often the nearest, graduate school to obtain there the full professional mastery of their respective fields that the doctor's degree is ordinarily considered to represent.

There is surely no fundamental reason why the same procedures could not be applied to the selection and training of college teachers of Sacred Doctrine. Actually, of course, tremendous progress has been made in that direction over the course of the last ten years or so. But encouraging as this

progress is, it should not lull us into a dull complacency or blind us to the still obvious fact that the preparation required of college teachers in this field still falls far short, generally speaking, of that required in the ordinary secular branches.

I spoke some moments ago of the doctorate as the normal term of the graduate preparation that is expected of college teachers in other fields. This point needs, I think, particular emphasis here. Without ignoring the real contribution that the many excellent programs leading to the master's degree have made to advanced teacher-preparation in this specific field, we must, it seems to me, face the fact that the master's hood is rapidly becoming the normal academic insignia of the high school rather than of the college teacher. Certainly, many college teachers have terminated their formal training at the master's level; many of them, too, by reason of intense personal and professional activity, have become even more skilled in the art of college instruction than their gold-tasseled colleagues. But these concessions do not alter the *per se* status of the master's degree as representing something less than complete professional competence.

This inadequacy of the ordinary master's program for the training of college teachers is more evident, perhaps, in the field of Sacred Doctrine than anywhere else. For one thing, many of these courses are established as theology for the laity. As such they are organized on the principle enunciated ten years ago by Father John Courtney Murray that the lay vocation demands a theology course different in its finality and method from that of the priest. However valid Father Murray's views may be with regard to the theological training of laymen, they do not necessarily apply to the lay religious, particularly those who will teach Sacred Doctrine in college.

Some masters' programs, too, are more concerned with method than with content and consequently supply only a minimum content coverage. Often, too, the majority of students actually enrolled in such master's programs are destined for high school rather than for college teaching. Such diversification, not only concerning the *finis operis* but also the *finis operantis*, urge some caution before these programs can be enthusiastically endorsed as adequate agencies for the preparation of college teachers of Sacred Doctrine.

Apart from the matter of finality, the question might also be asked: Just how much mastery does the master's degree give? Very few of the recently organized master's programs in theology or religion require much by way of previous credit hours in courses of a truly college calibre. Often, indeed, the courses bearing graduate credit in theology are hardly beyond the level of the undergraduate college course they should presuppose.

And then, what of language requirements? It seems inconceivable that a student could be said to have a graduate mastery of a field whose sources he could not read. To teach even the most basic college course in Sacred Doctrine, the teacher who would be a master in the real sense of the word should surely read Latin well enough to be able to use Denzinger effectively, and French to be able to work his way through the pertinent articles in the D.T.C. And this says nothing of the vast body of scriptural, patristic, and theological literature that is available otherwise only second hand or, in many cases, not at all.

Finally, where is the time in the thirty-odd hours usually allotted to the master's degree to adequately cover on the graduate level the entire field of fundamental, dogmatic, moral, and sacramental theology? There is a tendency in some programs to further delimit the time that is available, by offering courses in such peripheral and auxiliary disciplines as Church History, Patrology, Canon Law, Liturgy, and mystical theology. There are, it seems, just too many obstacles to prevent the master's degree in theology from becoming, ordinarily at least, what its name implies.

A remark or two should be injected at this point concerning the adequacy of the seminary course as a means of preparing college teachers of Sacred Doctrine. Since, however, Father Harvey will discuss that particular point at length, I think that it may well be left aside here.

To come now to practical measures. By reason of a deep conviction that the selection and training of college theology teachers should be based on the norms adopted in other fields, religious brothers have in recent years been assigned in increasing numbers to schools of Sacred Theology to pursue there courses leading to the doctor's degree. At the present time there are brothers so engaged in the Gregorianum and Angelicum in

Rome, at the Catholic Universities in Louvain and Washington, and at the Grande Seminaire in Montreal. These men have, for the most part, been assigned to such studies after some years of religious profession and teaching experience. They will be expected, on the completion of their studies, to organize and direct courses in Sacred Doctrine in our institutions of higher learning. While it will take many years to train brothers in sufficient numbers to cover all the sections of theology courses in our colleges, it is felt that those who complete their doctoral work will be qualified almost at once to provide adequate direction for the preparation of teachers for specific courses, where the complete mastery of the whole field may be, for one or another practical reason, temporarily unattainable.

We feel, consequently, that at long last we are on a path that will ultimately lead our religious brothers who teach Sacred Doctrine in college to the same professional competence as their confreres in other fields. While this particular solution has been worked out primarily for our teaching brothers, the principle upon which it is based seems equally valid for priests and sisters.

The priest has an advantage over us in having already completed the seminary course pre-requisite to graduate study in theology. Priests in greater numbers could, therefore, be assigned to such graduate work with a view to college teaching in Sacred Doctrine.

As for the sisters, an understandable reluctance to have the seminaries turn co-ed makes it impossible for them to follow the regularly established courses leading to the S.T.L. and S.T.D. degrees. Until such courses can be separately established, the program for the doctorate offered at St. Mary's, Notre Dame, unique so far as I know, is, from many points of view, comparable in depth and scope to an S.T.D. program.

In cases where the master's degree is the only possible choice, whether for priest, brother, or sister, our principle still applies. Every care must be taken that only those programs be selected for the training of our college teachers in Sacred Doctrine whose pre-requisites, requirements, and level of instruction most closely approximate the standards that prevail in other fields.

I should like, in a final word or two, to insist that the training I have advocated here is proposed in terms of an ideal; an ideal already taken as a matter of course in our training in the secular

branches; an ideal of advanced graduate study for all who teach Sacred Doctrine in college—brothers, sisters and priests as well; an ideal that seems more capable of realization now than ever before. That ideal is the doctorate, and the doctorate, obviously, not so much for its extrinsic usefulness in satisfying accrediting agencies, but rather, and principally, for the breadth of coverage and professional competence it should ordinarily represent.

In a short discussion such as this, there is not time to make all the necessary qualifications that one would like. Certainly some master's programs in theology do have pre-requisites and language requirements. Certainly too, the very fact that such programs are offered represents a tremendous advance over our situation of ten years ago. It is certain, above all, that individual teachers with master's degrees in Sacred Doctrine have distinguished themselves by their truly professional grasp of the subject and their pedagogical skill in imparting it. But for all these concessions, it must be insisted that an ideal that we have set, and often realized, for training in our secular branches should be, must be, and indeed now often is established as the norm and objective measure of the proper training for the college teachers of Sacred Doctrine.

BROTHER CELESTINE LUKE, F.S.C.
De La Salle College
Washington

THE PROBLEM OF TRAINING COLLEGE TEACHERS OF THEOLOGY AS IT CONCERNS THE PRIEST-PROFESSOR

It is my purpose to submit for discussion the problem of pedagogical and theological preparation of priest-professors of sacred doctrine. It has frequently been assumed that four years of seminary theology prepared a man to teach religion on any level. Surely, it was thought, after such a training the priest knew far more theology than he would be able to communicate to the relatively immature minds of college students. Of course, he would have to consider a few minor practical details, such as simplifying his knowledge of theology to meet the intellectual level of the students (usually underrated), selecting what Father Walter Farrell called "chunks of theology" to step up their spiritual life, assigning suitable reading material from available texts in English, and the like. But the more basic problems of the very nature of theology and its ideal relationship to curriculum organization, or of the objective purpose of all the courses in religion as forming a habit of theology in the student mind, or of the need to stress certain elements of theology as the intellectual basis of the social apostolate of the laity—such problems as these—did not seem to enter his mind. The very notion that the priest-professor of college religion needs far more preparation than the mastery of the essentials of a seminary course is the product of a healthy ferment of discussion among priest-professors of religion during the last decade or so.

To say that seminary theology is not an adequate preparation for teaching theology on the college level is not a criticism of the ordinary seminary course. It happens that the finality of the seminary course is different from that of the college. So apparent is this difference that it needs little elaboration before a learned group like this. The courses in moral and pastoral theology, for example, deal with many difficult and delicate questions, the knowledge of which would be of minimal benefit to the average laymen,—psychiatrists, doctors, and lawyers, perhaps, excepted.

Indeed, as I have learned from teaching college religion, a superficial grasp of the principle of good faith can be a source

of scandal to the layman, unless the teacher corrects it with a full discussion of its limited valid application. The knowledge of this principle, like several others, is far more necessary for the confessor than for the layman. Its full discussion must be part of a seminary course, but it does not belong in a college course, except perhaps to be explained privately, to the very intelligent who inquire into its meaning.

While it is granted that four years of seminary theology give the future priest-professor a tremendous background, and a certain advantage over the sister and the brother, at least in regard to the opportunity of gaining a comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter of theology, it must be asserted that the seminary course is not sufficient to prepare a man to teach college religion. His inadequacy may be viewed from the vantage point of content matter and from that of method. First I want to dwell upon the degree of content *mastery* of theology possessed by the average priest graduate of the average seminary. (I realize I am treading upon very thin ice in making statements about the sacerdotal average!)

From the experience of teaching college religion I have formed the opinion that the priest-professor must have a more adequate comprehension of the entire science of theology than that possessed by the average priest after the ordinary course of training. The average parish priest knows sufficient theology to fulfill his mission of the pastoral care of souls. He can preach clear sermons, instruct both children and adults in the rudiments of the Faith, offer spiritual guidance, and exercise his sacerdotal powers in diverse ways. As a confessor endowed with a certain prudence gained through prayer, Divine Grace, and experience, he may surpass the seminary professor who taught him his knowledge of moral theology. But such gifts do not qualify him to teach either in the seminary or on the college level. What the priest-professor of college religion needs is a grasp of the principles of theology as thorough as that penetration of the principles of chemistry required of a college teacher of chemistry. His knowledge of theology should be equivalent to the degree of learning expected of a Doctor of Philosophy in some other field.

After all, a young man selected to teach in the seminary after his ordination is guided into the concentration program of graduate theology. He is expected to learn methods of research

and seminar techniques before he is allowed to take an oral comprehensive examination for the Licentiate in Theology. He is expected to apply research methods to the writing of a Doctorate thesis and to demonstrate his mastery of his subject in more oral examinations before he receives the Doctorate in Sacred Theology. All this he accepts as preparation for teaching in a seminary. May I not plead the reasonableness of a comparative training for the young man who is going to teach sacred doctrine on the college level? He too needs a graduate school mastery and attitude towards theology.

What elements should enter into the formation of this future priest-professor? That is a good question for you to discuss shortly. It is my opinion that some type of degree work in theology would seem to be required to achieve this preparation. In general, those who teach economics on the college level are required to have their Master's degree, and are expected and encouraged to work for their Doctorate. Shall we expect less of the priest-professor of theology?

The kind of degree which the priest-professor of theology should possess is another point for your discussion. It seems that it should be at least the equivalent of the Licentiate in Sacred Theology.

To turn now to the second seeming inadequacy, namely, a lack of acquaintance with all those elements which I shall subsume under the general idea of method, several points may be made. The average graduate of a seminary course does not have knowledge of the problems of curriculum-organization and the diverse points of view which are their basic principles, as we saw in yesterday's animated discussion. He is not fully aware of the relationship of theology to the other branches of learning. Indeed it is the recollected experience of many priest-professors of college religion that at the beginning of their assignment they were not aware of the existence of so many complex questions. They never dreamed teaching religion in colleges could be so involved.

From the catechetics course, it is true, they may have garnered a restricted idea that methods of pedagogy have some importance, but, by and large, they remained unaware of problems of methodology on the college level. A lesson plan in a catechetical outline is quite different from a lesson plan for a college re-

ligion class. So also are the outside reading assignments on diverse intellectual levels. Even to make the assignments in college theology demands an up-to-date acquaintance with theology books in English, written on an adult level. . . . There is an even more marked difference in intellectual capacity and motivation between the average Catholic college student and the average adult in a catechetics class. In short, the new priest-professor of college religion has much to learn about pedagogical methods in general and classroom techniques of test construction and marking in particular, not to mention other instruments of teaching.

Again, it should be granted that many of these particulars of pedagogy he will acquire as he teaches with his eyes wide open. However, Father John Hardon, S.J. thinks that the future priest-professor can learn some of these things during his seminary courses in theology, provided he received from his superiors some kind of assurance that he will teach theology on the college level after he finishes his course of studies.

Putting his theory into practice, Father Hardon has organized a seminar at West Baden College, Indiana, of six Jesuit scholastics who have received tentative assurance that they will teach college religion in one of the colleges or universities of the order. On the basis of trial seminars during the past year he composed an outline for future seminars entitled: *Towards An Improvement of Religious Instruction in Catholic Colleges*. Among the purposes of the seminar he lists the following:

- (1) To make the prospective teachers aware of the problems which will confront them, especially that of making the teaching of religion vital in the lives of the students.
- (2) To consider how much and what aspects of supernatural truth should be given to a college student, independently of his subjective likes and dislikes, interests, background, or future work as a layman.
- (3) To consider some of the specific needs, capacities, or limitations, found in the student "which *necessitate* an adaptation of the objective ideal of concrete circumstances." (Fr. Hardon, *Notes*, 1)

The members of the seminar become aware of some of the problems which they will meet by reading and discussing ar-

ticles similar to those found in the Select Bibliography of College Theology, which you have received at this meeting. The least to be derived from such concentration is a more comprehensive grasp of the nature and scope of theology. Seminar discussion on the purpose of college theology will give the prospective teachers an added incentive to get the most out of their seminary studies. They will see a deeper penetration of those aspects of seminary theology which they consider to have optimum pedagogical value on the college level. Far from neglecting their seminary classes, they will exceed their requirements, because they have an additional objective in mind..

After one has taken a definite stand on the objective aims of college theology, says Father Hardon, there remains the practical problem of adapting these aims to the students' needs, capacities and limitations. It is a question of adapting the aims to contingencies of personality, time, and place with considerations of such factors as textbooks, classnotes, coordination with the college curriculum and with extra-curricular activities.

Personally, I am inclined to doubt the value of seminars on problems of subjective adaptation to men who lack the experience of teaching college religion. Within the limited time at the disposal of the future priest-professor he would do well to concentrate far more upon the nature of theology and the purpose of theology for the layman, however controverted these may be. I have been informed that Father Hardon stresses the objective purpose of theology more than the question of the subjective adaptation of religion to students' needs.

In addition to the points already submitted for discussion one may add the following:

1. Is it practicable for superiors of religious congregations and of seminaries to designate beforehand the men who will teach religion in the colleges which they are committed to staff?
2. What elements of method can be explored more profitably in seminars similar to that of Father Hardon?
3. Should not discussion of theology as an integrating force in Catholic higher education be given priority in such preparatory seminars?

The reason for this third subject for consideration is to point up the preeminent place which theology should have in the curriculum. Theology is "discursive wisdom that considers God as He knows Himself and reveals Himself to others, and it considers all other things precisely in their relationship to God Who is their beginning and end."¹ Theology, as Father Donlan expressed it yesterday—and in the paper given before the NCEA in 1953, must develop in the student an habitual knowledge of the truths which are to guide his entire life. Properly taught, "it will equip our students as far as any academic means can equip them, for a journey that leads them through this life and into the next, because we have equipped them to think, to judge, and to act constantly and consistently, not only according to the light of reason, but especially as reason is illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ."²

Can we be too careful, then, in preparing college teachers of such wisdom?

¹ Thomas C. Donlan, O.P. *NCEA Bulletin*, "Theology As An Integrating Force in Catholic Higher Education" 50:188.

² *Ibid.*, 192.

THE REV. JOHN F. HARVEY, O.S.F.S.,
Dunbarton College of the Holy Cross
Washington

DISCUSSION OF PAPERS ON TEACHER TRAINING

Sister Consuelo Marie, S.S.J., Chesnut Hills College: Asked for information about the languages used at the *Regina Mundi* in Rome.

Mother Therese: As far as I know, English, French, Spanish and probably Italian are used. The individual student, however, need know only one, as the entire curriculum and faculty are repeated in the four languages.

Sister Raymond, O.S.B., St. Scholastica College: Is it true that the Brothers and laymen studying theology at Catholic University follow the same program as the seminarians?

Brother Luke: Yes.

Father Sloyan (who was asked to comment on the graduate program leading to the doctorate in Religious Education from Catholic University): The Catholic University's department of religious education has, since the mid thirties, offered masters' and doctors' degrees in religious education. Sisters as well as Brothers and laymen are eligible for these degrees.

Bro. Albert, F.S.C., De La Salle College, Washington: I have just completed the work for the doctorate in the field of religious education here at C.U. I think it covers all the courses that could be taught on the college level. All were given on the graduate level.

The following are those offered: There are two courses given in moral theology, one in general, the other in the theological and moral virtues. Both are given by Father Connell, C.S.S.R., Dean of the School of Theology. There is a course in divine grace by Father Benard, a course in sacramental theology given by Doctor Doronzo, a course on *De Deo Uno, De Deo Trino*, and on the creation and fall of man. During the summer are given a course in fundamental theology by Monsignor Fenton and a course on the Incarnation by Father Dowd. There is also a complete course on the essence of sacrifice and the sacrifice of the Mass, one on the mystical body, and one on marriage both as a sacrament and as a vocation in life. There is a course on psychology in religion given by Dr. Van der Veldt, a course in religious guidance and one on the life of Christ. There is also a course on the social encyclicals in which some twenty-five encyclicals are covered. There is a course on natural theology or the moral law.

There are a number of courses on the social teaching of the church, one given by Dr. Furfey on the social teaching of the Gospels, Epistles and Apocalypse. Finally there is a series of courses given on marriage and the family. Such constitutes an outline for the doctorate in religious education at Catholic University.

Father Eugene Burke, C.S.P., asked Brother Albert if the content-courses given by the members of the School of Theology were given during the academic year or in the summer session.

Brother Albert replied they were given in the summer session.

Father Dwyer, S.J., Fordham, pointed out that the doctorate is more and more becoming a research degree. Are present students doing masters' and particularly doctorate work prepared to do such real research?

Brother Albert: Some of the Catholic University courses in religious education are research courses.

Father Finn, S.J.: I have an extended comment and then two questions. The extended comment has to do with what I consider an omission in the paper of Mother Marie Thérèse, an omission for which she cannot be blamed. She speaks of the pioneers in this movement of lay theology, and of getting the

undergraduate courses aimed at the students, and not a duplication of the seminary courses, and she goes back to 1939. She speaks of Father Phelan, Father Murray and Father Farrell, but omits mention of Father Morrison, S.J., of St. Louis University. Twenty-five years ago Father Morrison began a series of conferences—they were largely his work—of Jesuit college teachers of religion, which are now known among us as the Campion conferences, because they were held at Campion. The work there was largely his own—the work of culling, adjusting, and planning the agenda and so forth. As a result of those conferences he himself wrote a series of text-books, as you know, that have had wide use and are far from being seminary text-books. No matter what you think of them, there is one thing you must say about them, and that is that they are *not* seminary text-books. Father Morrison certainly dominated the entire mid-West as far as the Jesuit colleges were concerned. So I think it good to make mention of that fact. I think I would be remiss if I came here and did not bring that out. Some of you may wonder why he is not here. He is the head of the department; I am not. But just a year ago he had a stroke and he is working at very reduced rate just now, teaching only one three-hour course, but conducting the department.

The first question I would ask, and I'm asking it of both Brother and Mother: do you think that our undergraduate colleges and schools must carry two curricula—one for those who are going to teach college religion and know it, and one for those who are not?

The second question asks for an expression of your feeling. After both Brother Luke and Mother Therese mentioned that there were now five universities—the Gregorianum, the Angelicum, Louvain and the Grand Seminaire of Montreal—and now the Sisters can get a course in Rome just like the priests are getting, I would like to know how you felt when Father Harvey got up and said—"that is not enough." We are finding out at long last that the seminary course for priests is not enough to prepare a man to walk in and teach a course in college theology. Something more is needed.

Mother Therese: (replying to the second question) We Sisters are very grateful for such a tremendous step in advancement. Previously Sisters could do no advanced work at all in theology. As future training improves for priest-professors, we may hope that it will also improve for Sisters and Brothers.

Father Finn restating his first question asked whether the Sisters wanted more special pointing in the undergraduate courses when they know they are going to teach religion later.

Mother Therese: In women's religious communities the aim would be to avoid all differentiation on the undergraduate level, and to give all the Sisters a broad, sound training. Later after some teaching experience, some individuals could be chosen for further study.

Brother Luke added that it seems almost axiomatic that religious communities must give to all a basic training, and then choose certain individuals for further training.

Brother Alban of Mary, F.S.C., Manhattan College, asked Brother Luke to give the plan for training the Christian Brothers of the Baltimore and Philadelphia provinces. Brother Luke answered that each province gives a basic program of twenty-four hours, but the Philadelphia province use its summer sessions differently.

Fr. Bernard Murray, S.J., Canisius College, asked Brother Luke: How do the Brothers doing graduate work in schools set up for priests manage since the priests have already had the full seminary course as a basic background?

Bro. Luke: The Brother to be so trained first has to get his regular Bachelor's degree, then do three or four years teaching in grade or high school. Then he gets his master's degree in some field like Latin or philosophy which will be useful in theology. Incidentally, one of the Brothers now in this field has his Master's in both Latin and philosophy. Then the Brother must go through the entire seminary program with the seminarians before he can finally go on to his doctorate work in Sacred Theology.

