Cahiers Internationaux de Théologie Pratique

Série « Recherches » n° 15

Theological Aspects of Catechesis in the United States of America in the First Decade of the 21st Century

John Paul Zenollito Pedrera Granada (éd.)

John Paul Zenollito Pedrera Granada

Theological Aspects of Catechesis in the United States of America in the First Decade of the 21st Century

Abbreviation

APNE	Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism
APRRE	Association of Prof. and Researchers of Religious Education
CCC	Catechism of the Catholic Church
C-CCC	Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church
CCD	Confraternity of Christian Doctrine
COINAT	International Theological Commission
C-SD	Compendium of the Social Doctrine
CT	Catechesi Tradendae
CTSA	Catholic Theological Society of America
CUA	Catholic University of America
EDB	Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna
EN	Evangelium Nuntiandi
EV	Enchiridion Vaticanum
GCD	General Catechetical Directory (1971)
GDC	General Directory for Catechesis (1997)
LEV	Libreria Editrice Vaticana
LG	Dogmatic Constitution on Church
NCCB	National Catholic Conference of Bishops
NCCL	National Conference for Catechetical Leadership

NCEA	National Catechetical Educational Association
NDC	National Directory for Catechesis
NFCY	National Federation of the Catholic Youth
NFCYM	National Catholic Educational Association
OHWB	Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us
PAC	Partnership in Adolescent Catechesis
RCIA	Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults
RE	Religious Education
REA	Religious Education Association
SLF	Sharing the Light of Faith
TLL	The Living Light
USCC	United States Catholic Conference
USCCA	United States Catholic Catechism for Adults
USCCB	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

CONTENTS

Introduction

This study is about the catechesis of the Catholic Church in the United States of America in the first decade of the 21st century, with a particular focus on theological aspects. The place (USA) and time (2000-2010), aside from being a definition and delimitation of the object of study, unveils a concrete picture of an audacious catechetical enterprise in our times animated by the original zeal to educate in faith characteristic of Christ's Church. The aim of this study is to point out and evaluate some theological aspects of the catechesis in the USA in the decade 2000-2010.

The perspective of this study

Catechesis in the Catholic Church refers to its educating activity in the faith in Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, true God and true Man. The New Testament records the first Christian community's use of the word referring to its solicitude to instruct, educate, and form its members in faith.

Throughout the progression of ecclesial consciousness, the Church came to develop in different forms the practice of catechesis. One thing is however clear: she has always been aware of the significance of the *education dimension* in the mission of Jesus which she now realizes with Christ. The Church does Christ's mission in *three* interconnected (circumencessio) grand activities – *missio ad extra* (mission "ad gentes"), *missio ecumenica* (ecumenism), and *missio ad intra* (pastoral). These activities, forming one singular whole of the Church's mission, as one and the same with Jesus' mission, are imbued with the so-called *tria munera*. In other words, every activity, say for instance, the *missio ad intra*, is made to happen in *three* concrete expressions – kingly, prophetic and priestly expressions. In the *missio*

ad intra, those ecclesial action related to her member's civil life is referred to as the *kingly* expression of its pastoral mission. Her activities related to the sanctification of her members through the Liturgy and which culminates in the Holy Eucharist, express the *priestly* aspect of the pastoral mission. The Church's actions which have something to do with teaching the doctrines, with theological enterprises, and transmitting and guarding the truths entrusted to her by the Jesus, express the *prophetic aspect* of that same pastoral mission.

In addition to that, since participation in the mission of Jesus Christ in the Church has two essentially distinct forms (by incorporation through baptism and by Order), a distinction between the exercise of *those who received baptism* (baptized) and *those who received not only baptism but also given the task to do it as a ministry through Order* (baptized and ordained), may likewise be distinguished within that one and single mission.

Now, the education in faith came to be designated as catechesis. It is a constitutive and permanent element in ecclesial action, in the Church's self-realization. She realizes her identity as Christ's mystical body doing Jesus' mission. Therefore, it may be said that wherever the Church is, she cannot but do Jesus' mission. In doing that mission under whatever cultural context or existential condition, for our interest, she cannot but *catechize*. Definitely, to catechize may fittingly correspond to necessity of a highly educated particular society; but foremost it is a demand of the Church's nature itself.

Recent major studies on the US catechesis

This study leans greatly upon two studies excellently made about *catechesis in USA* – the study of Maria Martorell Estenjer (Spain) and Maria Thompson Hagarty (USA). Both were dissertations published in 2000.

Maria Martorell Estenjer's *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis en los Estados Unidos: cinco autores católicos (1966-1992)* was doctoral thesis submitted to the Faculty of Theology in the University of Navarre (Pamplona, Spain). Maura Thompson Hagarty' *The Role of "Experience" in Religious Education/Catechesis in the United States of America since the Second Vatican Council: An Analysis and Critique* was also a doctoral thesis, submitted to the Department of Religion and Religious Education School of Religious Studies of the Catholic University of America (Washington, D. C., USA).

M. Martorell identified five authors – Gabriel Moran, James Michael Lee, Thomas Groome, Berard Marthaler, and Michael Warren – as central to the study of the contemporary shape of US catechesis. Her work scrutinized intellectual foundations underlying the catechetical doctrines of those authors representing US catechesis. In her synthesis, M. Martorell observed the predominant attention given by American catechists to the catechesis' *experiential dimension*. According to her analysis, G. Moran and J. M. Lee tended to consider the experience as the *absolute* authority in catechesis; B. Marthaler and M. Warren confronted experience employing the socialization theory applied to catechesis. Th. Groome had a middle point approach: the sharing of experience (praxis) within the community. For Groome, experience is both an instrument and source itself of divine revelation. Martorell concluded pointing out an *epistemological or philosophical problem* underlying the US catechesis. She rightly observed that those American authors assigned *a principal role* to "human experience" (a channel of knowledge of God and direct source of catechesis). Indeed, with the *new catechetics* proponents, there was *a shift of attention* in the USA catechesis from the purely doctrine-centered catechesis to a catechesis with ample consideration to human experience. However, there was no common understanding between authors about the nature of

"experience". That is why they had different approaches to human experience and also different understandings of what catechesis is. These differences of understanding "experience" are what Martorell referred to, in her conclusion, as "the underlying epistemological problem".

The above-mentioned observation about the epistemological problem counted among the conclusions of M. Martorell. It is interesting to note that MT Hagarty, the other researcher, without knowing the work of Martorell, fixed towards the same subject matter, even more: she made it the very center of her research, though from a different perspective. MT Hagarty's study focused directly on *the role of "experience" in the magisterial documents* (GCD, SLF, GDC, "Evangelium Nuntiandi", "Catechesi Tradendae", "Catechism of the Catholic Church"), and *in the writings of some authors representing US catechesis* (Moran, Groome, Marthaler, McBride, Dulles and Wren).

She found out that: (1) both magisterial documents and important American catechists in the decades 70s-90s accommodated more or less 'experience'; (2) in that accommodation, catechesis ultimately assumed a hermeneutical function before 'experience'; and (3) experience is either taken as a direct object of study or, at times, as a means towards subservient to the task of understanding the Christian Message. She concluded with the importance of the awareness of the question (the role of experience in US catechesis/religious education) and further indicated various implications of the taking into account the importance of experience' role (such as in defining nature of catechesis or religious education, in the Church's mission, etc.).

As mentioned above, we greatly depend and depart from the findings of these two authors. While their interest was vast, ours

focus more on the theological aspects. While they covered the important writings of American catechists since the 60s up to the 90s, we focus on the writings of the first decade of the 21st century. While MT Hagarty focused on both important magisterial documents and writings of the American authors (all covering the last three decades of the 20th century), we follow Martorell's focus on the five authors representing the US catechesis.

The parts of the thesis

Our study, the theological aspects of the catechesis in the USA 2000-2010, is composed of four parts. Part I, *The Historical and Theological Context of US Catechesis in the first decade of the 21st century*, as its title suggests, aims at providing a theological and historical backdrop to the catechesis in the USA in the decade 2000-2010, bearing always in mind of the study's focus, the theological aspects.

Chapter I is the Part I's only chapter, *"New catechesis" and the attention to human experience*. It is actually our personal reconstruction and analysis of the US catechesis of the past three decades. In our opinion, the past three decades of US catechesis gives a context to US catechesis in 2000-2010 because those years, especially with the rise of the *new catechetics*, have defined the direction of US catechesis up to the 21st century.

New catechetics is a significant factor in the US catechesis' opening to the contributions of *human sciences* and *of other theological sciences* like liturgy and scriptures, in its catechetical reflection and practice. New catechetics likewise has played a role in opening the focus of the US catechesis from instructing children to revitalizing the whole of Christian life of all baptized persons (not only children). New catechetics have included 'man and his existential reality' (the anthropological dimension) in the 'God-centered' horizon of the US catechesis.

The catechetical paradigm shift in which *new catechetics* was actively involved was certainly not without risks. As the US Bishops have welcomed many reformative insinuations from the clamored catechetical renewal of that time, they also had to uphold clear teachings. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) had to present the necessary and clear distinction between *public revelation* and *divine manifestations and communications*. While it had to affirm divine manifestations in objects and events, it had to make clear the fullness of divine revelation in Jesus Christ. While it affirms that catechesis cannot be authentic without the help of *human sciences*, it had also to clarify that catechesis and catechists, even how deeply anchored to human sciences, are primarily dependent on God's actions.

Since the 'revolution' of the *new catechetics*, three decades have passed. The developing reflection over the nature and mission of the Church, the Church's focus on evangelization and new evangelization, the progress in theological sciences as liturgy and scriptures, the rediscovery of catechumenate, and many others, have favored or accompanied journey of US catechesis up to the 21ˢᵗ century.

Part II, *Revelation, Culture and Hermeneutical Catechesis*, and Part III, *Church, Mission and Evangelizing Catechesis*, try to present an answer. Many American catechetical theorists and genuine proposals have risen in these three decades. However Martorell's five authors prove to be relevant and influential in the US catechesis until our times. Their long presence in the field of catechesis proves to be a major asset.

The catechetical reflections of Moran, Lee, and Groome present a catechesis directed to human experience, an interpreter of

experience. It is the main idea that the term 'hermeneutical catechesis' in Part II's title suggests.

The catechetical reflections of Marthaler and Warren in 2000-2010 associate more to the evangelizing mission or pastoral activity of the Church. To evoke this association, we placed the term 'evangelizing catechesis' in Part III's title.

Part IV, *Synthesis and Evaluation*, has only one chapter, Chapter VII *A Synthetic Analysis and Evaluation of the US Catechesis in 2000-2010*. The hermeneutical and evangelizing US catechesis in 2000-2010 is (1) clear of focusing its attention on Christian life, (2) on the integration of *an erudite religious-cultural education* (cognitive dimension) and *a socializing catechesis* (affective and experiential dimensions), (3) committed towards maturity of faith through formation within the believing community and in view of serving the community, (4) values the symbols and traditional practices of the ecclesial community, (5) is steadfast for the transformation of society, and (6) directs its attention to the present culture.

In the conclusion, we have affirmed all our positive findings above. We include in our conclusion an observation of a sort of an 'ecclesial' protagonism in the US catechesis. Authors are one in affirming the centrality of the *church's* mediation and role in catechesis. In that situation, there is a very positive growing awareness of the utmost importance of the *lay people* in the Church and their 'teaching role'. In our opinion, this situation is a good occasion for deepening the ecclesial understanding necessarily associated in this growing awareness of lay people's importance.

Among the many things that we have learned in the course of doing this study, we value most the fundamental insight that catechesis (directed to the study of the reality of the divine human dialogue) depend on *three* indispensable elements: reason, tradition,

and experience. Without reason, catechesis would be purely memorization of formulae. Without tradition, it will be foundationless adventure. Without experience, catechesis will purely be a speculative rendezvous.

It is in that same logic above that, at the end of this study, we feel deeply indebted to three "groups" of persons. We consider the following as the "tradition" of this study: Most Rev. Jose S. Palma, D. D., now Archbishop of Cebu, and Most Rev. Pedro R. Dean, D. D., now retired (but never tired), both former archbishops of Palo, the Archdiocese of Palo itself (where my family belongs – the priests and my parents and brothers and sisters) which is now under the administration of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Jaime Villanueva, H. P., The Society of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei, Rev. Dr. Jose Ramon Villar and Rev. Dr. Juan Chapa and the Faculty of Theology of the University of Navarre, the generous hearts behind the name Vasconia Foundation.

We consider Rev. Dr. Ramiro Pellitero Iglesias, the director of this thesis, as the "experience". To him, we are infinitely indebted.

Finally, we consider as "reason" of this work: Rev. Dr. Enrique Borda Leniz and Rev. Dr. Joaquin Calvo-Álvarez, the family of Colegio Mayor Humanidades "Juan Pablo II" (CMH), Jan Ramos, Niño Escalora, Rev. Raymun Sotto, Christian Conde, Christian Custodio, and the pretty Lady of the Campus living near the Clínica Universitaria.

To all and to God, my deepest gratitude.

PART 1: THE HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF US CATECHESIS

The aim of this part is to provide a historical and theological context to the principal topic of this thesis: the theological aspects of the US catechesis in the writings of principal American authors in the years 2000 to 2010.

One indispensable way to achieve this aim is recourse to the past. Catechesis in the US context, on one hand, displays that zeal characteristic of the Church since her historical origins in *educating in faith*; on the other hand, it demonstrates some features which are distinctively (US) American.

This part consists only of one chapter. Our discussion in this chapter will engage right away with the modern catechetical movement, in particular, with the US catechesis' *owning* of that 'european' catechetical movement. As it is known, the modern catechetical movement entered the soils of what is now the USA little by little. The embers of the catechetical movement were further fanned by the renovations of the Council. In the post conciliar years, there is an observable 'personal initiative' on the part of the Church in the USA, as in other regions of the world, in pulling the bandwagon of catechetical renewal towards the 21st century.

CHAPTER I. 'NEW CATECHETICS' AND THE ATTENTION TO HUMAN EXPERIENCE

The catechesis in the first decade of the 21st century in the USA is marked, among others, by the catechetical reforms proposed by the *new catechetics*.[1]

---

[1] The historical trajectory of the US catechesis dates back to the colonial era. For the interest of this present study, we are indebted to the outline of M. Martorell. She divides the history of the US catechesis into *three* phases: The Beginnings (1400 – 1800), Kerygmatic period (1900-1950), and the post Vatican II period (1966-1992). (Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis en los Estados Unidos: cinco autores católicos (1966-1992)*, Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 2000, 3-6). She further establishes more or less a similar outline in the later part of his work namely: a large period of initiation and progressive consolidation (1885-1958), the kerygmatic era (1958-1966), and the post-conciliar era (1966-1992) (*ibid.*, 43-76). Martorell notes a special incision in the catechetical history, the year 1992, the promulgation of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, in which effectively a long debate over the CCC's relevance has prolonged and divided catechetical theorists in two parties (cfr. *ibid.*, 42). Other writings treating the historical development of catechesis and catholic education in USA are the following: WALCH, T., *Parish School. American Catholic Parochial Education from Colonial Times to the Present*, Washington DC: The National Catholic Educational Association, 2003; WALCH, T., «Being Good Shepherds: The Contours of American Catholic Educational Leadership», in AUGENSTEIN, J., KAUFFMANN, C. AND WISTER, R. (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Catholic Education: Historical Essays in Honor of the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 89-112; WALCH, T., «Coming Full Circle: The Contours of Catholic Educational Leadership», in *Faithful Past, Faith-Filled Future. Papers Commissioned for the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 53-60.

To situate the history of US catechesis within the universal catechetical trajectory, *Vid.*; ETCHEGARAY CRUZ, A., *Storia della Catechesi* (2nd ed. riveduta e ampliata), Roma: Edizione Paoline, 1983; KELLY, F. D., *The Mystery We Proclaim. Catechesis for the Third Millennium (2nd revised ed.)*, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999, especially his Stages of Catechetical Movement, 151-157; HAGARTY, M. T., «Overview of official Ecclesial Documents: Background, text Development and Content», in *The Role of 'Experience' in Religious Education/Catechesis in the United States*

1. The origins of the "new catechetics"

New catechetics refers to the US American version of the modern catechetical movement. The great renewals in catechesis were conceived in Europe in the early 19th century. From the commonly known catechesis based on doctrines written in the catechisms and memorization of doctrinal formulae and predominantly for children, novelties were brought by previous initiatives like the *Munich method*, *Montessori method*, and *l'ecole active*. Zeal to improve the reception of the message which catechesis aims to transmit is evident in those mentioned method-centered initiatives.

Perhaps the most significant of all catechetical reforms of the 19th century was so-called *kerygmatic catechesis*.[2] Kerygma, as the main

---

since the Second Vatican Council: An Analysis and Critique, Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 2000, 29-63; ALBERICH, E., *La Catechesi oggi. Manuale di catechetica fondamentale*, Torino: Elledici, 2001, 21-36; 307-310; ELIAS, J., *History of Christian Education: Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox Perspective*, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company, 2003; BISSOLI, C., *Va' e Annuncia (Mc 5, 19). Manuale di Catechesi Biblica*, Torino: Elledici, 2006, 25-58; PELLITERO, R., «La Catequesis en el Siglo XXI», in SESE, J.-PELLITERO, R. (eds.), *La Transmisión de la Fe en la Sociedad Contemporánea*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2008, especially 182-186.

[2] Kerygmatic catechesis serves as the jumping board of the 'americanized' modern catechetical movement (new catechetics) that surged in the years before the Second Vatican Council and eventually diffused in the US territories shortly after the Great Council. The renewal in catechesis forms part of *a broader theological renewal* in Europe at the end of the 19th century. A growing interest on liturgy, on patristic literature, and the Sacred Scripture – in addition to the solidly organized scholastic theological system - in the doing of *theology* marked this renewal (cfr. ETCHEGARAY CRUZ, A., *Storia della Catechesi*, cit., 302-316). The proposal of the liturgy professor Andreas Jungmann of a kerygmatic theology was specifically part of that renewal in theology which descended to the catechetical camp. He posed that the current theological system during that time was insufficient in transmitting the gospel message or the kerygma. At par with the speculative theology founded on scholastic principles, Jungmann suggested a 'kerygmatic' theology, a way of doing theology based on the dynamic history of salvation. In the field of theology, Jungmann's proposal was rejected. German-speaking theologians themselves

paradigm of the Christian announcement of the Good News, refers to the proclamation of event 'Jesus of Nazareth'. The Apostles and the first Christian community usually proclaimed about the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus from the dead.[3] Now, kerygmatic catechetical renewal centered not on methods but on the *content* itself, that is, the kerygma. Kerygma-centered catechetical program for example was a discussion of the mystery of Christ *in Scriptures*, *in Liturgy*, *in the doctrines of the Church*, and *in community service* or *witness*.[4]

All those catechetical novelties promoted by the European modern catechetical movement have crept into the catechetical praxis in what is now USA. For instance, Jungmann's principles now adapted to the renewal of catechesis were developed and rapidly diffused by colleagues and disciples. At the international level, M. Martorell notes that the diffusion of the principles of the modern catechetical movement, in particular, the ideas of Jungmann, that of

---

contemporaries of Jungmann, like Michael Schmaus, perceived that the former's proposal does not unite, but rather divide, theology. It was perceived that creating another theological system was not the needed solution since theology itself has necessarily a Christological dimension (cfr. PELLITERO, R., *Teología Pastoral. Panorámica y perspectivas*, Bilbao: Grafite Ediciones, 2006, 22; MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis*, cit., 63-64; ILLANES, JL - SARANYANA,JI, *Historia de la Teología*, Madrid: BAC, 1995, 338.) If the kerygmatic renewal in theology reached an immature natural demise, its overwhelming story in catechesis was all the contrary.

[3] See, for instance, Acts 2:22-26; 4:9-12; 5: 29-32.

[4] The kerygmatic catechesis considers the *Sacred Scriptures*, the *Liturgy*, the *teachings of the Church*, and the *witness of the community*, as principal sources of the presentation of the 'Jesus event'. In catechesis, those four elements are usually considered the four sources or signs from which catechesis draws the 'contents' it conveys. These four elements have different variations, depending on which moment of history or which region of the world. In the USA, for instance, the first national directory prefers to distinguish between biblical, liturgical, ecclesial and natural signs (cfr. *SLF* Chapter II, Part C, nn. 42-46). For more discussion, *vid.* E. ALBERICH, «Fuentes de la Catequesis», in GEVAERT, J. (dir.), *Diccionario de Catequética*, Madrid: CCS, 1987, 392-395.

kerygmatic catechesis, was due to two elements: *first*, the efforts of *Johannes Hoffinger* (1905-1986), a direct disciple, and *second*, through the catechetical institutes.[5] J. Hoffinger himself translated Jungmann's work, gave conferences in and wrote books himself. In addition to that, he personally manhandled the six renowned *International Catechetical Weeks*: Nimega (1959), Eichstätt (1960), Bangkok (1962), Katigondo (1964), Manila (1967) and Medellín (1968). The diffusion of modern catechetical movement is also indebted to the catechetical international centers like *Centre International d' Études de la Formation Religieuse Lumen Vitae* (Brussles), *Deutscher Katecheten Verein* (Munich), *Istituto di Catechetica* of the Salesian Pontifical University (Rome).

In addition to J. Hoffinger's initiatives, many persons in the USA promoted kerygmatic catechesis. M. Martorell notes for instance the influence of Brussel's *Lumen Vitae* group in the USA in the publication of their magazine *Lumen Vitae* in the USA since 1950s, in the enrollment of many US American students in the said catechetical institute and the active presence of many *Lumen Vitae* personages in catechetical circles in the USA. Moreover, American promoters of the kerygmatic views held very influential posts in the educational system in the USA during these times. *Mary Perkins Ryan* was the editor of *The Living Light*, the official quarterly of the Catholic Bishops' Conference and *Gerard Sloyan*, dean of the Department of Religious Studies at the Catholic University of America, intellectual furrow of American education.[6]

---

[5] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 61-72.

[6] Cfr. ELIAS, J., *A History of Christian Education….*, cit., 209-216; ELIAS, J.-NOLAN, L. (eds.), *Educators in the Intellectual Tradition*, cit., 245-296. Martorell also notes, regarding Sloyan's involvement in the kerygmatic movement, that his book *Shaping the Christian Message* (1958) was a palpable evidence of the kerygmatic influence in the United States: the articles complied in this book were mostly written by European authors of the kerygmatic movement (MARTORELL, M.,

All these were important elements in the modern catechetical renewal in the USA. What is later known as *new catechetics* is however distinguished from the European modern catechetical movement. Aside from its geographical aspect – that it has taken place in the USA - its proponents were US American catechists. *New catechetics* is considered now as an 'americanization of the modern catechetical movement' (M. Martorell) or the 'maturity' of that movement in USA (J. Elias) or a continuation of the modern catechetical movement (MT Hagarty). In any case, *new catechetics* is considered a new phase in the history of the catechetical renewal in the USA.

In general, *new catechetics* was characterized by *three* things: (1) its criticism of the traditional founding principles of catechesis (teaching of doctrines and memorization of doctrinal formulae); (2) its recourse to human sciences such as psychology, sociology and pedagogy or education, in addition to theology, and; (3) its proposal of new catechetical alternatives (in focus and approach). Martorell indicates the *Boston College Symposium in 1977* as the moment of clarification of the foundations of the American modern catechesis.[7] The interventions of this very important symposium in the history of US American modern catechetical renewal is compiled by *Padraic*

Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis…., cit., 65-72). The religious educator L. English' observation is also significant. In an essay about J. Elias, professor of Adult Religious Education at Fordham University, she points out that the *Lord and King Series* – used mainly at Fordham Preparatory School in the Bronx, New York – were written by a group (Frs. Vincent Novak, Joseph Novak, John Nelson, and James DiGiacomo) who studied at *Lumen Vitae* catechetical center in Belgium, an institution known for its promotion of the kerygmatic approach to education in faith (cfr. ENGLISH, L., «John Elias», in *Christian Educators in the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University [www.Talbot.edu/ce20]).

[7] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 73; MORAN, G., «Philosophies of Religious Education among Roman Catholics» in TAYLOR, M. (ed.), *Changing Patterns of Religious Education*, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1984, 42.

O'Hare in his book, *Foundations of Religious Education* (1978). Indeed *new catechetics* is better understood by an introduction of the principal proponents and their proposals.

2. Proponents and proposals

The catechetical repertoire called *new catechetics*, aside from being a result of varied reformative events, is played by many protagonists. Following the studies concerning US catechesis, we likewise focus on the usually named figures like Gabriel Moran, James Michael Lee IV, Thomas Groome, Berard Marthaler, and Michael Warren.

2.1. Moran and the new catechetics' anthropological shift

Many attribute to G. Moran the pioneers-ship of the new catechetics (and some, the maturity of the modern catechetical movement in the USA).[8] It is to him that US catechesis' shift of

---

[8] Gabriel Moran, once a member of the Roman Catholic Order of Christian Brothers, was born in Manchester, New Hampshire, in 1935 to Mary Murphy and John Francis Moran. From 1958 to 1961, he taught at a high school in Providence, Rhode Island (RI). From 1962-1965, while teaching philosophy and religion in Washington, D. C., Moran at the same time studied and earned his master's and doctor's degree at the Catholic University of America. After his graduate studies, he engaged in teaching activities with base in New York. In 1965, he became professor of Religion at Manhattan College (Bronx, New York). Right away, he was named director of the Graduate Religious Studies of the same institution and remained in that post until 1970. In these times, he was also professor of Religion at New York Theological Seminary (New York, NY), and visiting professor at New School of Religion in Pontiac, Michigan (from 1971-1973). In 1979, he became associate professor of Religious Education at New York University (New York, New York), until now. From 1970 to 1973, he sat as president of Long Island-New England province of Christian Brothers.

It was along this period that he founded the newsletter 'Alternative' or 'Alternative Religious Education' with a group of friends. According to Moran, the

attention from teaching doctrines to the consideration of human experience is attributed,[9] and thus the introduction of the experiential or anthropological turn of religious education in Catholic education. As J. Elias describes G. Moran's feat:

> Maturity came to the catechetical movement when the kerygmatic approach received a full-scale criticism from Gabriel Moran. Moran pointed out the weakness of the theological underpinnings of the approach, focusing especially on the theology of revelation. Moran viewed religious education as a process that invited

---

newsletter tries to address audiences not served by the present Church. Moran considers Gerard Sloyan, Karl Rahner, St. Thomas Aquinas and Ludwig Wittgenstein as the persons who may have influenced his thought. However, more than the many theoretical influences, Martorell says that the peculiar cultural and social configuration of northern American Catholicism underlies in Moran's work. Martorell therefore says that like any other American authors of his time, Moran shares the common principles inherited from the fathers of *Religious education movement* in North America, Horace Bushnell and George Albert Coe.

Over the course of forty-five years, Gabriel Moran has published twenty-two books and over two hundred essays on religion, ethics, and the nature of teaching. Some of these works have been translated into Spanish, Portuguese, French, German and Korean. He has lectured throughout the United States, as well as in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Ireland, England, the Netherlands and Africa. He has helped organize programs in Jewish-Christian-Muslim inter-religious dialogues with the Religious Education Association (REA). Moreover, he has served on the board of directors of the Religious Education Association (REA) and the International Seminar on Religious Education and Values. He was president of the Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education (APRRE). He currently teaches International Education. In 1988, he was given the F. Sadlier Dinger Award by the National Conference of Catechetical Leadership for his contributions to religious education. We created this short biography of G. Moran from the following materials: THOMAS GALE's *Contemporary Authors (2007)* (sold at amazon); G. MORAN's *electronic mail*, Wednesday, February 17, 2010; SMITH, J.-O'BRIEN, M., *Maria Harris* in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/); ELIAS, J., *A History of Christian Education….*, cit., 211-212.

[9] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 81-113; HAGARTY, MT, *The Role of "Experience" in Religious Education/Catechesis in the United States of America since the Second Vatican Council: An Analysis and Critique*, Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 2000), 177-220.

students to reflect God's present revelation in their lives. He also exposed kerygmatic approach's weak educational theory, characterizing it as merely a recounting of events from the past. In sum, Moran found the kerygmatic approach wanting on many fonts, but especially in dealing with the religious experience of students.[10]

2.1.1. Revelation and experience

In general, the trajectory of Moran's thought may be observed in his principal works published since the *Scripture and Tradition* (1963) up to *Reshaping Religious Education* (1998), a book-interview together with Maria Harris.[11] In a moment which can be considered a *first phase*, in the 60s, Moran considers *catechesis as an intermediary activity of ongoing revelation*, that is, an activity which interprets personal (religious) experience. In the 1980s, the *second phase*, Moran's shifts from the use of 'catechesis' into the employment of 'religious education' in referring to the totality of educational efforts of religions including the Catholic religion.[12] In the 90s, this moving within the 'intra-religious' sphere, he began to refine more *three practical consequences* (in the field of *ethics or morality*, in the field of *interreligious dialogue*, and in the field of *education*) of the mother concept of *revelation* he has always proposed. Moran founds his initiative for catechetical renewal on a concept of 'revelation' which gives great attention to human experience.

---

[10] ELIAS, J., *A History of Christian Education….*, cit., 211.

[11] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 81-82, especially footnote 113. In the same footnote, M. Martorell presents a list of Moran's principal books (up to *The Grammar of Responsibility*) published until 1996. We simply add the following: *Showing How: The Act of Teaching*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, l997; *Reshaping Religious Education*, Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1998.

[12] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 81; ELIAS, J., A *History of Christian Education….*, cit., 211-212.

The books, *Theology of Revelation* (1966) and *Catechesis of Revelation* (1966), stem from his doctoral thesis at the Catholic University of America where he studied from 1960-1965. In *Theology of Revelation* (1966), Moran sustains the idea of an *ongoing revelation*. He presents two fundamental ideas in the mentioned understanding of revelation. *First*, the contents of revelation are inseparable with the act of revealing. According to him, revelation is all about God revealing himself. *Second,* the most eminent instance of human intellectual reception of *the revealing God* is *the human consciousness of the risen Christ.* Moran sustains that *the fullness of revelation* happened in the human consciousness of the Risen Christ, and from His the resurrection and the glorification, the full activity both in redemption and revelation likewise begins in Christ's members, *in each of their personal experience.*

In *Catechesis of Revelation* (1966) - the book which he himself thinks he had made an influence to Catholic catechesis - Moran seems to indicate the place or role of catechesis in the proposed 'ongoing revelation' phenomenon. The concept of ongoing revelation criticizes the fundamental principles of the modern catechetical movement.

Among other points, *first*, Moran put forward a pre-catechetical moment in which man discovers God's revelation (that is, without or anterior to any proclamation of the Word). While he affirmed that man's discovery of God is foremost God's initiative and that he may also discover God through the community, Moran disputed however the idea of *'not being able to know the revealing God not unless it is proclaimed or announced to him'*.[13]

---

[13] MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit*.,* 93-94.

Second, Moran with his ongoing revelation, criticized the pedagogy of kerygmatic catechesis' four signs (*liturgy, scriptures, doctrine and testimony*). He indicated that there are not only four but more. In addition to that, he demonstrated the inadequacy of each of the four signs.[14]

Third, he criticized the underlying concept of history of salvation in kerygmatic catechesis. He says that kerygmatic catechesis understands history as a series of past events. On the contrary, he proposes the idea of history as man's self-awareness in time. Therefore, he says, that if God has entered into history to go to man's encounter, there is then divine-human encounter in *man's consciousness*. By inference, it can be said that the history of salvation is an encounter of man and God in man's consciousness, and therefore, as Moran had demonstrated, any catechesis must depart from man's experience.[15]

Fourth, he underlined the *freedom* of the students. Martorell writes that Moran proposed the relinquishment of teaching the truths of the faith and further proposed that students should be allowed to discover themselves what they are called for.[16]   In this case, Moran

---

[14] *Ibid.,* 94-95. Concerning *liturgy*, Moran comments that kerygmatic catechesis has limited itself to explaining religious symbolisms ignoring their significance to the children's contemporary experience. Concerning the *Bible*, Moran presents it as a narration of the people of Israel and of the apostles which documents their *privileged* experience with God; but according to him, it is not the only source of revelation. Regarding *testimony*, Moran comments kerygmatic catechesis interprets the narrations of the bible according to the human experience, instead of explaining human experience in the light of what the Bible says. Regarding doctrine and teachings,   he comments that kerygmatic catechesis holds dogmas more important than the intersubjective relationship between man and God.

[15] MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 95-96.

[16] *Ibid.*, 96-97.

inaugurates the hermeneutical function of catechesis, that is, the clarifying of 'ongoing-revelation' experiences of individuals.

Martorell marks the observable 'amplification' of Moran's attention in the 1980s. This shift is characterized by Moran's interest, *on one hand*, of all religions and their educational activities, and *on the other hand*, the total relinquishment of the term 'catechesis' in favor of the second language 'religious education'.[17] Even before, Moran had previous writings which already carried the signs of his amplification of scope. For instance, *Design for Religion: Towards Ecumenical Education* (1968) and *Catechesis, RIP* (1970), *The Intersection of Religion and Education* (1974), and his intervention in the 1977 Symposium in Boston College (about the new catechetics) are previous writings - and intervention – that carried the symptoms of that *shift* in the 1980s.

2.1.2. Religious education and catechesis in revelation-human experience relation

Martorell marks the books, *Religious Education Development. Images for the Future* (1983) and *Religious Education as Second Language* (1989), as significant writings which indicate Moran's concept of catechesis. She writes that in those books, *catechesis* is considered a concrete expression of the ampler *religious education*. In *Religious Education Development. Images for the Future* (1983), he considers catechesis as *an intermediary state of religious education*. In the context of his polemical intellectual rebuttals with J. Fowler, he says that faith is both *subjective* and, with its inseparability to belief (the material aspect of faith), *objective*. He reacted to Fowler in terms of the inseparability of faith (subjective dimension) with belief (the material expression or the objective dimension) because, for Moran, these elements are

---

[17] Cfr. *ibid.*, 81.

necessary for the concretization or for the expression into a particular religion of the inexpressible religious reality. This transformation into a particular religious expression, that is, the religions, takes place through the so-called religious education. In this line of thinking, catechesis is the educational process of acquiring a particular identity inherent in the catholic religion.[18]

In *Religious Education as Second Language* (1989), Moran underlines religious education as interreligious. According to Martorell, Moran views each particular religion as an incomplete access to God, and that therefore, it (a particular religion) must learn from the history, doctrines, and practices of other particular religions. For Moran, continues Martorell, catechesis is no more than 'a concrete expression of religious education'. It is *an intermediary state* in the individual and collective religious development. Moreover, he considers religious education more adequate (than catechesis) to the pluralistic reality of contemporary society.[19]

In the 90s, Moran's writings revolve around *interreligious* religious education of particular religions, such as Islam, Jewish and Christian religions. It is also observable that within this interreligious context, Moran began to refine *three practical consequences* of the long proposed understanding of *revelation*. He focused on (1) the field of

---

[18] In the course of correcting Fowler, he made his own stages of faith's development: simply religious (corresponding to the primitive era), being a Jew, Christian, Muslim (scholastic period of the 13th century) and religiously Jew, Christian, Muslim (contemporary era). He puts catechesis at the period of acquiring a particular religion wherein one needs a sort of a narration of the history of the particular religious experience, and eventually acquires that common religious sentiment or belongingness. However, Moran believes the fittingness of the term 'religious education' better than 'catechesis' due to contemporary times' pluralistic and catechesis' close association with a particular religion or church (cfr. *ibid.*, 104-113).

[19] *Ibid.*, 109-113.

ethics/morality, (2) on the practical concept of revelation in inter-religious dialogue, and (3) on the field of education.

In the field of *ethics or morality*, he offers a concept of *responsibility* that is a moral consequence of revelation. Responsibility, in Moran's use, fundamentally refers to the *ability of the person to respond* (response-ability). In this case, Moran focuses on the man's attitudes or reactions in front of the revealing God. His book, *A Grammar of Responsibility* (1996), offers an exhaustive discussion. His main idea is: the *responsibility of every person over his or her actions* is determined by *the present relation he or she has with God* (revelation). His emphasis on human acts determined by the *relationship* with God is a sort of a reaction to a morality in which human actions are determined by mere *laws* or *prescriptions*.

In the field of *religious dialogue*, Moran offers in his book, *Uniqueness. Problem or Paradox in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (1992), the concept of *inclusive uniqueness*. Inclusive uniqueness simply means that a certain religion may claim *uniqueness* and *universality* (in relation to other religions) at the same time. The main idea is that Christians may be different but not indifferent to other religions. It may claim uniqueness but without excluding others. We comment however that in Moran's view, a religion's claim of uniqueness pertains to its *personal* perspective on matters that are universally acceptable. Following Moran's logic, we may say for instance that *salvation in Jesus Christ* is the personal stance of the Christian concerning the concept of salvation preached by all religions. Finally, he claims that the concept of inclusive uniqueness is a consequence of looking at Christian life as a present relationship with God (revelation).

In the field of *education*, particularly in *Showing How: The Act of Teaching* (1997), Moran, develops the idea of education as a metaphor of the God's dealing with man. His concept of revelation refers to

the present divine-human interaction. We observe that Moran starts with the idea of teaching-learning as a "metaphor" of the divine-human relation and ends considering the human teaching as actually a participation in the divine act of teaching.

It is interesting to note that in the first decade of the 21st century, Moran collates these *three principal themes* together with some variations in his re-proposal of his concept of *revelation*.[20]

Now, Moran had proposed a renewal of catechesis – from God-centered to man-centered. He underlined the human capacity to perceive divine manifestations or communications. With his mental framework, it seems that there is a risk of reducing the role of ecclesial tradition to something merely extrinsic, or merely auxiliary in the process of concretizing the communications of the revealing God in one's life.

2.2. Lee: human experience and religious instruction

With the attention of catechesis geared towards 'human experience', another American instructor of religious education, John Michael Lee IV, created a pedagogical approach which pretends to 'foster' faith or religion.[21]

---

[20] See for example *Both Sides* (2002), especially, Chapter 6 Responsibility and Revelation (133-161), Chapter 7 The Logic of Revelation (162-187), and Chapter 8 Revelation as Teaching and Learning (188-214). This is repeated in *Believing in a Revealing God* (2008), especially in Chapter 4 A Responsible Church (83-104), Chapter 5 Christian Interpretation of Divine Revelation (105-126) together with Chapter 6 Aesthetic Understanding of Believing in a Revealing God (127-150), and Chapter 7 Revealing-Believing as Teaching-Learning (151-172).

[21] James Michael Lee IV is an important figure in the contemporary history of religious education in USA, both in the catholic as well as in the non-catholic ambit. Contemporary educators coincide in attributing to Lee *two* principal contributions to religious education: *first*, his pioneering and eventual systematization of the *social science* approach in doing religious education, and; *second*,

J. M. Lee is an educator by profession. At around 1959 while teaching at Brooklyn High School, he decided to formulate the social science approach to teaching religion. His years at the University of Notre Dame, 1962-1979, were fruitful in his administrative functions and as well as in his function as educator/writer. Those years were the boom of the reception of the advances of social sciences (especially of psychology, sociology, and others) in the field of education[22].

his founding of the Religious Education Press in 1974. Lee belongs to a wheel-heeled family. In his early academic formation (from elementary up to tertiary education), he attended the schools run by the *Brothers of the Sacred Heart,* the *Jesuit priests*, and the *Maryknoll Fathers*.   In 1949, as he was interested in becoming a priest-missionary in China, he spent his tertiary educational training at the *Maryknoll Junior College* in Lakewood (New Jersey). In 1951, he left seminary formation and enrolled at *St. John University College* (Brooklyn). In 1956, he subsequently continued his studies for a master's degree at the Department of Political Science at Columbia University with a major in American History. In 1958, he obtained a doctor's degree at the *Teachers College* (Columbia) with a dissertation entitled 'Commencement Activities in Secondary Schools'.   After obtaining a doctoral degree, Lee taught in various schools – Brooklyn High School and St. Joseph College (Connecticut) to name a few - and simultaneously attended some classes at *Fordham University*. He further specialized in Catholic schooling and reforms.   He wrote a textbook about catholic secondary schools which was intended be used in Catholic Colleges to prepare aspirants for High School teaching.

[22] In 1962, the *Department of Education of the University of Notre Dame* offered him teaching loads. Hermick says that, in Lee's time, he became the youngest person to be named as full professor. Three years after, he was offered chairmanship of the same department. As head, he made major emphasis on building up both the Administration and Guidance/Counseling programs and established doctoral programs in both areas. He also inaugurated the *Graduate Program in Religious Education* which formally began in 1967. In 1977, at the Boston College Symposium, Lee contributed to the determination of the identity of the new catechetics in the USA. He left University of Notre Dame (Boston) and worked in the University of Alabama (Birmingham).

Lee's influence was not confined in the circle of Catholic educators. He was an active member of ecumenical associations as the Religious Education Association (REA) and Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious

As a prolific educator who occupies the teaching of religion and who is familiar with the religious education praxis of other Christian denominations, his 'educational approach' to religious education and his eventual creation of a macrotheory is understandable.[23] Furthermore, it is no surprise that at the moment of determining the identity of the teaching of the catholic faith in the contemporary times, he stands in favor of 'religious education' than in the traditional 'catechesis'. His principal writings were: *Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction* (1977), *Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always* (1988), and *Facilitating Growth in Faith Through Religious Instruction* (1990).[24]

Education (APRRE). Lee himself wrote in *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium* (2000), the last book REP published before his death, of REP's closure due to lack of funds. He was its Corporate Executive Officer until his death caused by a car accident on July 15, 2004. However, in 2005, his wife announced that REP will continue its publishing activities in Lee's honor.

This is based on the following: ATKINSONS, H., «James Michael Lee», in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/; BURGESS, H., «Memorial: James Michael Lee [B. 9-29-1931, D. 7-15-2004]», in *Religious Education*, 100/2 (2005) 109-112; HERMICK, E., «James Michael Lee IV (1931-2004) – RIP», in *TLL* 40/4 (2004) 6-8; MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 115-140.

[23] J. M. Lee's macrotheory, the social science approach to religious education, is systematically exposed in three books published within the decades of 70s-80s. The following writings of Lee present his fundamental ideas on religious education: *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (1971), *The Flow of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1973), and *The Content of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1985). It is not difficult to imagine how much influence his approach had to many educators and catechetical leaders in USA within this period and after.

[24] The first writing is Lee's position paper delivered in the 1977 Boston College Symposium. The second is his contribution to the collection of essays which surveys the acceptability of the 'new' discipline 'religious education' in different Christian denominations. The third essay is Lee's contribution to the collection of essays (which he himself edits) regarding faith and its nurture. All these three essays present either a summary or a part of Lee's principal discussions in his *religious instruction trilogy*.

2.2.1. The 'why' and 'how' of instructing religion

In *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (1971), Lee lays down the *rationale* for his opted approach. M. Martorell writes that in this book, Lee presents a religious instruction based, not on theology, but on social sciences.[25] She further notes that this new approach, according to Lee, aims at overcoming the method-content opposition unresolved by catechetical instruction.[26] Instead of a religious instruction which is dependent on theological principles, Lee, according to M. Martorell, presents a religious education focused on the nature and methods of improving the *teaching act* (and the other factors that condition learning).[27]

If in the first book, Lee highlights the teaching-learning activity as the central point in the social science approach to religious instruction, in *The Flow of Religious Instruction. A Social Science Approach* (1973), he seeks to answer the following question: *how does the teaching act in religious instruction take place?* Lee usually uses, especially in his posterior works, the term 'structural content' referring to the pedagogical approach, which in this case, is the main topic of this second book. For him, for every desired educational result, there is an appropriate pedagogical process. H. Burgess, Lee's disciple and vice-president of the Religious Education Press, comments that Chapter 9 of this book presents the best summary of Lee's social-science theory.[28].

M. Martorell, reiterating J. M. Lee's doctrine on the flow of the teaching of religion, writes that the teaching act appears to be an

---

[25] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Catequesis en Estados Unidos….,* cit., 117.

[26] Cfr. *ibid.*

[27] Cfr. *ibid.*, 120-126.

[28] Cfr. BURGESS, H., «Memorial: James Michael Lee [B. 9-29-1931, D. 7-15-2004]», cit., 109-112.

existential process which involves psychological, physical and social influences. She continues that for Lee, teaching is an intentional process through which various experiences are systematically organized in such a manner that they bring modifications in the cognitive, affective and practical dimensions in the person taught.[29]

She further writes that Lee, giving valuable importance to the centrality of experience in the process of learning, considers teaching task a sort of a configuration of the experiences of the students. This is realized through the selection of experiences adequate to the *four variables* which composes the single teaching-learning activity (teacher, student, subject, and conditions of learning). In the case of religious education, the experience being dealt with is the faith-experience of students. Since the beginning of the process, *the act of religious instruction* modifies 'faith' in the process and the other variables that intervenes in its (faith's) development. A new reality is created at the end: *faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting*.

Here the new reality (faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting) is qualified as an experience. Inasmuch as it is composed of set of experiences or acts (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), it is further qualified as a *lifestyle*. It is conditioned other than theological factors, by psychological, sociological, and physical factors. In this case faith seems to be a psychological product, or in Lee's terms, a 'construct'.

Citing J. M. Lee, Martorell explains that a *construct* is a concept which has the added meaning of having been deliberately invented or consciously adopted for particular purpose. It is functional by nature. In addition to that she says that construct of faith is *necessarily inexact*, *probable* and *mutable*.

---

[29] *MARTORELL, M.,* Catequesis en Estados Unidos…., *cit., 118.*

Moreover, M. Martorell recapitulates J. M. Lee's criticism over modern catechesis, discussed in the same book.[30] According to Martorell's view, Lee holds modern catechesis to be still dependent on theology. She continues that Lee considers theology being solely a cognitive science and therefore, considered as such, is insufficient to serve as foundation to any instruction in faith.

Up to here, we recapitulate asserting that Lee, as a school instructor, was dissatisfied with the theological approach to teaching the faith (or religious education). For him, the theological approach seems to remain in the cognitive dimension and less (or nil) in the practical or experiential dimension. The educational approach - then imbued by the advances of other social sciences as psychology, pedagogy, sociology, together with the Marxist leaning educational ideologies common in those times – foments the experiential dimension in teaching religion. It deals with elements which are verifiable, measurable and modifiable (behaviours, intellectual constructs, thinking patterns, and the like). From the educational point of view, Lee's approach deals scientifically well the experiential dimension of teaching-learning in the teaching of the faith.

However, we think that the positive treatment of experience of the social science approach brings with it an innate difficulty. Lee's religious instruction deals with phenomena or behaviors or experiences. We hold however that those phenomena, behaviors or experiences involved in religious instruction do not have only empirical dimension (and therefore measureable or verifiable more or less by scientific processes); they also bring in themselves something *coherently divine* visible through the eyes of faith. In other words, religious education deals not only with modifiable *intellectual constructs*, but of *mysteries of the faith*.

---

[30] Cfr. *ibid.*, 127-130.

2.2.2. A fundamental problem: can faith or religion be taught?

J. M. Lee, exposing his position in the 1977 Boston College Symposium, received hard criticism from theologians in his understanding of *faith*. His paper, titled *Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction* (1977)[31], reveals the principal points of his stance: the relinquishment of the traditional term 'catechesis' in favor of the anglo-american term 'religious education'.

First, Lee indicated the antiquated-ness of catechesis in the contemporary times. He points out the catechumenal context of religious instruction cycle in the primitive Church (kerygma-catechesis-didascalia). He writes that in that cycle, catechesis refers to the 'oral' and 'cognitive' instruction imparted to beginners 'about the rudiments of the Christian religion'. Lee saw the religious instruction program of the early Church to be inadequate to describe the contemporary religious education. For that, he proposed five reasons for its abandonment. He writes:

> I firmly believe that when the term 'catechesis' is used today, it should be reserved exclusively to refer to the second phase of the kerygma-catechesis-didascalia cycle employed in the religious instruction program of the early Church. And I strongly urge that the terms 'catechesis' and 'catechetics', when intended to denote contemporary religious education or religious instruction, be completely abandoned. I recommend this for five reasons. *First*, the term 'catechesis/catechetics' inherently suggests more of a pedagogical strategy (verbal transmission/proclamation) than a field or a major subdivision of a field. To equate religious education or religious instruction with any pedagogical strategy – and uni-dimensional, limited, and relatively ineffective one at that – is to rob

---

[31] LEE, J. M. IV, «Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction», cit., 40-63.

the enterprise of a great deal of its potential success. *Second*, there seems to be no consensus –on the meaning of the term 'catechesis/catechetics'. Disagreement and confusion about the meaning of the basic terminology is fatal to any field. *Third*, catechesis/catechetics' is an archaic term, one bearing little or no relevance to the modern world. *Fourth*, 'catechesis/catechetics' is a separatist term in an age when protestant and Catholic religionists and educators are increasingly dialoguing together, researching together, and developing instructional strategies and methods together. 'Catechesis/catechetics' is a uniquely Catholic term that must continually be translated for protestants and others involved in or interested in religious education. *Fifth*, the term 'catechesis/catechetics' is a useless one and serves no purpose. It obfuscates and fogs up what should be relatively easy, clear, and readily understandable terminology.[32]

Second, Lee reiterates the fundamental elements of religious instruction mentioned in his anterior works. Referring specifically to teaching religion, he applies the four basic elements in an 'instruction event', namely, the teacher, the learner, the substantive content, and the environment.[33] Moreover, he endows a role of mediation to *the teaching act* in the processing of the student's *experience of faith*. He describes the outcome of the teaching mediation thus:

> The dynamic interaction among the four molar variables means that each of these variables becomes conjoined in actuality. In this conjoinment, each of the elements combines with the others so that singly and as a whole they are subsumed into a new reality. This subsumptional process is called mediatorship. […]. This new reality, this mediated entity, (1) incorporates and retains the essential features of faith, and (2) puts the essential features of faith into a new fused relationship with the three other molar variables so that they are no longer separate but become

---

[32] *Ibid.*, 43ff. (cited from MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 132-133.

[33] LEE, J. M. IV, «Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction», cit., 291.

inextricably combined in an ontically new reality, namely faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting.[34]

Third, M. Martorell notes that Lee seems to simply reduce faith into mere human experience processed or elaborated into an *intellectual construct*.[35]   Inasmuch as it is a human behavior, it is understood to be composed of cognitive, affective and psychomotor operations. As an *experience*, Lee defends the fittingness therefore of social sciences – neither the theological sciences nor the Magisterium - as that which should study and systematize those individual faith-experiences.[36] It is not surprising that Lee at the end holds religion to be a purely human matter. He writes:

> Religion is that form of lifestyle which expresses and enfleshes the lived relationship a person enjoys with a transpersonal being as a consequence of the actualized fusion in his self-system of that knowledge, belief, feeling, experience, and practice that in one way or another are connected with that which the individual or society perceives to be divine. This definition is a behaviorally oriented one. It thus represents an attempt to move away from a notional definition and toward an operational one.[37]

Lee's approach to religious education seems to fall short in a theological evaluation of the *experience of faith*. The third book of the trilogy, *The Content of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1985), focused on the substantive content of religious instruction. By substantive content, he means 'that which is classically considered

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 291ff (cited from MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 120-121.

[35] Cfr. *ibid.*, 136-137.

[36] Cfr. *ibid.*, 122-123, 136-137. *Vid.* also NEWELL, E. J., *"Education Has Nothing to Do with Theology": James Michael Lee's Social Science Instruction* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series), Princeton: Pickwick Publications, 2006. This is the most recent study concerning Lee's doctrine. In this book, Newell focuses, in particular, Lee's view on the relationship between theology and social science in religious education.

[37] LEE, J. M. IV, «Key Issues….», cit., 41ff (cited from MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 121-122).

the content of what is taught'. For him, the substantive content of religious instruction is religion, faith transformed into practice, into day to day life.

In a book which makes a survey on whether the religious institutions or churches really want Religious Education, Lee contributes an essay which clarifies the place of catechesis in his concept of religious instruction. The context of his essay is the Catholic Church and religious education. In *Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always* (1988)[38], he closely identifies catechesis with the Catholic Church's pastoral activity. He writes:

> Catechesis is that form of pastoral activity which, under the explicit direction and control of the Catholic hierarchy, seeks by intentional and deliberative pedagogical procedures to teach persons to faithfully follow in a personal and corporate manner the teachings of the Catholic Church as the ecclesiastical hierarchy authoritatively interprets these teachings.[39]

For him, ecclesiastical authority over religious instruction is a problem. Lee considers it (religious instruction) as a science governed by principles deriving from faith-elaborated-from-experience. From this perspective, catechesis, being governed by an external authority, that is, the Church Magisterium, stands outside the category of religious instruction. He writes:

> Any judgment or evaluation of religious instruction by ecclesiastical officials always and necessarily remains external to religious instruction. When the locus of authority of religious instruction finds itself in divergence with the hierarchy or with the hierarchy's duly appointed officials, then religious instruction must

---

[38] LEE, J. M. IV, «Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always», in MARY, M. (ed.), *Does the Church Really Want Religious Education. An Ecumenical Inquiry*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1988, 32-66.

[39] *Ibid.,* 37.

resist ecclesiastical pressures because the ecclesisasticum has no internal authority in religious instruction.[40]

Lee clarifies therefore that catechesis is a form of pastoral ministry of the Church. However, he intends for pastoral ministry as a political tactic on the part of the Church to reach specific aims.[41] Lee writes:

> Pastoral Ministry is not simply activity which helps enhance the religiosity of a person or a group. Rather, pastoral ministry is also – indeed, first and foremost – that kind of activity which helps enhance the religiosity of a person or a group in the way that the catholic hierarchy interprets religiosity and in the way that the hierarchy officially approves one or another facilitational procedure. That the pastoral activity called catechesis is above all a political endeavor can be seen in the concrete actions which the ecclesiasticum consistently takes in catechetical matters and also, derivatively, in the verbal language which the hierarchy imposes on catechesis.[42]

Despite of his apparent biases regarding the ecclesiastical authority over catechesis and its disqualification for being an authentic religious instruction, Lee recognizes a certain dosage of catechesis necessary for the Catholic Church and for its members' initial stages.[43] He is however convinced that the maturity of Church members lies not in catechesis but in religious instruction. He writes:

> However, the Catholic Church's efforts to teach religion systematically ought not to be confined to catechesis. Catechesis is probably necessary as a grounding and foundation for persons of all ages. But if learners are to come into personal contact with the whole sweep of religion, and if learners are to develop themselves as appropriately autonomous Catholics and Christians, then it is absolutely imperative that at the pedagogically auspicious

---

[40] *Ibid.*, 43.
[41] Cfr. *ibid.*, 59, 73.
[42] *Ibid.*, 59-60.
[43] Cfr. *ibid.*, 64.

time these persons leave the domain of catechesis and enter into
the land of religious instruction.[44]

In Lee's perspective, teaching the faith is a demand of faith's
nature itself (note: the way he defined 'faith'), and not by the 'whims'
of the Church's hierarchy. In his perception, faith is something *inside*
(internal) to the teaching parameters; it is something elaborated from
experience and is modified in the teaching process. The
Magisterium, however, (according to him) exercises its authority or
directs teaching *from the outside*.

We have two observations. *First*, we observe that in Lee's
perspective of faith, *God's part* remains unelaborated. *Second*, we note
that the Lee's interpretation of the Magisterium as a 'manipulator'
because of its 'external location' to the teaching act is too simplistic.
Any teacher may 'manipulate' the *substantive* and *structural* contents of
teaching towards a desired end, the truth. In this case, the
Magisterum seeks the same truth (converted into charity) which the
Holy Spirit promotes *from the interior* of the Christian's soul. But the
fact that the Holy Spirit may act upon the soul *from the outside*, that is,
through the Magisterium, does not mean that the same Holy Spirit is
'extrinsic' to the Christian. The Christian forms part of the living
Church, the mystical body of Christ, who is animated by the Holy
Spirit.

2.2.3. Facilitating' the growth of faith/religion through instruction

The main objection on Lee's exposition in 1977 was on the
issue whether faith can be taught. Teaching, in his perspective, is
closely linked to reaching the desired *concrete* result. In *Facilitating*

---

[44] *Ibid.*

Growth in Faith Through Religious Instruction (1990)[45], Lee shows the fundamental importance of religious instruction in 'teaching faith'. By teaching faith, he means two things: facilitating it and causing it.[46]

In his short introduction where he classifies religious instruction as a form of religious education[47], he also pointed out the centrality of the task of teaching in Jesus' mission and in the Church.[48]

In this essay, therefore, Lee analyzes the process 'religious instruction' applied to faith, a faith aimed at concrete action or practice. In religious instruction, he distinguishes two contents: the

---

[45] LEE, J. M. IV, «Facilitating Growth in faith Through Religious Education», in LEE, J. M. IV, (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1990, 264-302.

[46] *Ibid.,* 267-271. Lee had been criticized by his contemporaries for this stance. It is clear that faith is neither caused by the catechist nor by catechesis itself, no matter how well anchored it is on pedagogical sciences. Faith is a *gift* of God. In fairness to Lee, however, we observe that in his writings before, he defines faith in consistency with his social science theory, that is, faith as an intellectual construct. Indeed it had its own risk considering that faith indeed, though it has concrete external expressions, is primarily a divine gift. In his essay in 2000, through he maintains his position of nurturing a faith translated into life through religious instruction, he mentioned nothing about social sciences causing it.

[47] For Lee, there are three forms of religious education, namely, religious instruction, religious guidance, and the administration of religious activities. Religious instruction, according to him, is a process by which a desired learning outcomes are facilitated (cfr. *ibid.*, 265).

[48] *Ibid.,* 264-265. In the ancient Church's teaching activity, Lee classifies three phases: *the kerygmatic phase, catechetical phase and the didascalia phase.* The first has for its aim the motivation of non-Christians to respond favorable to God's invitation to faith. The second aims at learning 'what it is to bear the Christian faith' or learning 'the Christian lifestyle'. This phase ends at baptism. The third phase, a teaching 'by word, by affect, and by deed', aims at widening and deepening the faith (cfr. *ibid.*, 265).

substantial content (that which is taught) and the structural content (the pedagogical procedure).[49]

In relation to the substantial content in religious instruction, Lee writes that 'faith as construct' is that which is dealt with. Lee defines a 'construct' as a concept that which has the added meaning of having been deliberately invented or consciously adopted for a particular purpose. It is therefore observable how Lee had taken seriously 'human experience' as 'defined' by G. Moran. He applied his knowledge of pedagogical techniques in order to evaluate it. Above all, Lee's endeavour was plausible in its intuition that in 'human experience' the *speculative* and *practical* aspects of Christian faith really take place.

Despite of that, we comment further that Lee seems not to take seriously the ecclesial dimension of faith. The Christian experience is not merely a personal experience. It is always an experience *within* a community, within a 'living body', the 'historical subject' we usually denominate as Church, People of God, Mystical Body, Temple of the Holy Spirit. The Church is the mystery of communion living in time (and therefore with a structure) in order to be a universal sacrament of salvation.

2.3. Groome: *shared praxis* and christian religious education

Thomas H. Groome, Director of the Institute of Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry in Boston College, is another icon of the *new catechetics*.[50] He proposed *an approach based on shared praxis of*

---

[49] *Ibid.*, 266.

[50] Thomas H. Groome is among those who favored the relinquishment of its traditional name *catechesis* and proposed instead the term *christian religious education* (in his past writings). He maintains his proposal of doing education in faith 'with an appropriate approach', that is, the *shared praxis approach*. Th. Groome himself

the community to 'christian religious education', the term he employs in reference to the educational task of the Church. The approach underlines the enriching mutual dialogue between the community's present and past 'religious' experiences.

The rudiments of the *approach* was composed in those years when he was still teaching religion (as part of his apostolate as deacon) in Ireland.[51] Perhaps Th. Groome's fame as religious

---

traces the roots of his vocation as a religious educator to his parents, seeing himself in them as *the tree in the seed*. He was born in County Kildare in Ireland, in a brood of nine children. From his father's part, he learned 'a Christian faith that takes seriously its social responsibilities and a critical consciousness and openness to the universal'; from his mother, 'the faith formation that nurtured him deeply in a particular faith identity' which, in this case is, the catholic identity.

Th. Groome likewise considers his formation in St. Patrick Seminary (Carlow, Ireland) – from 1964 to 1968 - significant to his vocation as religious educator for *two* things: *first*, for his familiarization of thomistic principles, and *second*, for Vatican II's teaching on the universal call to holiness based on baptism. As an ordained priest, he exercised his ministry in the Diocese of Dodge City in Kansas (USA). He obtained a master's degree in Religious Education at Fordham University. Thereafter, he took a combined doctoral program in Theology and Education from the joint program of Union Theological Seminary and Columbia Teacher's College. He wrote a dissertation proposing a shared praxis approach to religious education.

[51] His formation in Ireland was later fortified by the further studies he had in the USA. He would further attribute major influences on the persons and authors he encountered in his post-graduate studies. At Fordham University, he got acquainted with Françoise Darcy-Darube, another icon in 'modern' religious education. Groome attributes to her his first break into the public forum of the catechetical world. Moreover, he shows indebtedness and gratitude to his doctoral thesis advisers: Dwayne Huebner at Columbia Teacher's College and Beverly Harrison at Union Theological Seminary. Huebner convinced Groome of the politics of all education and the urgency to craft a socially responsible pedagogy. Harrison introduced him to the feminist theology and consciousness.

He acknowledges 'enrichment to his catholic theology' the ideas of great protestants whose works he got acquainted with at Union Theological Seminary such as the Neihburs, Bonhoffer and Barth. In his own scholarly efforts, Th. Groome admits the deep influences of Gustavo Gutierrez in theology, Paulo Freire in pedagogy, Jürgen Habermas and Hans-Georg Gadamer in philosophy.

educator precedes the success of the publication of his book, *Christian Religious Education. Sharing Our Story and Vision* (1980), as noted by E. Keane.[52] Th. Groome himself recalls his 'first break' in the catechetical world to be way back in 1973 when he was invited to be a keynote speaker in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown (PA).[53]

Gutierrez and his *Theology of Liberation* (1973) made him understand 'what the Gospel is all about' – a liberation of the whole human person here and hereafter. Freire provided him the principles of 'emancipator education'.

Habermas taught him reflective critical thinking of reality and dialogue between reality and one's ideal. Gadamer showed him the fusion of horizons between one's ideal and tradition.

Th. Groome himself indicates that the *approach* is best developed in two of his important books, *Christian Religious Education* (1980) and *Sharing Faith* (1991). He wrote religion textbooks for Saddlier Publishing Company (New York). *Sharing Faith* (1991) received first place in the Catholic Press Association Awards. In 1997, the National Conference of Catechetical Leadership (NCCL) presented Groome with a special award for his work in catechesis. In 2000, the National Association of Parish Catechetical Directors awarded him its Emmaus Award for Excellence in Catechesis, the highest honor in the field of religious education in the US. Groome, at an unknown point, left the ministerial priesthood and sought laicization. Th. Groome has taught religious education and theology at Boston College since 1976 until he was endowed with full professorship in 1992.

We have based our reconstruction of Th. Groome's biography on the following: KEANE, E., *A Generation Betrayed: Deconstructing Catholic Education in the English-Speaking World*, NY: Heatherleigh Press, 2002, 1-7; MADGES, W. AND DALEY, M. (eds.), *The Many Marks of the Church*, CT: Twenty Third Publications, 2006, 79-80; GROOME, TH., «Remembering and Imagining», in *Religious Education* 98/4 (2003) 511-520; MADGES, W. AND DALEY, M. (eds.), *The May Marks of the Church*, cit., 80; Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Foreword: Wisdom from the Heat of the Day», foreword to DARCY-BERUBE, F., *Religious Education at a Crossroads. Moving On in the Freedom of the Spirit*, NJ: Paulist Press, 1995, ii-xiv; and in his *profile* in www.bc.edu/schools/cas/theology/faculty/tgroome.html.

[52] Cfr. KEANE, E., *A Generation Betrayed….*, cit., 4.

[53] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Foreword: Wisdom from the Heat of the Day», cit., xiv.

2.3.1. Christian religious education and shared praxis approach

Summarizing Groome's three principal writings - *Christian Education for Freedom. A "Shared-Praxis" Approach* (1977), *Christian Religious Education. Sharing Our Story and Vision* (1980), and *Sharing Faith. A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry* (1991), M. Martorell comes up with the following description of how *the teaching of the faith through shared praxis* should take place.

As a pedagogical approach, it has the following characteristics or moments: (1) there is one common theme or an activity which is suppose to capture the interest and involve those present (generative theme), (2) each one gives his or her critical assessment on the generative theme, (3) a *christian story or vision* is made accessible to all, (4) a dialectical comparison of the *christian story or vision* with the actual praxis will be made, and (5) the community decides to compromise to plan of action geared towards the fulfillment of God's reign.[54] Th. Groome employs the so-called 'Christian Story/Vision' to refer to the Christian version of living or practicing the universal religious phenomenon. Moreover, that Christian way of realizing the religious phenomenon present in all cultures is characterized by its concrete

---

[54] These 5 instances are according to M. Martorell's analysis of Groome's three principal writings: *Christian Education for Freedom* (1978), *Christian Religious Education* (1980) and *Sharing Faith* (1991). In relation to Groome's understanding of the Church's traditional catechesis and his proposed Christian religious education, we note one significant observation made by M. Martorell. According to Martorell, Groome designates the *third* moment (that of making accessible the Christian story/vision) the shared praxis as catechesis. This third moment involved a sort of a teaching or a transmitting of a message. This is true, according to Martorell in *Christian Education for Freedom* (1978) and *Christian Religious Education* (1980). However, in *Sharing Faith* (1991), observed Martorell, this sort of catechetical instruction part in the shared praxis eventually disappears (cfr. *ibid.*, 171).

objective (vision) – the furthering of God's reign here on earth and in the next.

M. Martorell presents Th. Groome's shared praxis approach to catechesis as an *alternative*, something that may possibly substitute catechesis. Analyzing the data M. Martorell has presented in his reading of Th. Groome, Th. Groome's proposal of 'Christian religious education'[55] as an alternative to catechesis may be synthesized into three ideas.

First, he disagrees with the semantic amplification of the term *catechesis* just to update it to the needs of the times.[56] For him, catechesis is basically *oral* teaching (informative in nature) suited and effective in the context of the ancient Church. He thinks that filling it with formative and experiential dimension in order to adjust it to the contemporary times would be equal to destroying its efficacy.

---

[55] The proposal of another alternative is traced to Th. Groome's disagreement to some author's conceptual redefinition of catechesis. Referring to the same teaching reality, he proposes the term *christian religious education* in his proposal, education takes the priority. M. Martorell notes that by education, Th. Groome refers to it as an *intentional* (with a certain vision), *integral* (aimed at the development of the whole person) and *political* (aimed at acquiring a certain way of living in a particular social context) activity. Regarding its two adjectives – *religious* and *christian* – Th. Groome do not use them arbitrarily. By *religious*, he means it is an educational activity aimed at having consciousness of one's relationship with the ultimate source of being and at seeking to express in some ways that relationship. With the tem *christian*, Th. Groome aims at giving *religious education* a concrete and particular identity. He thinks that such a qualification '*christian*' would remind the ecumenical goal, that is, according to him the calling for everyone to 'a universal Christian Church' (cfr. *ibid.*, 163).

[56] Th. Groome, according to M. Martorell, understands catechesis as originally an oral instruction. The attempts to attribute it a socialization meaning (J. Westerhoff and B. Marthaler) clearly goes out from its original meaning. Instead of redefining catechesis, he proposed *christian religious education* (cfr. *ibid.*, 163).

Second, the teaching of the faith in our times must consider or include on one hand the contributions of sacred sciences (Scripture, Theology, etc.), and on the other hand, of human sciences (pedagogy, psychology, sociology, etc.).[57]

Third, the teaching of the faith in our times must necessarily have a 'political' end. For him, the *faith* involved in this teaching has a necessary consequence, that is, *the furthering of God's reign* here and now.[58] It consists of the establishment of *God's desire of peace and justice, love, order, etc.* for man, starting now here on earth until the afterlife.

For Th. Groome, *educating in faith* by way of *shared praxis* is [1] applying one's faith traditions, convictions, symbols (and the like) to day to day living, [2] within a community of primus inter pares, and [3] as a community, they resolve how to apply the 'faith' shared by all in the concrete here and now.

2.3.2. The philosophical and theological foundations of shared praxis approach

In tracing the philosophical and theological foundations of this approach, M. Martorell writes that Th. Groome, with his *shared praxis approach*, basically aims at overcoming speculative-practical dichotomy (*knowing-being*, in Th. Groome's terms) latent in catechesis or in education in general. This *approach* depends on an experiential or sapiential type of understanding things (which he terms as *epistemic ontology*).[59]   By the very term experiential or sapiential, Th. Groome

---

[57] Cfr. *ibid.*, 165-168.

[58] Cfr. *ibid.*

[59] M. Martorell explains that Th. Groome observes that catechesis eventually been emphasizing the 'transmission and assimilation of theological concepts' and that he sees it as a manifestation of M. Heidegger's diagnosis over the European thinking as 'olvido de ser' (the forgetfulness of being). This Heideggerian concept divides reality into *being* (the historical practical dimension of reality) and *knowing* (the speculative or ideal dimension of reality). Therefore,

vies for a kind of educating which does not remain in the speculative sphere, instead, something which truly brings concrete effect in the practical plane. M. Martorell traces the origin of this notion from M. Heidegger's epistemological doctrine. She writes that the existential author employs the term 'conation' to underline that knowing involves all the dimensions existence – corporal, intellectual, volitional, affective, etc. – and not just a pure exercise of the mind.[60] According to M. Martorell, with that epistemological framework, Th. Groome borrows, on the other hand, the Aristotelian categories *theoria-praxis-poiesis* and eventually presents his concept of *praxis*, now referring to that active life imbued with the intellectual (theoria) and productive (poiesis) characteristics.[61]

With the *epistemological dimension* of Th. Groome's *epistemic ontology* in place, M. Martorell continues her analysis with the *ontological dimension* of that same concept. She observes that Th. Groome applies his *concept of knowing* (described previously) in the anthropological terrain, that is, in man's being-in-the-world. M. Martorell rightly attributes necessary application of knowing to the existential plane due to, again, the Heideggerian concept of *dasein*. Th. Groome employs the term *agent-subject-in-relationship* to refer to *man in his existential condition*. In this framework, *knowing* takes on another 'form', that is, as a *remembrance of being*, a key concept in religious education. In fact, his catechetical framework includes a sort of fetching a pale of wisdom from the community's common experience (the third moment of the shared praxis approach).

---

according to M. Martorell, Th. Groome founds the *shared praxis* in an *epistemic ontology*, a concept which attempts to bridge the epistemological (knowing) and ontological (being) gap to which catechesis is a victim (cfr. *ibid.*, 142-147).

[60] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 142-143.

[61] Cfr. *ibid.*, 143.

The philosophical bases of shared praxis somehow explain Th. Groome's understanding of fundamental theological concepts, as *faith, revelation,* and *church and magisterium.* According to M. Martorell, Th. Groome distinguishes *faith*, the *a priori* 'gift from God' which disposes a person towards relationship with God, from the *Christian faith*, the *specific faith tradition* to which the Christian community nurtures its members.[62] With the philosophical foundation exposed above in mind, Th. Groome seems to consider these two 'faiths', not as different and separate kinds but two *dimensions* in the exercise of *one single reality* called 'faith'.[63]

M. Martorell then observes the close relation between Th. Groome's faith a priori to Christian determination and the Heidegerrian concept of *conation.* She further notes that Th. Groome identifies the *Christian faith* - the specification of that general understanding of *religious* faith – with the *Christian story and vision.*[64] The term 'Christian Story' refers to one particular version of the universal story of religious phenomenon. Its descriptive word 'christian' associates that Story with a distinctive inseparable Vision, that is, the furthering of God's reign from this moment up to hereafter.

The mentioned understanding of faith, held by Th. Groome, is related to another theological concept: *divine revelation.* For him, revelation refers to God's entrance into time to encounter man; it is therefore a divine-human encounter in time/world. He has however something to comment concerning the relationship between

---

[62] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 147.

[63] GROOME, TH., *Sharing Faith….*, cit., 18 [quoted by MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 148].

[64] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 148-149.

primordial revelation (divine revelations in the past) and *general revelation* (revelations taking place at present).[65]

Now, Th. Groome understands *revelation* as a divine-human encounter taking place *in time*. He holds that in its *historical* realization, God's 'entrance in time' in the past has *an intimate relation* with his revelations at present.

How does he explain this intimate relation? For Groome, divine revelations which happened in the past are those which are recorded in sacred beliefs, symbols and customs. He considers them as useful references or orientative tools in interpreting revelations that may occur at present. He considers Scripture and Tradition as 'normative in guiding the collective discernment of the divine designs' here and now. Conversely, past divine revelations are re-interpreted with the 'new' revelations taking place at present. There is therefore an intimate relation between the revelations in the past and those which happens at present.

---

[65] M. Martorell identifies *two moments* that in the specification of Th. Groome's understanding of revelation – *first*, in holding the intimate relation between general and primordial revelations against G. Moran's denial of revelations that take place in the past as revelation; *second*, in holding that those past revelations or the revelations which are now expressed in *symbols and formulae* are open to further re-interpretation (in confrontation with the present experience of the community). Against the concept of *present revelation* defended by G. Moran, he vied for the *intimate relation* between - using J. MacQuarrie's distinction - *general* and *primordial* revelations. General revelation refers to 'the contemporary experience which takes on revelatory dimension' while primordial revelation, to such 'which give rise to communities of faith'. Th. Groome claims that G. Moran, in *The Present Revelation* (1972), denies revelations that have taken place in the past as revelations. He holds that they are not contradictory, but intimately related. Regarding *past* revelations, he points out *two points:* (1) past revelations are open to re-interpretation, and (2) past revelations embodied in Scriptures and Tradition are normative for the understanding of the present revelation and present revelations' interpretation (cfr. *ibid.*, 150-154).

In addition to that, he believes that every divine revelation (may it be that in the past or that which has taken place at present) is *open* to re-interpretations.

In any case, he does not mention about the fullness of revelation which culminated in Jesus Christ and which is sealed in the apostolic times, as the Christian tradition holds.

Finally, for Th. Groome, the task of interpreting revelation is crucial. For him, by its very nature, revelation has the need for a hermeneutical mediation. It is in this mediation 'scene' that *his* church and magisterium come in. For Th. Groome, the Church's *raison d'etre* resides in its sacramental or symbolical mediation.[66] The Church, for him, has the fundamental role of interpreting the divine reality entrusted to her by God to the world of men. The mediation of the Church, as it is clear, is to represent God before men, to interpret that which God transmits to His people.

With Groome's positive consideration of the human agency (the emphasis on the responsibility and capacity of the human part in God's salvific plan), Groome is silent of the Church's role or mediation in offering to God (in the behalf of men) the offerings of the people of God, as in the Holy Mass, for example.

Continuing with Groome's understanding of church, we may indicate *three* distinctive characteristics. *First*, for him, the community of disciples of Christ has to be a church, not just a sect or a mysticism. For him, a church is a community which exercises a

---

[66] M. Martorell traces the influence of Dilthy and Heidegger's idea of the necessity of a hermeneutical mediation in knowing any reality. Or in other words, for these authors, there is no immediate knowledge; everything passes through the bridge of symbol or language (cfr. *ibid.*, 155).

transforming influence in the world.[67] *Second*, community of disciples according to Martorell's interpretation of Th. Groome, suits as a description to the community of God's *learners* through a shared praxis, dialogue and discernment on how to live the way of Jesus.[68] *Third*, for Th. Groome, it is not only a community of disciples but an *inclusive community of partnership, inclusive discipleship of equals*.[69] Despite of Th. Groome's evident difficulty of emphasizing the importance of the lay faithful and participation in the teaching mission of the Church (without undermining the part of the hierarchy), *his model of the church* encourages dialogue, community life and dynamic relationship among members. Moreover, in that ecclesial model, the

---

[67] Th. Groome basis this axiom on E. Troeltsch' s classification of predominant social forms of Christianity: church, sect and mysticism. According to that classification, mystical type of church refers to an agglomeration of individual persons driven by 'inner spiritual experiences and dispositions' but without a formal religious structure whatsoever. A sect, on its part, is a group of persons characterized by their common desire to strictly observe Christian values apart from a hopeless world. The church type is a community of persons characterized by its openness to all, its dependence on God's grace, and its social influence in whatever context it is formed. It is on this third sense that Th. Groome affirms the community of disciples to be a church (cfr. *ibid.*, 156).

[68] *Ibid.* M. Martorell notes that Th. Groome chooses this description from the *four* images of a church: *Body of Christ*, *People of God*, *Community of Disciples*, and *Sacrament of God's reign*.

[69] M. Martorell writes that Th. Groome's concept is inspired by E. S. Fiorenza's *inclusive discipleship of equals* (cfr. *ibid.*, 157). This perspective sees in another light the nature of the Church, its mission, its structures and functions. Th. Groome in fact, in order the sustain that radical equality employs the *designated Christian ministry* (a function entrusted by the community and corresponding to a gift of the Spirit) and the *Christian universal ministry* (a prerogative of all members of the church by virtue of being members of the body of Christ and therefore co-responsible for Christ's mission) to explain the various offices in the Church. As M. Martorell rightly observes, such a distinction has a negative consequence to his understanding of the hierarchical constitution of the Church as well as of the Holy Orders (especially in matters like the gift of celibacy and the traditional masculine priesthood) (cfr. *ibid.*, 159).

services of ordained ministers appear to be an appointment from God enacted through the lay people's consensus.

M. Martorell rightly notes Th. Groome's ecclesial model repercussions in his understanding of *the teaching dimension* of the Church. As a Church among equals, Th. Groome distributes the teaching authority *equally* among three entities: (1) *the official teaching office associated with pastoral authority* (to pronounce officially the faith consensus of the community), (2) the *theologians* (their researches and investigations), and (3) the *sensus fidelium* (the discernment of the people).[70] Again, here, an effort to explain the shared responsibility of all baptized in the teaching mission of the Church where everybody belongs is evident. While his emphasis on the part of the researches of theologians and the teaching role of the lay faithful may indeed help discover their fundamental right to exercise the prophetic function, he elaborates less of its relationship to the ordained ministers' exercise of the same teaching function.

---

[70] M. Martorell comments that Th. Groome tends to limit the function of the Magisterium to the mere confirmation of the *sensus fidelium*. She also observes that Th. Groome positively recognizes the work of theological experts in the shaping of what the Church holds as her faith. Th. Groome holds a so-called *hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed*, that is, of those who are directly involved in the works of promoting justice and peace, those who are combating the plague of hunger and sickness, etc.. He attributes them a sort of *knowing better* in the practical dimension of reality which the Church confronts. Th. Groome underlines the contribution of each of *his* three sources the Church's magisterium. In our opinion, his thought needs to be completed with a specific discussion of the exercise of that teaching authority by the bishops of the whole world in communion with the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and customs (LG 23, 25) and of the Roman Pontiff's exercise of it as Vicar of Christ and Pastor of the whole Church (LG 23).

2.3.3. A faith-based education geared towards life: an educational philosophy at the close of the 20th century

Ever consistent to education in faith's *existential* logical repercussion and the *universal* (not only for Church leaders) teaching obligation, Th. Groome closed the 20th century with a reflection of the role of 'non-clerical' educators – parents and teachers. In *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent* (1998)[71], he proposes to educators – teachers and parents – a philosophy of education based *not on a pragmatic vision*, but *on a Catholic-inspired spiritual vision*. In other words, he proposes a spiritual vision which permeates the education agent's soul and his teaching. Being based on Catholic religion's *substantial* spiritual characteristics, the catholic philosophy he proposes is expected to be *humanizing* (helping the students to be more human) and *universal or catholic* (may be adapted by teacher of whatever religious or denominational background).

Having in mind his shared praxis approach, Th. Groome pairs this proposed philosophy of education with a *humanizing* pedagogy which permits the *spiritual character* of his vision to influence into concrete reality. This intent is embedded in his famous phrase – *to bring faith to life and to bring life to faith* or *an overall dynamic of from Life to Tradition to Life, to Tradition to Life to Tradition*.[72] In addition to that, this humanizing pedagogy is more concretely characterized by what he terms as *seven sub-commitments* which are: *engaging, attending, expressing, reflecting, accessing, appropriating,* and *deciding*.[73]

---

[71] GROOME, TH., *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent*, Texas: Thomas More. An RCL Company, 1998.

[72] This *touch of reality* characteristic of his pedagogical process is a cycle. It involves 'an endless and creative exchange of between learners' own lives in the world and the legacy those before and around them' (cfr. *ibid.*, 429-440).

[73] *Ibid.*

Therefore, Th. Groome postulates that Catholicism's *substantial* characteristics or *core convictions* may offer a spiritual vision on which an educational philosophy may be founded. It has to be noted however that Th. Groome, in his writings, uses the term 'catholic' to mean primarily as 'universal', regardless whether one is a Roman Catholic or a Christian protestant.

For the interest of our study – the theological aspects – we may focus more on those characteristics which Th. Groome considers substantial of Catholicism (and relevant to education not only in within the religious realm, but also in the realm of *life*) and less on his discussion on how to make them operative in the teaching activity. He therefore believes that Catholicism has (1) a positive perspective of man (*positive anthropology*), (2) a perspective of the world (*a sacramental consciousness*), (3) a perspective of *community life* which fosters commitment to relationship and community, (4) a perspective of *time and history* which fosters appreciation for tradition, cultivating for reason and wisdom of life, and (5) the *three* principal (or he terms it *cardinal*) *commitments* of fostering holistic spirituality, formation in social justice, and inculcating a catholic world view. All these *four perspectives* (*speculative* in nature) and the *three practical* commitments of Catholic Christianity, Th. Groome holds, forms a spiritual vision on which his proposed educational philosophy may be grounded.[74]

The *first* claim, that is, that Catholicism offers a *positive anthropology*,[75] Th. Groome, through the term *person*, presents man as

---

[74] The distinction *perspectives-commitments* are important to note. Th. Groome hints that they function in a different mode. Perspective refers to Catholicism's mental framework while commitment, to its operational framework. See Th. Groome's explanation in Chapter 7 where he starts with the first commitment, that is fostering holistic spirituality (GROOME, TH., *Educating for Life*…., cit., 322).

[75] Cfr. *ibid.*, 67-116. This covers chapter 2 of the book, titled *A Good People: "God's own Image and Likeness"*. Th. Groome's perspective of man is completed with

'an agent who initiates one's own actions and yet finds human identity in relationships'. He therefore writes that the Catholic perspective of man (anthropology) essentially sees persons as: essentially good and dignified (through capable of sin, he remains in the divine image), a body-soul union alive in God's spirit, partner with God and ever in need of God's grace, partner in community, with freedom, rights and responsibilities, an unfinished agenda (becoming, knowing and creating), with the Divine Law written in his 'nature', *agent-subject* who can make history, made for Love and for loving, and with eternal destiny.

For the *second* claim – that Catholicism offers a cosmological perspective, or what he calls, *a sacramental consciousness*[76] - Th. Groome writes departs from, what he claims to be catholic conviction, that 'God mediates Godself to humankind' through the world He created 'directly or in partnership with humankind'. Therefore, he continues that man, on his part, receives God's grace and discover God's desire for him through, *in his words*, 'nature and the created order, through human culture and society, through our minds and bodies, hearts and souls, through our labors and efforts, our creativity and generativity, in the depth of our own beings and through our relationships with others, through the events and experiences that come our way, through what we are doing and what is 'going on' around us, through everything and anything of our world'. Therefore, Th. Groome comes up with what he calls *the sacramentality of life*, that is, the mediation dimension of reality of God's manifestation.

This therefore, he continues, encourages and forms *the sacramental imagination or consciousness*. Somewhere, he simplifies his

chapter 4 (chapter 2-3 included). While chapter 2 focuses on man as a person in a community, chapter 4 underlines the community as composed of persons.

[76] Cfr. *ibid.*, 117-170.

explanation of sacramental consciousness as 'to see God in everything' or 'to encounter and to respond to God through the medium of the world'. Thinking of the 'mediation' of the seven sacraments and the Sacred Scriptures, Th. Groome explains that this perspective 'does not diminish reverence for the liturgical sacraments and for the Word of God through Sacred Scripture'. He opines however that their sacramentality be understood 'within the divine milieu of the world and represent high points of the sacramentality of life'. The world then is the point of the divine-human encounter. Regarding the seven sacraments, he seems to simply underline more the *effective* dimension of concept of sacrament (and less of the its *sign* dimension).

For the *third* claim – that Catholicism has a sociology which encourages *commitment to relationship and community* - Th. Groome claims that Catholicism affirms the individuality of persons but at the same time believes that the community is, in his words, *the primary context for being saved* and *becoming human*. These two elements of the communal context – *being saved* and *becoming human* – leads Th. Groome to affirms that, for Catholicism, the Church as a community of persons, works for *God's reign* here and now and for the society's *common good*. The Church's working for God's reign, he writes, is made concrete through specific tasks or ministry – *koinonia* (a *welcoming* community), *kerygma* (a *word-of-God* community), *leitourgia* (a *worshipping* community), *diakonia* (a community of *welfare*), and *marturia* (a *witnessing* community).

For the *fourth claim* – a Catholic perspective of time and history – Th. Groome writes, basing on the previous claims that Catholicism fosters, what he calls, a *critical appreciation* of tradition and an occasion of exercising *human agency* in handing on the tradition (by discerning what is God's reign here in now). Here, Th. Groome, goes back to his idea that Catholicism regards history as a privileged

locus for the human-divine encounter. As he wrote in the previous chapters, God mediates his divinity through the world; man in his turn discovers, and eventually responsibly responds, the divine plans in that same world. Therefore, he claims that this perspective fosters a certain attitude towards things of the past – tradition – that is not purely passive but of *critical appreciation*. With his human agency, man has the task *to evaluate and discern* in tradition the elements of God's reign and *to appropriate* them to the present with view of the future.

This attitude towards tradition permeated by the Catholic core convictions, Th. Groome believes, clarifies three important realities: *the natures and relationship of Scripture and Tradition*, *the blending of faith and culture, Catholicism's long time commitment to humanizing education*.

Taking up *the natures and relationship between Scriptures and Tradition*, we begin recalling that for Th. Groome, tradition is a legacy of history; history is a medium of divine revelation; therefore, tradition carries with it *sparks* of divine revelation. Man therefore (in this framework) may *respond and appreciate* God's revelation which he discovers in tradition and, by his human agency, may *creatively* appropriate it to the 'needs of the present times', thus continuing the weaving of tradition. In this framework, Th. Groome considers Scriptures and Tradition as the 'original' and 'cumulative' symbols of God's self-disclosure over time. For our theological interest, these lines by Th. Groome are important:

> God's revelation through history is continuous. For Christian faith, divine revelation began in a primordial way with the Israelites, reached its high point in the event of Jesus Christ, and has continued over time as living tradition in the community of Jesus' disciples, the Church in the world. The primary and unsurpassed symbol of this primordial divine revelation over time is the Scriptures. […]. Catholic Christianity emphasizes, however, that biblical faith must continue to 'develop' (Vatican II's term) as a living tradition. As Christians have lived their faith in different times and places, their understanding and appropriation of it has

grown and developed, and guided by God's Holy Spirit working through the faith community, this living tradition gives rise, after time, testing, and consensus, to revered Tradition – with a capital *T*. This Tradition functions as a partner with Scripture, and together they provide the primary Christian symbols through which God mediates revelation to people's lives from one generation to the next. The caution here is that mainstream Christianity does not view Scripture and Tradition as direct equivalents of 'God's word'. Never embracing a fundamentalist position – in which primordial symbols of revelation would be taken literally – Catholicism insists that Scripture and Tradition, as media of communication, reflect the historical context in which they emerged – its mores, language, and culture. […] mainstream Christian faith approaches its scripture and Tradition symbols of revelation as symbols of revelation rather than the equivalents […]. These symbols must be constantly reread and reinterpreted in every age from the perspective of what God is revealing now in people's lives and consciousness, and their reception must be guided and tested by their living faith of contemporary Christian communities.[77]

According to Th. Groome's observation, the Church has the tendency to overemphasize Tradition and thereby falls to authoritarianism. He therefore vies for a *real partnership* of the two *primordial media of God's revelation*. He believes Scriptures provide Tradition 'the guidance of an original identity to which it (Tradition) must be faithful', while Tradition on its part 'lends vitality' to the Scriptures.[78] Tradition animates Scripture provided that Tradition itself must be continually revitalized by being reinterpreted according to contemporary understanding and living of biblical faith, and he adds too, 'in the light of changing circumstances and contemporary consciousness'[79].

Th. Groome comments on the absolute authority given to Tradition (to the depreciation of Scripture) in the Church's teaching

---

[77] *Ibid.*, 299-230
[78] *Ibid.*, 238.
[79] *Ibid.*, 242.

activity and to the teaching authority of the Church itself.   He underlines that the teaching authority of magisterium cannot be limited to the 'institutional magisterium' but 'to the whole community of the body of Christ, including all the baptized Christians'.[80]   In addition to that, while he appreciates the importance of Tradition's authority in the Church's teaching task, he vies, on the other hand, for the constant re-interpretation or a sort of a constant updating of Tradition so as to avoid the pitfall of authoritarianism.[81]

The other two themes to which Th. Groome traces his concept of tradition are *in Catholicism's inculturation* and *its consistent commitment to humanizing education*. For the humanizing education, he simply presents the Church's tradition (small *t*) of favoring in its education curricula the study of humanities, arts, and sciences. For inculturation, Th. Groome points out the Catholic faith's 'strong disposition' to blend with culture, or faith's capacity to be a way of life. He claims that the usual tendency of inculturation is *encouraged* by Christians' (including therefore *Catholics*) 'strong position on the reality of Incarnation'. He writes:

> All Christians take a strong position on the reality of the Incarnation […]. It condemns as heresy any position which claims less than a full and real union of the human and divine in the one person of Jesus. the conviction that God in Jesus took on language, mores, and ethos of a particular culture – that of a first-century Palestinian Jew – encourages making Christian faith indigenous among every people. In other words, the union of

---

[80] Once again, he revoked his three cooperative sources of teaching and learning in the Church – the research of the scholars, the discernment of ordinary people of faith, and the official magisterium of the papacy/episcopacy (cfr. *ibid.*, 241-242).   Here he underlines the *cooperation* of the three and the official magisterium's role as *consensus builder*, and that authority in the church must 'always leave room for freedom of conscience', without specifying in which *state* the conscience is found.

[81] Cfr. *ibid.*, 242-245.

divine and human in Jesus encourages the integration of faith and culture in history.[82]

He adds in that 'sentiment to inculturate Christian faith' the support of 'a positive anthropology, the principle of sacramentality, and emphasis on community'.[83] He further writes:

> Just as there is never a cultureless Christian faith – it is always mediated through particular human symbols – so there is never a Godless culture. God is present among every people. The universal divine presence in love makes every culture a fitting medium for expressing Christian faith. Conversely, for Christian faith to be vital, it ought to be indigenous to each culture.[84]

Discussing *the cardinal commitments* of fostering holistic *spirituality*, formation in *social justice*, inculcating a *catholic world view*, Th. Groome explains that these three define the identity of Catholicism by 'helping compose the esprit de corps that makes Catholic Christianity distinctive' and that 'each is significant to a philosophy and spirituality for teachers and parents'.[85]

The characteristics of Christian *spirituality* are (1) it originates from God, (2) it is a human desire toward God, a human affinity to turn toward God (which God himself implanted in man), (3) it is a human-divine partnership, (4) it is a God-conscious way of life in relationship, (5) a necessity for human wholeness, (6) it is a call to holiness with justice and compassion, (7) it is the way of living discipleship with Jesus Christ, (8) it is a way of living in solidarity with everyone in the whole, (9) it is a work of the Holy Spirit, etc. He gives the following definition of spirituality:

---

[82] *Ibid.*, 224

[83] For the explanations of these terms, please refer to the four *claims* discussed previously.

[84] *Ibid.*

[85] Cfr. *ibid.*, 322.

> Christian spirituality is consciously living one's life in relationship with God, empowered by the Holy Spirit and following the 'way' of Jesus Christ. Allured by God's desire within human hearts, the Christian spiritual journey is into right relationship with God, self, others and creation, permeated by justice and compassion. It is sustained by prayer – personal and communal – and lived through a Christian community for the coming of God's reign in the world.[86]

Th. Groome in commenting the Church's distinctive commitment to justice underlines, among others, the following characteristics: it is done after the example of Jesus' promotion of God's reign, done with a special favor for the poor, done as partners in God's intentions of shalom by living a faith that does justice for peace, for the common good.[87] An ampler discussion on *faith and culture* is presented further below.

For the Church's commitment to have a universal point of view, Th. Groome underlines the radical treatment without distinction that the Church should have, the idea which he has in an inclusive community of disciples.[88] The context of this idea is what he claims as sectarian and parochial mindsets still present in the Church. His insistence on the radical equality among members of the Church has allowed himself to discover the 'right and responsibility' of *lay people* (he does not use the term) to catechize or to educate in faith by reason of their baptism. A downside of his ecclesial paradigm is the putting aside of the 'share' of those who received Sacrament of Holy Orders in the Mystical Body's teaching function.

---

[86] *Ibid.*, 340.
[87] Cfr. *ibid.*, 360-378.
[88] Cfr. *ibid.*, 395-413.

2.4. Marthaler: catechesis as a socialization process

Another American, Berard Marthaler, professor of Religion and Religious Education at the University of America and Chief Editor of *The Living Light*, advanced a model of catechesis as a socialization process.[89]   The cultivation of the experience of an individual takes place in the community with all its enriching rituals and symbols.

The origin of B. Marthaler's long engagement with catechesis is marked by two events in his life: *first*, his succession of Gerard Sloyan in the headship of the Religious Education in 1967

---

[89] Berard Marthaler is a professed member of the Louisville Province (Our Lady of Consolation) of the Order of Friars Minor Conventual (OFM Conv.). He taught at The Catholic University of America from 1963-1997. In one of his interviews, he said that by training he is a theological historian but catechesis 'claimed him' through a friendship with noted religious educator, Mary Charles Bryce.

He was born in Chicago Heights, Illinois in 1927. His father was of German descent and his mother, Irish. With the obvious influence of the Franciscan priests in the neighborhood, Marthaler, fresh from high school, entered the Order of Friars Minor Conventual in 1946.   After his novitiate training at Our Lady of Carey Seminary in Ohio, he studied and completed theological studies at Seraphicum University in Rome, from 1948-1953.   He received the Sacred Orders in 1952, the year before. He graduated with a dissertation titled *Original Justice and Sanctifying Grace in the writings of St. Bonaventure*. In the years 1953-1962, zenith years in US Church of the NCEA and the CCD, Marthaler exercised his pastoral work as a Church history professor in different schools run by religious congregations, such as Assumption Seminary (Minnesota), St. Richard's School of Adult Education (Minnesota), Ursuline College (Kentucky) and Bellarmine College (Kentucky). It was in these same years that he studied and obtained a doctor's degree in ancient history at the University of Minnesota. The book, *Two Studies in the Greek Imperial Coinage of Asia Minor*, published in 1960, resulted from this postgraduate study. The less noticed aspect of the person of Berard Marthaler as expert of Ancient History was the principal element for which he was hired in the Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C., and thereupon be associated with catechesis and religious education. He started as undergraduate professor of Church History in the Department in 1962 until 1965.

(specifically in his second term, c. 1974-1984) and *second*, that of Mary
Perkins Ryan in *The Living Light* in 1972.[90]

------

[90] In 1969, with CUA's academic updating (which fused and transformed
many departments), the *Graduate Department of Religious Education* was changed into
Department of Religion and Religious Education with Marthaler as its head. He held the
position twice, in 1969-1972, and again, in 1974-1984. S. Willhauck notes that in
those years of headship, Marthaler advocated curricular changes that gave priority
to a more profound study of religion and which eventually led to its being a subject
with its own entity and different from the rest of the subjects in the curriculum.
Moreover, he authored the policy obliging undergraduates to take the subject
'Religion' for their cultural formation. In addition to all these, he introduced
subjects or courses in Phenomenology of Religion, Protestant Thought, Eastern
Religions and the Black Religious Experiences. Due to the pluralistic ambiance
(students of different backgrounds), an interdisciplinary, ecumenical and
interreligious approach was embraced in the Department. Among 'the generations
of catechetical leaders he formed over the years', S. Willhauck lists Catherine
Dooley, Ann Marie Mongoven, Michael Warren, Marianne Sawicki and Robin
Maas, Rosemary Rogers, Ruth Roochigian, and Maura Thompson Hagarty. He
was awarded the Benemeriti award by Pope John Paul II in 1988 for his
distinguished 25 years of service to the American Catholic University.

At the peak of his career in CUA, that is, as the main man of the
Department of Religious Education, Marthaler was entrusted the editorship of *The
Living Light*, the interdisiciplinary review or journal of the Department of Education
of the then NCCB/USCC after the retirement of Mary Perkins Ryan in *1972*.
Aside from the editor's note, he wrote numerous catechetical articles in the said
journal. He continued to head the journal for almost 34 long years until its
foreclosure in 2004.

Furthermore, he was one of the delegates of the US Conference to the
International Catechetical Congress in Rome in 1971. He collaborated in the
elaboration of the first US national directory, *Sharing the Light of Faith* (1979) and
USCC's *Guidelines for Sound Catechetical Materials* (1991). He served as consultant in
the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy since 1992 and worked in the redaction of
the official English translation of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*.

At the height of determining the nature of the new catechesis which was
more or less settled in the symposium on catechesis in Boston College in 1978,
Marthaler defended catechesis as part of the Church's pastoral ministry and
presented the Church's catechetical practice in a language intelligible to other
experts, that is, catechesis as a sort of socialization to the Church's own creeds and
practices.

2.4.1. Theology and anthropological catechesis

In the 70s, Marthaler's fundamental principles regarding catechesis were already clear enough. In 1973, Marthaler authored the book *Catechetics in Context: Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory.* S. Willhauck says that, on one hand, that book introduced *General Catechetical Directory* (1972) to the American context; on the other hand, it outlined the general features of the US national directory, *Sharing the Light of Faith* (1979).

The categorization of catechesis as Ministry of the Word alongside others (first proclamation, liturgical preaching, and theology) is first given by the *GCD*. This point is incorporated by Marthaler in, *Catechesis and Theology* (1973), the paper he presented to the Catholic Theological Society of America in that same year. He wrote that catechesis 'ministers' the Word, not systematizing and analyzing it (as theology does) but simply presenting the Word (not excluding, of course, theological rigor). The 'catechetical presentation' of the Word aims not only to man's cognitive dimension but to the whole person. It is noteworthy that as early as this point, *Marthaler already indicates catechesis 'going beyond' the kerygmatic catechetical approach.* He claims that *GCD* – while adopting the framework of the kerygmatic approach – gives catechesis an identity

---

Marthaler was one of the first Roman Catholic members of the ecumenical Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education (APRRE) and also served as its first Roman Catholic president. He further served as editor of the second edition of the revised *New Catholic Encyclopedia* published in 2002. In addition to that, he was named recipient of the NPCD Emmaus Award in 2006. This short biography is based on the following: HAGARTY, MT, *The Role of "Experience" in Religious Education/Catechesis….*, cit., 221-249; WILLHAUCK, S., «Berard Marthaler» in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/) and *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry: A Digest of Recent Church Documents'* page dedicated to its author, 275.

of its own: *a move in the direction of the so-called 'anthropological catechesis'.*[91] As such, he therefore underlined the importance both of scientific theology and human sciences in catechesis. In addition to that, he also pointed out the importance of the role of the community in the introduction or familiarization of catholic individuals to its symbols and rituals which 'communicate the meaning and values of the gospel message'. For him, community is the keeper of tradition and meaning of the common faith, and it is in that believing community that catechesis best functions.[92]

Again, in a paper presented to the CTSA in 1976, *To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith* (1976), the same principles may be observed. In this paper, he illustrates the distinction between the tasks of theology and religious education (understood as catechesis), Here, he is more explicit of catechesis' *integral* aim and its focus less on *fides quae* (intended simply as contents) but more on *fides qua* (referred simply to the transmission of contents), and therefore on the interpretation of rites, formulae, symbols which provokes and confirms faith. He likewise adds in this bi-polar schema the

---

[91] MARTHALER, B., «Catechesis and Theology», cit., 262. He vied for Lonergan's idea of 'functional specialties' in understanding catechesis' role towards the Word. Basing on it, catechesis and theology are considered as specialized functions in the one service or ministry to the Word. *Vid.* LONERGAN, B., *Method in Theology* (1972), for the 8 functional specialties in theology (research, interpretation, history, dialectics, foundations, doctrines, systematic, and communications). According to Marthaler, catechesis is found in 'communications', which means, it moves in the theology's *external* relations (with history culture, art, media communications, etc.). With the Lonergan framework, catechesis pretends to go beyond the task of theology (characterized with 'managing' the foundational symbols necessary to communicate the Gospel message).

[92] As can be alluded, Marthaler associates catechesis with the idea of socialization. If in Boston Symposium in 1977, he talks already of catechesis as socialization, well in this point of time, Marthaler writes of 'catechesis as an *aspect* of socialization' (*Ibid*, 265).

importance of human sciences in catechesis, especially in relating 'learning doctrines-socialization into rituals and practices' to 'the concrete conditions of human existence'.[93] It was the time when the modern catechetical movement started in Europe a century earlier was being digested in the USA catechetical system.

2.4.2. Socialization model of catechesis

In 1977, in the already cited symposium convoked by Boston College, Marthaler aimed among others at determining the nature of the Catholic Church's catechetical ministry (in the USA) in the contemporary times. He defended the theory that maintains catechesis as socialization of its members to the Catholic Christian religion. Basing on M. Martorell's careful study of Marthaler's socialization model, we lay down three general points here of Marthaler's doctrine.

First, catechesis forms part of the Catholic Church's pastoral ministry. In his defense of catechesis as socialization of the Church's members to its creeds and traditions, Martorell indicates that Marthaler together with M. Warren defends the Church's primary responsibility to educate her members in the faith entrusted to her by the Lord. This idea is basically traceable to *GCD* 10-35, that catechesis is one of the Church's services to the Word. From his commentary of the *GCD*, that is, in *Catechetics in Context: Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory* (1973), Marthaler maintained this idea in subsequent writings. Indeed, after the entrance of a person to the Church, a deepening in knowledge and practice of the faith he or she received in baptism is realized through catechesis. Catechesis rightly corresponds to the natural human need to know more about Jesus

---

[93] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., «To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith», cit., 232-233.

Christ after having been initiated member or Jesus' community or family. Thus, in the Church total effort to transmit, lead, and form her members, catechesis forms an important part.

Second, catechesis is, in concrete, how the Church socializes its members into the Catholic faith. For Marthaler, catechesis is a process of social formation in which personal faith is awakened, nourished and developed through dialectical relationship with the community's institutionalized faith.[94] It is a sort of a community education in which the neophyte slowly assimilates the Christian *beliefs*. Quoting Marthaler, Martorell writes that inasmuch as catechesis in the primitive Church was an intentional process, socialization was traditionally called "catechesis".[95] Martorell continues that Marthaler admits that in our days, the usage of the catechetics, which Marthaler synonymously uses with religious education and education in faith, has extended its meaning thus including kerygma, the preparation for the sacraments and the ongoing formation which nurtures the life of faith of Christians.[96]

In this socialization theory, Marthaler holds that any beginner in the faith finds an already "objectified" or organized set of Christian practices, creeds and symbols (*beliefs*) – a complex system which was "exteriorized" by previous generations who shared a

---

[94] *Vid.* also Marthaler's other writings about the catechism: *Catechetics in Context. Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory Issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy* (1973), *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Traditional Themes and Contemporary Issues* (1994), and *The Catechism Yesterday and Today. The Evolution of a Genre* (1994).

[95] MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 181, 184,191.

[96] Cfr. *ibid.,* footnote 316; MARTHALER, B., *Catechetics in Context. Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory*, Indian: Our Sunday Visitor, 1973, 75.

common Christian faith.[97]   For Marthaler, beliefs are specific expressions of personal faith, and therefore, assume an intermediary function between personal faith and its meaning. Catechesis, as a socialization process, in his mind therefore, moves more in the plane of *beliefs* than directly in faith. It is clear that maturation in faith comes about in the dialectic interaction between personal faith and the community's faith.

Marthaler therefore delineates three objectives in the education of faith, namely, (1) growth in personal faith, (2) religious affiliation, and (3) the maintenance and transmission of a religious tradition.[98]

From this point of view, catechesis appears to be the preparation of the terrain, the cultivation of the seed of faith, or the familiarization of the road signs of the catholic religion. Through the language of *socialization*, Marthaler is able to transmit the idea of the Church's formation in the Catholic faith of every Catholic. From a socialization theory perspective, a baptized person is initiated and further made familiar with the fundamental convictions, the common

---

[97] Martorell notes that Marthaler's work, Socialization as model for catechetics, is an attempt of reading catechesis from the perspective of the sociology of knowing. The term, sociology of knowing, first coined by Max Scheller and passed to the English speaking world, describes the relationship between human knowledge and its social context. Berger and Luckmann used the term in their socialization theory. Their direct disciple Schutz, utilizing it in expressing Husserl's phenomenology, diffused the term in USA. Marthaler assumed phenomenological sociology in his catechetical theory. In this theory, man is a product of society and society is man's product. Man and society transforms each other through dialectical relationship. (Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….,* cit., 186-197, especially 186-190 (the socialization process according to Berger) and 191-193 (catechesis as Christian socialization).

[98] *Ibid.*, 197-205.

rituals proper to the Catholic religion, and its basic Christian practices and traditions.

Martorell says that Marthaler bases his position on the following: (a) the catechetical theories of socialization held by some contemporary American Protestants, (b) Vatican II's idea of the Church, and (c) the phenomenological sociology of Berger and Luckmann.[99] Even though the socialization theory dwells more on the 'external or social factors' – or the so-called 'symbolics of faith' -, nevertheless, Marthaler's choice of it excellently brings home the point: *catechesis as formation in the larger group's faith and which is fundamental to any member.*

Third, catechesis is closely associated with the proclamation of the Word, service in the community, with the celebration in liturgy. Aside from the *GCD*'s emphasis on catechesis as a Ministry of the Word which thus closely associates catechesis to it, Marthaler's idea of the close relation of catechesis with service in the community and liturgy is evidently influenced by his commentary work with *Sharing the Light of Faith* which has this main principle (taken from *To Teach as Jesus Did*). This idea will continue to be observable among the emphases that Marthaler develops in his commentary to official church documents published in the third millennium.

---

[99] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 183-191; 267-281. According to many other catechetical theorists whom Marthaler cites, Protestants like Bushnell, CS Nelson and J. Westerhoff mark his idea of catechesis as nurture and as a process of socialization. Berger and Luckman hold that the external surroundings influence one's mode of being and one's way of thinking. Marthaler acknowledges that in catechesis, there is a need to give weight to the social circumstances or the culture in which the Church exists. He seems to focus more on the 'symbolics of faith' which does not necessarily identifiable with the contents of faith but those 'structures' necessary for faith's authentic comprehension and even for its safe transmission.

With those basic principles mentioned above, it is easier to understand his positions in the catechetical issues which arose in the decades of the 80s and 90s, such as the identity of religious education, liturgy and sacred symbols in catechesis, catechesis in community, and the pitting of the catechism and the directory.[100]

2.5. Warren: counter-cultural catechesis

Michael Warren succeeds B. Marthaler in conceiving a catechesis which gives due consideration to 'nursing' human experience in the community.[101]   The two main features of his

---

[100] *Concerning the catechism and the directory,* Marthaler's significant writings are: *Catechetical Directory or Catechism? The Wrong Question* (1987), *The Catechism of the Catholic Church in the US Context* (1993), *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church. Traditional themes and Contemporary Issues* (1994), and *Catechism Yesterday and Today. The Evolution of a Genre* (1995). *On the debate among catechetical educators pitting against each other the universal catechism and the catechetical directory*, Marthaler published *Catechetical Directory or Catechism? The Wrong Question* (1987) establishing the mutual relations between the two important instruments in the Church's catechetical ministry. Within this context, Marthaler affirmed the importance of both 'instruments' in the total effort of catechesis. He will later consider the Catechism as a 'genre' of catechetical literature used by the Church throughout.

Another idea of Marthaler which is often cited by his students is that the directory was the new genre of catechetical instrument which the Fathers in Vatican II (especially citing the Decree *Christus Dominus*) corresponded to the undone project of creating a small catechism promulgated in Vatican I. From the point of view of catechesis as moving in the atmosphere of symbolic rather than on faith itself, the considering of the directory and the catechism as 'genre' or (merely) 'instruments' is understandable enough.

Finally, for him, the universal catechism and general directories are to be adapted according to local churches circumstances and needs. *Related to the issue of adult catechesis*, he defended and emphasized the importance of catechesis in the Roman Catholic tradition and the catechesis of adults in *Catechesis Isn't Just for Children Anymore* (1997) citing thoroughly the 1971 *GCD* of its mention of adult catechesis as the axis in which other catechesis revolves.

[101] Our knowledge of professional whereabouts of Michael Warren is limited to the short descriptions that are written at the section 'about the author' in his published books and articles. However, this brief information is enough to

catechetical doctrine are: (1) the nurture of faith within the community experience, and (2) the belligerent characteristics of culture. The trajectory of M. Warren's catechetical thought may be

---

draw a complete context useful in understanding the author's thought. He earned a doctor's degree in religious education with a thesis on the sociology of religion at CUA in 1974. The following year, he became professor for Religious Education and Catechetical Ministry at the Department of Theology at St. John's University, Jamaica, New York. In these same years, he held the post of director of youth catechesis *NCCB*'s Department of Religious Education and Catechesis from 1973 to 1975. In addition to that, he has taught in various secondary schools and member of youth and adult formation teams in catholic parishes. This explains why one of the fundamental contexts of his writings concerning catechesis and formation is the youth ministry. Influences on Warren's thought can best be traced in Martorell's outline of Warren's principal catechetical ideas.

Martorell sketches Warren's ideas in the following: *first*, in the author's relation to the modern North American catechetical movement, *second*, in the 'liberation' developments of his thoughts (between the late 70s and early 80s), and in his definitive *hermeneutical dislocation* style. In the years following the Second Vatican Council, there was a debate regarding the identity of Catholic traditional catechesis. Against those who understand it from the educational paradigm, Warren together with Marthaler holds that catechesis is a process of social formation. He identifies his stance with the traditional use of the term and practice in the Church, with that of the Congregationalist H. Bushnell, S. Smith, CS Nelson, J. Westerhoff and B. Marthaler. He locates catechesis inside the parameters of the Church's ministry of the Word. He understands 'church' as the local congregation and as principal agent of catechesis. However, with a stress on the need to confront the historical dimension of existence, Warren finds conceptual instruments from the theology of liberation in expressing his catechetical stance.

In the early 80s, his writings stress more on the community's testimonial aspect, that is, the furthering of God's reign in the concrete 'here and now' of everyday life. As Martorell observes in Warren's writings during this period, he seems to equate catechesis and theology of liberation's "liberation" thus using frequently the term *catechesis of liberation*. Basing on his recent writings, we observe Warren's intentional citations and use of intellectual categories of authors like Herman Lombaerts and his *analysis of society*, William Christian and the *distinction between primary and secondary doctrines*, Erik Erikson and his *development of self*, the psychologist Shoshana Felman and her *learning situation*, and the sociologist Raymond Williams and his *signifying system*.

summarized like this: from *socialization process* to *the catechesis of liberation*.[102]

The conceptual elements of Warren's thought were dispersed in various books and articles. However, his general interests, *on one side*, on the influence of culture and society in believers and, *on the other side*, his deep conviction that Christian discipleship consists more of praxis than theories.

2.5.1. *Sociology of religion, church evangelization and catechesis*

In *Evangelization: a catechetical concern* (1973), a work published a year earlier he obtained doctor's degree with a thesis on sociology of religion in CUA, Warren argues the importance of testimony of life in the task of evangelization and catechesis. After following Liege's

---

[102] Here are some of Warren's writings (arranged in chronological order) which documents the development of his thought: «Evangelization: a catechetical concern», in *TLL* 10 (1973) 487-496 (reproduced in WARREN, M. (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics*, I, MN: Saint Mary's Press, 1983, 329-338); *Youth, Gospel, Liberation*, New York: Harper & Row, 1978; «A Third World Focus», in *Religious Education* 74 (1979) 496-502; «Catechesis: An enriching category for Religious Education», in *Religious Education* (1981) 115-127; *Youth and the Future of the Church*, New York: Seabury Press, 1982; «Youth and Religious Nature», in TAYLOR, M. (ed.), *Changing Patterns of Religious Education*, Tennessee: Abdington Press, 1984, 244-255; «Religious Formation in the context of social formation», in *Religious Education* 82 (1987) 515-528; «The Worshipping Assembly: Possible Zone of Cultural Contestation», in *Worship* 63 (1989) 2-16; «Cultural Coding in the Young: the ongoing dilemma», in *Listening* 25 (1990) 47-60; *Communications and Cultural Analysis. A Religious View*, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 1992; *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church*, New Jersey: Mahwah, ²1993; «The Local Church and Its Practice of the Gospel: the Materiality of Discipleship in a catechesis of liberation» in *Worship* 67 (1993) 433-460; «Judging the Electronic Communications Media» in *TLL* 31 (1994) 54-64; (ed.) *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics*, II, MN: Saint Mary's Press, 1997; *Seeing through the Media: a religious view of communication and cultural analysis*, Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1997; *At This Time, In this Place. The Spirit Embodied in the Local Assembly*, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

analysis of the route of the concept of evangelization in development of catechesis, he cites the Church's *historical commitment* as pronounced in the International Catechetical Week in Medellin in 1968. He says:

> The catechetical leaders at Medellin recognized that a credible proclamation of the Gospel must be radically historicized by being addressed to the concrete human situation of a particular people at a time in history. Further the Church and human kind must meet within the total human situation, by entering and becoming a living presence with that situation.[103]

According to Martorell's study, for Warren, that *historical commitment* in Medellin opened a new perspective for the understanding of evangelization and catechesis.[104] Warren's tendency to emphasize *the historical expression of the Gospel* characterizes later his stance in the debate concerning the so-called *new catechetics'* search for identity (c. 1977). Warren took the position of B. Marthaler, that is, considering *catechesis as a socialization process* to the reality of Christian life.

The socialization language permits Warren, *on one hand*, to participate actively in the catechesis-religious education dilemma of the late 70s and, *on the other hand*, to extend the catechetical function in the ambit of social liberation.

Aside from the observable presence of tiny conceptual sparks of principles of theology of liberation, Warren in *Youth, Gospel, Liberation* (1978), presents in some parts, the history of the communal/ecclesial character of the Christian formation process first theorized in American soil by the Congregationalist H. Bushnell. Bushnell conceptualized formation in the Christian faith as nurture.

---

[103] WARREN, M., «Evangelization: a catechetical concern», in WARREN, M. (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics*, I, cit., 333. This is the re-published edition of the article written 10 years ago.

[104] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 215-216.

However, he says, Bushnell's insight was forgotten in the entrance to the scene of George Albert Coe and the followers of *religious education movement* at the beginning of the 20th century. The movement bannered the then novel progressive explorations in the field of education and psychology. However, sometime between the great World Wars, scholars came to understand of the inadequacy of the category 'education' in expressing the reality of faith formation. The recovery since then started with the use of the pair *nurture-education* by H. Shelton Smith and eventually overcome by C. Ellis Nelson with his emphasis on the importance of the communal aspect in the formation in faith. Warren in the end traces contemporary authors at the same line of thinking as J. Westerhoff and B. Marthaler.[105]

Warren applies the same line of reasoning in *Catechesis: An enriching category for Religious Education* (1981). In this article, he underlines how the modern catechetical movement amplifies religious education from its limited educational language. Warren claimed that the former, through socialization, links the latter to the richer way of learning, that is, through ecclesial experience.

2.5.2. Catechesis, local church, and culture

M. Martorell marks the year 1984 as something significant in the development of Warren's understanding of catechesis as a socialization process. She says that Warren himself writes that it is in the said date that he encountered the social insights of Raymond Williams. Since then, Williams' thoughts will be ever present in his writings (more than those of the liberation theologians) such as in *Faith Culture and Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church* (1989), *The Worshipping Assembly: Possible Zone of Cultural*

---

[105] The facts were eventually completed in *Youth and Religious Nurture* (1984) and the re-edition of *Youth, Gospel and Liberation* (1994).

Contestation (1989).[106] The term 'catechesis of liberation' became a frequent phrase in his writings and which signify more than *a socialization process*.

Williams speaks of a cultural materialism which moulds human perception or philosophy. As a culture, it appears as a truth and dominates people's way of thinking. Warren, with Williams' outlook, evaluates the dominant culture of our times (US setting), that is, the consumerist culture, and considers it as incompatible and a even stumbling block for people to understand the values of the Gospel.[107] *On one hand*, he observes a dominant culture which is a hindrance for the appreciation of the Gospel values, and *on the other hand*, the Christian message which pits the community against the dominant consumerist culture. Warren then calls role of catechesis in this given situation as *ministry of life structures*, that is, the cementing of profound structures on which the disciple of Christ's action proceeds.[108] He describes liturgy, for instance, as a moment of ministry of life structure (more than an effort of making understand what is it).[109] In short, he marks catechesis with *a counter-cultural character*.[110]

If Marthaler is interested in the study of *symbolic systems* (those which help maintain and transmit the faith or *symbols* in the future generations) because of the strong cultural context of a given period of time in which the Church exists, Warren is rather more concerned on *how* to maintain and transmit such faith or *symbols* or what he calls

---

[106] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 218-219, 223.

[107] *Ibid.*, 233.

[108] *Ibid.*, 225.

[109] *Ibid.*, 227.

[110] Martorell traces this idea as an influence of the French neo-marxist sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (cfr. *ibid.*, 234).

'symbolic of practice' or 'life practice symbols', through a process he calls 'hermeneutical dislocation'.[111]   Warren, maintaining a socialization theory inspired by William's neomarxist sociological ideas, conceives catechesis as a pastoral ministry specifically concerned with the formation *life structures* shaped by the Gospel and confronting cultural hegemonies squarely opposed or which hinder the formation of Gospel-inspired life-structures. More than rational discussion of divinely revealed truths, for Warren, catechesis is more concerned with *the testimony or the faithful practice* (of the Gospel) *of the believing community*, or more particularly, to the *life structures*.[112] Warren, says Martorell, curiously observed that liturgy for instance coincides with catechesis in this matter: creating life structures through confrontation or familiarization with Christian symbols or embodiments of the Christian faith, or simply, through Christian practice or testimony of the community.[113] The end of catechesis is transformation of one's life according to the demands of the Gospel. It further extends its end in the criticism of the dominant hegemony or the consumerist culture which, in his opinion, is in radical opposition with the Gospel values and therefore, either hinders its assimilation in the life of individuals or totally eradicates a Christian environment.[114]   Therefore, as Martorell affirms, for Warren,

---

[111] *Ibid.*

[112] Life structures condition our perception of reality.   Martorell, summarizing Warren's explanation in Faith, Culture, and the Worshipping Community. Shaping Practice of the Local Church (1989), says that life structure is a habit, emphasis or a stable model through which behaviors, actions or personal conduct are governed. It is acquired unconsciously and configured through influence of culture (Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 225).

[113] Cfr. *ibid.*, 226-230. In this, Martorell notes Warren's priority of practice over contents in catechesis.

[114] Warren, says Martorell, establishes two dialectical tensions: (1) the consumerist society opposes the sense and practice of the Gospel, and (2) the

catechesis or Christian formation in general must be counter-formation, that is, leveled against the hegemony of consumerist culture.[115] More than just the maintenance of one's religious world and the transmission of community practices or of *symbolics*, Warren goes beyond the socialization theory with his idea of 'the transmission of life practice symbolic through a hermeneutics of dislocation'.[116]

Warren is however clear that such 'a ministry of life practice symbolic through a hermeneutic dislocation' is an ecclesial task. In the same work, *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church* (1989), Warren clearly outlines catechesis as one of aspects of the Church's Ministry of the Word.[117] Martorell says that for Warren, ministry of the word is ecclesial action.[118] But how does Warren understand ecclesial action? He writes:

> The phrase *ecclesial action* locates the context of catechesis in the community and names the chief agent of catechesis as the same community. Within this principle lie the seeds of a revolution in how local churches think of the process of fostering a mature faith and in how they actually do it. [….] Properly understood, catechesis is a kind of therapy for fostering the corporate health of the *ekklesia*, with adult catechesis as its chief form.[119]

Deriving from all these insights, M. Martorell therefore makes two conclusions: *first*, Warren locates catechesis inside the

---

Gospel confronts the liturgical assembly or the local church against the dominant culture at hand (cfr. *ibid.*, 223-224).

[115] Cfr. *ibid.*, 234.

[116] Hermeneutics of dislocation, explains Martorell, consists in a critical process or discernment (judgment, reflection, discourse) which is facilitated through forging bonds with the poor and the marginalized of society (cfr. *ibid.*, 237-238).

[117] Cfr. WARREN, M., *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community….*, cit., 12.

[118] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 213.

[119] WARREN, M., *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community….*, cit., 13.

pastoral action of the local community; *second*, having defined catechesis as a process of formation in the faith *of* the community and *in* the community, the principles on which *the modern catechetical movement* has started are far different from those of *the religious education movement*.[120]

In the 90s, Warren gave more attention to *culture at hand* and its influence on the current Christians especially at the hour of *doing* their Christian faith (inside the Church or in their day to day lives).[121] This led to the publication of *Communications and Cultural Analysis (1992)* and which was revised and published later as *Seeing through the Media: A Religious view of Communications and Culture Analysis* (1997). Other writings which manifest the Warren's more mature catechetical thought are *The Local Church and Its Practice of the Gospel: The Materiality of Discipleship in a Catechesis of Liberation* (1993), and *At This Time, In This Place. The Spirit embodied in the local assembly* (1999).

According to Martorell's study, Warren's importance in the field of religious education or catechesis is found in two instances: *first*, his defense and holding on to use of the traditional term 'catechesis' in reference to the Church's educational ministry, and *second*, his attribution of the catechetical practice to the pastoral ministry of the local Church.[122]

---

[120] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 214.

[121] Cfr. WARREN, M. (ed.), *Changing Churches – the Local Church and the Structures of Change*, OR: Pastoral Press, 2000, 1.

[122] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 207-240.

3. Summary and Evaluation

New catechesis serves as an important bookmark in the pages of the history of US catechesis. As catechesis reflects on the dialogue between God and man, *new catechesis* indicated the sudden shift of focus towards the anthropological dimension of catechetical reflection over that divine-human dialogue.

The principal proponents of *new catechetics* studied above showed great attention to 'human experience'. They departed however from different point of views.

Gabriel Moran's questioning the foundations of kerygmatic catechesis and proposal of founding it to an understanding of *revelation* which emphasized the indispensability of the human response to God's manifestations at present, opened the usual doctrine-based and often cognitive catechesis to the *experience dimension*. Moran proposed the focus of catechesis on that common, natural and actual dialogue between God and man. Aside from using the term 'revelation' to refer to that divine-human communication, he places *a character of indispensability* to the human part in that 'communication'. Moran pretended to correct a catechesis which remains solely on the superficial level of notions, doctrines, symbols or practices and negligent of the interior being of man.

That attention on experience dimension was assumed by JM Lee in his religious instruction theory based on social sciences. Convinced that the teaching process is capable of producing concrete results, he subjected human experience to the rigors of social sciences, and concluded, not with creating or producing faith itself, but of predictable manifestations of *a faith-filled lifestyle*.

Th. Groome, on his part, proposed an educational approach which focused on a mutual and enriching *exchange* between the community's experience of the past and of its experiences at present.

B. Marthaler likewise preferred to delimit the consideration of experiential catechesis within the community and in view of the community. Considering catechesis as a socialization model, he vied for the nurture of the life of faith within the community through its system of symbols and practices. M. Warren, continuing the same line, focused more on the hindrances of culture foreign to the nurturing symbolic system of the ecclesial community.

New catechetics' therefore forcefully suggested the US catechesis' incorporation of the 'experiential dimension' and move more towards an integral catechesis which comprehends both *knowing* and *living* the Christian faith.

<div align="center">∗∗∗</div>

The prods of reform by the *new catechetics* marked the direction of US catechesis towards the 21st century. The considered comprehensive and representative national catechetical directory for Catholics in the USA, *Sharing the Light of Faith* (1978), drafted and finally published at the height of new catechetics' influences, manifest indeed new catechetics' suggestions. In its very first chapter, the directory dedicated a survey of the positive and negative elements in the religious and cultural context of the USA (Chapter I), dedicated in concrete a separate chapter on Liturgy (Chapter VI), and on Social Ministry (Chapter VII). It likewise clarified many points: the relationship between catechesis, theology and human sciences,[123] placed as end of catechesis the maturity of faith,[124] affirmed that

---

[123] Cfr. *SLF* 37.
[124] Cfr. *SLF* 33.

catechesis cannot but be scientific but at the same time it made clear that neither catechesis nor catechists produces faith,[125] and made distinctions between God's public revelation and God's manifestations in created realities or in natural signs.[126]

The proliferation of catechetical initiatives in the renewal of the US catechesis[127] (led by *new catechetics*) went hand in hand with the

---

[125] Cfr. *SLF* 100.

[126] Cfr. *SLF* 49-55.

[127] After recognizing the vast horizons opened by the pioneers of American new catechesis, Kelly, Elias, Moran and Harris speak of the emergence of new interesting aspects in education of the faith such as the achievements and influences in contemporary religious education of the developmental psychologies of Piaget, Kohlberg, Fowler, etc., the pluralism of approaches in Christian education based on feminism, liberal theology, justice and peace issues, close attention to the latino culture and their popular religion, discussion on ethnicity issues, ecology or environment, sense of identity as adult religious educators, etc. (cfr. ELIAS, J., *A History of Christian Education….,* cit., 210; MORAN, G.-HARRIS, M., *Reshaping Religious Education. Conversations on Contemporary Practice*, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998, 3-4; KELLY, F. D., *The Truth We Proclaim*, cit., 29-31). According to J. Elias, some catholic religious educators have paid attention to the role of aesthetics in religious education in response to a rationalistic and method centered religious education. He names Durka, Harris and Sawicki as proponents in this area. They have pointed out that Catholic religious education has tended to focus on rational and intellectual goals and methods. According to J. Elias, utilizing research on the two hemispheres of the brain and the nature of symbolic or metaphoric thinking, Durka has contended that religious educators should include the nurturing of experiences or artistic enrichment, interpretations of wide variety of artwork, and art forming through the use of many artistic media. Harris, on her part, has explored the theories of imagination and the ways in which religious educators can attend more creatively to the imagination of students. Sawicki has explained how liturgical symbols foster religious understanding.

Moreover, J. Elias says that education for peace and justice also count as one of the principal focus of the 90s. According to him, this was inspired by the developments of liberation theology and the social teachings of the Church. The educational component of these approaches is largely indebted to the educational theory of Paulo Freire. Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed was based on the premise that education is not a neutral process but rather a tool for liberation or domestication. The task of educators is to humanize individuals by engaging in a process of analysis, confrontation, and transformation. Also, feminist elements

rapid progress in the Church's deepening of the reflection concerning the nature and mission of the Church in Pope Paul VI's Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelium Nuntiandi* (1976), the contextualization of catechesis in the evangelizing mission of the Church in our times in Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Exhortation *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979), Pope John Paul II's promotion of the *new* evangelization throughout his long papacy, the further determination of the social teachings of the church, the making of a catechism of the teachings of Vatican II started in 1985 and published as the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* in 1992 (and its compendium), and which led to the revision of the general directory, known as the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997). All these have conditioned the last mile of catechesis not only in the world but also in the USA.

Following the revised catechetical directory's insinuations concerning *the centrality of adult catechesis and the idea of baptismal catechumenate as inspiring model of all catechesis*,[128] the Bishops' Conference's Committee on Evangelization together with the Committee on Evangelization collaborated with the *NCCB/USCC* Committees on Education, Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, Liturgy, and Pastoral Practices, conducted a national study of the implementation of *RCIA* in the USA, in April 1997. The report

---

were later introduced to religious education. J. Elias notes of Durka focusing on the structural situation of women in religious organizations and in religious education, especially as this relates to power. MC Boys has synthesized feminist theories on knowledge, sources, overlooked information, methodology, and new theories. Drawing on these theories as well as on the work of feminist theologians, she argues for the importance of a feminist perspective in religious education. She contends that feminist religious educators can contribute the feminist commitment to process and collaboration as well as other aspects of feminist pedagogy. Harris has written about the connections among religious education, feminism, aesthetics, and spirituality (cfr. ELIAS, J., *A History of Christian Education….,* cit., 214-216).

[128] Cfr. *GDC* 59.

Journey to the Fullness of Life was published in 2000.[129] It gave a positive result of the adult catechesis patterned from the baptismal catechumenate.

In 1999 then, with a special gaze towards the new millennium, the US Bishops formatted its pastoral plan with priority on adult faith formation, that is, the *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States* (OHWB).[130] It banked on the maturity of faith *in* and *through* the ecclesial community. A survey concerning the effectiveness of the catechumenate conducted in the 1997 clearly supported this pastoral direction.

OHWB (1999) was again corroborated by the US Bishop's renewal of commitment in 2000 to the catechetical ministry, through a statement made on the occasion of 'the new millennium and 65th anniversary of the Holy See's establishment of the Catechetical Sunday'.[131]   In this statement, the bishops start by offering a short observation on the context in which presently catechesis occurs. Then, they recall those events and people in the past instrumental for the present progress and identify the gifts the present positive elements in catechetical ministry. In addition, they offer their observations about the ministry of catechesis. Finally, they declare their re-commitment in support of catechetical ministry.

---

[129] NCCB/USCC, *Journey to the Fullness of Life. A Report on the Implementation of the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults in the United States*, Washington, D.C. (October 2000).

[130] USCCB, *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999.

[131] NCCB/USCC, Statement *In Support of catechetical ministry*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, June 16, 2000.

At the national level, the bishops commits: (1) to lead catechesis by reason of office, (2) to lead with catechetical leaders and catechists in all areas so that it is clear to all that catechetical ministers work together with the bishop, and (3) to support priests in the parish in their efforts to provide catechesis at the parish level.

At the diocesan level, the bishops declared that through their diocesan catechetical offices, they will provide formation to improve the competence of their catechetical leaders and catechists for all age levels and those who work with the disabled, in the diocese. The statement specifies that formation as not only in technical matters (use of media communications, better communication skills, or better collaboration) but also in relationship with the Lord. At the end part of the statement, the bishops express their concern regarding the recruitment of 'qualified people vital to this ministry'.

In addition to that, the bishops commit to the centralization of the *CCC* and the *GDC* in the formation of priests, deacons, seminarians, lay ministers, and catechists, and in all catechetical endeavors. They reason out stating that 'only with a common vision and a clear understanding of the Church's direction for catechesis can those who serve together in this mission orchestrate *a symphony of faith* for those to be catechized'.

In other words, the bishops commit to also give serious look, as they always do, the doctrinal content of catechetical materials as both *faithful to the teaching of the Church* and *complete in its expression*. The statement concludes hoping for a common catechetical effort - an expression of the new evangelization - by virtue of one baptism.

As Cardinal Wuerl puts it, the publication of the *CCC* influenced the re-direction of the catechetical efforts of the Church

in the USA.[132] In concrete, the cardinal indicates that the Catechism became source of inspiration and normative guide: (1) in the catechetical texts for the use for the primary and secondary school levels in schools and parishes, 2) in the making of the of the national catechism for adults initiated by the Episcopal conference, and (3) for the doctrinal components and contents of various catechetical initiatives and formation programs.

While *USCCB* revised its own national directory, following the example of the *GDC*, it has worked on a national catechism for the formation of adults, through the mentioned catechumenal program. The national directory, National Directory for Catechesis (*NDC*),[133] was published in 2005 and the national catechism, United States Catholic Catechism for Adults (*USCCA*),[134] in 2006.

With the progress and development in the pedagogical-catechetical aspect prodded by the *new catechetics* and with the many initiatives in documents as well as in practice on the part of the *USCCB*, a parallel theological reflection on the catechesis in the USA is timely called for.[135]

---

[132] WUERL, MOST REV. DONALD, DD, «La Applicacion del Catecismo de la Iglesia Catolica en las Iglesias Particulares de Norteamerica», in *Actualidad Catequetica* 195-196 (2002) 451-458.

[133] USCCB, *National Directory for Catechesis*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005.

[134] USCCB, *United States Catholic Catechism for Adults*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006.

[135] See for instance the essay, PELLITERO, R., «La reflexión catequética actual en los Estados Unidos», in *Scripta Theologica* 29 (1997/2) 585-620.

PART 2: REVELATION, CULTURE AND HERMENEUTICAL CATECHESIS

Part II opens our search for a picture of the USA catechesis in 2000-2010 so as to be able to discern some theological aspects in it. This part is composed of three chapters. Chapter II presents Moran and his proposal of 'religious education based on the present divine-human encounter' experienced by to all men. Chapter III presents Lee and his proposal of a religious instruction which is capable of determining a faith-filled lifestyle. Chapter IV presents Groome and his 'shared praxis approach in catholic education'.

These three authors anchor with new catechetics' welcome of the anthropological-experiential dimension to catechesis. Thereupon, critics and protagonists in the US catechesis talks of a hermeneutical catechesis. Before 'experience', catechesis assumed the role of a hermeneutist or interpreter of experience.

In each chapter, after exposing all the writings of the particular author in question (in the chapter), a summary and evaluation is presented.

CHAPTER II. MORAN: REVELATION AS GOD-MAN DIALOGUE IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

What does Moran say about catechesis? The figure of Gabriel Moran, professor of religious education in the University of New York, is associated with the 'new catechetics'. Moran at a certain point of his career dedicated himself to interreligious dialogue. As it can be recalled, at the Boston Symposium of 1977, Moran proposed the relinquishment of the term 'catechesis' in favor of the anglo-american expression 'religious education'. Since then in fact in referring to the formative or educational reality of a religion – usually Islam, Christianity and the Jewish religion – he employs the term 'religious education'. This further implies that for Moran catechesis is an intra-mural term intelligible among the Catholic Christian circle referring to the formative reality promoted by the Church for its members.

1. Religion and Education: Moran's general concepts

Moran deals with the formative aspect or activities in a particular religion as religious education. For him, each particular religion has a particular way of educating its members (itself a *religious act*) and employs intramural language and code intelligible by those who are 'inside'. However, in our times, he proposes an inter-religion approach to religious education, not only in terms of instruction but also of formation. Thus in his present writings, he presents a *religious education* viewed from the 'outside'. *What are his works in which he deals with religious education in these last 10 years?* Moran has several books and many essays in which he speaks about education, religion and education and religious education. Even in

his books dedicated to revelation, one of themes he explored enough in the earlier part of his career, Moran deduces implications relevant to religious education.

The chronological exposition here therefore presents chosen essays and books in which Moran's thoughts on religious education today may be seen through. The *first* is an essay contributed to James Michael Lee IV's collection concerning religious education in the third millennium, published in 2000, *Building on the Past*.[1] The *second*, titled *Both Sides: The Story of Revelation (2002)*,[2] a book about revelation from the educational perspective, implicates, among others, education. The *third*, *Fashioning A People Today: The Educational Insights of Maria Harris (2007)*,[3] is actually about Moran's educational insights following the structure (and departing from) of Maria Harris' theory of church education. The *fourth*, *Speaking of Teaching: Lessons from History (2008)*,[4] is a book concerning Moran's idea of teaching based on some prominent thinkers from Plato to Wittgenstein. He dedicates a chapter on teaching religion. The *fifth* book, *Believing in a Revealing God: The Basis of the Christian Life (2009)*[5], deals principally with his proposed understanding of the revelation as the basis of Christian living. Like in *Both Sides* (2002), he proposes revelation as a present encounter between the divine and the human. From that

---

[1] MORAN, G., «Building on the Past», in JM LEE (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium*, Al: Religious Education Press, 2000, 134-154.

[2] MORAN, G., *Both Sides: The Story of Revelation*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2002.

[3] MORAN, G., *Fashioning a People Today: The Educational Insights of Maria Harris*, MN: Twenty Third Publications, 2007.

[4] MORAN, G., *Speaking of Teaching: Lessons from History*, MD: Lexington Books Lanham, ²2010.

[5] MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God: The Basis of the Christian Life*, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.

concept of revelation, he dedicates a chapter on teaching-learning as metaphor of revelation.

1.1. A description of religious education (RE)

In BUILDING ON THE PAST (2000), Moran offers a piece of his mind regarding the religious education in the future. He says that in order to be able to predict about the future, one needs to be anchored on the past. A prediction anchored on the past has more probability of giving a realistic preview of the future. He points out that future programs related to religious education must take inspiration from the developments in the past. This therefore also applies to religious education, a 20th century phenomenon. He begins with a sort of a description of what religious education is. He says:

> "… religious education is the meeting place of religion and education. How they should meet can endlessly be debated, but I wish to give equal weight to the two components. Religious education should be neither education's view of religion nor religion's use of education. Instead, religious education should be a genuine confrontation of these two important dimensions of human life. Religion ought to be challenged by its encounter with education. Likewise, the configuration of education ought to be open to fundamental change by the challenge that religion offers."[6]

In his terms, he considers religious education as a synthesis of religion and education. Therefore any attempt of limiting any of either side, will effectively weaken religious education. Progress of either side is considered an opportunity for religious education. Therefore, in this article, he offers to look at the two building blocks of religious education, that is, religion and education, and identify some limitations and possible progress.

---

[6] MORAN, G., «Building on the Past», cit., 134.

He proceeds with his discussion following this sequence: (1) the recent past of religious education, (2) the current religious outlook, (3) educational reform, and (4) the future of religious education. *In this first part,* RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: A CENTURY, he presents the development of religious education. He divides it into two historical periods – the *first half of the 20th century* and the other, *the second half.*

In the *first half of the 20th century*, even though he clearly says that religious education is not the same with Religious Education Association (founded in 1903 by George Albert Coe and company), he recognizes its part in the evolution of this phenomenon. He says that REA represented the great hopes of the people who were responsible for the first widespread use of the term 'religious education'. He claims that what was announced way back then was not an organization but 'a new movement that would bring the forces of education and religion into a dynamic new relation.' The association was composed of persons of varied professions (educators, businessmen, religious, politicians) and they listened to a keynote speech on the possibilities of the then new field of psychology, given by John Dewey. However it showed the signs of failure to contain all parties in one umbrella. According to him, liberal Jews who were in it distrusted any thing with Christian trappings. Roman Catholics created its own organization, NCEA. Moreover, the Evangelists, considered the conservative wing of US Protestantism were also absent. Too soon, religious education movement was identified with the protestant liberals and their kind of education.

In the *second half of the 20th century*, Moran indicates *two events* qualifying the name 'religious education'. The *first* is Roman Catholics' regular use of it. He says that they used it in a narrow meaning, a synonym for the CCD or other parish based programs

somehow on formation in Christian doctrines. He pointed out that one thing was clear: *it was an educational or formational activity contrary to that in Catholic schools.* The *second* qualifying event was England's use of it referring to the academic subject about religion mandated in state schools. He says that the term 'religious education' migrated from US through statements at missionary conferences. In any case, he considers however REA's aims in 1903 worth-pursuing.[7]

Moran considers the Catholic's use of 'religious education' and also the British exclusive of the term (religious education) to refer to the subject taught in schools both seem restrictive. In the case of Catholic's use, 'religious education' became an *intramural language* of a particular group, that is, only of Catholics. 'Religious education' became a venture solely of Catholics, instead of an activity in which other groups may likewise contribute or participate.[8] Regarding the British experience, he says that it must be studied and still needs to be understood in the US especially in the aspect of professionalizing religious education. In the US, religious education is not a subject taught in state schools. Curiously he says that this fact reveals that any group or country cannot just dictate the meaning of religious education.

The *second part of the essay,* RELIGIOUS RESOURCES, is all about the current religious outlook. His main idea is that the present understanding of religion varies and this could be both a disadvantage and an advantage for the progress of religious education.

He first indicates the radical distinction between true and false religion existent in the olden and medieval times. Beginning the

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 135-136.
[8] *Ibid.,* 137.

16th century, however, a new categorical distinction emerged, that is 'religions'. This refers to a plurality of religious institutions, specifically the so-called 'Christian religions'. He alludes to the division of the Reformation from which various Christian denominations emerged. In the 17th century, he says that another category emerged and replaced the anterior one. He refers to the so-called distinction between 'natural' and 'revealed' religions. He claims that since then, historians, philosophers, anthropologist sand sociologists considered as pure and simple fact the existence of institutions called 'religions'. Moran exquisitely indicates two problems. *On one hand*, people in a religion consider their being-in-their-religion as more than 'merely having a religion' or 'simply being enrolled in a religious institution'; it is more of their deepest beliefs and practices. *On the other hand*, from the point of view of those people from outside the 'religions', all are but the same – religious institutions.

Thus Moran says that this reality has to be considered at the moment of rethinking religious education. *First*, 'religion' is a helpful but not comprehensive basis for understanding the lives of Jew, Christian, Buddhist, or Muslim. *Second*, the formation into the practices of one religious way of life is educational, but the consideration of the plurality of religions in relation to that particular religious formation must not be ignored.[9] In other words, the formation into being religious, while being distinguished from the study of religions, is inseparable with it. Real education therefore has to include both the understanding of religion and the practice of a religious way of life.[10]

---

[9] *Ibid.,* 139.
[10] *Ibid.,* 147.

If the second part was all about religion, the *third part,* EDUCATIONAL REFORM, focuses on the other block of religious education – education. This part focuses on educational reform. While he points out the special involvement of schooling in education since the spread of literacy, education has mostly occurred in the family, the church liturgy and apprenticeship for work.

He observes of the worldwide emphasis on education in schools in the 19th and 20th centuries. While he recognizes the positive side of this progress, he likewise points out its disadvantages: (1) education became identified with a single group (children), and (2) it became identified with a single form of teaching (classroom instruction).

He traces the evolution of 'education in schools' since the 19th century until the recent times. He observes that in the USA, behind the concept of the common school, there was that widespread belief of the substitution of religion and church by education and the schools, respectively. He further comments that the so-called 'public education', a subsequent development of the 'common schools', presumed the modern distinction between *natural religion* and *revealed religion*. 'Natural religion' refers to a generalized Christianity while 'revealed religion', a purely sectarian concept added to 'natural religion' idea. He says that the aim of public schools was to prepare children for the public life of the nation through forming them in the wisdom of that so-called generalized Christianity (or natural religion). Moran points out that Jews in the USA rode on with this *common public schooling* while supplied *the particular Jewish education in homes and synagogues*. Roman Catholics on the other hand created their own educational system. This explains why catholic schools do not receive funds from the government.

In the 1960s, the US Supreme Court did away with the 'generic Christianity aspect' in public education. Moran says that even when US continued with its commitment on state schools which included the college studies in the years after the World Wars, the idea of education in schools was still child-oriented. However in the 40s and 50s, feminist movement has started to revolutionize the concept of education. In the 20th century, in fact, he saw the 'adult education movement' as a sign of reform in education. He however points out that there is still more to be done. In short, public education begins to mean adult education, that is, education for the whole community, not only for children. Moreover, adult education is life-long (continuous) and life-wide. However, in the present concept of adult education, he observes still a space to work on more: the incorporation of religious education in public adult education.

The *fourth part*, RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: POSSIBILITIES, is about the four characteristics of religious education in the future. Basing on the developments of the past century, Moran presents his realistic judgment as to the meaning and practice of religious education in the future. Religious education will be *international, interreligious, inter-institutional,* and *intergenerational.* Here he emphasizes not only the diversity but the interaction among the diverse elements.

In religious education being *international*, Moran refers to the international context of religious education despite of the fact that it is practiced locally. He cites that in other countries, there are diverse concepts or languages used to refer to the reality of religious education. In contrast with religious education as a subject taught in schools like in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, South Africa, Netherlands, Scandinavia and other places, Moran says that USA stands out as different in its concept of religious education: a peculiar configuration of religion and education. USA is clear that

authentic religious education cannot be achieved only in synagogues and churches.[11]

In religious education being *inter-religious*, it shall involve dialogue about religion itself. He alludes most especially to the fact of plurality of religions in the USA and in other places. He means *first of all* that the Christian forms of religious education need to be practiced within a greater religious diversity than as it generally exists in the United States, that 'our own religion is understood and practiced in a continuously closer relation to other religious peoples whose religions we have to respect and try to understand'. *Secondly*, interreligious religious education includes one's own religious commitment but as well as help transcend one's own religion or as he calls it 'offer the opportunity to understand religion as a step toward reforming its institutional aspects'.

He explains it better with the analogy of learning another language. He says:

> Being religious is similar to speaking a language. A person can speak a language without studying any of its rules. The best way to realm the rules of one's own language is to study another language. At the university where I teach, a professor of Islam told me that his classes were filled with Jewish students who wished to understand Judaism. Strange as it may seem, it makes sense; Judaism and Islam are structurally very similar as religions. If we already speak a language, then learning its rules can improve our speaking. But before one acquires the ability to speak a language, learning rules can actually interfere with speaking, as most adults find out when they try to learn to speak another language. Eventually these two processes should help each other: speaking a language and understanding language. Similarly, practicing a religious way of life and understanding religion (one's own in comparison to others) are distinct activities that can

---

[11] *Ibid.,* 148.

interfere with each other. Eventually, these two aims of religious education can reinforce each other.[12]

Religious education being *inter-institutional*, Moran emphasizes the cooperation between education institutions which for him are the family, churches and synagogues, and schools or universities. In Moran's mind, in an inter-institutional religious education, (1) the community or congregation teaches the individual to practice a way of life and (2) the schools teach the understanding of religion.[13]

For sure, the formation provided by the community or congregation in this case (which includes formation in the homes, the experience of leisure activities and practices of liturgy), involves a minimum of academic element. He cites as example the Catholic Church's catechetical activity. The problem he says is that the Church equates catechizing with the whole of religious education. He therefore speaks of 'a proper situating of catechetical instruction within the liturgy'. He says that this 'proper situating' is indispensable for the internal life of the Catholic Church and its relation to other institutions.[14] On the other hand, he writes that formation in schools does not only deal with academic matters; it includes 'a community formation with its own *liturgical* experience.'[15] He is open to the idea of an academic formation in schools not only for children but even for aged ones. He emphasizes clearly that the whole educational burden should not be laid on the schools' shoulders. He means that there should be apprenticeship courses (and the like) coordinated by the schools. He also cites the classroom instruction in religion as helpful for everyone, not only in terms of asking for economic support from public funds given by the

---

[12] *Ibid.,* 149.
[13] *Ibid.,* 150.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] *Ibid.,* 151.

US government. Moreover, he indicates the need for betterment in the public education system, in particular in its civic, artistic, and welfare aspects of the community life as well as religion concerns.[16]

For religious education being *inter-generational*, Moran seems to break from the traditional grouping in schools, that is, according to age. His description is short but solid:

> Interaction across generations is important for all education but preeminently for religious education. The first great moment of religious education is being born; the final one is dying. We start to learn a religious way of living at the moment of birth. As infants and small children, we learn from all generations before us. When we go to school, we should be able to learn to understand religion and very probably we will eventually learn to rebel against religion. We need academic teachers to help us understand religion. And as we rebel against religion, we need the example and testimony (probably at a distance) of an older population that remains faithful to religious practice. When young adults became parents, they find themselves in 'inter-generational dialogue', that is, talking with their children. What they often need is dialogue with their own parents. These older parents can be of special help with infants and teen-agers when society's superficial barriers are broken through.[17]

After G. Moran's description of religious education and his affirmation that 'religion does not fully describe the religious reality, that is, that aspects of human reality in which man relates with God, it is opportune to ask: *what really happens in that man-God relation which the word religion tries to describe?*

1.2. Religion, revelation and RE

In Both Sides: The Story of Revelation (2002), Moran presents a slightly *new* concept of revelation and argues how it can

---

[16] *Ibid.,* 152.
[17] *Ibid.,* 153.

solidly serve as foundation for the understanding of the *inclusive uniqueness* of each particular religion,[18] of religions' moral-ethical system, and of education. In the part where he deals with education, Moran discusses the reality of teaching-learning in Christian and Jewish religions.   It is noteworthy that he begins considering education as a metaphor for understanding the *divine-revelation-human response* relation and later, somewhere, he ends presenting teaching as participation to the divine pedagogy. *Both Sides: The Story of Revelation* (2002) is divided into two parts. Part I is composed of *Chapter 1 Is there a Problem?*, *Chapter 2 Bible and Revelation*, *Chapter 3 A Split World*, *Chapter 4 Revealed Religion* and *Chapter 5 Liberal and Conservative Religion Responsibility*.   Part II is composed of *Chapter 6 Responsibility and Revelation*, *Chapter 7 The Logic of Revelation*, and *Chapter 8 Revelation as Teaching-Learning*.

          Part I is an attempt to historically found Moran's proposal – an understanding of revelation as a present encounter of the revealing divine and its human recipient. He says that the Church tends to equate 'revelation' with a thing, to a doctrine, to a body of knowledge which can be possessed, protected and be transmitted. He claims that originally revelation, aside from its present revelatory notion, also possesses an apocalyptic connotation. Apocalyptic connotation means that revelation means also something which will be revealed in the future and therefore still unknown at present. He therefore presents this understanding of revelation: a present encounter between God and man. The fusion of *the apocalyptic aspect* and *the revelation aspect* of the term 'revelation' results to 'the present

---

[18] Note: *inclusive uniqueness* is a term coined by Moran applied the legitimate claim of any particular religion to be unique, but without leaving the impression that others are not. Moran's inclusive uniqueness seems to underline a simple idea: that all religions are legitimate ways to God. This idea of Moran certainly arouses the doubt of the place of Jesus Christ (the Way) in these 'ways' to God.

revelation'. In Part I, therefore Moran traces in history the dichotomy of those two aspects and the need to unite them back.

Part II is all about the practical embodiment of his proposed concept of 'revelation'. In the Chapter 6 (of Part II), he deals with responsibility as the ethical translation of revelation. In the Chapter 7, he deals with the so-called 'The logic of revelation''. In the Chapter 8, he takes on *teaching-learning as the model for the relation of divine revelation and human response.* In addition to this, in the last chapter dedicated to Moran's conclusion, he gives a very compact summary of his thought regarding *teaching-learning as metaphor of revelation.* The third chapter of Part II and the part of the Conclusion that speaks of teaching-learning interest our exposition.

Therefore, it is in *Chapter 8 Revelation as Teaching-Learning* that Moran's fundamental concept about the educational activity in Religions is revealed. He presents a sort of 'rich and full' understanding of teaching-learning as a metaphor useful for the understanding of the revelation he is proposing. The chapter is divided into the following subtitles: *To Teach* (about the meaning of the teaching act), *The Bible and Teaching, Three Christians and a Jewish Writers,* and *The Languages of Teaching.*

He says at the outset that his approach in the book is educational.[19] In this approach, education is intended as a lifelong process of maturing. This lifelong process of maturing involves a relation, that is, the teaching-learning relation, which Moran holds as reality which offers a fruitful metaphor for the understanding of revelation. He moves a step further: in order for education or lifelong process of maturity to serve as a metaphor for the relation of divine revelation and human receptivity, it must first be purified from

---

[19] MORAN, G., *Both Sides….,* cit., 6.

its 'professional captivity'[20] and be understood in its 'richness and fullness'.

Thus the first subtitle, *To Teach*, he says that nowadays the idea of education has been reduced to 'that which takes place in classrooms' or school teaching, when in fact, it has an ampler sense. That 'ampler sense' refers to what he calls 'showing how'. Therefore, for him, education is a daily human activity in which there is one 'teaching' or demonstrating another how to live and to die (death as formative in the way one lives life). In other articles of Moran, he refers to this reality as apprenticeship. In this concept of education, teaching and learning is 'a single activity seen from either end' in which teaching is showing how while learning is the response to being taught. Aside from emphasizing the close relation between teaching and learning, Moran underlines the importance of learning for teaching to be real teaching. In fact he says that in a relational world, the test of teaching is learning; if there is no learning, there is

---

[20] In the 'rescue operation' for the teaching from its professional captivity, Moran cites to Karl Barth and John Calvin. He says that Barth faults Calvin for having reduced the concept of teaching into school-teaching. However, Moran says that Barth does not provide any other imagery useful to imagine the relation of God to the universe.

Furthermore, Moran points out other 'imperfections' in the understanding of teaching within professional realm. One is the concept of teaching defined in opposition to rational adulthood, an understanding which he traces back to Kant's time. Teaching here is understood as something applied to beings with capacity for rational activity but must be told how to exercise it. Teaching here ceases as soon as the being thinks for him or herself begins.

Another professional imperfection in the concept of teaching is the one-time regime of psychology over educational language in the recent 20th century. Here he says teaching is always suspect. In this realm, an assumption very present in the concept of teaching prevalent even in out times is that 'teaching and learning have no real connection'. Here teaching is reduced to try to promote learning, or motivate learning, or not interrupt learning. All these professional imperfections hail from studies on the effectiveness of teaching in the classroom context. (cfr. MORAN, G., *Both Sides….*, cit., 188-190).

no teaching. Conversely, according to Moran, the test of learning is teaching; no teaching, no learning. In addition to that, he associates teaching-learning relation to 'that relation that exists between adults.'[21]

In the second subtitle, *The Bible and Teaching*, Moran affirms that the relation teaching-learning discussed beforehand offers a comprehensive metaphor for what Jews and Christians call revelation. Such as concept of relation does not, he claims, conflict with other traditional images used for divine-human relations. Moran considers *as traditional images of divine-human relations* in the Sacred Scriptures the following: the divine-human encounter in the covenant, the image of God as lover and humans the one loved, and God as Father and the people, His children. In addition to that, Moran says that the metaphor teacher-learner and the activity teaching-learning can not only embrace those biblical images but also includes what he calls 'the movement of learning'.[22] He refers to the fact that the human recipient in these images manifest that liberty of questioning, doubting, contradicting, for the sake of understanding better. The recipients, in other words, are presented not as passive spectators in the teaching-learning relation. He concludes saying:

> Teaching-learning is not simply providing and acquiring knowledge as a step prior to acting. Teaching is showing someone how to live and how to die. Learning is a response to being shown how. Most profoundly, that means responding to how we live and die with understanding, gratitude and acceptance. If teaching-learning is understood in this way, then the revelation and redemption are not entirely discrete processes. Such understanding of revelation and revelation is crucial for how

---

[21] *Ibid.*, 188-192.
[22] *Ibid., 194*.

Christian ministers see their role and for the entire pattern of
Christian church life.[23]

The third subtitle, *Three Christians and one Jewish Writers*,
presents Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas,
and Martin Buber and their relevance to education.   He points out
the following ideas in Clement of Alexandria:[24] (1) Clement of
Alexandria represents the Greek fathers adoption of the classic
paideia and its rich cultural connotation, that is, the incorporation of
the study of Greek classical literature as part of 'Christian education'.
(2) He adopts Plato's concept of God as teacher and considers
Christianity as 'the learning' part or the 'receiving' activity of the
divine teaching. (3) He also emphasizes the chronological priority of
the practical aspect of education (the improvement of the soul) to the
theoretical aspect (knowledge).

In St. Augustine, Moran points out the following ideas:[25] (1)
St. Augustine attributes 'teacher' only to God and excludes of its
attribution to human beings for two reasons: that men may be proud
and in order to point out to that greater reality that transcends mere
teaching, that is, the God's teaching act. (2) St. Augustine emphasizes
also the part of the learner: he is not mere passive recipient.
Learning takes place within the soul of the receiver of the teachings.

Moran lauds St. Thomas Aquinas for two things among
others:[26] (1) St. Thomas Aquinas affirms that human beings can be
called teachers for their participation in the teaching act of the
Divine. (2) He likewise talks of a 'mystical side' of teaching wherein
the teacher always hast to renounce the fruits of his teaching activity.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, 194-195.
[24] *Ibid.*, 195-196.
[25] *Ibid.*, 196-198.
[26] *Ibid.*, 198-200.

At last, for Martin Buber, Moran has the following points:[27] (1) Buber says that the Torah is the clearest expression of divine instruction, but specific laws cannot be identified with revelation. (2) Revelation is the teaching of God who is present and the learning of the community comes into existence by responding. Moran underlines Buber's emphasis on the importance of the human learner in the coming into being of revelation. Buber says that the human response is not mainly in the form of knowledge or belief, but engagement of the whole person, belief expressed in action. (4) Buber affirms that the divine teaching uses the whole creation in its teaching activity.

In the fourth subtitle, *The Languages of Teaching*, Moran identifies three families of languages of teaching, namely the rhetorical language, the therapeutic language, and the dialogical language. Rhetorical family includes storytelling, lecturing and preaching. Examples of therapeutic languages are *thank/welcome*, *confess/forgive*, and *mourn/comfort* speeches. For dialogical language, he names the dramatic performance, the dialectical discussion, and the academic criticism. Every educational setting has a proper teaching language and must not be interchange.

Finally, in the conclusion of *Both Sides* (2002), Moran gives a compact gist of the whole book. *If in the beginning education was considered as a context helpful to understand revelation, it ends up a participation in the divine teaching.* Here are Moran's words:

> The key to Christianity's formation of its own members, to dialogue with other religions, and to criticism of secular society is education, including but not restricted to academic instruction. In both Christianity and Judaism, education is often equated with trying to instill answers into children's minds. If revelation is assumed to be a written data from the past, then only a few people

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 200-202.

can and will be trained to read the revealed truth. The rest of the people are told what to think. But if revelation/word of God is understood as a teaching-learning relation, then human teaching is a participation in divine teaching and a person learns by responding to all of God's creatures.[28]

Further ahead, he points out 'the professionalization of multifaceted education as a logical consequence of considering teaching-learning a metaphor of faith-revelation.[29]   Without downplaying Moran's positive deductions from his idea of education as participation in God's action, we must say that the role of the Holy Spirit in education, an idea very common to the Catholic thought, is absent in his (Moran's) educational framework.

2. RE within the Church: an interplay of ministries

2.1. The church, curriculum of religious education

After BOTH SIDES (2002), the second book by Moran in this decade was published in 2007, FASHIONING A PEOPLE TODAY: THE EDUCATIONAL INSIGHTS OF MARIA HARRIS (2007). Moran describes this book as a 'conversation with Maria Harris. Harris presented her personal reflection on Church education in her book *Fashion Me A People* (1989). Harris' educational insights consists in the following: (1) the church is a people; it becomes true to its identity as a people principally through education; (2) education is a continuous cycle of fashioning and refashioning the Church-people; (3) the fashioning process consists of interplaying the existing elements which she calls

---

[28] *Ibid.*, 224.

[29] In fact somewhere Moran says: "If revelation is the present relation between a God who speaks and a human who responds with all of his or her being, then a multifaceted education of each person is called for: a formation of good habits, an appreciation of art and science, a training for one's work and for political engagement, an assistance in personal and communal prayer" (*Ibid.*, 224-225).

'curricular forms' or ministries (*koinonia, leiturgia, diakonia, kerygma* and *didache*). In *Fashioning a People Today*, Moran follows the structure of Harris' book, starts every chapter and subtopics with a quotation from Harris' book, and adds an Introduction and an Epilogue which narrate the life and last agonies of Maria Harris.

The *first* and *second chapters* are all about the nature of the Church and its educational ministry, respectively. The *third* up to the *seventh chapters* are about the Church's educational ministries through which, as theorized by Harris, the Church fashions her members. The fashioning of the members concretely takes place through the constant process of change of these education forms and through their interplay with each other. From this perspective, while the Church fashions her members, the church herself is re-fashioned in the process.

On the first chapter, titled *The Church: a people*, Moran maintains Harris' idea of a the church as a people and comments that Harris' choice of 'a people', instead of 'a people of God', as a definition to church avoids the arrogant image that the second may produce to other religions and thus be a hindrance to dialogue. He envisions a church-people whose people-hood is expressed locally and, with such local expression, is able to discover its connectedness to the global church. He envisions a church-people with varied undifferentiated ministries in which each one may assume for the service of the whole. He envisions a church-people whose concern for the present maintains its memory of its past and its worry for the future. Furthermore, Moran envisions a church-people in which

everybody may teach, and speaks a language understandable and indiscriminating to those who do not belong to it.[30]

On the second chapter, titled *Educational Mission and Curriculum*, Moran simply underlines the importance of the interplay of the educational forms that indeed in education may take place. He observes that the educational framework that Maria Harris uses fits to the Catholic Church's catechetical ministry. He even notes that the *GDC* and the *NDC* were published after Maria Harris' *Fashion Me a People* and that 'the two mentioned Church documents have a

---

[30] Moran comments on the *three* tension-based pairs with which Harris says that the Church is understood today, namely, the tension of local and global dimensions of the church, the clerical and lay divisions in the church, and the priestly and prophetic functions in the church. According to him, these tensions always threaten a complete division in the church, or will lead to its complete ruin, if not handled well.

In the first tension, Moran vies for a church which is locally expressed. One of the true result of a locally expressed church is its awareness of being connected with other churches. Here, however, Moran mistakenly attributes to Catholics the idea that the parish is the local church.

In the second tension, Moran points out that a church divided as clergy and lay is no longer applicable to the present times. He points out an attempt which may be a solution, that is, the idea of ministry. His idea however is a ministry which is undifferentiated or common to all and may be given through ordination or by any other form of delegation.

In the third tension, he simply affirms that there is no conflict between the prophetic and the priestly functions. The first deals with the future of the church and the second, with the past or tradition. These two functions may be reconciled by the church's concern for the present or what he designates as the political dimension. Through the above descriptions, Moran ably gives an idea of the present condition of the church that needs to be re-fashioned through education.

In the chapter's end, Moran comments on the need for the Church to be educated in affirming itself as a people of God in a manner that avoids needless offense and invites cooperation with the non-Church (or non-people of God) (cfr. MORAN, G., *Fashioning a People Today*, cit., 13-32).

strong resonance with the five classical forms of church life and their interrelationships.'[31]

Moran does three things in this chapter: *first*, he draws out two cautionary lessons from the history of education and religious education; *second*, he reflects on Harris' idea of form and educational curriculum of distinct but related forms, and; *third*, he explore the teaching possibilities of a people or a church in the educational framework mentioned beforehand (the intermingling of forms).

First, there are two cautionary lessons from the history of education and religious education. The *first cautionary lesson*, taken from the history of religious education is that educational language in the church has to be based in language that is familiar and particular to the group. He posits that, at least in the religious educational world in the USA, the current usage and choice of the terms 'catechesis' (Catholics) and 'Christian education' (Protestants) are exclusive of each other.[32] The *second cautionary lesson*, from modern secular education and the religious education movement, is that the adult and lifelong learning have been advocated for a long time already and that therefore   what must be done now is point out its hopeful signs but with an awareness of 'some historical perspective on the difficulty of changing educational patterns'.[33]

Here Moran comments both *GDC* and *NDC*'s consideration of adult catechesis as the organizing principle of all other catecheses. He compares it to what happened to the adult education movement in the history of secular education which ended up standing in the

---

[31] Cfr. *ibid.,* 34.

[32] *Ibid.,* 38.

[33] *Ibid.,* 38-39.

opposed position with children education.[34]   He likewise points in question the idea of adulthood that adult catechesis has.

Second, Moran comments Harris' idea of education as an interplay of family, job, schooling and leisure (the life or educational *forms*).   Moran restates them as familial relations, academic instruction, job performance, and leisure activities.[35]   Education consists of the endless reshaping of the present form that resulted from the previous reshaping process.   Therefore in Church education, the church is an educator in itself and a locus of the interplay of 'church' educational forms or ministries. The church is an educator, he comments, by being an interplay of forms to reshape itself and the world about it.[36]   It is likewise the location of the continuous interaction of the different church educating ministries. Now it is clear that the church is fashioner and the fashioned.

Third, he inserts that which he claims to be a religious idea of teaching (in contrast to that of a secular idea) as from birth to death. The secular limited idea of teaching that he describes is its idea of non-relation between the teacher and the pupil and its narrow connotation of teaching as merely classroom instruction.[37]   He underlines that every occasion and every individual involved in the teaching-learning process may teach. He points out the use of the term 'magisterium' in the Catholic Church as obscurantist in the

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 36.

[35] *Ibid.*, 43. The same author says that each of the four embodies partially universal values of community, work, knowledge, and wisdom. Familial relations express community; academic instruction literary knowledge; job, a form of work; and leisure activity, wisdom. He says that in some stages of life, one of the four forms may become the most urgent while the others stay at the sides (but not disappear) (cfr. *ibid.*, 43-46).

[36] *Ibid.*, 41.

[37] *Ibid.*, 46-49.

discussion of teaching.[38] He says that its current use has the effect of trying to eliminate the other forms of teaching in the church.[39] Moreover, he underlines again his idea of teaching as not merely a talking affair and that it must include silences, and therefore the other nonverbal forms of teaching.[40]

2.2. The education 'forms' of the church

On the third chapter of *Fashioning a People Today* (2007), titled *Forms of Community*, Moran deals with the first educational form or ministry: the community. He departs from Harris' idea that the church is the fashioner and the fashioned.[41] Moran cites *GDC*'s insights about the ecclesial community as being the agent as well as the content of catechesis.

Moran says that community, like the other educational ministries, is an ultimate value.[42] For him, community is foremost a desire dwelling in the human heart of every individual. He theorizes that such individual desire may in principle be satisfied and supported by a community experience provided by the varied community forms.[43] As community living is hallmarked by mutuality, the realization of this natural 'community' desire is impeded by 'each person's self-dividedness (interfering then his or her own

---

[38] *Ibid.*, 50.

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] *Ibid.*, 51-53.

[41] *Ibid.*, 54.

[42] For Moran, educational ministries as ultimate values imply the development 'through education of the forms of education (community or church, work or liturgy, knowledge or doctrine, and wisdom or service) until they fully embody those values they respectively signify. Community ministry, as an educational value, concerns the achievement of the community value.

[43] *Ibid.*, 55-56.

wholehearted self-giving), and the spatial and temporal conditions of human life that makes mutual exchange impossible'.[44]

Moran therefore examines the community stereotypes present in society, including the church. He focuses on presenting the kind of community-experience these community forms may provide to every individual. He lauds the family for being the most important community educating form for that seeks to satisfy that natural 'community desire' of every individual. He however points out some novel ideas about family like the inclusion of the idea of 'childing' process, that is, that children can 'teach' their parents (instead of just parenting process). For him, the direction of the educational reform of the family towards making it a genuine form of community should be towards the union of all the members while affirming the individuality of each person.[45] He however comments that the idea of a parish community as composed of families may result as a 'no vacant' sign for individuals looking for a community.[46]

Despite of the importance of the family as a communal form, Moran bestows to the Church a responsibility and a task: *the responsibility of being a reminder that the family is not the only communal form* and *the task of attending to the family to grow or develop outwards*.[47] Thus he says that a local church does not have to go completely on its own; instead 'be a part of a network of national or international renewal'.[48] He vies for the idea of multiplicity of communal forms (or even of the permanence of the multiplicity of varied communal forms) at the

---

[44] *Ibid.*, 56-57.
[45] Cfr. *ibid.*, 62.
[46] Cfr. *ibid.*, 62-63.
[47] Cfr. *ibid.*, 63.
[48] Cfr. *ibid.*, 64.

service of the satisfying the natural 'community' longing of every individual.[49]

He moves to another idea of the church as a haven for various communal forms at the service of individuals, most especially in terms of 'those who seek advice when they need it and find forgiveness when they fail' in sexual moral issues. [50] As he abhors the idea of the church emphasizing decisions and will control of young people, he suggests that the church 'provide realistic religious community forms within which the sexual is acknowledged, including provision of rituals for engagement and courtship.[51]

Moran further suggests that the church as a community should, like the rest of communities and above them, be a paragon of 'dialogue within', that is, each individual member has the freedom to choose. Such a freedom consists of a subjective, intelligent and lifetime evaluation on the part of individual of the church's teachings and his or her own belief. Thus he suggests of programs for 'ex-members' of the church-community. Lastly, he underlines the experience of community that the church may provide to all – classified by gender orientation and by generation.[52]

On the fourth chapter, *Liturgy and Work*, Moran deals with the second church educational ministry: liturgy, the church-community's public prayer. Moran elaborates his insights about the mentioned topics by discussion the nature of art, work and teaching.[53] He departs from the basic idea of Harris of liturgy as central to the Christian's relation to God.

---

[49] *Ibid.*
[50] Cfr. *ibid.*, 65.
[51] Cfr. *ibid.*, 66.
[52] Cfr. *ibid.*, 68-71.
[53] Cfr. *ibid.*, 73.

In his reflection on the nature of art, Moran comments on the liturgical updating specifically on the aspects of music and liturgical actions. He underlines the importance music in liturgy as more than reviving the Gregorian chant and adopting to popular music. He points out a degree of 'professionalism' in the employing of music in liturgy as well as the preparedness of ministers. In the aspect of liturgical actions, he underlines the aspects of sacraments as signs, the idea of *ex opera operato*, and the public dimension of liturgy. He says that the liturgy, as the public expression of the church's life, affirms an artistic and stylized way the fundamental gestures of human life.[54] He says that all bodily actions, whether public or private, can be *sacramental*.[55] He thus examines the actions of eating and dancing. For him, these bodily actions, once ritualized and therefore surrounded with rubrics, humanize. For instance, he says that the Eucharist is a sacrament, the sacralizing of one of life's basic and frequent actions: eating. He likewise relates the liturgy with dancing. He says it is 'an elaborately choreographed dance of the community with God and before God'.[56] Dancing, for him, is related to the reality of sexual activity. These actions are pleasurable in themselves and can be dangerous if done excessively. Surrounding it with rubrics therefore make sense.[57] His point is that art likewise teaches in a non-verbal way.

---

[54] Cfr. *ibid.*, 77.

[55] Moran's use here of 'sacramental' certainly alludes to the idea of sacrament, that is, a sacred sign effecting grace. Therefore, by *sacramental*, Moran underlines the 'being a symbol' dimension, and makes no hint concerning the 'effective' dimension of sacraments. Having in mind this perspective, Moran's treatment above of the Holy Eucharist as merely 'making sacred' the common human activity of eating, and nothing more than that, is understandable.

[56] Cfr. *ibid.*, 80.

[57] Cfr. *ibid.*, 75-82.

In his reflection on teaching, he vies for an ampler meaning which accompanies art. He points out two 'teaching' dimensions the liturgy. As a whole, it 'teaches' in a non-verbal manner. In the sermon, liturgy does teaching in an 'instructional way'. He writes that *GDC* affirms this idea when it claimed that the liturgy must be regarded as an eminent kind of catechesis (*GDC* 71).[58] In addition to that, Moran considers the Christian liturgy as a prayer (directed to God) which allows the interior of an individual to be expressed publicly.

In his reflection on work and liturgy, Moran underlines two points: (1) liturgy as a peculiar work worth doing with pleasure, and; (2) the importance of private interior prayer in the larger of context of liturgical public prayer. For the first point, Moran comments of the *ex opere operato* principle in sacraments. Here he equates the total dependence of the sacrament's effect on God to the denial of the 'middleman' role of the priests.[59] For the second point, he says that as leisure stabilizes the oppressing burden and mechanical-ness of work, the Sabbath and other rest days have the same function to the public prayer of the Church.[60]

On the fifth chapter, *Proclamation and Witness*, Moran comments of the kerygma or the first proclamation of the paschal mystery. While he says that the whole chapter is all about the verbal dimension of teaching in the church, he begins affirming that kerygma is best done though the lives of Christians,[61] thus the association of proclamation with witness. He comments on the three verbal languages of teaching – storytelling, preaching and

---

[58] Cfr. *ibid.*, 82-83.
[59] Cfr. *ibid.*, 87.
[60] Cfr. *ibid.*, 88-91.
[61] Cfr. *ibid.*, 93-94.

lecturing.[62] He emphasizes the end in view and the context in which one language of teaching may be fittingly used.

On the sixth chapter, *Teaching and Doctrine*, Moran starts his discussion with Harris' didache. He says that didache refers to the doctrinal and moral teachings given to Christians immediately after the reception of the kerygma. He is clear that these teachings are contained in the scriptural canons and subsequent writings. Moran therefore focuses his discussion in this chapter on the following: (1) on the nature of the process for establishing what is acceptable, and what is not, in Christian life; (2) the dialogue between the Christian teaching with other religions, which for him, is not foreseen by the New Testament; and (3) the formation of Christians to live in today's world.[63]

For Moran, the 'teachings' are contained in what we now consider as Scripture and Tradition. On the nature of the teachings, Moran underlines the fact that sacred writings, referred to the Scripture and other 'uninspired' writings, are but testimonies to the words and actions of Jesus.[64] Tradition on its part is formed from the commentaries of those testimonies (and other previous commentaries); it serves as interpretative context of the sacred writings.   Moran is correct when he says that they should not be identified with God's revelation. He vies more for the idea that revelation is a continuous dialogue initiated by God to his people and which involves response on both ends. In this framework, Jesus, as

---

[62] Cfr. *ibid.*, 95-109.

[63] Cfr. *ibid.*, 110-111.

[64] Moran distinguishes between 'testimonies' and God's words itself. Commenting on the early church teachers, he says that they had some flexibility because they did not mistake their words for God's and that that had to engage in discussion and debate to decide which teachings give authentic witness to the revelation of Christ (cfr. *ibid.*, 113).

Moran writes, is the culmination of the divine-human encounter and, thereupon, becomes the interpretative key to the continuing dialogue.[65]

Concerning the dialogue with other religion, Moran departs from the need of today for Christians for a continuous formation. Moran describes such a formation or nurture as 'generated by a community and intellectual conviction stimulated by knowledgeable and skilled teachers'.[66] He adds that such religious education must be both a 'formation in the practices of their own religion and an understanding of religion. he says that the first is learned in the community while the second may be carried out in catechetical and theological instructions. Moran however warns that nowadays we are faced by a new understanding of religion.

Regarding the moral dimension of the teachings, Moran comments the Church's moral guidance in general and on the Church's teaching on birth control and euthanasia in particular. Moran affirms that the moral instruction has always been present in the Church. He says that they were meant 'to channel life's forces in the direction of love of God and love of neighbor'. He likewise points out the need for rituals 'that control the small things in life so that the big things will take care of themselves'. He says that Christian morals should have a sacramental character: the spiritual expressed through the body. Regarding birth control and euthanasia, he affirms the Church's presence and position in the conversation concerning the defense and nurture of human life and in its opposition to whatever is opposed to the exercise of human powers

---

[65] Cfr. *ibid.*, 110-115.
[66] Cfr. *ibid.*, 121-125.

and those artificial means destructive of the human body and human dignity.[67]

On the seventh chapter, *Compassion and Service*, Moran exposes his ideas regarding the fifth educational church ministry: diakonia. He departs from Harris' idea that diakonia is the spirit of all the church's ministries; without it, 'the church's claim to be the people of God would ring hollow'.[68] Moran's discussion underlines service as the power of the Church found in serving the poor in the neighborhood concretely (local level) and in its participation in the search for world peace (global level).

Against the common understanding of power as force or advantage, he baptizes service with the phrase 'the paradox of power'[69]. At the local level, Moran directs against the common prejudice of service as servitude and against the accusation against the church of glorifying suffering. He clarifies that service is directed to the efforts of relieving suffering and poverty by sharing and standing with those who suffer and the poor.[70] He underlines that Christian service does not embarrass or humiliate those who are at the receiving end.[71] In the global level, he praises the Church's record in serving world peace. While he criticizes the current understanding of power as synonymous with force and force with war, he indicates that the church may contribute to the search for world peace by giving witness to a just peace by being a peace-loving community and engage into a dialogue with the secular world speaking of today's

---

[67] Cfr. *ibid.*, 115-121.
[68] Cfr. *ibid.*, 128-129.
[69] Cfr. *ibid.*, 134-135.
[70] Cfr. *ibid.*, 130-135.
[71] Cfr. *ibid.*, 135-139.

language of today's ethics, politics, international relations inspired by the teaching of Jesus and the witness of Christian saints.[72]

2.3. Christian life, faith and revelation, and religious education

In BELIEVING IN A REVEALING GOD. THE BASICS OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE (2009), Moran retake the theme 'revelation', but this time, in the catholic ambit. In the conclusion of *Both Sides*, Moran writes about *a multifaceted education* which is as an inevitable consequence of considering seriously teaching-learning *not only as metaphor of divine-revelation* but also, or most especially, *as participation in the divine teaching*.[73] In *Believing in a Revealing God* (²2010), Moran describes in detail that multifaceted education in Roman Catholic Church and in other Christian ecclesial communities if they were to adapt his understanding of 'believing in a revealing God'.

The book is divided into *seven* chapters. Moran himself says in his introduction that Chapters 1 and 2 (*'Believing in …'*, and *'… a Revealing God'*) 'set out the fundamental ideas of faith and revelation so that their relation constitutes the basis of Christian life.' Chapter 1 examines the various meanings faith receives in both secular and religious contexts. Chapter 2 puts into question the Christian usage of the term 'revelation'. Chapter 3 (*Authority in a Believing Church*) probes 'authority' in the Church. Moran suggests that a pattern of church authority has 'to be made intelligible to members, drawing on the richness of tradition while open to the best of modern political reforms'. Chapter 4 (*A Responsible Church*) criticizes today's Christian life and the way (Christian) traditions dialogue with today's complex moral concerns. Chapter 5 (*Christian Interpretation of Divine Revelation*) places the Christian understanding of faith and revelation in the

---

[72] Cfr. *ibid.*, 139-147.
[73] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Both Sides….*, cit., 224.

context of dialogue of religions. Moran claims that Muslim and Jewish religions, like the Christian religion, also give a prominent place to both faith and revelation. It is therefore now up to Christians, Moran says, whether to condemn these religions as false or else to enter into serious dialogue with them. Chapter 6 (*Aesthetic understanding in a Revealing God*) develops the theme that particular religious practices can embody a nearly universal meaning, Moran writes. He explains that the logic of religion is similar to the logic of the arts: that is, particular people, events and symbols can be revelatory of profound truths. He speaks of a profound understanding of time, body and power on the part of Christian liturgy in its practice of joining prayers and rituals together.

Up to here it can be said that Moran proposes 'believing in a revealing God' as a dialogue between the revealing divine and the indispensable responding human recipient. He thus proposes the rethinking of revelation not as a body of revealed truths but God acting on the universe. From that, faith is not a response to a thing, but an act directed to another person. Thus, believing in a revealing God is a dialogue between the divine and the human.

After he examines surrounding concepts in the Church which he deems needy of rethinking if the Church has to be consistent with 'believing in a revealing God' (that is, chapters 3 to 6), he encapsulates all the previous ideas in Chapter VII *Revealing-Believing as Teaching-Learning*. The relation revealing and believing, he seems to indicate, can be best understood by 'education'. He clarifies however that by education, he means not the course studied in schools but as 'the lifelong journey of response to a divine teacher.' He continues that 'believing in a revealing God' may be interpreted as 'a form of teaching-learning that begins at birth and continues until death'. According to him, in a sacramental universe, everyone and everything can share in divine teaching. Thinking of the Church's relation to the

world today, he says that she needs 'people thoroughly versed in Christian teachings who can relate those teachings to contemporary situations'.[74]

The chapter is divided into four subtitles, namely: *Metaphors for a Divine Revealer*, *Augustine versus Aquinas*, *The Modern Flight from Teaching*, and *Teaching-Learning in a Sacramental Universe*. As he indicated earlier, the chapter tries to present ideas concerning the dialogical relation existing in 'believing in a revealing God'. Moran's choice once again of education (teaching-learning relation) as expressive of divine revelation-human faith relation may be revelatory of his ideas regarding religious education in the Catholic Church; however, it is in fourth subtitle, *Teaching-Learning in a Sacramental Universe*, that he deals directly with subject matter of our interest.

Therefore, in this seventh chapter, Moran starts with an indication of the advantage and disadvantage of Christians' claim of 'having a writing that was inspired by God and is chief source for reflection on the relation between divine and human.'[75] Having the New Testament which 'testimonies the life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, who is called the Christ', Christians, he says, have a definite image in mind when they refer to God.

However, Moran says that such anchoring of imagery and language in the portrait of Jesus, something which has something to do with imagination, 'can too quickly shut down when the mystery of God has barely begun to be explored'. That 'mystery ' refers to the fact that today, as Jesus also confirmed before, God is revealed in the Spirit-filled Christ, and therefore the revelation of God 'cannot be

---

[74] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God…*, cit., 14.
[75] Cfr. *ibid.*, 151.

confined to what Jesus said in his lifetime.[76]   We cannot but ask however: was Jesus God? Was Jesus filled by the Holy Spirit only after his resurrection?

2.3.1. Metaphors for a divine revealer

In the first subtitle, *Metaphors for a Divine Revealer*, Moran shows how Christianity has adopted and personalized the different metaphors for a Divine Revealer which existed in the history of religions, especially those found in Jewish and Greek traditions: that of king, warrior and father, to name a few. He points out Christianity's great irony of having an image of a divine teacher which supposed to induce a dialogic element into the relation between divine and human, but in either its educational practice and structure, the Christian church have not generally shown a dialogical relation.[77] He comments that the Catholic Church is divided into the church teaching (a small minority speaking) and the church taught (everyone listening). He says that such a situation is contrary to education where 'the youngest child has some experience from which to draw questions and indicate interests'.[78]

Moreover, he makes a distinction between Jesus as teacher and Christ as teacher. As Christians turn to the New Testament portrait of Jesus to discover what God looks like, he says that the most prominent picture of Jesus as rabbi is inescapable. However, he says that such an image was changed after Jesus' resurrection. The picture of Jesus as first century rabbi suggestive of God's image

---

[76] *Ibid.*, 151.

[77] *Ibid.*, 153.

[78] *Ibid.* This division of the church as 'church teaching-church taught' is overcome by Vatican II. According to Vatican II's teaching, all the members of the Church teaches, though in different ways.

was superseded by Christ as contemporary teacher through the work of the Holy Spirit.[79]

2.3.2. Participation in God's teaching act

In the second subtitle, *Augustine versus Aquinas*, Moran simply emphasizes the difference between the two great Christian thinkers regarding their doctrines on teaching. On one hand, he attributes to St. Augustine the attribution of God as Teacher; however he laments the bishop's restriction of teaching as proper only to God. On the other hand, he underlines an intuition which he deduces from St. Thomas Aquinas' doctrine which goes this way: as creatures participate in the Divine Being and the divine function of teaching cannot be separated with God's being, therefore, creatures can also teach (and therefore be teachers).[80] He concludes saying:

> Thomas Aquinas, in contrast to Augustine, posits a modest but realistic place for human teachers. Teaching is a humble activity, central to humans and extending at least to all living beings. The human teacher remains dependent on the natural powers of the learner and the environment; the teacher can only perform certain movement, none of which is guaranteed to bring about learning in the student. Teaching-learning is a single activity, but there is always a gap between teacher's intention to teach and the teaching-learning activity.[81]

---

[79] Moran attributes this transformation to Christian's enmity with Jews. Christians insisted that what is passed down the centuries in Christianity is not a body of teachings of the Teacher but his person. All the same, the focus is with the person of the teacher, before a Jewish rabbi teaching and now still present teaching through the Holy Spirit (cfr. *ibid.*, 156). As a sort of a comment, we hold that the transmission of the faith's focus on the person of Jesus does not exclude the 'truths of faith' (fides quae).

[80] Cfr. *ibid.*, 157-160.

[81] *Ibid.*, 160.

2.3.3. Emancipation of 'teaching'

In the third subtitle, *The Modern Flight from Teaching*, Moran summarizes the Modern thinking about teaching with the statement: humans do not teach. He saw an indifference towards teaching and education in the language of the Enlightenment. USA, being a child of Enlightenment, adapted this stance for a period of time. The Modern flight of teaching basically founded on the notion that humans do not teach is manifested in the USA's restriction of teaching to schools (education is what happens in schools) and reducing the school age into infants and adolescents (schools as for persons who are still incapable of thinking for themselves). He saw a ray of hope on the 19th century movement for universal schooling of the young and the adult education movement. He ends with a lament that the modern flight of teaching has also crept into the Church mentality. He says:

> A myth of adult education which has sometimes infiltrated into church circles, is that education has been concerned with children, not enough with adults. Actually, the worst part of modern educational theory since nineteenth century has been its exclusion of children in their most formative years. The primary education is not in primary schools but in the 'preschool' years.[82]

2.3.4. The sacramental universe: backdrop of the church's engagement to education

Finally in the fourth subtitle, *Teaching-Learning in a Sacramental Universe*, Moran does not mention the term 'religious education' but of 'the educational activity of the Catholic Church' and of 'catechesis'.

Firstly, he describes that 'sacramental universe' in which the Church's educational activity takes place. The so-called sacramental

---

[82] *Ibid.*, 162.

universe serves as the raison d'être of the Church's engagement into educational activity. He says that the starting principle for church involving in education is that the revealing God teaches through everyone and everything. This means for him that every creature participates in the process of teaching-learning.[83]

Secondly, after describing the sacramental universe, the space in which education takes place, Moran comments on the en vogue 'lifelong education' which obviously is patent in Catholic Church. He says that the Catholic sacramental system from baptism to the last anointing was lifelong education long before that phrase had to be invented as a protest (in the creation of an educational system focused on children). Therefore, from the idea of a sacramental universe in which teaching is participation, or a sacrament, of the divine teaching (or dealing with the created world), Moran widens the concept of the current idea of lifelong education adding another idea, the so-called 'life-wide education'. Therefore, for education to be really sacramental (or symbolic and at the same time effecting the divine revelation and human response reality), it has to be lifelong and life-wide.[84]

Thirdly, Moran says that the concept of lifelong and life-wide education is best encapsulated in a term with a long Christian history: formation. According to Moran, that term suggests that all forms of

---

[83] Moran's idea of 'sacramental universe' may be acceptable, but with the necessary distinction of modes (of being sacramental). An acacia tree cannot be 'sacramental' of God in the same way that a Church does. If Christianity assumes 'revelations' of God in nature, in the wisdom of theologians, etc., it is still necessary to distinguish all those 'revelations' from the Revelation (SLF uses the term *public revelation*), properly speaking, which is fully fulfilled in Christ.

[84] If *lifelong education* refers to the extension of the teaching-learning reality to all ages (from toddlers to aged), *life-wide education* refers to the extension of education to diverse realities of life that 'teaches' or 'educates', such as the family, orientations for workers, etc. (*Ibid.*, 163-164).

life (family, work, school, leisure activity) are teachers. He adds then
that teachers would best look at how to improve these forms if they
are really to teach.[85] However, formation is distinguished into simply
formation and doctrinal/academic teaching (information). Moran
describes them in a context of a fruitful tension. While formation is
'a bracketing of academic matters' or the cementing of foundations,
academic instruction deals more with the opening to new horizons
and risks, or with challenging those foundations received in
formation.[86]

   Fourthly, Moran launches at commenting the formation of
Christians. He once again reminds that the teacher in the community
is literally everyone and everything.   In concrete he says that the
Roman Catholic Church shares with most institutions 'an overly
restricted imagination' for its understanding of teaching.[87] Thus he
criticizes the concept of 'magisterium' as 'a term which constantly
obscures a discussion of teaching-learning in the Catholic Church'.[88]

---

[85] *Ibid.*, 164.

[86] Moran notes that an academic instruction which does not bring with it
risk of challenging the foundations in which one is formed, ends in indoctrination,
that is, the use of coercive methods to put particular doctrines in people's heads.
Christian educational activity is simply contrary to indoctrination. In real
community formation, they speak of 'love bombing' in complete contrast to
indoctrination. (cfr. *ibid.*, 165-166). Moran here mentions of the inclusion (in
academic instruction) of *the risk of challenging the foundations of Christianity*.
Somewhere he admits that this may lead to doubts. But he affirms that at the same
time, this also leads to facing and resolving doubts. In any case, Moran does not
include the destruction of the foundations (faith, sacraments and moral
foundations) in this idea of 'risk of challenging the foundations.

[87] *Ibid.*

[88] Moran's objection can be summarized thus: aside from the recent coinage
of the idea in Middle Ages referring to the academic office of theologians and
pastoral teachings of bishops and a later abstraction of that idea in the 19th century
translated into the term 'magisterium', it reduces the 'being a Catholic' of the
majority into a mere passive acceptance of what is taught by those minority who
have the power to teach. In another instance, Moran, insisting education as

He recognizes the incomparable worth its doctrines formed throughout its experience, but laments on the neglect it does to the similarly rich teachings in liturgy, family life, artistic works, leisurely play, and political protest due to its emphasis on the first.[89]

Fifthly, while he criticizes the official teaching office of the Church (magisterium), Moran gives a good eye to liturgy as the correct *locus* of lifelong and life-wide education of the community. To emphasize this point, he goes on to say that 'the teaching of a bishop is not an enforcer of orthodox beliefs'; instead, yes, as 'enforcer of liturgical life in the diocese'.[90] He even cites *General Directory for Catechesis*' affirmation of 'the liturgy as an eminent kind of catechesis' (GDC 71). As he puts it, if 'catechesis' belongs anywhere, it belongs with liturgy.

He warns however about catechesis' 'intramural sense' and therefore that its users must bear in mind that outside Catholic Church it (the term 'catechesis') is unintelligible. This leads him to one conclusion: catechesis should be talked about in its proper setting, that is, inside the Catholic Church, in liturgy in particular.

Thus he laments on catechesis' 'swallowing' of the whole of church's education. According to him this 'undermines the full range of education and does no service to the liturgical place of catechesis'.[91] In other words, Moran intends to say that catechesis is

---

showing how – in contrast with the idea of education of telling people what to think – indicates explicitly how the concept of magisterium then is 'an obstacle to thinking about teaching in the Catholic church' (cfr. *ibid.*, 165-167). We simply note however that Vatican II, on the contrary, clearly conceives the official teaching office of the Church as a service.

[89] *Ibid.*, 166.

[90] *Ibid.*, 167.

[91] Cfr. *ibid.*, 168.

one of the forms of effective teaching in Catholic Church but it should not take on 'the whole task of church education'.

Moran further sets catechesis, together with liturgy, in the 'inner language of formation', or of the formation aspect of education in the Church. He cites therefore with delight the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults as 'may be' the most successful educational innovation the study of liturgy has ever produced. The *RCIA* as an educational formation, he says, properly links catechetical instruction and the liturgy. In addition to that, Moran likewise alludes to 'other programs that are intended to show Roman Catholics what their beliefs of the tradition are and how to practice these beliefs'. He says that they are part of the Church's catechetical mission. He cautions however that these important functions of the church related to educational formation or that involves extensive knowledge of the tradition and skills of presenting it, must be given to competent and well-trained personnel.

Sixthly, Moran moves on with the academic aspect of Church's task of education. While indeed he appreciates the catechetical/theological aspect united in the 'formative side of the educational mission' in the Catholic Church, Moran makes it very clear that it should likewise 'include a distinct setting and an aim that is academic in nature'.[92]

How does Moran describe academic teaching? He says that it is (1) 'an examination of the church done by Christians and with Christian tools of scholarship', (2) 'but from an outsider's point of view', (3) free from the censor of any authority (unlike that of

---

[92] *Ibid.*, 169.

theology which is an ecclesiastical property), and (4) indifferent to interests related to orthodoxy and heterodoxy.[93]

Referring to whether entertaining this type of education is suicidal, he says that a view from the outside is 'at times needed' to have an imagine distance that would allow one to appreciate more his or her religion'.[94]   Moran is quite clear that the needed academic aspect of the Church's educational mission will surely, *on one hand*, resuscitate doubts but also, *on the other hand*, 'encourage facing doubts.'[95]   In addition to that, Moran's concern is that the Church speaks to outsiders in an intelligible manner.[96]

3. RE and the State

In SPEAKING OF TEACHING: LESSONS FROM HISTORY (2008), Moran writes about the educating activity or 'teaching'. In one of its chapters, he focuses about religious education and more particularly, on the issue of the *presence of religious education in public educational institutions*. As the title may reveal, the book is all about teaching from the perspectives of various learned thinkers in history – Plato

---

[93] A distinction must be made clear however. *GDC* mentions of the teaching of religion which must be supervised by the Catholic Church hierarchy. This provision holds true to any teaching which pretends to impart doctrines or truths of faith of Roman Catholicism. However, if it deals solely on a subject in the University about the comparative characteristics of institutional religions which include among others the Roman Catholic religion, or a teaching about religious phenomenon, hierarchical supervision may not then be necessary.

[94] A small note on one characteristic of academic aspect of Christian formation – indifference to orthodoxy and orthopraxy: this does not mean that Moran is denying the need for a church to concern for orthodoxy and orthopraxy (which indeed set boundaries of the right belief and practice); what he emphasizes is that in this aspect of education, the mentioned boundaries do not exist (cfr. *ibid.,* 170).

[95] *Ibid.*, 170.

[96] Cfr. *ibid.*, 170-172.

(*Chapter 1 Plato and his students*), St. Augustine (*Chapter 2 Augustine despite Aquinas*), Jean Jacques Rousseau (*Chapter 3 Rousseau: Teaching Emile and Sophie*), John Dewey (*Chapter 4 Dewey: why so misunderstood?*), and Ludwig Wittgenstein (*Chapter 7 Wittgenstein: I'll teach you differences*). It also tackles two great issues: whether religion and morality can be taught (*Chapter 5 Can morality be taught?* and *Chapter 6 Can religion be taught?*).

In this book, Moran departs from the presupposition that teaching is a very fundamental human act. However, he says it is not given sufficient attention in the USA. He therefore discusses teaching reality – including school teaching - in the context of the many forms of teaching. He stresses the need for the collaboration of the different agents of learning – family, school, and other institutions. In Chapter 5 and 6, he argues whether morality and religion, subject matters of great importance nowadays, can be taught or, accurately said, in what way they can be taught. We present here chapter 6, about the question of religion, which is directly related to our interest – the idea of religious education.

Chapter 6, *Can Religion be taught?*, is composed of the following sub-tittles: The Problem, A Comprehensive Religious Education, Legal Issues, The Legal Issue: Religious Education, The Meanings of Religion, Teach and Teach About, Study but not Teach, Toward Worldwide Religious Education.

At the outset, Moran introduces a 'dangerous situation' in the USA which in relation to public policy. This dangerous situation consists of two facts, namely: first, on any scale of national religiosity (belief in god, prayer, attendance at religious services), the United

States ranks near the top; second, there is a scandalous ignorance of religion, both an individual's own religion and the religion of others.[97]

Moran, in the first subtitle, *The Problem*, considers the widespread misunderstanding of religion, education and religious education in USA, and therefore declares that there is an urgent need of a comprehensive religious education. As he laments the absence of religious education in the public arena, Moran at the same time describes that 'religious education which is assumed to be the task of church, synagogue, mosque, and temple'. This kind of religious education is what he refers to as that which religions, including Christianity, do. He says:

> When religious education is referred to, it is assumed to be the task of church, synagogue, mosque, and temple, but those institutions do not use 'religious education' for the formation of their members. Each of the religions has its own intramural language of education. This focus of religious groups on the beliefs and practices of their own members is understandable. But where then are the other key elements of education in religious matters that today's enlightened citizen's needs. The logical answer would seem obvious: Schools that are called public.[98]

Aside from that 'religious education of church, synagogue, mosque, and temple', Moran says that in USA, at the beginning of the 20th century, leading educators and politicians recognized the need for something new – religious education that would encompass the several major religions of the Unites States. In addition to that, such a religious education would include public education along with education by religious institutions.

---

[97] G. Moran citing the data from PROTHERO, S., *Religious Literacy*, San Francisco: Harper, 2007, 21-38; GALLUP, G., JR.- CASTELLI, J., *The People's Religion: American faith in the 90s*, New York: Macmillan, 1989.

[98] MORAN, G., *Speaking of Teaching: Lessons from History….*, cit., 121.

Moran deems that this comprehensive religious education as a need for a religiously intelligent citizenry has become increasingly evident. This is Moran's initial description of the two aspects of religious education which somehow gives light to his idea of catechesis or religious education in particular religions.

In the second subtitle, *A Comprehensive Religious Education*, Moran again discusses the contemporary difficulties existent concerning the understanding of teaching and eventually religious teaching. He cites the secular outlook that holds that education primarily if not exclusively happens in schools. Also he cites the secular skepticism to religious education considering it as mere indoctrination. Here is a clearer description Moran gives:

> 'Religious education' is a term that connotes more than one religion; it is not the first language of any religious group. That is a present weakness but it is also a possible future strength. Each group has its own educational language. Even with Christianity, a world of Roman Catholic catechetics seldom meets the Protestant world of Christian Education. Even more puzzling would be Muslim, Buddhist, or Sikh languages of teaching-learning.[99]

Moran affirms the need for any religious group to educate its members of its own beliefs, rituals and traditions. However he says 'for its well-being, a religious group needs the perspective from the outside'. He also forwards the idea of academic programs wherein that 'perspective from the outside' may be given to members of a particular religion. On the contrary, he points out that a religious education 'from within the religious group' is inadequate. He seems to say that its inadequacy lies in its incapacity to give a wider perspective 'in relation to the larger world of religion and the world of secular education'.[100]

---

[99] *Ibid.,* 124.
[100] *Ibid.,* 124-125.

The third and the fourth subtitles discuss particular cases in different States wherein political and legal cases manifest the need of a comprehensive religious education.

In the fourth subtitle, he distinguishes *two* understanding of religion. Moran's particular aim in this distinction is to propose what kind of religion has to be taught or studied in state schools considering the legal intricacies that it may involve. With a historical back-up, he comes up with two understandings of religion. One is religion as genuine devotion and the other, the whole body of beliefs, rituals, and codes of institutions. The first is singular, one true devotion while the second refers to a plurality of religious institutions. Therefore Moran says that the second meaning of religion, taken as any human phenomenon that has a tradition of rational inquiry and a universe of discourse, may fit in to the needed religious education in public schools. These words are clarifying:

> […], religious education has to include formation in practice of a particular religion (or a personal choice to abstain from such practice) and some minimum competence in understanding the phenomenon of religion, comparing the religion closest to home with other religions. The first element of religious education does not belong in the state school; the second element is needed there. Without a language of religious education, including recognition of religion as a subject for intellectual inquiry, discussion of religion in state schools becomes bogged down either in fighting over devotional practices or by including religion in ways that avoid teaching an understanding of it.[101]

In the *fifth* and *sixth* subtitles, Moran discusses about the meaning of 'to teach' and the amplification of the understanding of education. He cites particular cases in USA. In the last subtitle, *Toward Worldwide Religious Education*, Moran champions the role that USA might lead in the advocacy for religious education (having the

---

[101] *Ibid.*, 132.

both aspects discussed above) for its special situation. He side comments the religious education model of United Kingdom which limits this kind of education in schools. He says on the contrary that schools cannot provide the whole of education in this area; it will need the collaboration of other educational agencies beginning with the family.[102]

4. Summary and Evaluation

We have reached the point of presenting a synthesis of the catechetical doctrine of G. Moran in 2000-2010. This task may be done starting from G. Moran's neutral and secular idea of religious education.

For him, religious education is the meeting point in which the two great elements of life meet – religion and education. According to his perspective, nowadays, we have to distinguish between *the religious educations done by particular religions* (Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, etc.) and *the religious education needed by the general public*.

The *first type*, done in particular churches, refers to the religious education aimed usually at religious socialization and fortification of one's religious identity.

The *second type* is necessary for the general public, may be promoted by the State for the cultural formation of its citizens, and centered mainly on the belief system and traditional customs and practices of particular religions.

He holds that this *second type* is likewise complementary and necessary in particular religions. He envisions that religions

---

[102] Cfr. *ibid.*, 138.

education in the 21ˢᵗ century will be international, interreligious, inter-institutional and inter-generational.

G. Moran notes however that in today's world, the use of the term 'religion' is ambiguous. 'Outsiders' refer it (the term religion) to the *institutional aspect* of any particular religion. For 'insiders', it is more than being a member of a religion or a church. The current use therefore does not totally describe the 'religious' reality.

What exactly happens in that 'religious' reality? Here enters the idea of revelation he is proposing and in which reflection about education, for him, must depart from. In Moran's perception, a man who is into a religion experiences a sort of a conversation or communion with the revealing God. Like in a school of thought, one enrolls in it, participates in it, involves oneself in it and takes an indispensable role in that divine activity. He uses the metaphor of apprenticeship, or the 'showing how' aspect of teaching-learning activity. In some cases, G. Moran seems to exaggerate the indispensable role of the human partner in that concept of revelation.

Before proceeding, it must be stated that Moran's use of the term 'revelation' in his catechetical doctrine is in a different sense from that of the Catholic tradition. He seems to equate 'revelation' with the 'religious sense', proximate to the patristic idea of the *semina Verbi* which the Holy Spirit sows on human wisdom. Later, the Church has applied moderately the idea of *semina Verbi* to religions with the thought that every religion may contain aspects or elements of truth or goods of salvation.

Now to continue, it seems that for G. Moran, every religion or religious institution or church is a legitimate way to discover universal truths or messages revealed by God. He does not pronounce however as to the equal or non-equal value of religions especially in penetrating divine truths. Neither does he comment

about the need for religions to be 'purified' by the revelation of Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, the fullness of God's revelation.

Specifically focusing on Roman Catholicism (taken as a particular religion), Moran considers it as one of the many legitimate particular expressions of nurturing the reality of divine-human conversation common to all men. In his past writings, he explains this natural access of every man to God through the humanity of Christ. He held that since Christ's resurrection, communion with the revealing God was opened and humanity in general was capacitated to take part in that divine activity, that is, the divine-human interpersonal communication.

In the 2000-2010 decade, this thought is present in his affirmation that today God speaks not in the teachings and actions of Jesus of Nazareth but in the Spirit-filled Christ who rose from the dead. In another occasion, he affirms that educational reflection or reflection over the divine-human relation (God-man relationship) in the Church should not depart from so-called 'inspired writings' (referring to Sacred Scriptures) or from commentaries over those testimonies of Jesus' words and actions (referring to Tradition), but on the conversation between man and God which takes place at the present time. A question may surge in one's mind: were the words and actions of Jesus of Nazareth words and actions of the revealing God? In other words, was Jesus of Nazareth God? Why exclude then the Sacred Scriptures and Tradition in a reflection on revelation (religious education)?

Continuing with Moran's mental framework, he affirms of a sacramental universe wherein God acts in everything and everyone. This has two consequences to education: *first*, the assertion for a

lifelong and life-wide education; *second*, the affirmation of the church-people's engagement to the educational task.

Concerning the first, Moran founds the idea that education should be lifelong or in his favorite term 'from womb to tomb', and also life-wide, that is, that all instances of life must be educational, because of the fact that God acts in everything and in every person. We have commented already regarding this point. Even if this assertion may be true, distinction between the level of intensity of sacramentality of a thing or an instance must be done. Only one has the fullness of revelation (or rather, is the fullness of revelation): Jesus Christ. Moran surprisingly does not insert in this topic the 'obligation' or 'right' of each person to teach.

In that sacramental universe, man likewise may be said to participate in the divine act. It is on this fact that G. Moran bases the educational activity of the church-people (his other term for the Church). The Church-people participates in the divine apprenticeship, in God's 'showing how'. Given that in this sacramental universe everyone teaches and everything is an instrument of teaching, he goes further to affirm that the education in the church must be life-long and life-wide.

Lifelong education simply means permanent, that is, from womb to tomb. Life-wide education means that all instances in life, not just the school hours or formations years in universities, must be educational.

In relation to the second consequence, the church-people's engagement to the educational activity, he affirms that effectively each person may participate in the divine teaching act. There is a need however to explain further his notion of church-people and the individual 'desire for community' in order to capture well the church-people's engagement to education.

Moran affirms that every individual seeks to satisfy his natural desire for community in the church-people. This longing is met through education in the community. Education in the community simply refers to the interplay of education forms (job, family, leisure, and school). It seems that the education forms are the same with the so-called community ministries (liturgy, service, teachings, kerygma and witness).

Concerning the *teaching* ministry, Moran gives importance to laypeople's exercise of magisterium but contrasts it to the magisterium attached to the pastoral functions of ordained ministers.

As to the *liturgical* ministry, Moran identifies the liturgy as the *locus* of life-wide and lifelong education of the community. He praises liturgy's use of nonverbal language in its educating act. He affirms also that the Church's catechesis fittingly belongs in the liturgical ambit. Let us note that for Moran, catechesis refers more to the socialization aspect of religious formation.

He further comments that catechesis must not take on the burden of the whole Church's educational task; it must participate in the interplay of ministries or other educational tools.

In the ministries commented above – *teaching* and *liturgical* ministries - we have reserved two observations for Moran's assertions about the role of the ordained ministers. In the *teaching* ministry, in his promotion of the lay people's teaching function, he presents the Church magisterium as an obstacle, instead of a service. In the *liturgical* ministry, Moran presents the bishop's teaching as enforcer of right practice (orthopraxis), not of right doctrine (orthodoxy).

In any case, the catechetical reflection of Moran in the 2000-2010 decade has a noticeable displacement *from* the exclusive divine-human present encounter *to* a divine-human encounter within a

church-people, a community. Moran purposely seems to present a picture of *a church-people* without reference to the hierarchy in order to emphasize the total equality and the democratic characteristic of the community. Even then, Moran's concept of people-hood does not reach the level of the Old Testament *qahal* or the New Testament *ekklesia*, biblical categories often used in defining the mystical body of Christ, the Church.

CHAPTER III. LEE: "RED-HOT RELIGION" THROUGH RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

James Michael Lee IV is an important figure in the contemporary history of religious education in the USA, both in the catholic as well as in the non-catholic ambit. Contemporary educators coincide in attributing to Lee *two* principal contributions to religious education: *first*, his pioneering and eventual systematization of the social science approach in doing religious education, and; *second*, his founding of the Religious Education Press in 1974.

H. Atkinsons summarizes influence of Lee's influence on the shaping of the religious education in the USA, saying:

> It is probably safe to say that there is scarcely a religious educator since 1971 who has not been influenced in one way or another by Lee. Since his first book on religious instruction was published in 1971, most thoughtful religious education monographs have followed Lee's total ecumenical flavor. Since 1971, there has been a notable increase in the scholarly tone and content in religious education works, something that Lee himself has pioneered.[1]

The idea about *religious instruction aimed at putting faith into practice* seems to be a continued object in Lee's attention. In *re-proposing* his theory of religious education as a social science in the context of vision and prophecy, he focuses on forging a red-hot religion through religious instruction.

His sole thought related to religious education in the first decade of the 21st century is contained in the last book he edited four years before his demise in 2004 – the *Forging a Better Religious Education in the 3rd Millennium* (2000). This book which he edited, and in which

---

[1] ATKINSONS, H., «James Michael Lee», in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/.

he contributed some essays together with other prominent educators in the field of religious education in our times, orients towards the future of the religious education field.[2] The essays here, according to Lee himself, are characterized by *three* elements: (1) they offer a vision concerning religious education, (2) their prophetic spirit, and (3) their wide-ranging viewpoints.[3] *Vision* refers to the 'what should be' of religious education in the future. By *prophetic*, it means religious education has to be 'a fore-doer', a leader in effecting change. Vision and prophecy are interrelated. While prophecy anchors a vision-ed religious education in *action*; vision grounds a prophesied religious education in *scholarly and scientific foundations*. The *wide ranging viewpoint* characteristic of the articles of the book bears relation to both the competence of its contributors in the field of religious education and their widely varied denominational convictions.

Lee's essays, the *introduction* and more importantly the concluding one, *Vision, Prophecy, and Forging the Future*[4] develops the abovementioned characteristics. Lee's prophecy/vision of a better religious education in the future is encapsulated in *three* ideas: *first*, religious education should be the first priority of institutions; *second*, religious educators ought to be highly competent; and *third*, religious instruction activity must concentrate on its two major elements – religion and instruction.

---

[2] As it may be observed, its contributors respectively belong to the Mainline Protestantism, Evangelical Protestantism and Catholicism. They are: Norma Cook Everist, Barbara J. Fleischer, Charles R. Foster, Kenneth O. Gangel, James Michael Lee himself, Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore, Gabriel Moran, Richard Robert Osmer, Robert W. Pazmiño, Ronnie Prevost and Anne E. Streaty Wimberly.

[3] LEE, J.M. IV, «Introduction», in LEE, J.M. IV (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 2000, 2.

[4] LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», in LEE, J. M. IV (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education*, cit., 243-267.

Kieran Scott, reviewing the mentioned book in *The Living Light*, significantly commented that Lee's second article seems to be a veiled apologia pro vita sua (a defense of religious education as a form of social science).[5] Filled with prophetic (as Lee intends the word) spirit, Lee seems to justify lengthily the social science approach in religious education against the theological approach, and against pastoral theology's claim of religious education as being a branch of theology.

Lee's *Vision, Prophecy and Forging the Future* (2000) is composed of *six* subheadings. The *first* is the *Introduction* which introduces *the prophetic and visionary tone* of his essay. This part repeats the notions of prophecy and vision discussed in the book's introduction (which is written by Lee himself). The *second up to the fifth subheadings* are all about Lee's the visions/prophecies concerning religious education in the future, (*The Supreme Importance of Religious Education*, *The Scholarly Base of Religious Education*, *The prophetic Imperative of Religious Instruction*, and *The fountainhead of all religious instruction activity*). In simpler terms, the mentioned subheadings underline the necessary conditions, according to Lee, for religious education to have a better future. By way of conclusion, the last subheading, *Good Morning Third Millennium*, Lee wishes a bright future for religious education. Following the essays main points, we present Lee's thought as the following: *first*, the vision/prophecy general spirit of Lee's essay, *second*, Lee's three visions/prophecies for religious education in the third millennium and *third*, religion and instruction: fountainhead of religious instruction.

---

[5] Cfr. SCOTT, K., «Book Review of Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium» (2000) in *TLL* 37/2 (Winter 2000) 77-78.

1. Prophetic and visionary: RE in the future

In the Introduction of *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium* (2000) and in the introduction of the article, *Vision, Prophecy and Forging the Future*, Lee begins with the warning that his essay (and the other essays) breath a prophetic and visionary spirit. In Lee's usage, the terms 'vision' and 'prophecy' situates well what religious instruction should be in the future. His claim finally is religious education is distinguished for *breathing a prophetic spirit* and *for having a clear and well-founded vision*. It is but sound to pry about the meaning of the two hermeneutical keys, 'vision' and 'prophecy', before entering into his understanding of religious instruction.

In both the introductory and concluding articles in *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium* (2000), Lee speaks lengthily of prophetic and visionary characters inherent in religious education or instruction. He associates *vision* with religious educations' scholarly and scientific foundation and its *prophetic character* with eventual expected transformation (through religious education).

1.1. Prophecy and its implication to religious instruction

The prophetic spirit that imbues the whole of religious education in Lee's mind refers not only to religious education's capacity to forecast the future but also and most importantly to *hasten* the foreseen future.[6]   Transformation, according to him, is the banner identity of that foreseen future.   He thus writes about prophecy or the prophetic role of religious education:

> Prophecy links vision with action. […]. To be prophetic is not so much to see the future as to make the future – or to hasten the

---

[6] LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 253-254.

> future, as I like to say. In its prophetic dimension, religious
> education visions a broad sweeping future and then makes that
> future happen earlier than it would have happened if religious
> education were not there: this is what hastening the future means.
> Unlike vision considered in itself, the prophetic role brings with it
> considerable sacrifice and suffering. Vision in itself is threatening
> to other persons and to the status quo only conceptually. The
> prophetic role, in marked contrast, is threatening to other persons
> and to the status quo all along the line, conceptually, affectively,
> and, most tellingly, in actual concrete practice.[7]

The 'foreseen' and 'hastened' transformation through
religious education is put in concrete in the so-called *assimilative
learning*. Lee foresaw the inevitable involvement of confrontation and
disagreement within the field of religious education, in particular in
its struggle for change.[8] Regarding the distinction of assimilative and
accommodative learning, he says:

> Assimilation is the process of placing new learnings into an already
> existing framework. In marked contrast, accommodation refers to
> the kind of learning that either radically changes an already existing
> framework or actually establishes a fundamentally new framework
> capable of accommodating the new learning. This fundamentally
> new framework is required when the old framework is not capable
> of satisfactorily dealing with the new learning. […].
> Accommodative learning is typically quite upsetting because it
> wrenches one out of one's accustomed comfortable way of
> interpreting and valuing the world and places one in a far different
> and often unfamiliar world.[9]

Assimilative learning is obviously for Lee the appropriate
learning mode for the prophetic religious instruction. In addition to
this, Lee figures out a *divine origin* and *mission* underlying religious
education reality. He thus writes:

---

[7] LEE, J.M. IV, «Introduction», cit., 3.
[8] Cfr. *ibid.*, 245, 253-256.
[9] LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 244.

By virtue of baptism, by virtue of participation in the divine life in which all Christians share thanks to God's overflowing grace, each Christian is called upon to be a prophet, along with being a priest and a ruler. Because religious educators are called by God himself to be his special corps of elite, the prophetic office is especially incumbent upon each and every religious educator in the third millennium.[10]

It is interesting how Lee connects the 'vocation to be a religious educator' with the *munus docendi* shared by all Christians through baptism. He does not however elaborate whether all baptized are called to be religious educators and in what sense.

One thing certain is that he claims that by virtue of that *prophetic office*, all religious educators must necessarily be prophets not only because God has given them a divine vocation to be religious educators but also because they are, by profession, teachers. According to him, to be a teacher is to automatically be a prophet.[11] As noted above, Lee does not explain further. Instead, he emphasizes the prophet's principal quality of *being a fore-doer*, and secondarily, *as announcer*. It is his having done first what he preaches that makes a prophet more credible. He says:

The prophet is one who makes the road by walking it, by blazing the trail. […] . True prophets do more than just speak the truth; they do the truth in their lives and actions. But they always do it with love and for love, even when truth seems to burn the positions held by others.[12]

In Lee's anchorage of religious education to Christ's *prophetic office* shared by all Christians by virtue of baptism, he did not intend to allude to the religious education's relation to being a form of Ministry of the Word. With it, he simply emphasizes the *practical aspect* (more than the verbal or notional) of religious education.

---

[10] *Ibid.*, 153.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] *Ibid.*, 254.

1.2. Vision and its implication to religious instruction

Religious education's leaning towards practice or experience, however, is not a direction-less tendency. It is closely associated with a clear and well-founded vision. Vision refers to the general picture of what religious education should be in the third millennium, he writes somewhere. Lee holds that vision is important to religious education because 'it supplies that sweeping and necessary futuristic perspective that enlarges religious education from where it is now to where it should be in the future.'[13] Like any reality, without vision, religious education will be reduced to the past, without relevance for the present and eventually will be outdated. In contrast, with the ocean wide vision, the vessel of religious education is strongly anchored in rock-solid reality.

> Describing vision, Lee says:
>
> … at every stage of its development, vision is anchored in fruitful theory, proven practice, and solid research in the field in which vision applies. It is this constant anchorage in theory, practice, and research that keeps vision in line and prevents it from degenerating into wild flights of fancy. Vision necessarily grows out the past and the present. The more religious education creatively recognizes the endless workable possibilities which lie hidden within past and present theory, practice, and research, the greater and more potentially productive vision is thereby enabled to become.[14]

For Lee therefore vision is a *sine qua non* for religious education. A systematized vision, for Lee is a theory. At the bottom of his conviction regarding religious instruction's close relation with a systematized vision (or theory) is its fundamental link with practice. Somewhere he affirms that one basic purpose of theory is to make

---

[13] LEE, J.M. IV, «Introduction», 2.
[14] *Ibid.*, 3.

practice more effective'.[15] In other words, a religious education with vision does not remain in the realm of concepts; with a 'theorized vision', it permeates the ambit of the 'concrete'.

Finally, religious education is anchored in 'theorized vision', that is, based on concrete reality and practice.   This is the hinge to which the other characteristic, the prophetic spirit, connects with religious education. A prophetic religious education with a 'theorized vision' is authentic and trustworthy. He says:

> True prophecy always incorporates vision, broadly seeing possibilities and their fulfillment. Vision […] is grounded in proven knowledge and unconditional love. Proven knowledge comes from being intimately conversant with the best facts, laws, and theories about a reality. For the religious educator as prophet, knowledge is gained from being acquainted with top scholarship in the field and from solid practical knowledge gained from experience and tested by theory and research.[16]

It is then clear that with the visionary characteristic, Lee vies for a religious education which is not only *practical* but also *grounded on the concrete*.

2. Lee's threefold vision/prophecy for RE

With a prophetic spirit fixed firmly on a well-defined vision and with a vision anchored on scientific theory (as presented in his essay's *Introduction*), Lee proceeds in the next three subheadings with his visions/prophecies for a better religious education in the future. He discusses three, namely, *first*, it must be the priority of priorities in educational institutions of every religious denomination; *second*, religious educationalists themselves must vie for scholarship, and;

---

[15] LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 260-261.
[16] *Ibid.*, 254.

third, religious education itself must focus on instruction and religion. Because of the *third* vision/prophecy's theological importance, we provide a more detailed presentation in a separate number.

2.1. Religious education, priority of the ecclesiastical institutions

Lee's first vision/prophecy for religious education in the third millennium is leveled against a reality, which he claims, is one of the key points to be transformed if religious education has to be a better future: *the priority of the hierarchy or educational institutions in the religious education field.*[17] Based on gathered facts and data, Lee wrote that there is less interest among church leaders for the religious education field.[18]

With a direct application to the Catholic Church, Lee recognizes the need to reinvigorate the so-called 'religious education dimension of the Church (or the prophetic function of the people of God). At the mention of the clergy and its prophetic office as part of the re-animation of the prophetic dimension of the Church,[19] Lee in effect recognizes the part shared by those who have received the Holy Orders in the Church's prophetic office.

A clear distinction in the sharing *munus docendi* shared by all Christians as members of the one mystical body of Christ would have saved Lee's classification *ecclesia* and *ecclesiasticum* in his previous writings.[20] He attributes to the *ecclesiasticum*, the governing body, as

---

[17] *Ibid.*, 246-247.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] Cfr. *ibid.*, 249.

[20] With *ecclesia*, he refers to the true people of God; while with *ecclesiasticum*, to the hierarchy or the ecclesiastical authority taken as a whole. *Vid.* for instance LEE, J. M. IV, «Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction», cit.; LEE, J. M. IV, «Catechesis Sometimes, Religious

purely with a 'political' end, and thus reduces the hierarchical order into a political party holding the present administration. By the expression 'political end', Lee refers to a social agenda or program which a group or a party wishes to promote.

He figures out that the cause of the non-interest of church leaders on religious education is due to RE's prophetic and transformation-aimed tendency. Many find it an annoyance to the status quo. However, Lee counsels:

> If religious educationalists and educators truly love the field of religious instruction, they will not snub or isolate or persecute those who disagree with one or another of their positions, but rather do everything they can to ensure that all positions are heard so that out of the clash of positions the truth can emerge. If religious educationalists and educators love the field first and foremost, they will welcome critiques and will work energetically with the persons offering the critiques to openly and unegoistically seek the truth.[21]

Lee ends up giving a concrete recommendation to church leaders saying that every Catholic and Protestant church with more than three hundred parishioners should have a full-time paid and professionally prepared director of religious education.[22] Moreover, he urges to create more centers of formation for religious educators.[23]

Education Always», cit.; LEE, J. M. IV, «Facilitating Growth in faith Through Religious Education», cit.

[21] *Ibid.*, 245-246.
[22] *Ibid.*, 250.
[23] *Ibid.*, 248-250.

2.2. The scholarly and scientific competence of religious educators

If the *first* prophecy/vision addresses the real sentiment of leaders regarding the future of religious education, Lee levies the *second* prophecy/vision to its agents: do religious educationalists want religious education?

Lee laments of the very poor scholarship among religious educators. He points out two causes: *the wrong motivation of religious educators* and *'the erosion of professional identity' of religious educators who provide formation and trainings in universities and other educational centers.*[24] He denounces further the mere search for prestige and title of many educators.[25] As to religious educators' search for prestige, he comments:

> True prestige in the religious sphere comes from a job well done for the Lord and for his people. Religious educators seem to be suffering an identity crisis when they vaingloriously seek to be identified by titles other than religious educator. This identity crisis can be solved only when religious educators recognize that they are God's corps of elite, and only when they concentrate on the instructional dynamics of the glorious apostolate to which they have been called by God himself. Religious educators in the third millennium should exhibit enormous and rightful pride in their identity of religious educator.[26]

This is indeed one of the remarkable points in Lee's ideas. He considers the 'vocation' of the religious educator as a responsibility before God, before the Church, and before the world. Therefore, for Lee, there is a need to promote professionalism and competence in the said 'vocation'.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, 252.
[25] Cf. *ibid.*, 250.
[26] *Ibid.*, 250-251.

As to the need for improvement of the religious instruction act, he writes:

> Additionally, the scholarship of religious education faculty members in seminaries and universities should be directed primarily at that which makes religious instruction distinctive, namely, the religious instruction act. These faculty members should base their scholarship on validated empirical research into the teaching/learning act because teaching is an empirical activity. There is a necessary and important place for a theological, philosophical, and historical foundations of religious instruction with the religious instruction act itself. If we are to forge a bright future for religious instruction in the third millennium, then religious educationalists and educators alike must focus a large portion of their scholarly activities on analyzing, synthesizing, and improving the religious instruction act itself. Armed with this scholarly base, religious educators in the local church can thus be enabled to significantly improve the success of their efforts in the third millennium.[27]

He alluded therefore to the collaboration of religious education with other fields of knowledge in the learning of persons in general. He thus concretely recommends that 'religious education faculty members in seminaries and universities should engage in a much higher level of scholarship than at present, and should give their students a constant appreciation of the centrality of research as the necessary and pervasive underpinning of their future ministry'.[28]

2.3. Religious instruction activity's focus: religion and instruction

James Michael Lee believes that a better religious education in the future will be met, aside from making it a *priority* in spiritual and academic institutions or the improved scholarship of educationalists, if the field of religious instruction gives a detained attention to its

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 253, 258.
[28] *Ibid.*, 252.

two major constitutive elements, that is, religion and instruction. As he writes:

> The fountainhead from which all the streams of religious instruction activity flows is, of course, religious instruction. A viable and bright future for religious instruction throughout the third millennium can be forged only when the field concentrates on the two major elements that make up the field, namely, religion and instruction.[29]

Lee's most critiqued part of his doctrine is his proposed social science approach in religious education. He holds that religious education is a social science and therefore has to be handled like any other social sciences.[30] The social science approach in religious education centers principally on the analysis of the religious instruction act.

To our opinion, Lee's approach enjoys certain legitimacy; the claims he makes however based on the results especially regarding faith and religion may be disputable. What kind of religion or faith did Lee has in mind?

3. Forging a "red-hot religion" through instruction

The fifth subheading, *The Fountainhead all Religious Instruction*, is the meat of the essay. It is very common to find in Lee's work the affirmations such as 'the act of religious instruction forms or actualizes faith or a lived faith experience' or 'in the act of religious instruction, faith is developed and forged in the teaching/learning dynamic' or 'religious instruction does faith'.

We even find citations from M. Martorell of Lee holding religious instruction as capable of directly producing faith in

---

[29] *Ibid.*, 256.
[30] *Ibid.*, 258.

unbelievers or substantially augmenting it in those who already possess it.[31] It is notable that in this essay, Lee employed religion, instead of faith (as he used to do in his past writings), as the substantive content of religious instruction. Either for brevity or for the criticism he received from theologians in the past century, we do not have a way to know. In any case, in his past writings, religion appears to be a *lifestyle*, that is, a conglomeration of *faith-behaviors*.

3.1. Religion, substantive content of religious instruction

His discussion of religion is very short.[32]   Lee describes religion as 'the way persons live their life unto God'. Alluding to total difference of the goal of religious instruction from theological instruction's aim, he says that the religious instruction's 'religion' is essentially a holistic *lifestyle* in which cognition and affect play a contributory role.   As he puts it, full-blooded religion is the substantive content and goal of all authentic religious instruction.[33]

In addition to that, Lee emphasizes on an ardent way of living religion. Far from an ideological system of living life, he vies not only for a 'lived' way of spiritual life but a way of relating to God which is passionately lived. Thus he says:

> Religion in its finest form is what I like to term as 'red-hot religion', that kind of religion in which the person having religion

---

[31] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Catequesis en Estados Unidos….*, cit., 283.

[32] Lee recognized the importance of other sciences, including theological sciences, in religious instruction. He views religious instruction as aimed at forging a "red-hot" religion. But he openly limited the contribution of theological sciences in the cognitive sphere.   E. J. Newell theorizes that Lee constructed his social science theory at the service of an implicit theology.   The author has even systematized Lee's supposed theology. *Vid.* «Chapter 3 The Theology of James Michael Lee» of NEWELL, E. J., "Education has Nothing To Do with Theology"…., cit., 70-90.

[33] Cfr. LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 256.

> burns unquenchably for Christ, is consumed with the fire of love for God (Jn 2:17), and strives totally to enact every aspect of life for and in and with God (Gal 2:20). This is the kind of religion which, if taught, will forge a bright future for religious instruction in the third millennium. Religion always has primacy in the eyes of God over theology (Jas 1:27), and must always have primacy in any religious instruction that is true.[34]

Like the 'unmediated personal experience' which transforms into faith through the mediation of the religious instruction act, Lee traces the source of his 'red-hot religion' in experience, a religious experience. Like any other experience, it is one which can be conditioned or modified. He says:

> So very often the source of red hot religion is religious experience. Persons in our era yearn so very desperately for religious experience. Those churches that deliberately give congregants religious experience are thriving, while those that substitute rationalism in its stead are either dying or moribund. I never ceased to be amazed that so very many Protestant religious educationalists, especially those of the Evangelical persuasion, place theology as the process and goal of religious instruction when, in fact, the Reformers emphasized that it is a person's religious experience, the personal burning encounter with Jesus, that forms the basis of faith and indeed the foundation of Christianity.[35]

Lee categorizes the personal encounter with Jesus as an experience, a religious experience. He further says that this experience is the basis of faith. Being the basis of faith, he regards that same religious experience as foundation of Christianity.

He however refers specifically to a passionate way of living Christianity. This 'red-hot' religion can be forged by religious instruction. Instruction actualizes religion. He undoubtedly emphasizes the necessity to focus on religion (together with

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 257.
[35] *Ibid.*

instruction) if religious instruction were to better in the future. He says:

> Successful religious instruction in the third millennium will be forged when religious educators center their efforts on teaching red-hot religion and when do not substitute any correlative substantive content such as sociology or theology for religion, for the real thing.[36]

The religion which permeates real life, according to Lee, is the substantive content and the end of religious education. At the beginning of the third millennium, he presents anew religious education's capacity *to animate the life of religion of persons*.

After he points out the external possible stumbling blocks, such as the disinterest of authorities in religious education activity and the erosion of professionalism or scholarship among educators and institutions, Lee directs the focus of his vision/prophecy to the two principal constitutive elements of religious instruction, instruction and religion.

Before proceeding to the next topic, we must affirm Lee's idea mentioned earlier that Christian life precedes theology. In educating in faith, without putting aside the role of social sciences, it is theology which gives configuration religious education. But the kind of theology which assumes the said role must be defined.

Lee precisely gave little importance to theology because he always thought of theology as a purely cognitive science incapable of influencing a religious life. A rationalist theology is not a good foundation for religious education. Fortunately, no one now holds a theology which is purely cognitive.

---

[36] *Ibid.*, 258.

3.2. Instruction

Lee's discussion of instruction is much exhaustive. This may somehow manifest what for Lee, above all, is religious instruction. In essay's introduction, Lee justified his preference for the term 'instruction'. He writes that he employs the term rather than any other word which more or less means the same (like 'teaching' or 'education') because it 'makes more salient the inherent intentionality of and purposefulness of the teaching act'.[37] In explaining the term 'instruction' in religious instruction, he writes thus:

> In the term 'religious instruction', the word religious is the adjective – it specifies the substantive content that is being taught. Instruction is the noun in which the word religious inheres. Instruction specifies how religion in a cohesive set of instances becomes operative; it indicates the conditions in which religion is actualized. […] No one disputes that instruction is a form of education or that education is a form of social science. Therefore it follows logically that religious instruction is a form of social science. Consequently the basic macrotheory that explains, predicts, and verifies religious instruction is a social science.[38]

For him, therefore, religious instruction is fundamentally an educational science. To explain that teaching - *including teaching religion* - is a procedure, Lee describes it as an art/science. It is science in the sense that it deals with scientific facts, laws, theories, as well as concepts and principles of teaching and learning and is subject to the rigors of scientific evaluation.[39] Teaching, according to him, is art because it is 'a technical affair, a procedural matter'. He writes that in the religious instruction act, procedure is not everything, but everything is procedure.[40]

---

[37] *Ibid.*, 243.
[38] *Ibid.*, 258.
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] *Ibid.*, 259.

As an art/science, religious instruction has to be closely related to a theory, a program of action. For Lee, a theory is 'the scientific fashioning of meaning from the interplay of the facts and laws of a reality'.[41] Not only teaching must be linked to a theory, but to the appropriate theory. At this juncture, Lee inserts his fierce criticism against the theological approach to teaching and presents his social science approach. He pointed out that the theological approach is inherently incapable of explaining, predicting, and verifying the religious instruction act. He writes:

> A theological understanding of the religious instruction act is incapable of producing better teaching. It cannot explain why a particular teaching method was successful or failed. It cannot predict which teaching method would be effective in a particular situation and which would be unsuccessful. It cannot verify the degree of learning that actually took place in a religious instruction event. Social science can do all these.[42]

He comments on the rising trend of practical theology which was attempting to incorporate in it as branch religious instruction, in the last quarter of the 20th century. He writes:

> Of the many fatal flaws in the position that religious instruction is practical theology in action, two are especially salient. First of all, practical theology is still theology, and as we have seen, theological goals and methods are inherently incapable of adequately explaining, predicting, and verifying the religious instruction act. Second, practical theology is cognitive reflection, whereas religious instruction is concrete action. Practical theology, like all theology, reflects theologically upon the religious instruction act but is inherently incapable of validly intervening in an instructional manner in the religious instruction act. The basic principle here is that theological reflection on instructional practice is in no way tantamount to that practice itself.[43]

---

[41] *Ibid.*, 260-261.
[42] *Ibid.*, 261.
[43] *Ibid.*, 263.

Lee, however, recognizes one legitimate form of contribution on the part of practical theology in the religious instruction: cognitive theological reflection.[44] In other words, Lee's 'prejudice' to theology is not only of the theology's incapacity to produce 'desired instructional ends' (a certain behavior, for instance), but also, for him, it is *a purely speculative science.*

In the part of discussing theological and social science approaches in religious education, he has always maintained a rigid division between the two approaches. Even if he has recognized the cognitive contribution of the theological approach, no sign of complementarity or co-operation between the two approaches is found in Lee's writings.

4. Summary and Evaluation

Lee and his social science approach to religious education present a reality very common not only in the USA context in the Church: *a professionally competent educator* who takes teaching of religion seriously from his own expertise.

From our point of view, there are two theological aspects in which the Lee case may be evaluated: *first*, in his ecclesiological understanding and its teaching mission, and *second*, in his understanding of the relationship between divine science and social sciences.

4.1. Church, *munus docendi*, and catechesis

Lee has always made reference to 'religious educator's divine vocation' to teach matters of the faith. For him, that teaching task is

---

[44] *Ibid.*, 264.

participation of the teaching mission of Jesus Christ (munus docendi) and which an educator has acquired through baptism. Every baptized has a share in that task. In other words, following Lee's logic, the Church of baptized persons has that 'religious education' dimension and the teaching of religion or of the faith is a very important task.

The teaching tasks' anchorage to Jesus Christ as a participation in his mission to teach (through baptism), as we have seen somewhere above, did not lead Lee to deepen the *nature* of catechesis, that is, that the teaching task belong to the very nature of the content being taught – Jesus Christ, true Man and true God. The teaching dimension or catechetical dimension flows from the very nature of the God's Word through the Church.

However, Lee has intuited correctly that, *as a task or a function*, the transmission of the faith, religious education, or catechesis, is the responsibility of all the baptized. Any validly *baptized* person has the power to exercise the *teaching office* of the Church provided he or she has the sufficient and systematic knowledge of the faith's content. He is further right in connecting the *exercise of the teaching function* to the participation in Jesus Christ's *teaching function* by reason of one's incorporation to Him by the Sacrament of Baptism.

It has somehow to be made precise that by baptism, a person shares in the Christ's *triple functions* – including the *munus docendi*, not in an abstract way, but *in* the Church, Christ's mystical body. Jesus Christ lives in the Church here and now through the Holy Spirit. Therefore, by virtue of baptism, a Christian is incorporated to *Christus totus*. A mother's showing her son how to make the sign of the cross is not a *sharing* of the *teaching function* of his parish priest, but a *real* exercise of the teaching function (received together with the other functions) in baptism.

If we are to take the claim of Lee seriously, it can be stated that baptism, not the office of religious educator, founds the "daily work of parents in the first transmission of the faith of their children"[45].

Vatican II has been very clear about common priesthood of all the baptized. This priesthood is called 'common' because it is precisely commonly shared and exercised by all who received the sacrament of Baptism. In addition to that, the term 'common' distinguishes common priesthood from that participation in the priesthood of Christ through sacred Orders (the ministerial priesthood). Both *common priesthood* and *ministerial priesthood* are forms of exercising the *munus docendi* in the one Mystical Body of Christ.

In addition to that, we have to make it clear that inside that Mystical Body whose head is Christ himself, there are those assigned by our Lord to assume the office which has the task to *authoritatively* teach and to guarantee the faithfulness of the 'substantive content' of what is taught. This refers to the ministerial priesthood. The said authoritative teaching office used to be united with pastoral authority. As mentioned, its main purpose is to teach and at the same time to guarantee faithfulness. In other words, it is *at the service* of the common priesthood.

This picture is therefore squarely contrary to Lee's thought of the bishops as a privileged group in the hierarchy who manipulate the contents and the praxis in the whole Church's exercise of the teaching task.

His personal opinion or understanding of faith seems to disagree with the catholic doctrine. He claims that 'faith' (*faith-*

---

[45] Cfr. BENEDICT XVI, *Address given before the praying of the midday Regina Caeli*, Venice, Italy, 8 May 2011.

construct as he intended it) is the only authority to which the teaching task must confront itself. Faith and the teaching task belong, according to his thought, to the same teaching-learning dynamics. In contrast, ecclesiastical authorities in relation to 'faith' remain *outside* to the teaching-learning arrangement. With its assignment as something 'outside the dynamics', ecclesiastical authorities in the teaching task (catechesis, religious education, transmission of the faith, teaching mission) seem to assume the identity of an outsider, that is, with nothing to do with the teaching-of-the-faith affair.

In addition to that Lee attributes to the hierarchical order the following characteristics: *being a limitation to the possibilities of the teaching affair* and *doing political manipulation*.

We see behind Lee's particular considerations to the hierarchical order a certain fear of the "purity" of faith (or in his words, the *neutrality* or *value free*) being contaminated or manipulated. In square contradiction to Lee's idea, the *magisterium dimension united to pastoral authority* was purposely instituted by Christ himself to serve as assurance for the faith's purity.

In any case, the point we are up to is that the various forms of teaching done by the members of the mystical body of Christ form *one ecclesial act* which is aimed at one desired result: *salus animarum*.

Lee's consideration of religious instruction as something which responds to the demands of faith and is located at the same interior location with faith is a good observation. To evangelize is a demand of the faith itself and marks the nature of the Church. His insistence however that the Magisterium *stands outside* that teaching-faith structure seems to give less importance, or almost nil, to the *role of the Holy Spirit and the action of Christ*, in a religious education which is Christian and in the whole teaching mission of the Church.

4.2. Co-operation of sciences and lived religion/faith

There are *two* assumptions that we have pointed out above which are worth reiterating: *first*, *catechesis* or *teaching task* which flows from the Father's Word in the Church through the Holy Spirit; and *second*, catechesis or religious instruction which deals not only with verifiable expressions of faith but also or principally with sacred matters like faith. We ask: is the teaching of faith capable of influencing the realm of experience? As a science, can it effect change in practical life?

One key concept of understanding catechesis in the USA is the co-operation of sciences in catechesis. As systematized bodies of knowledge, theology and what they call 'human sciences' have a very important role in the teaching and transmission of the faith. It is noteworthy that in the Lee's last essay, that which we have analyzed here, in comparison to his position in the previous years, he cedes a place, even just very minimal, of theology, in religious instruction. He maintains his previous position concerning the decisive importance of human sciences in any religious instruction.

Purely pedagogical sciences or purely theology can never be sufficient in educating the faith. Lee seems to allude to this idea in his incorporation of sciences in religious instruction.

On one hand, he tends however to over emphasize the role of human sciences to the point that in previous writings he sustained that religious instruction assisted by social sciences may foment faith. Even in this point, he was not clear whether he meant that religious instruction really produces faith. In his 2000-2010 essay, it is clear that for him, the aim of religious instruction is to help in the living of faith. In what way? He does not give a direct answer. He somehow indicates that a religious instruction permeated by social science is able to demonstrate the behavioral characteristics based on which

one may conclude that faith is present or one is trying to put it into practice.

On the other hand, still in line with Lee's intuition of the importance of sciences in a religious instruction aimed at predicting or verifying the living of faith, he is insistent on theology's being a purely cognitive science and therefore its incapacity to be the main protagonist in the education of faith. As we have mentioned above, neither a purely pedagogical technique, *nor a purely cognitive theology*, can be a good foundation for educating in faith.

We feel obliged however to comment on Lee's concept of theology. He has always openly expressed in his writings his idea of theology as a purely cognitive science. He criticizes present growing trend in the USA in composing a practical theology, because, he insists, theology is purely cognitive. Lee is right that a purely cognitive theology is inadequate for an effective religious instruction. In our times, however, no one sustains the idea of that abstract theology anymore. As the Holy Father puts it, "theology is not theology unless it is integrated into life, and reflection of the Church through time and space."[46]

In any case, Lee's advocacy in the employment of social sciences to religious education is legitimate. We even dare say that his claim to forge *an ardent and zealous practice* of religion through religious instruction is legitimate. He seems to be deeply convinced that faith has to be concrete. If it is to be concrete, not just a cognitive reality, it must be expressed in some ways into concrete realities (behavior, constructs, etc.) or into 'elements' indicative of the faith's being. Thus if it has concrete and practical expressions, then he claims for the measurability or verifiability of those concrete

---

[46] BENEDICT XVI, *Address to Members of the International Theological Commission*, Consistory Hall, 3 December 2010.

expressions. He therefore banks on *the experimental dimension of the faith-experience.*

A risk is at hand: the reduction of *faith-experience* into a purely empirical reality and God's actions substituting immanently the operations of finite realities (*immanentism*). He may have affirmed that *faith as an intellectual construct* or *a cognitive entity* may be produced. At least in his last essay, never did Lee claim *to have produced faith* in a sense that God as its origin is re-placed.

Neither engaging the whole person to God through a systematic lecture of God's mysteries *alone* nor memorizing traditional formulae *alone*, do satisfy the inner longing of the human heart for God. This was very clear to Lee. He intuited that the *divine* is *experienced* in or through *the finite created world.* Unfortunately, by its very own nature, *experience* has to be evaluated by faith (a grace from God) in order to 'see' God in the finite. Setting aside his open prejudice to theological sciences, he could have entertained the question: what if theology and social sciences have specific roles in the task of educating in faith? Besides, what is the function of the Magisterium in the teaching of faith?

CHAPTER IV. GROOME: CATECHETICAL EDUCATION IN FAITH, LIFE AND CULTURE

Thomas H. Groome, Director of the Institute of Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry in Boston College, is considered one of the architects of 'modern' catechesis in USA and perhaps in all English-speaking countries.

His use of 'catechetical education' in his writings in this decade is more than semantic proposal. He holds the importance of both (1) communal socialization in view of forming a particular religious identity, and (2) an academic formation in religious culture, in the one task of catechetical education.

He continues however his proposal of educating in faith through the *shared praxis approach*. For nearly a generation of work in the field of religious education, his shared praxis approach – a participative, communal, and conversational style of religious education that encourages participants *to bring their lives to faith traditions, and faith traditions to their lives* – has been present in many parish communities and protestant congregations.

His writings may be classified into *three* – (1) the *total catechetical education* writings, (2) the *faith-culture* writings, and (3) *faith-life in the world* writings. The *first* refers to those which effectively deals with *total* (permanent, lifelong, personal and social) catechetical education; the *second*, to the Catholic faith's 'contribution' towards important perspectives significant to living in the world; and the *third*, Catholic faith's 'contribution' to the local culture.

1. Catechetical education: a description

In this decade, Th. Groome has employed the term *catechetical education* to refer to education in faith, be it sponsored by the State or by a church. He has a series of writings between 2001 and 2006 which presents *in general* the principal elements of the so-called *total catechetical education*.[1] These writings further present the nature and purpose of *education in faith* according to Th. Groome's mind. It has therefore *three* principal ideas.

First, it conceives education in faith (or catechesis) as an integration of *catechesis* (understood as socialization) and of *religious education* (informative teaching around the religious culture).[2] He considers catechesis and religious education as two important

---

[1] *Vid.* GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», in *TLL* 37/4 (Summer 2001) 16-29; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequética Global», in Concilium 4 (Fall 2002) 583-592; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», in GROOME, TH.-HORELL, H. (eds.), *Horizons and Hopes: The Future of Religious Education*, NY: Paulist Press, 2003, 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», in POPE, S. (ed.), *Common Calling: The Laity and Governance of the Catholic Church*, Washington: Georgetown Press, 2004, 195-208; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», in ANDERSON, H., FOLEY, E., MILLER-MCLEMORE, B. AND SCHRIETER, R. (eds.), *Mutuatlity Matters*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004., 211-224; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», in MADGES, W. AND DALEY, M. (eds.), *The Many Marks of the Church*, cit., 79-84; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», in IMBELLI, R. (ed.), *Handing On the Faith*, NY: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2006, 172-192.

[2] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 17, 26-27; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 583-584; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-3; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211, 221-222; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 177-173.

dimensions of one reality. He holds that religious education, focused on the 'information' dimension, and catechesis, more on the formation aspect, are two necessary dimensions of education in faith. Due to their give-and-take relationship, the downplaying of one dimension means the ruin of the whole system of education in faith. However, a distinction of the two, he writes, may help as the need arises depending on the demands of circumstances. As can be intuited, this stance affirms both the socialization and religious education positions held by catechetical theorists in the past decade.

Together with catechetical education's integration of catechesis and religious education, according to Th. Groome, it likewise promotes *continuous lifelong formation* and *that all instances of community life must have a catechetical consciousness.* For him, therefore, it is *total* catechetical education. In fact, against the alleged *totalizing catechumenal catechesis*, he defends the capacity of *his* catechetical education for *lifelong* (permanent) education in faith.[3] Against the 'school instruction paradigm' dominant in the education in faith or catechesis, he vies for 'a shared faith communities' which calls for a mobilization of all educational communities and programs to co-

---

[3] In Th. Groome's dialogue with the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997), he alleged that GDC has left itself open for misinterpretation. Its recommendation of having all catechesis be inspired by the catechumenate is being taken as if all catechesis must be modeled after the catechumenal paradigm. He holds that catechesis built on the catechumenal paradigm will not work in our present time because it was ever designed for a particular time and context very much different from that of the present. In particular, it focuses, instead on daily nurture of the faith, on sudden conversions (*vid.* GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224).

operate together in the faith education.[4]   Thus, once more, Th. Groome opts for a *total* catechetical education.

   Second, it is grounded on *faith*. It is of our interest that Th. Groome founds the demand for *totality* of catechetical education, discussed above, on the very nature of the Christian faith.[5] In these writings, however, he does not present an exhaustive explanation of the *nature* of that faith on which the totality of catechetical education is based. He simply points out the two *perspectives* in understanding faith – *holistic* and *communal* - and describes their implications to catechesis. The holistic dimension refers to faith's capacity to engage

---

   [4] Th. Groome, to stress his point of the need for a co-operation of educating communities – parish, family, and school – he demonstrates the need to overcome the school didactic paradigm of teaching the faith, the need for the family to take back its role as first educator, and eventually for the need of all educating communities exercising the ministries to work together (*vid.* GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 583-585; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 175-178; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 80-84). More than criticizing any conversion-leaning program in education in faith, Th. Groome deepens and continues his reflection on the communal dimension of education in faith. In the more recent total catechetical education essays, Th. Groome reaches the conclusion that 'the whole Church' is the 'catechist educator' (cfr. GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 175) and 'the whole church' must have 'a catechetical consciousness' (cfr. GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 80-81), and thus vies for 'a whole community catechesis'.

   [5] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 103-112; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 172-192.

the whole person or the whole identity of the one who has that faith. The communal dimension refers to faith's capacity to engage the whole community in its nurture. Thus, truly nurturing one in the Christian faith engages his or her integral person (cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects) and involves all educational agents around in that nurturing.

Understanding faith from the holistic and communal perspectives implies that faith must be nurtured not only on the moment of its reception, that is, in baptism, but throughout man's life. Deepening further these perspectives, as Th. Groome did, one comes to realize that such a faith must be nurtured not by one agent or program alone but by various agents or programs, by the whole community. In addition to that, such as faith is nurtured in a formal academic instruction classes only but within a communal atmosphere. Th. Groome, in short, as his recent writings show, came to formulate the idea of *the whole Church as the catechist educator*. His understanding of whole community catechesis is the following: that all educational communities – the school, parish, family and all other programs with educational end – should adapt a *catechetical consciousness* at the moment of exercising the Church's classical ministries.[6] As he puts it, 'everything in the Church and in the world should be intentionally crafted *to nurture* people *in faith*.'[7]

The two angles or dimensions from which to consider faith are indeed useful for an *operative* educational paradigm. Considering

[6] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 23; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 587-592; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 218; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 180-186.

[7] GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 177.

its holistic aspect, education in faith will take into account the cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of the whole person. Th. Groome concludes that education in faith deals with fomenting the Christian identity. Bearing in mind faith's communal aspect, education in faith will take into consideration the importance of community nurture in Christian identity formation. We wonder however whatever the result would there be if the *dimensional* description of faith on which Th. Groome has based catechesis, be enriched with faith's *essential* definition. One of his writings which give an ampler discussion of the nature of 'faith' will be presented below.

Third, Th. Groome is convinced, as ever, that lifelong and communal catechetical education will be effective only if it is paired by *an appropriate pedagogical approach*, alluding to his shared praxis approach.[8] It is curious that he founds his approach to a theological outlook: *a divine pedagogy concretized in Christ's pedagogy* and therefore is the model of the pedagogy appropriate to a total catechetical education. Here is a citation which is echoed by his other essays on total catechetical education:

God enters into the world and is actively present in the events of human history. Thus, the world and history are the loci of God's self-disclosure. Over time, and guided by the Holy Spirit, the great Scriptures and Traditions of Christian faith emerged from communities reflecting upon their experiences of God's presence and saving deeds, climaxing for Christians in Jesus Christ. Now, people can inherit the 'faith handed down' by learning the Scriptures and

---

[8] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 27-28; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 187-189.

Traditions that emerged from and mediate this normative revelation. However, if people are to appropriate Christian faith as truly their own and be educated to live it, then Christian pedagogy now should reflect God's pedagogy over time.[9]

In his last essay, *Handing on the Faith* (2006), after referring to the divine pedagogy reflected in Christ's pedagogy, the source and model of the pedagogy of faith, Th. Groome is able to proceed without difficulty of 'the relationship between *faith* and *culture* which total catechetical education presumes and promotes'.[10] A discussion on the subject matter will be presented below with the presentation of another set of writings.

2. Catholic faith, core convictions and catechesis

Another two writings of Th. Groome which has the same theme are *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002)[11] and *Let the Imagination Soar* (2003)[12]. The second is actually an excerpt of the first four chapters of *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002). Th. Groome has presented it in a collection of essays which aimed at proposing alternative perspectives of ecclesial community life. In introducing 'those excerpted texts', Th. Groome mentions of 'how Catholic faith might

---

[9] GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 28. This is exactly the same throughout the total catechetical education writings.

[10] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 189-192.

[11] GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, NY: HarperSan Francisco Publishers, 2003.

[12] GROOME, TH., «Let the Imagination Soar», in Huebsch, B. (ed.), *Imagining a New Church: Building a Community of Life*, Texas: Thomas More Publishing, 2003, 37-58.

prompt us to *imagine* a response'[13] to the 'great questions of life' (about being human, about being in a community, etc.). He is concerned in effect of the Catholic faith's power to give substantial responses to human existence.

His earlier writing, *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002), seems to move within an ampler context of religious and 'denominational' pluralism and the whole world at hand. In this book, Th. Groome draws the Catholic faith to *the sphere of spiritual wisdom* and presents it as a spirituality.

Spirituality, for him, refers to the symbiotic movement of *bringing faith to life and bringing life to faith*. He believes that Catholicism, with its Catholic faith, has a distinctive manner of *bringing faith to life and bringing life to faith*. He presented areas in life – the great questions of life – in which Catholicism with its *faith* or *core convictions* may offer a distinctive perspective. Those distinctively Catholic perspectives constitute the Catholic spirituality. He moves on further claiming that Catholicism, with a little difference of emphasis from Christianity, is actually a spirituality.

With an ocean of interesting theological concepts, our principal interest in this study demands that we focus on *that* faith 'that makes those who hold them catholic'. We reformulate his main idea in a form of questions: what is 'that faith' that constitutes one's identity and that which makes him or her have that distinctive perspective in the great questions of life? Is 'that faith from which the distinctively catholic perspectives originate and which eventually constitute Catholic spirituality' the same to 'that faith which requires education in faith to be communal and holistic?

---

[13] GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, cit., 46.

Th. Groome closed the 20th century with a proposal of a philosophy of education to agents of education (parents and teachers). Among other features, the educational philosophy was unique in three counts: (1) true to any educational philosophy, it was geared towards the human enrichment of teachers and students alike, (2) it was paired by a participative and dialogical approach, and (3) instead of being founded on pragmatic principles, it was based on a spiritual vision. The spiritual vision on which that educational philosophy stood was constituted by different *life-elements* (man, time, society, etc.) seen from the Catholic perspective. He himself qualified his educational philosophy to be Catholic-inspired in the sense that the spiritual vision on which the philosophy stands was weighed from the Catholic point of view (at least, he claims so).

With *What Makes Us Catholic. Eight Gifts for Life* (2002), Th. Groome almost opens the new century, and the new millennium, with the same fashion.[14] This time, he proposes not an educational philosophy founded on Catholic faith-inspired spiritual vision, but Catholicism itself as a spiritual matter.

This mode of presentation has certainly important implications in the Th. Groome's catechetical thought in his writings in this decade 2000-2010. Aside from the important theoretical implication, many of the ideas (almost all) in his 2000-2010 writings are incorporated in many parts of this book.[15]

---

[14] There is reason to believe that this book is Th. Groome's opening book for the new century. The book's preface, dated November 1, 2001, alludes to the recession of the past two millennia and the third which was about to start (cfr. *ibid.*, xxi).

[15] Many of Groome's ideas in many of his writings (or even entire excerpts) are found in this book. See for example, *Let Imagination Soar* (2003). This article is a sort of a *mutatis mutandis* of the first three questions Groome discussed in *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002).

In *What Makes Us Catholic. Eight Gifts for Life* (2002), Th. Groome has for main object the 'catholic identity engaged in everyday life', 'how Catholics are engaged in the world' or in his solemn phrase, 'a proposal of Catholicism as a spirituality for life'.[16]

As a general attempt to describe what for Th. Groome is spirituality, it is *bringing faith to life and bringing life to faith* and Catholicism or catholic Christianity (he interchangeably use the term) is its unique concretization. He elaborates his main theme in these words:

> My focus throughout this book is catholic Christian identity – when it seeps into people's perspectives and practices, when it permeates their everyday lives. […]. I try to describe the defining attitudes of Catholic Christianity as these might shape how people engage in the world, how they respond to the great questions of life. In other words, our focus is *how Catholics might put faith to work – their spirituality*. In fact, I propose that Catholic identity is a spiritual matter.[17]

The discussion of the so-called 'eight gifts for life' forms the body of the book.[18] These eight gifts, according to Th. Groome, are actually Catholic perspectives on the so-called 'great questions of life' (man, time, society, etc.). Basing on Th. Groome's presentation, the understanding of each *question of life*, considered from the point of

---

[16] Cfr. GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, cit., xvii.

[17] *Ibid.*, xviii-xix.

[18] The *eight* gifts for life constituting Catholic spirituality are [1] its anthropology (Chapter 2, 39-72), [2] its cosmology (Chapter 3, 73-104), [3] its sociology and idea of community living (Chapter 4, 105-132), [4] its understanding of time and history, Tradition and the Scripture (Chapter 5, 133-168), [5] its understanding of faith as investing despite of the risk (Chapter 6, 169- 206), [6] its politics or commitment to working for justice for all (Chapter 7, 207-234), [7] its distinctive commitment to loving without borders (Chapter 8, 235-264), and [8] its priority for growing spiritually (Chapter 9, 265-300). Chapter 8, about Catholic charity, is actually not a new topic. In *Educating for Life* (1998), this topic was incorporated within Th. Groome's discussion of justice.

view of Catholic faith, constitutes theoretically an element of the Catholic Christian spirituality (*faith put into action*).

Each *question* and the ideas are more or less the same with those described in *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent* (1998). This implies that the theological aspects involve are the same with that previous work: the concept of the Church, his understanding of the authority of the Magisterium, and the authority the Church endows to Tradition.

In the previous work, however, Th. Groome mentioned about the substantial features (in comparison to the accidental) of Catholicism upon which the spirituality his education philosophy was grounded.[19] Without prolonging his discussion, there was a sort of an insinuation regarding the essence of Catholicism. This topic is of importance to us since we anchor in that area our presentation of *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002).

We think that before exploring Catholicism's 'engagement with life or the world', it is but proper to ask, how does Th. Groome conceive the Catholic Christian identity or being Catholic? Or What are, in his words, the 'constitutive aspects of Catholic Christian identity'? Th. Groome offers an answer in *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002) and adds a theological approach on how to interpret 'that which makes us Catholic'.

Groome's presentation of *Catholic Christianity as a spirituality* is worth a second look. It is impregnated with a positive conviction that Catholicism, rather than being a sectarian religion (in a negative sense), is 'life-giving', that is, it has something to offer for the betterment of the whole mankind.

---

[19] Cfr. GROOME, TH., *Educating for Life*…., cit., 17-20.

In several occasions, in fact, he writes that Catholic Christianity has something to contribute to whatever society or culture and in whatever era of history it may find itself.[20]

It seems that for Groome, Christianity, at its best, is catholic in the sense that it is universal (as mentioned earlier). Caution must be made in reading Groome's writings, especially his confusing references between catholic Christians (catholic Christianity) and Catholics (or the Roman Catholics).

Moreover, for Groome, Christianity is a particular way of interpreting or narrating the great religious story which all mankind shares with. The Christian 'interpretation' of that religious phenomenon common to all human beings nurtures that same 'experience of the Transcendent as a God of loving-kindness' resident in the human heart. Therefore, the discussion in this part will focus on the particular Christian interpretation or version of the great religious Story of mankind, its Christian sources, and the core convictions (faith) of Christianity. The faith-experience that is nurtured by the Christian story, as we will see, is essentially *a faith shared with other believing entities or believing groups.*

Christianity for Groome is one of the many interpretative or narrative versions of the experience of man of the divine common to

---

[20] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», in *Faithful Past Faith-Filled Future. Papers Commissioned for the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Commission*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 25-36, but especially 33-34; GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic….*, cit., 157-158; GROOME, TH., «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», in AUGENSTEIN, J., KAUFFMAN, C. F., WISTER, R. J. (eds.), «One Hundred Years of Catholic Education: Historical essays in Honor of the National Catholic Educational Association», Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 179-198; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for now and Always», cit., 8.

all human beings. This particular religious interpretation or narration called 'Christianity', from Groome's point of view, is catholic or universal, 'for life for all'.[21] Let us therefore embark at knowing the specifics of Christianity according to Groome's mind. We will begin with the *first subtopic*, the Christian Story, that is, the Christian version of the universal religious phenomenon narrative. The experience of the divine common to all human beings seems to be the origin of religious phenomenon. However, Groome declares Scriptures and Tradition as official sources of the Christian narration. This will therefore be the *second subtopic*.

Finally, as the *third subtopic*, we will expose the contents or elements of the Christian faith according to Groome. The Christian version of the 'great' religious story of mankind nurtures 'in a Christian way' the innate restlessness in man's heart to be in communion with the divine. Groome's list of Christian core beliefs is characterized for its being 'shared' or something which in essence is similar to the core beliefs of other religious traditions.

2.1. The Christian Story

Groome considers catholic Christianity as among the 'diverse ways of living religiously within the great spiritual story of mankind, a particular way of interpreting or living that greater life-giving spirituality.[22] With a little bit of imagination, it can be said, following Groome's mind, that Catholicism is a kind of an official version a great film or narration (especially made for a specific audience). However, like in any official version, there could be false or erroneous copies which may present a false narration of the Catholic version of the great spirituality common to all mankind. He says that

---

[21] GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic….*, cit., 5-6.
[22] *Ibid.*, 5.

as indeed part of a greater spiritual Story, one has to proceed 'with caution' at the moment of interpreting Catholic Christianity.[23]

For Groome, 'with caution' means that one has to avoid presenting the catholic Christianity in a manner that it would be exclusive or, in his terms, 'a destructive sectarianism' or 'a surface kind of religious identity that is more sectarian than spiritual' or 'a narrow sectarianism that nullifies the spirit of the gospel preached by Jesus'.[24]   With this caution, he aims more at balancing between 'cherishing one's identity and appreciating diversity'. He in fact says:

> Every religion must avoid the pitfall of a destructive sectarianism. […] it's also true that every faith community needs to cherish and claim its own identity; its survival depends on it. in fact, the very future of the world may well turn on how adept we become at respecting differences while claiming particular identity. It will help Christians to juggle the two […] if we remember humanity's spiritual bond as one family of God. We must celebrate what we share in common with other religious traditions and among ourselves as protestant and Catholic members of the one body of Christ.[25]

Groome uses the metaphor 'story' in order to describe the particular Christian way of 'living religiously within the great spiritual story of mankind'. According to the Christian version, the Story is all about the divine and human affair. God has an interior divine wish of well-being (divine plan of salvation) for His creation and in which He made a contract with human persons to be His partners in realizing that 'divine wish of well-being' here in the world (the vision of God's reign in the world). From Christian faith's central belief in a Triune God up to how that God makes his divine adventure with

---

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *Ibid.*, 6.

[25] *Ibid.*, 6-7.

mankind on earth, the Christian version of the 'universal religious story' has a distinctive form of narration.

Groome usually refers to faith as something told as the case of popular stories. Hence, the narration of the faith, based on its 'sources' is called 'Story'. Moreover, since it is a 'faith narration' which has something to do with Christ and therefore involves all who profess faith in Christ, Protestants and Catholics alike, it is called 'Christian Story.' The Christian Story nurtures the faith shared by Christians.

In Groome's mind, three principal elements necessary to be taken into consideration regarding the Christian Story. To wit: (a) consider it as *a story in its state of unfolding*, (b) it is a story about *the vital divine-human partnership*, and (c) it is a vital partnership geared towards *the realization of God's reign on earth*. These elements demonstrate the dynamism of the Christian faith.

First, it is *a story in its state of unfolding*. Groome emphasizes Christian faith's dynamic and engaging and character. The Christian version, told and re-told in different situations and different times, does not lose its appeal and its captivating beauty. He says:

> Christian Story, like any other, has a great overarching narrative, with characters and plots, the serious and the comic, the meaningful and the tragic, sins and graces, heroes and villains, a few saints, and sinners galore. And like every great story, it can be retold and embellished from one generation to the next, remaining ever old and ever new.[26]

Moreover, he adds that Christian Story, like any story, has many versions or forms. He names the following: the canon of Scripture, dogmas, doctrines, and creeds; liturgies, sacraments, and symbols; theologies and philosophies; ethics and laws, virtues and

---

[26] *Ibid.*, 20.

values; spiritualities, lifestyles, and models of holiness; songs, music, dance and drama; art, artifacts, and architecture; community structures and forms of governance; ways to sanctify time and celebrate feasts; and always more.[27] This perspective of Th. Groome clearly has its own risk. It appears that according to this perspective, the creed and the sacraments possess equal importance with liturgical hymns and chants. In reality, the history of Christianity has always distinguished the value or importance of the realities and expressions of the Christian faith, of the sacraments, of the Christian life. It has always especially made distinctions in diverse time and place between those which are substantial and immutable from those which are accidental and variable.

Second, the Christian faith is all about *the vital partnership between God and man.* In other words, its content is the divine-human rendezvous. It can also be said that the two main actors in this story is God and man. He says that particular human existence in the world may be viewed as an affair with the divine. God has designed this partnership in a manner that human beings respond truly as partners, not active subjects or slaves of God, in realizing God's best intentions. He explains the adjective 'vital' before the term 'partnership' or 'covenant', saying:

> It is vital in many senses: as engaging the whole person and the whole community, as lively and to be lived, as invigorating and ever renewing, as revealing who we are and our finest possibilities. The partnership is vital, too, in that human participation is of real importance. Although God could bring about God's reign in history without us, God has chosen to wait upon human cooperation. So, God take us into partnership and graces us with the freedom and capacity to respond by living as people of God.[28]

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 20-21.

[28] *Ibid.*, 21.

Groome views the Christian Story as divine-human partnership which started with God's covenant with the Hebrews, continued and reached its zenith in Jesus Christ, again continued and is continuing with the Christian people living their faith throughout history. This Christian Story serves as guide and norm for all Christians throughout history in 'discerning what to believe, how to worship, and the ethics to live by.'[29]

According to the Christian narration, the natural desire in the deepest recesses of the human heart which animates him to get in touch with God, is a resonance of God's 'sentiment of love' for man. It is God Himself who has placed that 'spark of divine restlessness' resident in inmost core of the human person. By the threefold divine acts of creation, redemption and sanctification, the Triune God works not only in the world but also in the human person.[30] By creation, man is God's image. By the act of redemption, God glued more strongly the divine-human bond by Jesus' blood. By the Spirit at work in the world, God continues to fortify the human partner in realizing the inspirations and plans of God here on earth.

Third, God's reign is posed as both an *end to be achieved* (vision) and at the same time a *standard to be referred to in the discernment of God's will* (overarching guideline). *As a vision*, one has to consider God's reign as a challenge, an end to be achieved, an outcome to be worked for, in the living of Christian faith.[31] For instance, faith in God's love shall urge Christians to share *that* love to others. The Christian faith

---

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Cf. *ibid.*, 21, 44-45, 58-60, 61-65, 80, 87, 89, 274-279. Using this concept of 'operative presence of God in human life in the world' in a discussion over religious education, Groome coins the term God's pedagogy over time (cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When the We Thought the Debate Was Over», cit., 211-224, especially, 214-217).

[31] Cfr. GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic….*, cit., 21-22.

urges and pushes for its concrete and historical realization. Groome uses the term 'Reign of God' or what he also calls 'God's reign in the realization of *shalom*'.[32] He confirms this fact citing Jesus' earth life as having this same vision.

As an overarching guideline in the discernment, God's reign serves as a north star to what is or is not divine will.[33] He explains it this way. The human beings carry within (feel) their hearts 'divine desire for mankind'. Just by listening to one's authentic desires, one comes to intuit of what the reign of God is about here and now. That is how God's reign presents itself as a vision perceivable by the human heart. Groome eventually points out the *value* and *validity* of the 'best hopes' or 'best sentiments' found in any human heart especially in discerning God's will.[34]

Th. Groome's perspective of God's reign as the guide in every discernment is important. However, in the Christian perspective, the *reign of God* is not merely a bundle of religious values but an intimate vocation of every person and every human community before Christ and the Church. The reign of God includes the search for the common good and common religious values, and the proposal of the Christian faith.

2.2. The Sources of the Christian Story: Scriptures and Tradition

The basic religious phenomenon in which Christianity is an example of a particular narration attempt (Christian Story) appears to be anchored on the simple fact of the *divine initiative* and the *'direct'*

---

[32] For more discussion on God's reign and the shalom, *vid.* GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for now and Always», cit., 10-12.

[33] GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic….*, cit., 22-23.

[34] Cfr. *ibid.*

experience of the human community of the divine[35]. Throughout the course of time, the 'personal experience of the divine in a community' or perhaps the 'communal experience of the divine of every person' has undergone development. There emerges what Groome designates as the *official* means of divine revelation. Forming a single whole and with the same end of nurturing the faith, Scriptures and Tradition are ever interdependent with each other.[36] Both are the reliable sources of the Christian Story. Groome writes:

> The fountain of Christian Faith is God's revelation that finds echo in the human heart. The formal means that God employs to communicate with us – *the official media of Christian revelation* – are Scripture and Tradition, the latter what has emerged over time as central beliefs and practices of the faith. […]. Scripture and Tradition carry forward the deep currents of beliefs, rituals, and ethics that commingle as the great river of Christian Faith.[37]

Scriptures and Tradition seem to be, for Groome, the accumulation of both the accounts of divine intervention and reciprocal human experience of the divine.

Concerning the Scriptures, Th. Groome has these *four* important affirmations. *First*, referring to the Old and New Testaments of the Christian Bible, he says that the two 'testaments' of God's revelation make up the bible. He affirms that the books of the Old Testament are the vital legacy of the Hebrew Tradition to the Christian faith. However, he does not explicitly equate the Old Testament with the Hebrew Bible although he affirms that 'many now favor the term 'Hebrew Bible' out of respect for Judaism, avoiding the connotation of 'old' as out-of-date or replaced by something 'new'.' He also says that the books of the New Testament emerged from the first Christian community and are considered the 'uniquely Christian

---

[35] Cfr. *ibid.*, 274.
[36] Cfr. *ibid.*, 20, 30.
[37] *Ibid.*, 12-13.

Scriptures.'[38] *Second*, Groome affirms actually the divine revelation attributed to the Bible comes from within the communities of faith. *How is this explained?* These communities reflected their experiences of God's presence and saving deeds in their lives. From these 'reflections', divinely inspired authors put them into writing intending to express God's revelation through the language and ways of thinking of their concrete time and place.[39] He also cites somewhere the closing of the biblical canon on the fourth century emphasizing the communal effort. *Third*, Groome further says that since God's revelation is a memorandum coming directly from God, it needs interpretation (the task of figuring out what they mean here and now).[40] *Finally*, the final written texts serve as a medium through which persons may encounter a 'word of God' for their lives now.[41]

Concerning the other source faith shared by Christians, Tradition, or what he refers to as 'what has emerged over time as central beliefs and practices of the faith,'[42] Groome has these important declarations. *First*, tradition is the fruit of the Christian community's efforts of interpreting the Scripture in *their* given time, place, culture, problems, etc. in history. It thus develops, as Groome puts it, as a medium of revelation through history.[43] *Second*, the Holy Spirit has always guided the whole Church's discernment regarding the relevance of the words in the Bible to the particular context in which the same Church finds herself. He relates the emergence of great doctrines of the Christian faith to this interpretative phenomenon in

---

[38] Cfr. *ibid.*, 13.
[39] Cfr. *ibid.*
[40] Cfr. *ibid.*, 16-17.
[41] Cfr. *ibid.*, 13.
[42] Cfr. *ibid.*
[43] Cfr. *ibid.*, 14.

the Church.[44]   *Third*, tradition, like Scripture, is also in need of an interpretation, that is, the figuring out of its 'relevance' or applicability in the present.[45]

Scriptures and Tradition, according to Th. Groome, have an intrinsic need for interpretation. The messages of those two sources of faith - Scripture and Tradition - carry with them a very rich and long history. As mentioned above, they were formed in a particular time and in a particular culture.

Thence, two natural consequences – related to each other - follow: *first*, the need for interpretation in order indeed for the sources of faith to be relevant here and now, and *second*, the required communal context in that effort of interpretation given that they were 'produced' in a communal context.

For the *first* mentioned consequence, *Scripture and Tradition's the need for interpretation*, in addition to their *indirect* divine origin, Groome points out the particular cultural and historical contexts in which they were 'produced' as among the reasons for their need to be interpreted and be fitted to the recent times. He seems to hold

---

[44] Th. Groome cites here as an example the 'emergence' of the doctrine two natures of Jesus. He says: "[…] the one historical person, Jesus, had two natures – human and divine – is a central doctrine of Christian faith that is not explicitly stated in the New Testament. It is certainly true that the roots of are there, but this doctrine was not expressed precisely until the Council of Nicea in 325, and the Council of Chalcedon (451) clarified it further. Since then, belief in the divinity and humanity of Jesus has been a pillar of Christian Tradition. It is important to note that not all Christian tradition is of equal weight […]" (*Ibid.*). He therein classifies the teachings of the Christian faith as 'major league' (central dogmas and doctrines), 'minor league' (common church instruction), and 'local league' (favorite emphases in different times or cultures). In addition to that, he explicitly says that there is no official list of these teachings (cfr. *ibid.*, 14-15). But we have to clearly say that the Church distinguishes its central truths (dogma) from the rest, as in the *CCC* for example.

[45] Cfr. *ibid.*, 14, 16-17, 144-148.

that the above-mentioned factors may have also conditioned the promulgation of a dogma or a teaching of faith. He writes:

> God's presence and self-disclosure continue through all times and cultures; God's ongoing revelation in people's daily lives must also be considered. So, we always need to *interpret* the meaning of Scripture and Tradition for our lives now, to figure things out rather than expect pat answers. Here, the Bible itself is a model, the Hebrew people interpreted the story of Exodus quite differently when they had a powerful monarchy in place than when they were a dispossessed people in exile.[46]

That is indeed why he writes, on one hand commenting the Bible, that the risen Christ spent time helping the disciples understand the Scriptures; and on the other hand commenting on Tradition, he asserts that its emergence is a testimony of the continuing unfolding of God's revelation after the determination of the biblical canon. This effort of interpreting the sources of faith, he affirms, has been continued by the Christian community ever since.[47]

Scripture and Tradition seems to be, for Groome, fruits of the first Christian community's attempt to appropriate - and in the case of succeeding Christian communities, re-appropriation - of God's message or interventions in their own particular contexts.[48] Logically he concludes that in the contemporary times as in every era in history, there is too a need to 'interpret' or 'reinterpret' them. In some part, after affirming that persons are by nature interpreters, he asserts:

> When we interpret ancient texts of Scripture and Tradition […] we are also trying to bridge the gap between symbols of meaning

---

[46] *Ibid.*, 16; cfr. also 24-26.
[47] Cfr. *ibid.*, 16-17.
[48] Cfr. *ibid.*, 153-155.

from a previous time and our present-life situations. We are trying
to uncover what their original meaning might mean for now.[49]

In addition to that, Groome speaks of 'bring life to interpret
the Christian Story and the Christian Story to interpret life. In other
words, in the interpreting activity, there is a kind of dialog between
concrete living – experiences and actions, thoughts and feelings,
wisdom of mind and body, the happenings in society, in the
community, in the world - and the Christian faith. Groome says that
'bringing life to interpret Christian Story' and 'bringing the Christian
story to interpret life' means that 'that we draw upon our whole life
in the world to help us figure out what the Story means for now.'[50]
In other words, in interpreting the Christian Story, one must be
aware that there is a sort of mutual constructive confrontation
between faith and concrete life situation.

In some part, Groome says that man, by nature, is an
interpreter. The task therefore of bringing life to interpret the
Christian Story and vice-versa, has a natural foundation. He then
asserts that in that natural habit of interpreting things or events in
daily life, one has to somehow consciously allow the faith to
intervene or to be involved. In interfacing the current life situation
with the 'ancient wisdom of Christian Story', he gives *three* objectives:
(1) to see the presence of God in ordinary experiences and recognize
God's word for now, (2) to allow what is understood from faith
(head) to trickle down to the sentiments (heart) and eventually
conjugated into action (hands), and (3) 'to help faith to come alive
again in fresh and more life-giving ways.'[51] It must be briefly

---

[49] *Ibid.*, 18.
[50] *Ibid.*, 23.
[51] Cfr. *ibid.*, 24-26.

mentioned however that the 'effort' of interpretation does not in any way exhaust the wisdom latent in the treasury of Christian Story.[52]

Regarding the second logical consequence, that is, the need for a communal context, Groome affirms that the discernment concerning Scripture and Tradition takes place *within a faith community* and guided by a the *magisterium.* He alludes to a 'corporate wisdom' resulting from the participation of everybody in the task of discernment.[53] He specifies that in the ongoing communal discernment *a dialog* between the *faith* of what he calls 'ordinary Christians', the *research* of scholars in scripture and theology. For Catholics, he adds from the *two* aforementioned elements – faith and research – the *stewardship* of the college of bishops in union with the pope. Without reducing the Petrine office in the sole action of 'drawing into consensus the sentiments of ordinary Christians, scholars and bishops,' Groome mentions that the Supreme Pontiff's promulgation – he uses the term 'express' – is required to make such a faith official. He bases this aspect of the Petrine ministry on St. Peter's role in the first Christian community.[54]

With the involvement of the ordinary Christians, the scholars, the bishops and the pope, the required communal dimension of interpreting the sources of faith is met. He says, in fact, that the Church's function as teacher requires the whole community to participate, rather than a small group doing all the teaching and the rest doing all the learning.[55] He says:

> While Christians have great formal sources of revelation available to them in Scripture and Tradition, and are guided by the corporate wisdom of their faith community, they have no pat

---

[52] Cfr. *ibid.*, 22, 26-28.
[53] Cfr. *ibid.*, 18.
[54] Cfr. *ibid.*, 15-16.
[55] Cfr. *ibid.*, 17.

formulas for integrating their lives and faith into 'living faith'. *To figure out the most life-giving version of Christian faith […] the whole church and each member must take an approach of interpretation.* In fact, *all* we ever have as human beings is interpretation. This does not mean that our figurings are unreliable. With good guidelines and the help of God's Holy Spirit, we can always know enough from Christian Story to live faithfully as a people of God.[56]

Finally, Groome is very realistic in his views. He admits that the danger of misinterpretations is a reality in the arduous 'effort' of interpreting or drawing out what is right and relevant in the Christian Story (Scripture and Tradition).[57] Thence, he presents a concrete guideline for the community's interpretative task. They are: (1) Consider the Christian faith as a great unfolding Story of the vital partnership between God and mankind, and with the Vision of God's Reign; (2) Bringing life to interpret Christian Story and Christian Story to interpret life (3) Expect to encounter old and new spiritual wisdom; (4) Be alert for distortions and forgotten legacies; and (5) Always choose *for life for all*; (5) Honor Scripture and Tradition as symbiotic sources of God's revelation; (6) Approach the Christian Story with critical appreciation and creative appropriation; and, (7) Interpret Scripture and Tradition within the whole Christian community and in dialogue with life in the world.

One may wonder if Th. Groome, in his discussion about Tradition and Scriptures, has any word about the Magisterium official teaching office of the Church). In his 2000-2010 writings, the topic is completely absent. In his writings previous to the first decade of the 21st century, Th. Groome distributes the teaching authority among: (1) *the official teaching office associated with pastoral authority* (to pronounce officially the faith consensus of the community), (2) the

---

[56] *Ibid.*, 18. For more regarding the involvement of the whole community in the teaching office, cfr. 155-158.

[57] Cfr., *ibid.*, 19-33, 149-158.

theologians (their researches and investigations), and (3) the *sensus fidelium* (the discernment of the people).[58] He tends to limit the Magisterium's task to the mere confirmation of the *sensus fidelium.*

Th. Groome has an idea of an entity inside the Church who should have the principal task of safeguarding, teaching and preserving the faith. He seems not attribute that principal task to the Magisterium, for reasons which he does not clearly reveal or has not written about. He even holds a so-called *hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed*, that is, of those who are directly involved in the works of promoting justice and peace, those who are combating the plague of hunger and sickness, etc. He attributes them a sort of *knowing better* in the practical dimension of reality which the Church confronts. The hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed may be interpreted to be the 'more authoritative' magisterium of all the others in the Church.

We must however recognize that Groome's emphasis on the contribution of each of *his* three sources the Church's magisterium, may encourage other 'groups' in the Church (such as for example the lay people or theologians) to take their participation in the Church's teaching task (by reason of baptism) more seriously.

Anyhow, Groome's thought concerning the magisterium may be completed with a specific discussion of the exercise of that teaching authority by the bishops of the whole world in communion with the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and customs (LG 23, 25) and of the Roman Pontiff's exercise of it as Vicar of Christ and Pastor of the whole Church (LG 23).

---

[58] Cfr. Chapter I, 3.2.2 of this thesis.

2.3. The core convictions (creed) of Christianity

As stated above, the Christian version of the unfolding of the common religious experience nurtures that same 'experience', and eventually the faith which surges from this nurture. Groome seems to identify faith with core convictions. Somewhere, Groome holds that faith seems to be that interior conviction that influences their outlook, their perspectives, way of thinking and which eventually results into a distinctive Catholic imagination.[59]

For Groome, the Christian 'core convictions' or creed is a shared one. It has something or some things (*plural*) in common with other *believing entities*. With all believers and, in particular, with all who believe in God *through* and *in* the way of Jesus, Christian faith holds convictions (not only rituals) that are essentially similar to the religious creeds of other believers. Commenting on 'what makes us catholic', Groome says that in reality the question of the identity of catholic Christianity is not at all a search for the particular quality that defines it from the rest of religions or confessions[60]; its unique quality is its *shared faith*.[61] He thus writes:

---

[59] Cfr. *ibid.*, 9, 34.

[60] Th. Groome seem to hold that in the pre-Vatican II era, Catholic Christian rituals and practices were considered the its principal self-identifying elements. The elevation of some of its 'symbols' into sacraments prove the deeply Catholic outlook. However, afterwards, the gradual lessening of their importance also led to the dwindling sense of Catholic Christian identity (cfr. *ibid.*, Preface xix-xxi, 32-34, 84-90).

[61] Th. Groome notes somewhere some elements in Catholic faith which could be considered a defining quality. Among the few things, the devotion and obedience to the Holy Father remained as the apparent unique element. He says however that many Catholics now, while professing that they are Catholics, do not have any qualms in admitting conditional devotion or obedience to the Holy Father (cfr. *ibid.*, 31). This claim of Groome is clearly a sociological simplification. Those which distinguish us as Roman Catholics must not disappear or be laid aside just because unfortunately there are Catholics who have no longer believe in them. We

> It's not easy to capture what lends Catholic Christians their particular identity. Like all Christians, Catholics embrace faith in God, discipleship to Jesus, dependence on the Holy Spirit, and all great symbols that we hold in common. These make us *Christian* like other Christians and are interwoven constantly throughout this book. So, the foundation of what makes us Catholic is the shared faith of the whole Body of Christ; it is certainly not unique to Catholicism.[62]

It shall be added however that Groome is well aware of the diversity and obvious differences not only in practices but even in matters of faith between religions and even within Christianity itself. Commenting about it somewhere, he speaks of a so called *reconciled* diversity clearly differentiated from 'a blending all beyond distinction.'[63]

Fully aware of the differences, Groome opts to indicate the aspects of faith common and shared by both Protestants and Catholics as the source of catholic Christian identity.[64] Somewhere, he says that catholic Christianity's uniqueness is a matter of emphasis.[65] These being said, we move on with investigating about those common elements that Christianity shares with other religious traditions and confessions according to Groome.

---

differ from the Orthodox, for example, in little but important matters; from Protestants, for having the Sacraments; and from 'other religions', not only for the Sacraments but for the way of life. Stating clearly and recognizing what makes us distinct and what others hold sacred and which are different from our faith encourage more an authentic ecumenism or a true interreligious dialogue.

[62] *Ibid.,* 31.

[63] *Ibid.,* 12.

[64] Th. Groome does not say if in the other religions, they could also identify their distinctive quality in the faith shared with Catholics and other religions. Moreover, Th. Groome's point of view seems to clearly perceive the danger of relativism. As he says, his is a 'partial perspective' (cfr. *ibid.,* 32-33).

[65] Cfr. *ibid.,* 32.

2.3.1. Shared faith with non-Christian religions

Groome launches his search for 'what makes us catholic' in the midst of what catholic Christianity holds in common with other religions or confessions. They are, among others, the belief in a Transcendent God, the belief in salvation, the practice of charity, the demand to work for justice and peace and the need to serve others. We keep a personal wonder regarding Groome's discussion the catholic Christianity's relation to non-Christian religions. Having shown his great interest for the Second Vatican Council in general, he does not however make any reference whatsoever on the progress of the Catholic Church's work of interreligious dialogue or, to say the least, any reference to the Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions *Nostra Aetate*.

With the other religions, