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I believe that Vita's work is an important resource for those who believe that literary art can create human existence; and for those who are searching for ways to be pastorally sensitive to their sisters and brothers who struggle with the paradoxes and ambiguities of life's experience.

Hugh E. Brown, '88
Christ Episcopal Church
Charlottesville, Virginia


In conclusion, the present volume not only represents a fine example of literary criticism of the gospel but also addresses, in a thorough and informed fashion, a fundamental literary and ideological dimension of the fourth gospel. Though one may and will disagree with the author on a number of areas—theological, methodological, and critical—the volume does constitute a most welcome and timely addition indeed to Johannine criticism.

Fernando F. Segovia
Vanderbilt Divinity School
Nashville, Tennessee


Those of us who belong to an older generation will remember the remarkable change that came about in Roman Catholic biblical criticism in the early sixties. Until then Roman Catholics remained in almost complete isolation. From that time, however, they began to appear at scholarly meetings, and we non-Romans began to be invited to talk to their priests and to attend their scholarly meetings. (I shall never forget the.first time I spoke to a gathering of Roman clergy as the meeting broke up about 5 p.m. I assumed we were headed for the chapel for Evensong, but I discovered that our goal was the bar in the basement where, with an enormous selection of liquor, a happy hour was enjoyed by all.)

The story of biblical scholarship in the Roman Church in this country moved through three phases: tentative beginnings, a forty year cold war, and more recently Glasnost and Perestroika. Four main issues were at stake: the need for a reliable vernacular translation of the Bible, the clarification of the relation between scripture and tradition, the response to Protestant biblical criticism, and the problem of inspiration and inerrancy.

During the first period, John Carroll of Baltimore, responding to the challenge of an Anglican ex-Jenius, one Charles Wharton, espoused a dynamic view of the relation between scripture and tradition which anticipated Newman and Vatican II. Francis Kenrick in the mid-19th century hoped to revise the Douay-Rheims-Challoner Bible in the light of the original Hebrew and Greek. Toward the end of that century, as Catholic Modernism developed in Europe, its ideas were brought to this country by Europeans such as Henry Pocci who started teaching at Catholic University. (But he has any contacts with VTS?) At the same time, Charles Augustus Briggs of Union Theological Seminary, New York, was keeping American Catholics apprised of Modernist developments, hoping that biblical scholarship would lead to ecumenical rapprochement.

There early hopes were dashed by the repulsive policy of Pius X. In the wake of the Neo-Thomist revival fostered by his predecessor Leo XIII, Modernism was condemned and all theologians were compelled to subscribe to the anti-Monteforti oath. Biblical scholarship was put in the deep freeze which the older among us remember only too well. That period had its heroes and its villains, among the former Henry Pocci himself who lost his job at CU, as did Edward F. Segismun later from the same institution. Among the latter were Anthony J. Maas, editor of the American Ecclesiastical Review; Joseph C. Fenton, also of CU, and the Papal Legate Egido Vagnozzi.

It is an engrossing story that Fogarty has to tell, and he tells it well. There is only one question I would like to raise. In the 1980s we were told at Canisius that Pius X had been right in condemning Modernism, not for their critical views, but for their theology, or ideology. This approach is inappropriate itself, by the way, and the experiential understanding of Catholicism rather than on the revelatory acts of God ascribed in Holy Scripture. Fogarty, however, sees it differently: the Modernists were condemned for their attack on the Roman Catholic scholastic view of revelation in propositional terms. One could wish Fogarty had done more to clarify the difference between the theology or ideology of Modernism and that of contemporary biblical scholarship in the Roman Church. Scripture scholars today in the Roman Church are highly sensitive to the charge of Modernism. Where exactly do they differ from Modernists? This is not just a historical question. The great problem for them as for Anglican biblical scholars is mutualism, or to combine fearless biblical criticism with a firm adherence to authentic Catholic orthodoxy.

One minor quibble. On page 144, mentioning Branch, the authors place a parenthetical [sic] after their spelling of 'branch.' He is referring to the interesting suggestion that this is the accepted British spelling as opposed to 'branch.'

Reginald H. Fuller
Professor Emeritus
VTS

The Chase began tentatively with Pius XII's Divina Afflante Spiritu (1945). This charged scripture scholars to respect the various generations of Bible text. The scripture creation story, e.g., is myth rather than history. Yet this most influential papal document did not impact the Catholic Biblical Association was founded (1948) to study and prepare for a new translation of the Bible, and the Catholic Biblical Quarterly became its organ. If W.J. Aligbdt of John Hopkins played a valuable part in assisting these enterprises in their earliest days and so promoting that ecumenical cooperation which Charles Augustus Briggs had envisaged long ago, for this reviewer it was thrilling to read of the parts played by scholars whom he later knew as friends and colleagues, such as Mcl in Bour, Joseph Frenoyer and Raymond Brown, who are so widely and deservedly known today far beyond their own Church.

Many setbacks were still to come. But the eventual acceptance of critical biblical scholarship in the Roman Church was assured by the Biblical Commission's 1964 instruction on the historicity of the gospels, which recognized the three levels of the gospel traditions (Jesus, the early Church, and the Evangelist's reduction), and by Vatican II's decrees Dei Verbum. Both form and content of the statement were fully sanctioned.


1990 marked the centennial of Newman's death, and a host of biographical studies have appeared to celebrate the event. Martin's biography (first published in Britain in 1982 and republished for the occasion) is the shortest of these and provides a clear and complete overview of the major events, controversies and personalities of Newman's long and fruitful life. Martin traces the career of Newman as he evolves from an Anglican of the Evangelical persuasion through being an Anglo-Catholic into his being a Roman Catholic convert, who became a Cardinal, and who possibly (in the near future) will become a saint. But this journey was not an easy one, and a major motif in Newman's life is the painful transition from positions of prestige and influence to rejection and even ridicule. He undergoes this type of transition a number of times, and although each is an essentially intellectual upheaval, it takes a toll on his personal life as well. The transition from being a respected leader in growing Anglo-Catholicism to being a radical whose dismiserous opinions (Tract 90) on the 39 Articles were rejected by a scandalized establishment is only the most famous of these. He marked his decline by stepping off into a semi-romantic life at Littlemore and by disengaging from the more public pulpit of St. Mary's, Oxford. Each time, however, Newman confronted failure and used it to rebase and to clarify his own ideas. This resulted in a new vision that captured the imagination and catapulted him to a new position of intellectual significance. Out of the Littlemore experience came the Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine which argued that Christian doctrine like other ideas developed over time and implied that the Christian faith was still in the process of unfolding itself in human history. This concept of an historically evolving Christian doctrine provided the basis for a Christian response to Darwin a decade later. The Essay on Development also justified his conversion to Roman Catholicism. Although Newman became the darling of a restive English Catholicism, he did not remain in favor very long. Soon he was politely but insistently critiquing the cultural and intellectual ethos of the Roman and British Catholic hierarchies. His journey was marked by the silhouette of the Protestantism of the West. As the Protestant establishment tried to hit back by attacking the veracity of his "treatises," Newman, Newman answered by producing the most literate spiritual autobiography written in English—Apologia pro Vitae Sua. His repudiation of the respect of the British public allowed his ideas to take root in both Anglican and Roman Catholic circles. Eventually these seed-like ideas came to fruition, influencing the way Anglicans and Roman Catholics viewed each other and decisively shaping the modern Catholic Church through the impact of which on Vatican II.

Martin tells this story by introducing the events, characters and issues that molded Newman's life and placing them in their