Fr. Harvey: (replying to Fr. Finn's earlier question on pointing undergraduate courses in religion for Sisters who would later teach religion): The following questions are just examples of topics on which teachers often have special difficulties: truth-telling, keeping secrets, formation of correct conscience in children, natural and supernatural virtues.

Fr. Burke: (to Bro. Luke) Would you give us an impression of your seminary course as you went through it, since your experience is unique, that is, receiving a seminary training which was not ordered to the priesthood? I would like to hear your impressions—not only the advantages you found, but any criticisms you might have.

Bro. Luke: I would need some thought and time to give an adequate answer. One immediate impression I have is that the course, when given for Brothers, could be somewhat shortened.

Another thought I have is that there should be more time for, and practice in, research and personal responsibility. However the great positive contribution of such a complete training is that the entire subject of theology is covered. This full and complete program gives a truly sound basis for any future special work.

Fr. Bowman, S.J., West Baden College: Father Hardon whom you mentioned in your paper, Father Harvey, regrets sincerely that he cannot be with us here. He is at present busy with the provincial archives. Father arranged that I should represent him here. My right to that appreciated distinction is the fact that I am professor of catechetics at West Baden, and since I have taught it there one year, I am an expert! (Laughter) All in attendance here have received copies of Father Hardon's *Select Bibliography on Teaching College Religion*. There is a regrettable omission there of which we were informed when we arrived. Let me assure you that Father Donlan's *Theology and Education* will be added immediately.

In regard to Father Hardon's seminar, let me say that it has been composed of six or eight Jesuit theologians at West Baden who, after much effort on the part of those interested in providing training for future teachers of college theology, have been designated by our provincial authorities as scholastics destined for that work. These young men have no ironclad guarantee that they will teach college religion, but a reasonable assurance that they will. Like all Jesuit theologate students, they have had three years of philosophy and three years of teaching experience, and are now pursuing the regular theology program required before ordination. They have demonstrated teaching competence and interest. That interest in college religion is now being channelled definitely and directed under Father Hardon. May I say that the impetus for the seminar which he directs came from these scholastics.

About five years ago two scholastics destined for college religion were given a postgraduate year at West Baden to pursue a doctorate degree in theology from our *collegium maximum* there. Two summers and one complete year were spent in study for the degree which was conferred at West Baden. One of the two recipients was Father Filas who gives the television program on the Holy Shroud on Good Friday. While this opportunity for advanced study directed toward college religion teaching was an advance, there were difficulties attendant upon pursuing graduate theology at the same institution at which the undergraduate program had been followed. The degree that is desirable must be a research degree and facilities for such were not adequate at West Baden. Whether more of our men will go on

for that doctorate in America, I do not know. We have heard that the Missouri province is sending men to Rome this year. Father, have you heard anything about this matter?

Fr. Finn: Paris.

Fr. Bowman: Good! (Laughter) I just got back from the Gregorianum at Rome last August. We who have done our work there were disappointed when we heard that Missouri was sending her future teachers of college religion there, for we believe better preparation can be secured in Paris and Louvain. That is a private opinion; take it for what it is worth.

I would like to comment about the theology program for religious women initiated at the College of *Regina Mundi* this past year. It has a faculty drawn from the faculties from Rome,—Dominicans, Franciscans, Capuchins, Benedictines, and Jesuits. As Mother Marie Therese said, the courses are to be taught in at least three languages, probably four. Problems of organization have been multiple and are not yet solved adequately, if I am correctly informed. It is interesting to note that one of the great difficulties of its administration was to decide on the *finis* of the college, as well as on the method and order to pursue in it. The authorities apparently have decided on the method, for the tracts are listed in the syllabus of the first year which is now available. I think we can be encouraged by the uncertainty at *Regina Mundi* to proceed here with some confidence, knowing that the standards in America, comparatively speaking, will be as high, if not superior to those maintained for the training of Sisters in Rome. European appraisal of woman's intellectual training and competence is not high. That is my personal opinion formed from the discussions on the subject which were rife in Rome last year. The question of granting degrees there is another unanswered problem.

But to return to Father Hardon's efforts directed to the training of our own scholastics at West Baden. His seminar meets every two weeks. The period is devoted to a discussion of the articles listed in the *Bibliography* on the concept of teaching college theology. Father is convinced that much time must be spent on such a background. His students are eager to plunge immediately into the task of adapting seminary theology to college classes; but Father restrains their desire and directs their efforts to the study of the theoretical problems and their solutions. Secondly, he sustains interest by occasional instructions on the adaptation of certain seminary tracts to a vital class in college theology.

Father Hardon distinguishes quite clearly between the objective and the subjective attitudes and necessities of the prob-

lem of college theology. He maintains that colleges should decide resolutely on a definite theology program; that they should select, in other words, one approach and then organize the course around that *finis*, and not worry too much about obvious deficiencies that may be there. It is better to have a course and pursue it, than to worry about other master plans which you may or may not be able to incorporate in your plan.

In conclusion, and I know the words are welcome to you, I would like to say that if any of the delegates wish a copy of Father Hardon's notes, I am sure he will be happy to send them. If you give me your name and address, I shall forward the notes when I return to West Baden. If you wish to send your request to the Secretary of the Society, it will be forwarded to us and answered promptly.

Fr. Casey, S.J., Boston College: Seven or eight years ago I drew up a reading list on college theology which is intended to be used for outside supplementary reading. It is to be revised this summer and will be made available.

Fr. Sloyan, Catholic University: Notre Dame Alumni office has likewise a very fine bibliography for Sacred Doctrine, though I must say, when you write for copies, they do not seem to be available in large quantities.

Fr. Shea, O.P., St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans: I should like, in all this discussion of adaptation, to recall attention to the fact that theology is a science. When dealing with a science, the first principle which determines it is the object of the science, not the subject taking it. Thus I do not think we should overstress the extrinsic causality—the purposes—of those taking the science. Theology has its own end, the formation of the *habitus* of theology.

Sister Consuelo Marie, S.S.J., Chestnut Hill College, asked the length of the course at Saint Mary's School of Sacred Theology and the amount of research required.

Sister Charles Borromeo, C.S.C., Saint Mary's College, replied that the program had been set up eleven years ago with no experience or previous model with which to compare itself. St. Mary's was a pioneer in offering a full graduate program for the doctorate in theology for religious and lay women. The present program, Sister explained, is doing good work, but no one responsible for it believes that it is the final and perfect arrangement. From meetings like this national one, will come the thinking and insight that will eventually, God-willing, adapt and enlarge the program realistically.

Fr. Finn, S.J., emphasized that it seems that no one now holds that the college theology course and the preparation to teach it should be directly modeled on the seminary plan.

Fr. Bowman, S.J., called attention to the fact that at present the question of granting degrees at *Regina Mundi* seems to compromise the value of the work there, in view of the necessity of degrees in the American collegiate set-up. He said: "There is great difficulty in convincing Europeans that Sisters should study."

Father Haran, S.J., closed the discussion with pointing out that the study of theology is regulated from Rome, which now determines the whole system of degrees, but, of course, affects only seminary and clerical studies. He urged that we should follow the Roman thinking and directives in this matter, to see how the question is developing there concerning higher degrees in theology for Sisters and Brothers.

Recorder: SISTER M. CHARLES BORROMEO, C.S.C.
Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana

BUSINESS MEETING, APRIL 13, 1955

SOCIETY OF CATHOLIC COLLEGE TEACHERS
OF SACRED DOCTRINE

REPORT OF NATIONAL SECRETARY

First Annual National Meeting

Since the appointment of the Acting Secretary of the Society at the Organizational Meeting held at Dunbarton College of the Holy Cross, Washington, D.C., October 11, 1953 to the present First Annual National Meeting of the Society at Trinity College, Washington D.C., April 11-13, 1955, the following communications have been circularized through the National Office:

Letters announcing the first Organizational Area Meeting held at La Salle College, Philadelphia, on December 8, 1953, were sent to the head of the department of Sacred Doctrine and to the individual members of the faculty of these departments in the Catholic colleges of the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania	62
Reports of this meeting sent to each of the above addressees and in addition to the faculty of Sacred Doctrine of the colleges of the State of New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island	111
Invitations to the Constitutional Meeting held at Fordham University, February 22, 1954, sent to the head of the department of Sacred Doctrine in all Catholic colleges in the eastern area of the United States, from Maine to Virginia inclusive and to individual personnel therein	170
Report of the Constitutional Meeting at Fordham University sent to each of the 47 colleges represented thereat, and to other interested persons	65
Announcements of the meeting of the Society held at the National Convention of the NCEA at Chicago, Illinois, April 20, 1954, sent to the head of the department of Sacred Doctrine in each of the 247 colleges of the U.S., as well as to the previously acquired mailing list of the Society	417
Report of the NCEA Chicago meeting of the Society sent to Officers, Board of Directors, and Regional Chairmen ..	26
Announcements of the present First Annual National	

Meeting of the Society with tentative programs and re- turn postcards forwarded to	717
Members	257
Presidents of Catholic Colleges in the U.S.	247
Non-members who had expressed interest in the So- ciety since its organization	213
Answers to requests for information concerning member- ship in the Society have been mailed to	470
Answers to requests for history of the Society and copies of its Constitution, etc.	135
Estimated Total Communciations	2,173.

In addition, press releases of the Constitutional Meeting, the Chicago NCEA Meeting, and the present First Annual National Meeting were sent to the respective national news release services, and to the diocesan newspapers of the cities where regional meetings of the Society have been held, as well as to a number of the professional periodicals.

In addition, all correspondence concerning the organization of the seventeen regions of the Society, i.e., copies of the recommendations for organization, agenda prepared by the Current Problems Committee for the meetings of the first year of the Society, questionnaires, etc., as well as the correspondence necessary for the conduct of the business of the Regions in relation to the National Office.

Regular correspondence with Officers, Board of Directors, concerning the following meetings which have been held in the interest of the Society, as well as the minutes thereof:

- Organizational meetings held at Dunbarton College, October 11, 1953
- Organizational meetings held at Dunbarton College, November 15, 1953
- Organizational meetings held at La Salle College, December 8, 1953
- Organizational meetings held at Dunbarton College, January 10, 1954
- Organizational meetings held at Dunbarton College, February 7, 1954
- Constitutional Meeting held at Fordham University, February 22, 1954
- Board of Directors Meeting held at Fordham University, February 22, 1954
- Officers Meeting held at Dunbarton College, March 10, 1954
- Board of Directors Meeting held at Manhattan College, March 20, 1954
- Officers Meeting held at Dunbarton College, April 9, 1954

Meeting of Society at NCEA National Meeting in Chicago,
April 20, 1954

Officers Meeting held at Dunbarton College, May 14, 1954

Board of Directors Meeting held at St. Paul the Apostle Rec-
tory, N.Y., May 22, 1954

Officers Meeting held at Dunbarton College, December 7, 1954

Board of Directors Meeting held at St. Paul the Apostle Rec-
tory, N.Y., December 18, 1954

Officers Meeting held at Dunbarton College, February 27, 1955

Officers Meeting held at Dunbarton College, March 25, 1955

Board of Directors Meeting held at Trinity College, April 11,
1955

Board of Directors and Regional Chairmen meeting held at
Trinity College, April 12, 1955

To date, fourteen regions are operating in the Society. Re-
gions in Los Angeles, Portland, Oregon, and Cleveland-Detroit are
in process of organization.

To our esteemed President and fellow officers, to the Board of
Directors and Regional Chairmen, as well as to the many mem-
bers of the Society with whom the National Office has had con-
tact, the Secretary extends most sincere appreciation for their gen-
erous, kindly, enthusiastic cooperation.

Respectfully submitted,

SISTER M. ROSE EILEEN, C.S.C., *Secretary*

REPORT OF NATIONAL TREASURER

February 22, 1954-April 1, 1955

RECEIPTS:

Luncheon Fees: Feb. 22, 1954

96 @ \$1.50\$ 144.00

Memberships:

247 @ \$5.00 1,235.00

8 @ 3.00 24.00

Total Receipts\$1,403.00

EXPENSES:

Luncheon: Feb. 22, 1954 138.00

Printer: May 11, 1954 134.65

Treasurer's Office:

Stationery and Postage

May 25, 1954 26.60

July 15, 1954 5.00

Apr. 1, 1955 2.00

Secretary's Office:

Stationery and Postage

June 8, 1954	88.00
Sept. 25, 1954	5.00
Oct. 11, 1954	20.00

First Annual Meeting:

Typing Summary of Questionnaires	50.00
Printing: Summary of Questionnaires	308.00
Programs	20.00
Identification Tags	6.00
Envelopes	19.15
Bibliography for Distribution	8.82
Stationery and Postage	83.10
Total Expenses	\$ 914.32

SUMMARY: Total Receipts	1,403.00
Total Expenses	914.32
Balance on Hand, April 11, 1955	488.68

Respectfully submitted,
 BROTHER C. LUKE, F.S.C.
Treasurer

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

The Committee on Resolutions offers the following resolutions to the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine assembled for its first National Convention, held at Trinity College, Washington, D.C., April 11-13th, 1955.

Resolved: That the Gratitude of the Society be extended to:

His Excellency the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, for his permission and patronage.

Sister Mary Patrick, S.N.D., and the Administration of Trinity College for their gracious hospitality to the first National Convention.

The Christian Brothers of De La Salle College, Washington, who took care of the details of registration, transportation and other practical arrangements for this first annual meeting of the Society.

)

Sister Rose Eileen, C.S.C., of Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, for the initial suggestion which prompted the formation of the Society, as well as for her arduous labor as organizer and first secretary of the Society.

The Reverend Cyril Vollert, S.J., and the Reverend Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J., of St. Mary's College, Kansas for their encouragement and help in the formative period of our Society.

The Very Reverend Clement Kearney, O.P., of Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, the Reverend Thomas Hennessey, O.P., and the Reverend Urban Mullaney, O.P., of the Dominican House of Studies, Washington, for their generous efforts at the initial meetings at which the Society was founded.

The Reverend Gerard Sloyan, of the Catholic University, the Reverend Joseph Moffitt, S.J., of Georgetown University, the Reverend John Harvey, O.S.F.S., of Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Brother Celestine Luke, F.S.C., of De La Salle College, Washington, and Sister Teresa Aloyse, S.P., of Immaculata Junior College, Washington, for their assistance at the foundation and their continued labors for the development of this national group.

The Very Reverend Presidents of La Salle College, Philadelphia, and of Fordham University, New York City, for their gracious sponsorship of the first area meetings of this Society.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, Secretary General of the NCEA; the Reverend Cyril Meyer, C.M., Past President of the College and University Section of the NCEA, and Brother Bonaventure Thomas, F.S.C., now President of the College and University Section of the NCEA, for the patronage and generous cooperation they gave in the name of the Association.

The Reverend Eugene Burke, C.S.P., of Trinity College, retiring president of the Society, for his distinguished contribution of its foundation, his careful labor on its Constitution, his vigilant care over the infant organization in its first year, and his time-consuming and strenuous labor in preparation for this first annual meeting of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine.

Respectfully submitted:

REVEREND URBAN VOLL, O.P.

Chairman

Moved, seconded, carried

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

In accordance with the Constitutions of this Society, Art. VIII, Sec. 3, a nominating committee consisting of three members was appointed by the President at the first session of this National Meeting.

The persons appointed to this Committee were Sister Winifred Mary, S.C., of the College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station; the Very Rev. Sebastian Carlson, O.P., of the Dominican College of St. Thomas Aquinas; and the Reverend Robert E. Regan O.S.A., of Villanova University. Father Regan served as Chairman.

The work of this Committee was to submit the names of suitable candidates for the Office of President, Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer, and for four Directorships. (Permit me to remind you parenthetically that there are actually nine Directors of the Society; but four Directors elected at the last meeting carry over until the next meeting; while the outgoing President automatically becomes a Director for the ensuing year. The Directors whose term of office still has a year to run are: Reverend John Harvey, O.S.F.S., Dunbarton College of the Holy Cross; Reverend David O'Connell, O.P., of Providence College; Mother Marie Therese Charles, O.S.U., College of New Rochelle, and Brother Alban of Mary, F.S.C., Manhattan College.)

Besides the obvious consideration of fitness for office, the Nominating Committee has tried to be guided in its choices by the following considerations:

- (a) The need for a certain continuity on the organizational side of the still youthful Society;
- (b) The utility of having sufficient Officers and Directors to constitute a *quorum* living in approximately the same area.
- (c) The fitness of distributing the offices in some proportion—not necessarily mathematical—among the Religious priests, Diocesan priests, Religious Sisters, and Religious Brothers.
- (d) The wisdom of trying to have as many areas represented as feasible.

With these considerations in mind, the Nominating Committee arrived at the following list of candidates, and respectfully proposes them to the members of this Society in convention assembled for their consideration:

President: Reverend John J. Fernan, S.J., Le Moyne College
Vice-President: Reverend Thomas C. Donlan, O.P., Dominican College of St. Rose

Secretary: Sister M. Rose Eileen, C.S.C., Dunbarton College of Holy Cross

Treasurer: Brother Celestine Luke, F.S.C., De La Salle College

Director: Reverend James P. Lyons, St. Theresa's College, Kansas City

Director: Reverend Raymond Parr, Alverno College
Director: Sister M. Charles Borromeo, C.S.C., St. Mary's College, Notre Dame
Director: Sister Teresa Aloyse, S.P., Immaculata College, Washington, D.C.

REVEREND ROBERT E. REGAN, O.S.A., *Chairman*
VERY REVEREND SEBASTIAN CARLSON, O.P.
SISTER WINIFRED MARY, S.C.

Moved, seconded, carried that the Report be accepted as read.

Moved, seconded, and carried that the candidates submitted by the Nominating Committee be unanimously elected to their respective offices.

THE SOCIETY OF CATHOLIC COLLEGE TEACHERS OF SACRED DOCTRINE

HISTORY OF THE ORGANIZATION

The initiative for this Society was taken in Washington, D.C., through a series of meetings of representatives of Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, the Dominican House of Studies, Immaculata College, Georgetown University, Catholic University, and Trinity College. Under the chairmanship of the Reverend John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S., this group contacted colleges in the Baltimore, Philadelphia, New Jersey, and New York City areas, and a meeting was arranged for December 8, 1953, at La Salle College, Philadelphia. Representatives of 26 colleges attended this meeting and agreed to form a society of those engaged in the teaching of Sacred Doctrine. A provisional set of objectives was formulated and a constitutional committee formed. On February 22, 1954, representatives of 47 eastern colleges met at Fordham University to consider the report of the Constitutional Committee. After extensive discussion, a provisional constitution was adopted to serve as an instrument for organizing the Society on a national basis and the following officers were elected under this Constitution:

Reverend Eugene Burke, C.S.P., *President*
Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D.C.

Reverend Joseph Moffitt, S.J., *Vice President*
Georgetown University
Washington 7, D. C.

Sister M. Rose Eileen, C.S.C., *Secretary*
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
Washington 8, D.C.

Brother Celestine Luke, F.S.C., *Treasurer*
De La Salle College
Washington 18, D.C.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Two year term:

Reverend John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S.
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
Washington 8, D.C.

Reverend David O'Connell, O.P.
Providence College
Providence 8, Rhode Island
Mother Marie Therese Charles, O.S.U.
College of New Rochelle
New Rochelle, New York
Brother Alban of Mary, F.S.C.
Manhattan College
New York 71, New York

One year term:

Reverend John J. Fernan, S.J.
Le Moyne College
953 James Street
Syracuse 3, New York
Reverend Michael F. Mullen, C.M.
Saint John's University
75 Lewis Avenue
Brooklyn 6, New York
Reverend Clement A. Ockay
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey
Reverend Austin J. Staley, O.S.B.
Saint Vincent College
Latrobe, Pennsylvania
Sister M. Reginald, C.S.J.
Regis College
Weston, Massachusetts

TITLE OF THE SOCIETY

This title was chosen to avoid any implication of committing the Society to any specific method of teaching Sacred Doctrine, and to indicate its intention to be an effective meeting place for all interested in its objectives.

PURPOSE

The Society is fundamentally conceived of as a teachers' organization, and the conditions for membership are formulated with this in view, i.e., it is open to all those who by scientific training or experience are qualified for the teaching of Sacred Doctrine on the college level. Provision is made for an associate membership. Active members are assessed an annual dues of \$5.00, and associate members \$3.00.

OBJECTIVES

These are formulated with a view to making available to all engaged in this work, or preparing for it, the experience and knowledge gained by the faculties of Sacred Doctrine in the various

colleges throughout the country. In view of this pooling of experience and information, the Society seeks to open for fruitful discussion and planing such questions and problems as: methods; course organization; teacher training; relation of the courses in Sacred Doctrine to other academic disciplines; the effective integration of it in the curriculum; together with the allied topics that play a part in the effective teaching of college courses in Sacred Doctrine, and in teacher preparation.

ORGANIZATION

The constitutional organization of this Society envisages the balancing of a national organization with regional groupings that will take into account the particular problems of the various regions. Thus the Constitution provides for the appointment of regional committees which shall elect their own chairman and deal with their own geographical and educational situation. At the same time, it looks to setting up a reciprocity of effort whereby the national meetings will contribute to the national group as a whole, and the national group in view of its wider potential of experience and information will contribute to the regional meetings. To implement this effort the Board of Directors, will, as far as possible, reflect the geographical distribution of the Society. In addition, provision is made for a Current Problems Committee that will seek to formulate problems and subject material that will aid in crystallizing and directing the discussions of both the regional and national groupings. Out of this, it is hoped, will come programs for the national meetings that will effectively contribute to the accomplishment of our objectives.

In the by-laws of the Society provision is also made for affiliation with the National Catholic Educational Association. The purpose of such affiliation is to set up a normal means of obtaining the assistance and advice of the various departmental groups in the Association, and at the same time make available to it the results of the Society's own work.

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I

NAME AND PATRONESS

Preamble This association shall be known as "The Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine."

The Society shall be under the patronage of Mary Immaculate, Seat of Wisdom.

The Corporate Seal of the Society shall bear the motto: "Ad perfectionem caritatis."

ARTICLE II

PURPOSES

The ultimate objective of the Society shall be to assist teachers in imparting to college students adequate religious instruction well integrated with the rest of the curriculum. Proximately it shall seek to promote the following objectives:

1. To further an exchange of information and analysis of problems currently involved in the teaching of Sacred Doctrine.
2. To analyze inadequacies that may be found in present programs of Sacred Doctrine at the college level.
3. To formulate and suggest the objectives and proper content of the college course in Sacred Doctrine.
4. To discuss and evaluate the various modes of instruction in Sacred Doctrine.
5. To discuss and develop an effective program for realizing the proper place of Sacred Doctrine in the curriculum and its integration with the other disciplines.
6. To develop effective teachers of Sacred Doctrine on the college level.
7. To develop standards for the adequate preparation of teachers of Sacred Doctrine on the college level.
8. To study ways and means of coordinating the course in Sacred Doctrine with other college activities.

ARTICLE III

MEMBERS

Section 1. Members shall be:

- (a) active, i.e., those who are qualified by training or teaching experience for the scientific instruction of college students in Sacred Doctrine;
- (b) associate, i.e., those who wish to identify themselves with the aims and purposes of the Society. Election to each

class of membership in the Society shall be by vote of the Committee on Admissions.

Section 2. The annual dues for active members shall be five dollars (\$5.00) payable annually in advance on January 1 of each year. The annual dues for associate members shall be three dollars (\$3.00) payable annually.

Section 3. The dues of the new members shall begin with the year of enrollment.

Section 4. Any member who shall fail to pay his dues for the period of two years shall, after notification of non-payment by the Treasurer, be liable to forfeiture of membership.

ARTICLE IV

MEETINGS

Section 1. The annual meeting of the Society shall be held at the time and place to be designated by the Board of Directors. All members, both active and associate, may attend the meetings. One third of the total active membership shall constitute a quorum for the determination of all questions submitted to a vote.

Section 2. Notice of the annual meeting shall be given two months in advance thereof, signed by the Secretary. This notice shall contain a statement of the agenda, together with the designation of the day, hour, and place of the meeting. Notice of all special meetings shall be sent at least fifteen days in advance thereof.

Section 3. In addition to the national meeting there shall be regional meetings of the members of the Society in their respective regions in which there shall reside a sufficient number of members to justify such meetings. These meetings shall be under the direction of a committee of five (5) members appointed by the President and the Board of Directors.

Section 4. Special meetings of the Society may be called by a majority decision of the Board of Directors or upon reception by the President of the written petitions of twenty (20) active members. Such meetings shall be announced by the Secretary. Moreover, informal group or panel meetings of members of the Society for the discussion of theological questions on the undergraduate level may be called by the Committee on Current Problems at such times and places as it may designate. Such meetings shall be submitted to the President for approval. Notice of such meetings shall be sent at least fifteen days in advance thereof by the chairman of the Committee.

Section 5. Active members alone shall be eligible to vote in elections and hold office. At the first annual meeting the officers and nine (9) directors shall be elected. The officers as elected shall

hold office until the next annual meeting. The nine directors elected at the first meeting shall be divided into two classes of five (5) and four (4) each; the first class to hold office until the next annual meeting, and the second class to hold office until the third annual meeting. At each annual meeting of the Society thereafter, there shall be elected the above officers to hold office for the term of two years. The position of the ninth director is to be filled each year by the retiring President.

ARTICLE V

OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers shall consist of a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. This shall be the order of succession of officers in the case of absence or disability.

Section 2. The President shall preside at meetings of the Society and of the Board of Directors. He shall have power, when authorized by the Board of Directors, to enter into contracts on behalf of the Society. He shall make a report of the activities of the Society at its annual meeting. He shall have the usual duties pertaining to his office and such other duties as may from time to time be assigned him by the Board of Directors.

Section 3. The President shall appoint committees of five (5) members each to direct the various regional meetings. These appointments shall be made with the advice and consent of the Board of Directors. Each of these committees shall elect its own chairman.

Section 4. The Vice-President, at the request of the President, or in the absence or disability of the same, shall have and exercise the powers of the President.

Section 5. The Secretary shall perform in general, all duties incident to the office of Secretary and such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the Board of Directors. In particular he shall:

- (a) keep the minutes of all meetings of the Society, and cause the same to be recorded in books provided for the purpose, which shall at all reasonable times be open to the inspection of the members of the Society;
- (b) keep a record of the proceedings of all meetings of the Board of Directors;
- (c) inform members appointed to committees or elected to office in the Society;
- (d) keep a roll of members, a copy of which he shall certify to the Chairman of Elections at the meetings at which elections are held;

- (e) conduct the correspondence of the Society, and sign official papers in the name of the Association at the direction of the President and/or the Board of Directors;
- (f) be the custodian of the records of the Society, as well as of the official seal thereof;
- (g) be EX OFFICIO a member of the Committee on Admissions, and act as its Secretary;
- (h) see that notices of meetings are sent to members at the times designated in the Constitution.

Section 6. The Treasurer shall:

- (a) collect and disburse the funds of the Society;
- (b) cause all monies and other valuable effects to be deposited in the name and to the credit of the Society, in such banks or trust companies as shall be selected by the Board of Directors;
- (c) upon the order of the President or Board of Directors cause the funds of the Society to be disbursed by checks or drafts upon the authorized depositaries of the Society;
- (d) cause to be taken and preserved proper vouchers for all monies disbursed and to forward all such vouchers to the Secretary;
- (e) keep the financial accounts in books belonging to the Society, which books shall at all times be open to the inspection of the Board of Directors, to whom he shall, whenever requested, make reports in writing of the money received and disbursed of the funds on hand;
- (f) at the annual meeting make a full and complete report of the receipts and disbursements of the year;
- (g) send out notice to the members of the Society one month in advance that their dues are payable, and give them receipts for dues paid;
- (h) have the right and power, from time to time, to require from the officers and/or agents of the Society, reports or statements giving such information as he may desire with respect to any and all financial transactions of the Society.

ARTICLE VI

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of the officers of the Society namely the President, the Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer and nine (9) other directors elected as provided in Section 5 of Article IV.

Section 2. The Board of Directors shall meet for the transaction of business semi-annually at such a place as they may choose, and at such other stated times and places as shall be recommended or required by the rules of the Board. Special meetings

may be called at any time by the President or any three (3) other members of the Board, provided the call give fifteen (15) days' notice and specify the nature of the business to be treated, together with the day, hour, and place of the meeting.

Section 3. A quorum of this Board shall consist of five (5) members of the Board provided that at least three of the five shall be Directors. In the absence of a quorum the Officer or the senior Director shall have power to adjourn the meeting till such time as a quorum can be convened.

Section 4. If any vacancy shall occur in the Board of Directors by reason of death, resignation accepted by the Board, or otherwise, such vacancy may be filled by a majority vote of the remaining members of the Board, though less than quorum. Any such vacancy may also be filled by members entitled to vote at any formal meeting of the Society held during the existence of such vacancy, provided that the notice of such a meeting shall have mentioned such vacancy.

ARTICLE VII COMMITTEES

Section 1. All Committees shall at all times be subject to the Board of Directors.

Section 2. Except in the case of the Nominating Committee as outlined in Article VIII Section 3, the members of all Committees shall be appointed by the President with the approval of the Board of Directors.

Section 3. The President shall appoint members to serve on these standing committees in such manner that the personnel of each committee is replaced on the basis of rotation rather than of complete replacement in any given time:

- (a) the Committee on Admissions
- (b) the Committee on Nominations
- (c) the Committee on Budget and Auditing
- (d) the Committee on Current Problems

He shall have power to appoint such other committees as the general welfare of the Society demands.

Section 4. The Committee on Admissions shall consist of the Secretary of the Society and two (2) other members who are on the Board of Directors. This committee shall determine the conditions for associate membership, examine the qualifications of all candidates either to active or associate membership, and recommend qualified candidates for approval by the members or Board of Directors at the annual meeting. All proposals for membership in the Society shall be submitted to this Committee and acted upon by them under such regulations as the Board of Directors may from time to time prescribe.

Section 5. The Committee on Nominations (See Article VIII, Section 3.)

Section 6. The Budget and Auditing Committee shall consist of the President, the Treasurer, and three (3) other members appointed by the President at the recommendation of the Treasurer and approved by the Board of Directors. The Committee shall prepare an annual budget to be submitted to the Board of Directors at the time of the annual meeting. The Committee shall make an annual audit of the financial accounts and records of the Society.

Section 7. The Committee on Current Problems shall have charge of investigating and recommending the discussion of such current problems as are of pertinent interest to the Society. Informal meetings of the Society may be conducted under the direction of this Committee, but the Committee shall have no power to commit the Society to any policy or opinion with respect to current problems or questions pertaining to objectives of the Society. The Committee is empowered to make recommendations to the President and Board of Directors for agenda for all national and regional meetings of the Society.

ARTICLE VIII

ELECTIONS

Section 1. Active members only shall be eligible to vote in questions and formation of policies. Active members only shall be eligible to hold office in the Society.

Section 2. All voting for election shall be by ballot. Voting for motions may be either by ballot, or by Ayes and Noes, or by a show of hands. That election or motion shall carry which has received a majority of all the valid votes. If the first and second voting is indecisive, in the third voting a plurality shall be decisive. In the case of a tie after the third voting the presiding officer may break the tie.

Section 3. There shall be a nominating committee consisting of three (3) members who shall be appointed by the President of the Society at the first session of the annual meeting. At the first annual meeting the temporary officers shall appoint such a committee.

ARTICLE IX

PUBLICATIONS

Publications shall be determined and regulated by the Board of Directors but recommended and prepared by a committee appointed by the President.

**ARTICLE X
AMENDMENTS**

This Constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the active members present, provided notice of such proposed amendment, with copy thereof, shall have been mailed to the entire active membership not less than one month in advance of such meeting.

**BY-LAWS
ARTICLE I**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Section 1. The following shall be the regular order of business at all meetings of this Society:

1. Opening Prayer
2. Reading of the Minutes
3. Presentation of new members
4. Reports of Committees
5. Unfinished business
6. Old business
7. New business
8. Presentation and discussion of papers
9. Election of officers
10. Closing Prayer

Section 2. This regular order of business may be changed at any meeting by a three-fourths vote of the members present.

Section 3. Robert's RULES OF ORDER shall govern the deliberations of this Society in all cases where it does not conflict with a standing rule of the Society. But any rule of Order may be suspended temporarily by a simple majority of the members present.

ARTICLE II

The President and the Board of Directors shall be empowered to cooperate and work out affiliation with the National Catholic Educational Association.

**ARTICLE III
AMENDMENTS**

These By-Laws may be amended on the same conditions as provided for amendments of the Constitution.

REGISTRATION
FIRST NATIONAL MEETING
April 11-13, 1955

Alban, Brother, F.S.C., Manhattan College
Albert, Brother, F.S.C., De La Salle College
Ann Virginia, Sister, S.C.J., Fontbonne College
Anthony, Brother A., F.S.C., Manhattan College
Anthony, Sister Mary, O.S.B., St. Benedicta College, Minnesota
Aquinas, Sister, S.P., Immaculata Junior College
Arthur, Sister Mary, S.C.J., Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles
Assumpta, Sister Mary, R.S.M., Georgian Court College
Barrows, Reverend Leo, S.J., St. Peter's College
Basil, Brother K., F.S.C., St. Mary's College, Winona
Benigna, Sister Mary, S.S.N.D., College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Beston, Reverend William J., C.S.C., Kings College, Wilkes-Barre
Bourke, Mother, R.S.C.J., Manhattanville College of the Sacred
Heart
Bowman, Reverend David J., S.J., West Baden College
Broderick, Reverend Francis W., O.S.B., Mt. St. Scholastica College
Burke, Reverend Eugene, C.S.P., Trinity College, Washington, D.C.
Carlson, Very Reverend Sebastian, O.P., Dominican College of St.
Thomas Aquinas
Casey, Reverend William V., S.J., Boston College
Celeste, Mother, O.S.U., College of New Rochelle
Charles Borromeo, Sister M., C.S.C., St. Mary's College, Notre
Dame, Indiana
Clarice, Sister M., O.S.F., Mount Mercy College
Clarke, Reverend Arthur, S.J., Fordham University
Consuelo Maria, Sister, S.S.J., Chestnut Hill College
Conway, Reverend Francis, O.P., Trinity College, Washington, D.C.
Dominic, Sister M., O.P., Dominican Junior College of Blauvelt
Donahue, Reverend Joseph F., S.J., Boston College
Donlan, Reverend Thomas C., O.P., St. Rose Priory, Dubuque ,
Donohue, Reverend Cyril P., S.J., Marquette University
Dorothea, Sister, S.P., Immaculata Junior College
Dwyer, Reverend John F., S.J., Fordham University
Dyer, Reverend Ralph J., S.M., St. Mary's University, San Antonio
Egan, Reverend J. M., O.P., Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame,
Indiana
Emily, Sister Mary, S.C.N., Nazareth College, Louisville
Evelt, Reverend Lester J., S.J., Loyola University, Chicago
Fallon, Reverend James L., Assumption Junior College
Fallon, Reverend J. L., O.P., Providence College

Farren, Reverend E. J., S.J., Georgetown University
 Fernan, Reverend John J., S.J., Le Moyne College
 Finn, Reverend Edward E., S.J., St. Louis University
 Fortier, Reverend Theodore L., A.A., Assumption College
 Francis, Sister of St., College of Saint Francis, Joliet
 Francis Regis, Sister M., S.S.N.D., College of Notre Dame of
 Maryland
 Furlong, Miss Jane, Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana
 Gallagher, Reverend Eugene, S.J., Georgetown University
 Garvey, Reverend John D., S.J., St. Peter's College
 Gertrude Lenore, Sister, S.S.J., Chestnut Hill College
 Geurkin, Reverend Columban, O.S.B., St. Bernard Abbey
 Gormley, Reverend John A., S.J., St. Peter's College
 Grimes, Reverend E. T., O.S.A., Villanova University
 Haran, Reverend J. P., S.J., Holy Cross College
 Hargrove, Mother, R.S.C.J., Manhattanville College of the Sacred
 Heart
 Harvey, Reverend John F., O.S.F.S., Dunbarton College of Holy
 Cross
 Heath, Reverend Mark, O.P., La Salle College, Philadelphia
 Hennessy, Reverend James E., S.J., Fordham University
 Herron, Reverend M., T.O.R., College of Steubenville
 Horan, Reverend Dr. Thomas, Marywood College
 Howard, Sister Mary, S.N.D., Notre Dame College, Cleveland
 Hurley, Reverend Philip S., S.J., Fordham University
 James, Brother F., F.S.C., De La Salle College
 Jarcynski, Reverend E. M.
 John Bosco, Sister M., S.S.J., Saint Joseph's College, Hartford
 Jason, Brother, C.F.X., Xaverian College, Silver Spring, Maryland
 Julie, Sister M., C.S.J., Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts
 Keating, Reverend Francis M., S.J., Woodstock College
 Lavin, Reverend James M., St. Thomas College, Minnesota
 Leontine, Sister M., S.S.N.D., Notre Dame College, St. Louis
 Lohkamp, Reverend Nicholas, O.F.M., Franciscan Monastery,
 Washington, D.C.
 Luke, Brother Celestine, F.S.C., De La Salle College
 Lyons, Reverend James P., St. Teresa's College, Kansas City
 Madeleine Marie, Sister, C.H.M., Ottumwa Heights College, Iowa
 Magda Marie, Sister, O.P., Catholic University of America
 Mary of the Angels, Sister, S.S.C.M., Catholic University of America
 McCormack, Reverend Stephen, O.P., Providence College
 Meier, Reverend Alphonse, O.S.B., St. Vincent College, Latrobe
 Messemer, Reverend Edward J., S.J., Le Moyne College
 Molloy, Reverend Joseph J., S.J., Loyola College, New Orleans

Mooney, Reverend Donald J., O.F.M., Siena College, Loudonville,
 New York
 Mullen, Reverend Michael F., C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
 Murphy, Reverend William B., O.P., College of Saint Catherine
 Murray, Reverend Bernard J., S.J., Canisius College
 O'Connor, Reverend Joseph A., S.J., Fordham University
 O'Malley, Reverend Edward, Mount Aloysius Junior College
 Palmer, Reverend Paul, S.J., Wodstock College
 Parr, Reverend Raymond A., Alverno College
 Paul, Brother, F.S.C., Manhattan College
 Paulin, Reverend Leon S.S.E., St. Michael's College
 Perrotta, Reverend Paul C., O.P., Caldwell College
 Placide, Sister M., R.S.M., Mount Saint Agnes College
 Raymond, Sister M., O.S.B., College of St. Scholastica, Duluth
 Redempta, Sister M., O.P., Dominican College of Blauvelt
 Regan, Reverend Robert E., O.S.A., Villanova University
 Reginald, Sister M., C.S.J., Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts
 Roberta Joseph, Sister, C.S.J., College of St. Rose
 Rose Agnes, Sister, O.S.F., College of Saint Francis, Joliet
 Rose Eileen, Sister M., C.S.C., Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
 Rose Gertrude, Sister, C.S.J., Mount Saint Mary's College, Los
 Angeles
 Rose Marie, Sister, R.S.M., Mount Mercy College
 Rothlauf, Reverend Frederick P., S.J., Canisius College
 Rozsaly, Reverend Francis L., S.P., Georgetown Visitation Junior
 College
 Rushmore, Reverend Elbert, S.J., Fordham University
 Santen, Mother L., R.S.C.J., Newton College of the Sacred Heart
 Scanlon, Brother Robert, Iona College
 Scott, Reverend William A., S.J., Le Moyne College
 Selle, Reverend Paulinus J., O.S.B., St. Vincent College, Latrobe
 Sellinger, Reverend Joseph A., S.J., Georgetown University
 Shannon, Reverend James, Madonna College, Livonia, Michigan
 Shannon, Reverend William H., Nazareth College, Rochester,
 New York
 Shea, Very Reverend Leo M., O.P., St. Mary's Dominican College,
 Louisiana
 Shea, Reverend John T., Salve Regina College, Newport
 Sheehan, Reverend L. A., S.J., Fordham University
 Simonitsch Reverend R. G., C.S.C., Notre Dame University
 Sloyan, Reverend Gerard S., Catholic University of America
 Spitzig, Reverend Joseph, Ursuline College, Cleveland
 Stanton, Reverend Edward S., S.J., Holy Cross College, Worcester
 Stephen, Brother C., F.S.C., De La Salle College
 Stephanie, Sister M., R.S.M., Georgian Court College
 Sullivan, Reverend P. J., S.J., Dunwoodie, Maryland

Tarcisius, Sister M., C.S.J., Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts
Teresa Aloyse, Sister, S.P., Immaculata Junior College
Thacik, Reverend Arnold, O.S.B., St. Benedict's College Atchison
Therese, Mother Marie, O.S.U., College of New Rochelle
Thomas, Brother D., F.S.C., La Salle College
Treece, Reverend Raymond J., Bellarmine College
Vera, Sister M., R.S.M., Mount Saint Agnes College
Voll, Reverend Urban, O.P., Trinity College, Washington, D.C.
Walsh, Reverend A., S.J., Fairfield University
Weiss, Reverend Bernard, D'Youville College
Wilma, Sister M., O.S.B., Mount Marty College, Yankton, South
Dakota
Winifred Mary, Sister, S.C., College of Saint Elizabeth
Zita, Sister M., S.C., College of Saint Elizabeth

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY

April 13 1955

- Aherne, Sister Consuelo Maria, S.S.J., Chestnut Hill College
Allaire, Sister Mary Claire, S.S.A., Anna Maria College
Ament, Very Rev. Msgr. Ernest Paul, Loras College
Angers, Rev. John Joseph, O.P., Saint Catherine's College
Barron, Rev. Maurice Mark, O.P., Saint Mary College, Xavier,
Kansas
Barrows, Rev. Leo Branch, S.J., St. Peter's College, Jersey City
Becker, Rev. Joseph Louis, C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
Beston, Rev. William John, C.S.C., King's College, Wilkes-Barre
Bischofberger, Rev. George, S.J., Marquette University
Blanchette, Rev. Oliver R., A.A., Assumption College, Worcester
Bowman, Rev. David Joseph, S.J., West Baden College
Brady, Mother Cora, R.S.C.J., Manhattanville College of the Sacred
Heart
Brennan, Sister Benedicta, I.H.M., Marygrove College
Brennan, Rev. Joseph John, O.S.C., Crosier Seminary, Onamia,
Minnesota
Brennan, Rev. Vincent Leo, S.J., University of Detroit
Broderick, Rev. Francis William, O.S.B., Mount St. Scholastica
College
Browne, Rev. Joseph William, C.M., Niagara University
Bruns, Brother L. Gilbert, F.S.C., St. Mary's College, Winona
Burke, Rev. Eugene, C.S.P., Trinity College, Washington, D.C.
Carey, Mother Mary Christina, S.H.C.J., Rosemont College
Carlson, Very Rev. Sebastian, O.P., Dominican House of Studies,
River Forest, Illinois
Carnes, Sister Mary Loyola, H.N.J.M., College of the Holy Names
Casey, Rev. William Van Etten, S.J., Boston College
Cavanagh, Mother Elizabeth, R.S.C.J., Manhattanville College of
the Sacred Heart
Charles, Mother Marie Therese, O.S.U., College of New Rochelle
Cheap, Sister Alice Marie, C.S.J., Mount St. Mary's College, Los
Angeles
Clark, Brother Bartholomew Albert, F.S.C., De La Salle College,
Washington
Clarke, Rev. Arthur Albert, S.J., Fordham University
Coffey, Sister Loyola Marie, S.S.J., Chestnut Hill College
Coler, Reverend Emmett Joseph, Marymount College, Salina,
Kansas
Comey, Rev. John Martin, S.J., St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia
Conroy, Rev. John Jerome, O.P., Siena College, Memphis

Conway, Rev. Robert Francis, O.P., Trinity College, Wash-
 ington, D.C.
 Cox, Rev. Lewis Morris, S.J., Le Moyne College
 Cronin, Rev. Thomas Joseph, S.J., Spring Hill College
 Cunningham, Mr. Robert Louis, San Francisco College for Women
 Cunningham, Rev. William Murray, S.J., St. Joseph's College,
 Philadelphia
 Curran, Rev. Peter C., O.P., Dominican College, San Rafael
 Darby, Rev. Thomas J., College of New Rochelle
 Daues, Rev. Vincent F., S.J., Rockhurst College
 Delmage, Rev. Lewis, S.J., St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia
 Derrig, Rev. Philip Thomas, S.J., Creighton University
 Diviney, Rev. Charles E., St. Joseph's College, Brooklyn
 Donlan, Rev. Thomas C., O.P., St. Rose Priory, Dubuque
 Donoghue, Rev. John Dervin, S.J., Fairfield University
 Donohue, Rev. Cyril P., S.J., Marquette University
 Dooley, Brother Alban of Mary, F.S.C., Manhattan College
 Duffy, Rev. Brian Francis, O.F.M., St. Bonventure University
 Dwyer, Rev. John Francis, S.J., Fordham University
 Dyer, Rev. George, St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Connecticut
 Dyer, Rev. Ralph James, S.M., St. Mary's University, San Antonio,
 Texas
 Egan, Rev. Stephen Thomas, S.J., St. Louis University
 Emmans, Rev. Edward Philip, O.P., College of St. Catherine
 Engles, Sister M. Francisca, S.L., Webster College
 Evett, Rev. Lester James, S.J., Loyola University, Chicago
 Ewing, Rev. Thomas Donohoe, S.J., University of Detroit
 Fagin, Brother Levian Thomas, F.S.C., Christian Brothers College,
 Memphis
 Fallon, Rev. James L., Assumption Junior College, Mendham, New
 Jersey
 Farren, Rev. Edward J., S.J., Georgetown University
 Fernan, Rev. John Joseph, S.J., Le Moyne College
 Finn, Rev. Edward Ernest, S.J., St. Louis University
 Fitzsimons, Rev. Edward J., Trinity College, Burlington, Vermont
 Fitzsimons, Sister Helen Clare, S.L., Webster College
 Flynn, Rev. Thomas F., C.M., Niagara University
 Flynn, Rev. Thomas Valerian, O.P., St. Xavier College, Chicago
 Foley, Mr. Thomas Joseph, S.J., West Baden College
 Forrest, Sister Helen de Sales, S.S.J., Chestnut Hill College
 Franz, Sister Mary Patricia, O.P., St. Thomas Aquinas College,
 Sparkhill, N.Y.
 Freeman, Rev. Joseph M., S.J., Rockhurst College
 Freund, Sister Aloysia, M., S.S.N.D., Mount Mary College
 Friel, Rev. George Quentin, O.P., Siena College, Memphis
 Fritz, Sister Mary Mildred, O.P., Maryknoll Sisters Motherhouse

Furlong, Miss Jane Elizabeth, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame
 Gallagher, Rev. Eugene Bernard, S.J., Georgetown University
 Garvey, Rev. Charles Michael, Villa Madonna College, Covington
 Garvey, Rev. John D., S.J., St. Peter's College, Jersey City
 Gerencser, Rev. Stephen, S.P., Mount St. Joseph College, Buffalo
 Gimborn, Brother Didacus Thomas, F.S.C., La Salle College, Philadelphia
 Gladhill, Brother Albert Paul, F.S.C., Manhattan College
 Glose, Rev. Joseph Charles, S.J., Jesuit Educational Association,
 New York
 Glynn, Rev. Gerard Norvel, Webster College
 Goetz, Rev. Charles C., S.J., Spring Hill College
 Gormley, Rev. John Aloysius, S.J., St. Peter's College, Jersey City
 Haley, Miss Martha Mary, Mercyhurst College, Erie
 Halgas, Sister M. Borromeo, C.R., Mother Celine House of Studies,
 Port Chester, N.Y.
 Handren, Rev. Walter Joseph, S.J., St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia
 Hannan, Rev. James Edward, O.S.A., Merrimack College
 Haran, Rev. John Patrick, S.J., Holy Cross College, Worcester
 Hargrove, Mother Katharine Teresa, R.S.C.J., Manhattanville
 College of the Sacred Heart
 Harkins, Sister Mary Julie, C.S.J., Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts
 Harvey, Rev. John Francis, O.S.F.S., Dunbarton College of Holy
 Cross
 Harvey, Mother Marie Edmund, R.S.H.M., Marymount College,
 New York
 Hauber, Sister Rose Marie, Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh
 Hayes, Sister Marie Perpetua, S.P., Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College
 Heath, Rev. Mark, O.P., La Salle College, Philadelphia
 Heath, Rev. Thomas Richard, O.P., Trinity College, Washington
 Held, Sister Mary Leontine, S.S.N.D., Notre Dame College, St. Louis
 Hennessy, Rev. James E., S.J., Fordham University
 *Hockers Rev. Dominic H., O. Praem., St. Norbert College, West
 De Pere, Wisconsin
 Hoelle, Rev. Philip Charles, S.M., Colegio San Jose, Rio Piedras,
 Puerto Rico
 Hogan, Rev. Edmund Jerome, S.J., Fairfield University
 Horan Reverend Thomas C., Marywood College, Scranton
 Hunt, Brother Mark J., F.S.C.H., Iona College, New Rochelle
 Hurley, Rev. Philip Stephen, S.J., Fordham University
 Hyde, Rev. Emerick John, C.M., Niagara University
 Jarvais, Rev. Walter Gerard, Seton Hall University
 Johnston, Rev. Charles C., O.P., St. Xavier College, Chicago
 *Jolicoeur, Rev. Fabian A., O. Praem., St. Norbert College, West
 De Pere Wisconsin

Jones, Rev. Thomas Patrick, C.S.C., University of Portland
 Jurasko, Rev. Stephen Bernard, O.P., Mt. Mercy College, Pittsburgh
 Kaiser, Rev. Edwin George, C.P.P.S., St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Indiana
 Kaiser, Brother F. James, F.S.C., De La Salle College, Washington
 Kane, Sister Ann Virginia, C.S.J., Fontbonne College
 Kane, Brother Conrad Gabriel, F.S.C., Manhattan College
 Kearney, Very Rev. James Clement, O.P., Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
 Kearney, Sister Mary Benigna, S.S.N.D., College of Notre Dame of Maryland
 Keckeissen, Sister Mary Gertrude, S.C., College of Mount Saint Vincent
 Keenan, Sister Mary Emily, S.C.N., Nazareth College, Louisville
 Kelly, Mother Marie de Jesus, R.S.H.M., Marymount College, Tarrytown, New York
 Kelly, Sister Mary Tarcisius, C.S.J., Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts
 Kennedy, Sister Enda Marie, O.P., St. Thomas Aquinas College, Sparkhill, N.Y.
 Kennedy, Rev. Michael James, C.M., Niagara University
 Kenny, Mother Eleanor Sampson, R.S.C.J., Newton College of the Sacred Heart
 Keyes, Mother Louise Loughborough, R.S.C.J., Maryville College, St. Louis
 Kiley, Sister Mary Reginald, C.S.J., Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts
 Kinney, Rev. Donald Walter, C.M., Niagara University
 Klein, Sister Mary Baptista, Georgeown Visitation Junior College
 Knaup, Sister Etta Louise, S.S.J., Marymount College, Salina, Kansas
 Kostka, Rev. Leonard James, C.P.P.S., St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Indiana
 Laurick, Rev. Richard Anthony, C.S.C., Saint Edward's University
 Leimkuhler, Rev. Edwin Matthias, S.M., University of Dayton
 Leonard, Rev. Raymond Sylvester, St. Joseph's College, Brooklyn
 Lillie, Rev. Edward C., O.P., Dominican College, Racine, Wisconsin
 Lindekugel, Rev. Francis John, S.J., Seattle University
 Lohkamp, Rev. Nicholas Lawrence, O.F.M., Franciscan Monastery, Washington, D.C.
 Loveley, Rev. Arthur E., S.J., University of Detroit
 Lyle, Sister M. Wilma, O.S.B., Mount Marty College, Yankton, South Dakota
 Lyons, Rev. James Patrick, College of Saint Teresa, Kansas City, Missouri
 Maher, Rev. Edward Francis, S.J., University of Detroit

Maher, Sister Mary Gratia, R.S.M., Mercy Junior College, Tarrytown, New York
 Mahoney, Sister Hildegard Marie, S.C., College of Saint Elizabeth
 Martin, Rev. Joseph Lawrence, S.J., University of Santa Clara
 Masterman, Sister M. Rose Eileen, C.S.C., Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
 Masterson, Rev. John G., O.P., Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart, Madison, Wisconsin
 McArdle, Sister M. Paul Joseph, I.H.M., Marywood College, Scranton
 McAvoy, Rev. Philip Patrick, S.J., Fordham University
 McCarthy, Rev. David William, College of Saint Elizabeth
 McCormick, Sister M. John Aloyse, C.R.S.M., Gwynedd-Mercy Junior College, Pennsylvania
 McDonnell, Sister Mary Frances, Georgetown Visitation Junior College
 McGinnis, Rev. Edward F., St. Mary College, Xavier, Kansas
 McGrath, Sister Marie Padraic, O.P., St. Thomas Aquinas College, Sparkhill, N.Y.
 McKenna, Sister Michael Ann, C.S.J., Marymount College, Salina, Kansas
 McLaughlin, Sister Raymond, O.S.B., College of St. Scholastica
 McNeil, Sister Winifred Mary, S.C., College of Saint Elizabeth
 Meara, Rev. James Francis, S.J., St. Louis University
 Meier, Rev. Alphonse Herbert, O.S.B., St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pennsylvania
 Melvin, Rev. Edward James, C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
 Messemer, Rev. Edward John, S.J., Le Moyne College
 Moffitt, Rev. Joseph M., S.J., Georgetown University
 Monheim, Rev. Lawrence W., S.M., University of Dayton
 Mooney, Rev. Donald J., O.F.M., Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y.
 Moriarty, Rev. Thomas, College of New Rochelle
 Moriarty, Rev. Joseph T., St. John College of Cleveland
 Moslander, Miss Irene Elizabeth, College of Saint Teresa, Kansas City, Missouri
 Mount, Sister Teresa Aloyse, Immaculata Junior College, Washington
 Muckenhirn, Sister M. Charles Borromeo, C.S.C., St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana
 Mullen, Sister Mary Dominica, R.S.M., St. Xavier College, Chicago
 Mullen, Rev. Michael Francis, C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
 Murphy, Sister Ann Rita, G.H.S.H., D'Youville College
 Murphy, Rev. William Bernard, O.P., College of St. Catherine
 Murray, Rev. Bernard Joseph, S.J., Canisius College
 Murray, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward G., Archbishop Cushing College, Brookline, Massachusetts
 Murray, Rev. John Arthur, C.M., Niagara University

Nealy, Rev. Francis Dominic, O.P., University of Notre Dame
 Nebiolo, Rev. Emil, Donnelly College
 Nolan, Rev. Hugh J., Immaculata College, Pennsylvania
 Nugent, Brother Gregory, F.S.C., Manhattan College
 Nugent, Brother Serapion James, F.S.C., St. Mary's College, California
 Nugent, Rev. Vincent Joseph, C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
 Ockay, Rev. Clement Andrew, Seton Hall University
 O'Connell, Rev. David Arthur, O.P., Providence College
 O'Connell, Rev. John Edmund, O.P., Rosary College
 O'Connor, Rev. Thomas D., C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
 O'Donnell, Sister M. Alice Eileen, C.S.C., St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana
 O'Malley, Rev. Edward William, Mount Aloysius Junior College, Cresson, Pennsylvania
 O'Neill, Rev. Francis Stephen, St. Joseph's College, West Hartford
 O'Sullivan, Rev. John James, Catholic University of America
 O'Toole, Rev. Edward Joseph, Seton Hall University
 Pahler, Sister M. Clarice, O.S.F., Mt. Mercy College, Pittsburgh
 Palmer, Rev. Paul Francis, S.J., Woodstock College
 Pando, Rev. Jose C., C.M., St. John's University, Brooklyn
 Parr, Rev. Raymond Anthony, Alverno College, Milwaukee
 Peterson, Rev. James William, Gannon College
 Puhl, Rev. Robert Nicholas, C.S.SP., Holy Family College, Torresdale, Pennsylvania
 Putz, Rev. Louis Joseph, C.S.C., University of Notre Dame
 Ramsey, Rev. John Harrison, Villa Madonna College
 Reardon, Rev. John I., O.P., College of St. Catherine
 Regan, Rev. Robert Edward, O.S.A., Villanova University
 Reutemann, Brother Charles Lawrence, F.S.C., Manhattan College
 Reynolds, Sister Mary Eugene, O.S.U., Ursuline College, Paola, Kansas
 Rock, Rev. Augustine, O.P., Mt. St. Clare College, Clinton, Iowa
 Rohling, Rev. Joseph Henry, C.P.P.S., Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin
 Rothlauf, Rev. Frederic Paul, S.J., Canisius College
 Ruegg, Brother S. Dominic, F.S.C., St. Mary's College, California
 Rushmore, Rev. Elbert Joseph, S.J., Fordham University
 Ryan, Rev. Louis Antoninus, O.P., Providence College
 Salm, Brother Celestine Luke, F.S.C., De La Salle College, Washington
 Santen, Mother Mary Loretta, R.S.C.J., Newton College of the Sacred Heart
 Scanlon, Sister David Marie, O.P., Maryknoll College, New York
 Scanlon, Sister Roberta Joseph, C.S.J., College of Saint Rose

*Seemann, Rev. Lester William, St. Norbert College, West De
 Pere, Wisconsin
 Selle, Rev. Paulinus Jerome, O.S.B., St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe,
 Pennsylvania
 Sellinger, Rev. Joseph Anthony, S.J., Georgetown University
 Schmidt, Sister Madeleine Marie, H.H.M., Ottumwa Heights College
 *Schultz, Sister M. Veronica, C.P.P.S., St. Mary's Junior College,
 O'Fallon, Missouri
 Schwegel, Rev. Robert James, Webster College
 Scott, Sister Marie Pieta, C.S.C., St. Mary's College, Notre Dame,
 Indiana
 Scott, Rev. William Anthony, S.J., Le Moyne College
 Scullion, Rev. Raymond Matthew, O.P., Marycrest College, Daven-
 port
 Shannon, Rev. William, H., Nazareth College, Rochester, New
 York
 Shaughnessy, Mother Mary Celeste, O.S.U., College of New Rochelle
 Shea, Very Rev. Leo Martin, O.P., St. Mary's Dominican College,
 New Orleans
 Sheerin, Sister St. Francis, C.S.J., Mount St. Mary's College, Los
 Angeles
 Shircel, Rev. Cyril Louis, O.F.M., College of St. Francis, Joliet
 Simonitsch, Rev. Roland Gerard, C.S.C., University of Notre Dame
 Sloyan, Rev. Gerard Stephen, Catholic University of America
 Smith, Rev. Simon Joseph, C.M., De Paul University
 Smyth, Rev. James Patrick, University of Notre Dame
 Spitzig, Rev. Joseph A., Ursuline College, Cleveland
 Stanton, Rev. Edward S., S.J., College of Holy Cross, Worcester
 Stineman, Rev. William Frederick, Marian College, Indianapolis
 Stockhausen, Rev. Paul G., S.J., Marquette University
 Strauss, Sister Mary Regina, G.H.S.H., D'Youville College
 Sullivan, Brother C. Stephen, F.S.C., De La Salle College, Wash-
 ington
 Sullivan, Rev. Daniel Joseph, C.M., Niagara University
 Sullivan, Rev. Francis Bartley, C.P.P.S., St. Joseph's College, Rens-
 selaer, Indiana
 Sullivan, Rev. James Bailey, O.M.I., Mary Manse College, Toledo
 Sweeney, Sister Mary Assumpta, R.S.M., Georgian Court College
 Tait, Rev. Alexander Anthony, S.J., Loyola University of Los
 Angeles
 Taylor, Sister M. Redempta, O.P., Dominican Junior College, Blau-
 velt, N.Y.
 Teulings, Rev. Cornelius Philip, St. Joseph College, West Hartford
 Thack, Rev. Arnold John, O.S.B., St. Benedict's Seminary and Col-
 lege, Atchison

Tierney, Rev. Bernard Edward, C.M., St. John's University,
Brooklyn
Trainor, Rev. John James, C.M., Niagara University
Treece, Rev. Raymond Joseph, Bellarmine College, Louisville
Vogl, Rev. Robert Ralph, Loras College, Dubuque
Voll, Rev. Urban W., O.P., Trinity College, Washington
Wagner, Sister Mary Anthony, O.S.B., College of St. Benedict,
St. Joseph, Minnesota
*Whipple, Sister Mary Leonard, Georgetown Visitation Junior
College
Winkelmann, Rev. William John, C.M., De Paul University
Wolters, Rev. Gilbert Francis, O.S.B., St. Benedict's College,
Atchison
Woodward, Sister Mary Alma, R.S.M., Mount Saint Agnes College,
Baltimore
DECEASED:
McBride, Rev. James Thomas, Immaculata College, Pennsylvania

*Associate Members

REGIONAL CHAIRMEN OF THE SOCIETY

1954-1955

1. *Chicago*
Very Reverend Sebastian Carlson, O.P.
Dominican College of Saint Thomas Aquinas
Harlem Avenue at Division
River Forest, Illinois
2. *Cleveland*
Reverend Joseph A. Spitzig
Saint Mary Seminary
1227 Ansel Road
Cleveland 8, Ohio
3. *District of Columbia—Maryland*
Sister Teresa Aloyse, S.P.
Immaculata Junior College
4344 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington 16, D.C.
4. *Lake Erie*
Reverend Bernard J. Murray, S.J.
Canisius College
2001 Main Street
Buffalo 8, New York
5. *Los Angeles—San Diego*
(To be appointed)
6. *Louisville*
Reverend Raymond Treece
Bellarmino College
Louisville 5, Kentucky
7. *New England*
Reverend David O'Connell, O.P.
Providence College
Providence 8, Rhode Island
8. *New Jersey*
Reverend Clement Ockay
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey
9. *New York Metropolitan*
Brother Alban of Mary, F.S.C.
Manhattan College
Riverdale
New York 71, New York

10. *New Orleans—San Antonio*
Reverend Joseph J. Molloy, S.J.
Loyola University of New Orleans
6363 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

Reverend Ralph Dyer, S.M.
St. Mary's Seminary
San Antonio, Texas
11. *Philadelphia*
Brother D. Thomas, F.S.C.
La Salle College
Philadelphia 41, Pennsylvania
12. *Pittsburgh*
Reverend Paulinus J. Selle, O.S.B.
Saint Vincent College
Latrobe, Pennsylvania
13. *Portland*
(to be appointed)
14. *Saint Louis*
Reverend Edward E. Finn, S.J.
Saint Louis University
221 N. Grand Boulevard
Saint Louis 3, Missouri
15. *Saint Paul*
Reverend Thomas C. Donlan, O.P.
The Dominican College of St. Rose of Lima
Asbury Road
Dubuque, Iowa
16. *San Francisco*
Reverend Joseph Martin, S.J.
University of Santa Clara
Santa Clara, California
17. *Scranton—Wilkes-Barre*
Reverend Dr. Thomas C. Horan
Marywood College
Scranton, Pennsylvania

1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025

MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIETY

Active Membership

Open to those who are qualified by training or teaching experience for the scientific instruction of college students in Sacred Doctrine.

Annual Dues: Five (\$5.00) Dollars

Subscription to Annual Proceedings included in membership dues.

Associate Membership

Open to those who wish to identify themselves with the aims and purposes of the Society.

Annual Dues: Three (\$3.00) Dollars

Election to active and associate membership shall be by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Admissions at the time of the Annual National Meeting of the Society.

All applications and inquiries for further information should be sent to

The Secretary
Society of Catholic College Teachers
of Sacred Doctrine
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
Washington 8, D.C.



*Second Annual National Meeting
of the Society
Notre Dame University
April 2-3, 1956*

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Copies of the *Annual Proceedings* may be purchased at \$3.00
a copy.

Address request to

THE SECRETARY
Society of Catholic College Teachers
of Sacred Doctrine
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
Washington 8, D.C.