

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

The New College Theology

Richard J. Cronin

Philippine Studies vol. 4, no. 1 (1956): 57–73

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

The New College Theology

RICHARD J. CRONIN

LAST year, Father John Fernan, S. J., and his associates at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, New York, published the fourth and final volume in their new college theology series, *Christ In His Members*.¹ This series is the result of long discussion by Catholic theologians and educators and ably illustrates a new approach to teaching college religion which, although theoretically rated the most valuable subject in the curriculum, is often seriously neglected in practice. This article aims at acquainting the readers of PHILIPPINE STUDIES with the background, origin, and development of a movement in Catholic education which, it would seem, will inevitably have an increasing impact on religious training in the future.

BACKGROUND

In the past seventy years from Leo XIII to Pius XII, modern papal teaching has put great emphasis on the active role which the Catholic layman should play in the modern world. It is against the background of this emphasis that the new college theology course should be considered. Papal pronouncements on the Mystical Body, the Liturgy, the Social Order, and Catholic Action have set goals for the layman in general that the new course attempts to realize in practice for its students. As Richard Weaver states in the provocative title of a recent book, *Ideas Have Consequences*.² This new approach to college religion is actually only a consequence of

these recent ideas on the role of the layman in the Church and in society. Since the success or failure of the new course will rest ultimately on how effectively it prepares the college graduate to take his place in the world as the Catholic layman the Church would have him be, a brief historical perspective of what precisely this new role consists in seems necessary.

Historically, the role of the layman has been differently conceived as either the institutional or organic aspect of the Church herself has been stressed. From the Council of Trent in the sixteenth to the Vatican Council in the nineteenth century, the emphasis of papal teaching was on the institutional aspect of the Church. Against a Protestantism which denied the authority of a visible Church with a divinely instituted hierarchy, the Church asserted the power of the hierarchy to govern, to teach, and to sanctify the members of Christ's Church. She reaffirmed that power of jurisdiction and orders which has been delegated in unbroken succession from St. Peter and the Apostles, and ultimately from Christ Himself. Against a Liberalism which denied any dogma that unaided reason could not demonstrate, the Church defined the power of the Roman Pontiffs to teach infallibly the revelation which Christ entrusted to His Church. Never failing to measure up to Toynbee's celebrated test for vitality, the Church rose to meet the challenge of these two attacks with a clear and vigorous response.

But the institutional aspect of the Church, although very important, is only partial. The Church is not only an institution, it is also an organism. The Church not only has a Law, it also has a Life. Jurisdiction and authority do not tell the whole story. The Church is also the Mystical Body of Christ, whose members are united to each other and to their Head by bonds of inner love, as well as by external law. This complementary and equally essential aspect of the Church has received increased attention in our own century.

In the institutional aspect of the Church, little stress is put on the positive functions of the layman. Historically this is understandable. Protestantism asserted that each individual

was his own hierarchy, a law unto himself. Church law in righting the balance was forced to the other extreme. Canonically, the layman is defined negatively. Any baptized Catholic who is not a cleric is a layman.³ By his state of life, the ordinary layman is further distinguished from the Religious.⁴ In other words, the ordinary layman does not have orders,⁵ nor jurisdiction,⁶ nor vows.⁷ He is distinguished from the cleric by absence of orders and jurisdiction, and from the Religious by absence of religious vows and common religious life. From such a viewpoint, the layman is predominantly considered as a subject of the hierarchy without any active responsibility of his own in the Church.

In the organic view of the Church, however, the layman has a far more active and positive contribution to make. As a member of the Mystical Body, he has a distinct role to play which, be it only to stay in the state of sanctifying grace, vitally effects the life of the whole Body. By Baptism he becomes a member of this Mystical Body, and by Confirmation he assumes the mature obligation to collaborate in the apostolate of the Church. In the sacrament of marriage he shares intimately with God in bringing children into the world who will become members of the Church. In the Liturgy he is an active participant in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass. As a member of Catholic Action he cooperates in the work, if not the power, of the hierarchy. In the Social Apostolate, faithful to his obligations in social justice and charity, he works for the restoration of political and economic society in Christ. It is this responsible view of the Catholic layman that recent papal Encyclicals and Allocutions have heavily stressed. The new theology course for college students tries to refocus this responsible ideal of Catholic lay life in an intelligent, imaginative, and inspiring way. It is only against the background of this dynamic concept of the Catholic layman, therefore, that the new course can be adequately assessed.

ORIGINS

Although the origins of the course are European, this article will confine itself to college theology in the United

States. In the past twenty years, Father Josef Jungmann, S. J., and Father Franz Lakner, S. J., in Germany; Father George Delcuve, S. J., in Belgium; and Father Andre Ravier, S. J., in France have rethought the problem of religious education and produced textbooks which have been in use in their respective countries for over ten years.⁸ These men, however, were thinking in terms of the German *Gymnasium* and *Mittelschule* and the French *Collège* which are roughly equivalent to the period in Philippine schools from first year high school through second year college. Due to this difference in school systems, and for reasons of economy, only the origins of the college theology course in the United States will be considered.

In the United States the new course had its origin in two articles which Father John Courtney Murray, S. J. published in *Theological Studies* in 1944.⁹ Although the articles were entitled "Towards a Theology for the Layman," the layman that Father Murray had in mind was the Catholic college student who had the opportunity and background for such a course. These two articles have set the goals and sketched the main lines of the new college theology as it is actually being taught today. Although Father Murray is no longer officially connected with the course, subsequent work by Father Fernan at Le Moyne College and Father Gallagher at Georgetown University have consistently followed Father Murray's ideas in the difficult conversion from theory to classroom reality. Because of their importance, therefore, before considering the course as it is being taught in the United States today, a summary of Father Murray's articles on college theology will be given. The complexity of Father Murray's two long articles defies an exact précis in the space available. A description of his position must suffice.

FATHER MURRAY'S POSITION

Father Murray considers two principal problems in his articles on theology for the layman: 1) the problem of finality, what is the purpose of such a course; and 2) the pedagogical problem, how can such a course be structured to achieve this purpose. Father Murray begins at the beginning: what is the

specific purpose of the college religion course? To shape a suitably adapted course follows this consideration as an application of the means to the end.

There are some who maintain that the purpose of college theology does not differ notably from that of seminary theology. College theology, in this view, is nothing more than seminary theology simplified and abbreviated. The difference between the two, therefore, would be only rhetorical. Father Murray rejects this position as inadequate. He argues to a far more profound difference. College theology differs from seminary theology, not only in its manner of presentation, but also in its very purpose.

Before the purpose of the new college theology can be determined, the purpose of the older seminary theology must be examined. Father Murray says that historically theology's traditional role has been the service of the Church. Theology "... is social in its origin, in the collective faith of the Church; and it is social in its function—it exists for the benefit of the life of the Church..."¹⁰ The Church has looked on seminary theology as that scientific knowledge of the faith which assists the hierarchy in teaching revelation. The Church never teaches theology; she teaches revelation, something given to her by Christ Himself, not something she has worked out syllogistically by reason from self-evident principles. Yet since revelation must be taught in human language, the Church uses theology as the most suitable human means to present such teaching in intelligibly clear and unambiguous terms. In brief, theology's function is to serve the Church.

Since this is so, theology is an analogical concept,¹¹ that is to say in some ways it remains always the same, and in other ways it differs. All theology is the same in that its subject matter is the same divine revelation. Yet individual theologies will differ in their approach to divine revelation as the service which they render the Church differs. The priest and the layman have distinct jobs in the Church; they each render the Church different services. Since their purpose is not the same, neither should their theology be the same. Theology for the

priest enables him to cooperate with the teaching task of the hierarchy. Since the layman has no share in this task, seminary theology, in no matter what attenuated form, would seem ill-suited to his own special requirements. In the seminary, also, the dogmatic theology professor can presume that his students are receiving adequate religious formation from other sources. His stress can accordingly be highly intellectual and philosophical. His norm of teaching is clarity and orderliness in exposition. The college theology teacher, however, can rely on no such presumption. He must go beyond intellectual comprehension to that firm conviction and personal realization of the truths of faith which alone will motivate responsible action. He must aim not only at the intellectual formation of the student, but at his complete religious formation as well. His norm of teaching must be at the same time clarity and inspiration.

Because the specific purpose of college theology is determined by the layman's role in the Church and society, a more precise analysis of that role is essential. A brief introduction to the increasingly active nature of the layman's task in the Church has already been given earlier in this article. Father Murray narrows down this task more relevantly for the Catholic college student.

As the priest is the mediator between God and the members of His Church, so the layman is the mediator between the Church and the modern world. The priest's mediation is wholly of the spiritual order; he administers the sacraments and preaches the saving word of revelation. The layman's mediation, however, is both of the spiritual and of the temporal order. In the spiritual order, his action motivated by faith and charity aims at the religious and moral renovation of society. In the temporal order, his action, likewise motivated by faith and charity, aims at the reformation of the institutions of economic and political society.¹²

The most pressing heresy that the layman must face in the modern world is not Protestantism, but the twin heresy of religious indifferentism and secularism, which strives for a complete separation between the spiritual and the temporal

orders.¹³ The Church can not remain indifferent to the program of secularism. She is committed to deep concern with the institutions of temporal society because they can help or hinder her major work, the salvation of souls. By tragic experience the Church knows that a professedly amoral society is inevitably an unjust one, and injustice inevitably deters the general run of men from their pursuit of eternal life. In an unjust social order, man will care little for the Bread of Life, if the exclusive struggle for daily bread absorbs all his time and energy. The schism secularism would inflict on society is also a wound in the Body of Christ. To heal this wound the Church must rely on the layman. By his position both in the Church and in the temporal order, the layman is uniquely situated to mediate between the two. The only solution to secularism is so to transform temporal society in keeping with justice and charity that it allows the living of a full Christian life. This task of reformation rests primarily on the layman whose situation in society makes him the member of the Church best suited to bring direct pressure to bear on political and economic institutions.

The layman needs two essentials to do this job properly: 1) an intensification of his own religious life; and 2) an awareness of the modern social apostolate the Church calls him to join and dedication to that apostolate that only intelligent conviction will provide.¹⁴ The college theology course must fulfill this double need. It must aim at a religiously intelligent enthusiasm for the apostolate of the laity. Every word must be stressed. Without religious motivation there is no apostolate, and mere blind enthusiasm can be as detrimental to the Church's purpose as a sterile intellectualism. The aim of the new course, therefore, is both individual and social. It fosters the intellectual and religious formation of the individual student, and it strives to communicate to this student a desire to share in the Church's own great social apostolate—that Christ may reign over the hearts of men and over the institutions of society.

With the purpose of college theology outlined, Father Murray considers next the pedagogical problem of constructing

a course suitable to attain this purpose. The thorniest difficulty here is how to communicate, not only ideas to the intellect, but motivation to the will which will issue in concrete action. Father Murray finds two partial solutions to this problem: 1) in the teacher of the college theology course, and 2) in the structure of the course itself. Although there can never be a guaranteed formula for successful motivation, the teacher and the course itself are the two means best designed to approximate success.

The teacher of college theology, therefore, is of primary importance. The old fallacy that any priest because of his course in seminary theology is automatically equipped to teach college theology must be recognized for what it is. This course must be so presented that it not only seems true, but that it demands an answer in terms of life. This requires on the teacher's part an enthusiasm for his subject that will communicate itself to his students by contagion better than it could ever be communicated by exhortation. A class never rises above the level of its teacher. The teacher of college theology must keep abreast of recent work in Scripture and the Liturgy. He must be well read in modern papal literature on such subjects as the Mystical Body, the Social Order, and Catholic Action. He must have a ready acquaintance with the contemporary problems of modern man and modern society. In short, his own personality should radiate an outlook to his students which well may be the most decisive factor in communicating the love which forms apostles, over and above the ideas which make the theologian. Such a high ideal needs special training, or at least special preparation. The importance of his job demands that the college theology teacher be a specialist. Ideally, he should concentrate on this course alone.

The guiding principle in shaping the college theology course itself is adaptation. If it is to be true college theology, it must be adapted to the psychology of the college student, and it must present a scientific, unified view of divine revelation in keeping with the twofold purpose of its students as laymen in the modern world.

To achieve this the master idea of the entire course will be the *totus Christus*, the Whole Christ: Christ in his human and divine natures, and Christ in the members of His Mystical Body.¹⁵ The course's method will be psychological and scriptural rather than logical and scholastic. Where scholastic theology begins with the Trinity, God as He is in Himself, college theology begins with Christ, God as He appeared to us. Pedagogically, the difference is appreciable. By centering the course on the Person of Christ, the psychological approach offers its students a model for imitation that will help the students carry their theology over into life. A flesh and blood Leader is far more likely to inspire action than the cold logic of a syllogism. The new course will be historical rather than philosophical. Its manner will be positive, not polemic. It will depict the progressive revelation of God's whole plan of salvation—what the Fathers of the Church called the *economia salutis*—rather than examine the single truths of revelation in their relation to philosophy and to one another—what the scholastic theologians termed *theologia*, according to the norms of Aristotelian science.

In its approach to the teaching of theology, the new course in addition to Scripture will make use of the liturgy. The liturgy serves college theology in two ways. First, through the symbolism of the sacraments and the rites of the liturgy, the student is brought to a living realization of the truths of revelation that the liturgy and its ceremonies are founded on. The liturgy dramatizes these truths and, thereby, makes them live in a new way for the student. Secondly, the liturgy, especially in the Mass and the Eucharist, helps both to build up the student's religious life and to increase his social awareness. The liturgy is both social and sanctifying worship. Such social worship in this life-giving sense is the necessary prerequisite to social action.

Father Murray summarizes elsewhere the subject matter of the four year course in theology under the brief headings: Christ, the Cross, the Church, the Church and the Modern World.¹⁶ Freshman Year would study the life of Christ from the Gospels. This study would serve as a background for the

dogma of the Incarnation, formulated by the Church at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The Incarnation serves as the key to the whole idea of the supernatural: Christ, perfect God, perfect man, perfectly one. Sophomore Year using *The Acts Of The Apostles* studies the formation by the Holy Spirit of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. The Epistles lead to a further consideration of the nature of the Church and the role it plays in God's plan of salvation. Junior Year studies the meaning of the Cross in our redemption, and the continuation of the Cross in the Mass. Senior Year is devoted to the Church and Modern Society. By this time, the Senior has the philosophy required for such a course. Two problems would be considered: first, the relation of faith and reason; second, the mission of the Church to temporal society.

To conclude this summary of Father Murray's position on college theology, the social emphasis of his Senior Year course might be noted. This would seem entirely consonant with the objectives for the course that Father Murray originally drew up. Father Murray himself describes those objectives in the following way:

Our problem is to form Christian men strong enough to be plunged into the modern secularized milieu and confidently left to the inner resources of a mature faith that is able to stand by itself, supported by the strength of its own deeply experienced reality. More than that, our problem is to develop Christian men who will be intelligent and strong enough to reform the milieu itself. And for this task there is needed a rare type of spirituality—the spirituality of the man who is able to say, out of an insight and with a conviction approaching that of St. Paul, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel [Christ, and the whole economy of life of which He is the center]; for it is the power of God unto salvation for all who believe..." (Romans 1:16).¹⁷

In the light of such objectives, the college theology course would seem incomplete without some such consideration as Father Murray's on the Church and Modern Society. Yet in its actual development, this aspect of college theology has been most neglected.

FATHER MURRAY'S POSITION CRITICIZED

Before proceeding to the development of Father Murray's course in American colleges, it might be profitable to consider here the criticism that Father Thomas C. Donlan, O. P., offers of the new college theology. In his book, *Theology and Education*, while agreeing on the need of college theology, Father Donlan offers two criticisms of the course proposed by Father Murray's articles. First, the concept of the *totus Christus* is insufficient to order the college theology course because it ". . . is not ultimate in itself, and therefore requires explanation in terms of relationship to God."¹⁸ Secondly, aside from the vast amount of labor required to work out such a new course, ". . . it is not immediately clear that whatever good effects might be expected from the new discipline could not be had by the more simple approach of modifying accidentally what is already to hand in the traditional theology."¹⁹

Father Donlan is by no means alone in his first criticism. Father Gerald Van Ackeren, S. J., has urged the same objection to the *totus Christus* notion as the ordering concept of the whole course.²⁰ To reply fully to this difficulty of Father Donlan's would require a theological and technical discussion far beyond the scope of this article. The mere assertion, however, that St. Thomas was acquainted with this concept of the *totus Christus* and rejected it as the ordering notion of his *Summa Theologiae* does not close the discussion. Father Murray recognized this difficulty in his articles and outlined an answer.²¹ The works of Father Emile Mersch, S. J. and Father Franz Lakner, S. J. have given a more complete defense of the *totus Christus* concept.²² It will suffice to note here that as the college theology course has actually taken shape, in the textbook series of Father Fernan for instance, "the required explanation in terms of relationship to God" has been given. In the third volume of Father Fernan's series, *The Mystical Christ*, Father Edward Messemer, S. J. has written a chapter devoted to the Trinity as a necessary prerequisite to the ultimate understanding of the Mystical Body.²³

Father Donlan's second objection is pragmatic. The good effects of the new course can only be measured in practice. So far, actual classroom experience has borne out that there are effects from the course and that the effects are good. How the traditional theology course, only accidentally modified, would accomplish the same effects is, to use Father Donlan's phrase, not immediately clear. The whole burden of Father Murray's articles tried to show that the modern layman has a new specialized job that requires new specialized training. Father Donlan, adhering to the traditional Dominican position, maintains that this training can best be given by following the order and method of St. Thomas and by using the *Summa Theologiae* as a textbook. Taking nothing from the great Dominican tradition and the justly esteemed preeminence of St. Thomas among Catholic theologians, it is still difficult to conceive the first year college student truly assimilating the discussions of the *Pars Prima* on God's knowledge of the future, predestination, and the Trinity without any philosophical background. Nor would it seem any easier to find a detailed discussion of modern social problems in the *Summa*, problems so relevant to the modern layman. These, again, are pragmatic questions. Perhaps the traditional approach could meet the test of classroom practice. The respective merits of the two courses can only be measured by each school and by each teacher against that sobering norm what effects does the course produce in the students.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COURSE

When Father Murray's articles appeared in *Theological Studies* in 1944, the college theology course had already been tried experimentally at Loyola College in Baltimore and at Georgetown University in Washington since 1940. The publication of the articles stimulated wide interest in the new course. The increasing volume of periodical literature on college theology serves as an index of the interest the new approach has aroused. To show the practicality of such a course, the new college theology as it is actually taught in three American

colleges will be considered briefly. Each of these colleges has modified Father Murray's original plan in varying degrees.

Father John Fernan at Le Moyne College in Syracuse tries to bring the college theology course to bear more immediately on the students' own lives. The Le Moyne Program has the great advantage of being the first to have for the four year course a complete series of textbooks written consistently with its aims. Father Fernan expresses the practical stress of the Le Moyne Course in the Preface to the first volume of this series, *Christ As Prophet And King*: :

These two things, then, the college course in theology must do: a work of history and a work of synthesis. Both are works of science, but both, too, have a religious purpose, namely, a new enlightenment of faith, that it may in turn illuminate the whole of life, and direct and control its living. For though theology is primarily concerned with its intelligent organization, nevertheless, it has not achieved its total purpose if it stops at mere academic knowledge and does not become the inspiration of a way of life.²⁴

Father Fernan's books are by no means final. He hopes to revise them in the light of further teaching experience. In the fourth volume of his series, *Christ In His Members*, he notably departs from the original syllabus Father Murray outlined. This volume inserts a treatment of Grace and Ascetical Theology in place of the course on the Church and Modern Society. Father Fernan does not deny the need of the latter course, but he defends the omission simply for lack of time.²⁵ He chose the course on asceticism over the course on social problems on the assumption that added stress on personal holiness will lead in practice to social action.²⁶

Father Eugene Gallagher, S.J. at Georgetown has been the most faithful to the original aims of Father Murray. This is partly due, undoubtedly, to the fact that Father Murray himself inaugurated the course at Georgetown in 1940. Two of the textbooks he wrote at that time for the course are still in use. Father Gallagher who is now directing the course at Georgetown has tried to conserve the syllabus as Father Murray planned it. The syllabus taught at present is laid out as follows. *Freshman Year — First Semester*: The Quadriform

Gospel; *Second Semester*: The Life of Christ. *Sophomore Year — First Semester*: The Organization and Inner Nature of the Church; *Second Semester*: The Theology of Redemption. *Junior Year — First Semester*: The Theology of the Individual; *Second Semester*: The Spiritual Formation of the Laymen, Their Participation in the Apostolate. *Senior Year—First Semester*: The Catholic Philosophy of Religion; *Second Semester*: Christian Marriage, and the Church and the Social Order.²⁷ With the exception of the course on Ascetical Theology in Junior Year, the course of Father Gallagher follows closely the course Father Murray intended. Although as Father Gallagher himself admits,²⁸ a satisfactory presentation of the course on the Church and the Social Order has not been worked out in practice.

Father William Casey, S.J., at Boston College has stressed college theology as an intellectual discipline opposed to the moral discipline of religion.²⁹ He follows the psychological and historical approach to theology in the first two years of his course, but departs from it for the logical approach in the final two years. Freshman and Sophomore Years are devoted to what Father Casey calls Historical Theology, while Junior and Senior Years are devoted to strict Dogmatic Theology, although it is not taught in the rigid thesis form. Father Casey best cites his own aim for this latter part of the course:

After the two years of Historical Theology, the student is now in a good position for the mature study of Dogmatic Theology in his last two years. His first two years were spent in an historical approach to theology; now the approach is logical. Some minds are more attracted by the first approach, others by the second. We aim to please both types of mind during the four years here.³⁰

Even such a cursory view of college theology in these three schools points up the wide variety of emphasis the course has received in its transition from the theoretical stage in the articles of Father Murray to the stage of actual classroom teaching. Even in the eclectic program of Boston College, there is a general consensus that the old strictly apologetic course is no longer adequate to the contemporary needs of the modern college graduate. Luther has been quite dead for a

considerable time. Refuting him may still have some use for the college student, but it is hardly essential. All these three schools are aware of Father Murray's aims for college theology and in their own way try to accomplish them. In the time allotted for the course, they disagree on the specific means to achieve these goals. If conformity to Father Murray's original design for the course is desirable, Georgetown seems to have a decided advantage over the programs at Le Moyne and Boston College, at least in its Senior Course on the Church and Modern Society, even allowing for the dissatisfaction Father Gallagher has expressed with the course in its present form. As Pius XI said to a group of Belgian students, "...the personal apostolate cannot any longer suffice, if, indeed, it ever did suffice. . . ." ³¹ If the college theology course is truly to prepare the Catholic graduate for the work that lies ahead of him, the social emphasis of the course should not be left implicit.

THE PHILIPPINES

These new trends in the teaching of college theology are of course not unknown in the Philippines. In 1948 the Le Moyne syllabus was introduced into the Ateneo de Manila by Father James J. Meany, S.J., Dean at the time of the College of Arts and Sciences. In the summer of 1955 this program was evaluated in a special seminar of college professors of theology under the direction of Father Horacio de la Costa S.J. and Father Lino Banayad, S.J.

In addition to this college course, the Graduate School of the Ateneo de Manila also offers a two-year course in the "kerygmatic" approach to theology as conceived by Father Jungmann of Innsbruck and elaborated by Father Hofinger, S.J. of Chabanel Hall, Manila, whose articles in *Lumen Vitae* and elsewhere are well-known. The course is designed for teachers of religion and has been attended mostly by nuns. It elicited high praise from the Archbishop of Manila at the close of the summer session of 1955. This course is also under the direction of Father Banayad.

There are doubtless many difficulties still to be encountered, and the program at the Ateneo is still experimental. It

will be some time before a complete satisfactory course in college theology can be devised. One obvious difficulty is the number of students from public and other secular high schools who have not had a thorough grounding in Religion at the secondary school level though Father Casey believes that the new program will be successful even without previous religious education in the high school,³² while Father Gallagher thinks that the problem could be met by a semester of remedial instruction, supplemented when necessary by private tutoring.³³ Another difficulty might possibly arise from the inadequacies of college textbooks intended for use in American rather than Philippine colleges.

Whatever the difficulties are, however, there seems urgent need for this new orientation of college theology in the Philippines. The role of the Filipino layman in the Christianization of the entire Philippine milieu is obviously very important. Moreover, the social emphasis that Father Murray, (who, incidentally, used to teach at the Ateneo de Manila), envisioned for the college theology course would seem especially needed in the Philippines. In the light of the Joint Pastoral Letter of the Philippine Hierarchy in 1949 and the ominous presence of Communism throughout the Far East, the responsibility of the Filipino college graduate is crucial.

* * *

¹ Bernard J. Murray, S.J., John J. Fernan, S.J. and Edward J. Messemer, S.J., *Theology, A Course for College Students*. Vol. IV: *Christ in His Members* (New York, 1955).

² Richard M. Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences* (Chicago, 1948)

³ *Codex Juris Canonici*, Canon 87; 107; 108, 1. See also T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J. and Adam C. Ellis, S.J., *Canon Law, A Text and Commentary* (Milwaukee, 1951), p. 345; A. Vermeersch, S.J. and J. Creusen, S.J., *Epitome Juris Canonici* (seventh edition; Mechlin, 1940), I, 212-213.

⁴ *Codex Juris Canonici*, Canons 107; 487. See also Joseph Creusen, S.J., *Religious Men and Women in the Code* (fifth edition; Milwaukee, 1953), p. 9.

⁵ *Codex Juris Canonici*, Canon 118. See also Vermeersch-Creusen, *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Codex Juris Canonici*, Canon 118.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Canons 487; 572-586; 1307-1308. See also J. Creusen, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-165.

⁸ George Delcuve, S.J., "Modern Catechetical Method in Continental Europe," *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, LXIX (June, 1947), 465-478. This article gives a brief summary of the work on the Continent since 1900.

⁹ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Problem of Finality," *Theological Studies*, V (March, 1944), 43-75; "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Pedagogical Problem," *Theological Studies*, V (September, 1944), 340-376.

¹⁰ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Problem of Finality," *Theological Studies*, V (March, 1944), 49.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 71-74.

¹³ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Pedagogical Problem," *Theological Studies*, V (September, 1954), 351.

¹⁴ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Problem of Finality," *Theological Studies*, V (March, 1944), p. 69.

¹⁵ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Pedagogical Problem," *Theological Studies*, V (September, 1944), 363-364.

¹⁶ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "On the Idea of a College Religion Course," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XII (October, 1949), 84.

¹⁷ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Pedagogical Problem," *Theological Studies*, V (September, 1944), 350.

¹⁸ Thomas C. Donlan, O.P., *Theology and Education* (Dubuque, 1952), p. 114.

¹⁹ *Loc. cit.*

²⁰ Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J., "Basic Functions of College Theology," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XVII (January, 1955), 143

²¹ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Pedagogical Problem," *Theological Studies*, V (September, 1944), 359-366.

²² Emile Mersch, S.J., *The Theology of the Mystical Body* (St. Louis, 1951), pp. 47-74; Franz Lakner, S.J., "Das Zentralobjekt der Theologie; Zur Frage um Existenz und Gestalt einer Seelsorgstheologie," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, LXII (1938), 1-36.

²³ John J. Fernan, S.J., *Theology, A Course for College Students* Volume III: *The Mystical Christ* (New York, 1954), pp. 210-222.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Volume I: *Christ as Prophet and King*, (New York, 1952), p. xiii.

²⁵ *Proceedings of the National Jesuit Institute on College Theology*, (The College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass., August 2-14, 1951), p. 87.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-61.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

³¹ From a Discourse to Belgian Catholic Students in September, 1933. Quoted by John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Problem of Finality," *Theological Studies*, V (March, 1944), 72.

³² *Proceedings of the National Jesuit Institute on College Theology*, (1951), p. 127.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 7 and 63.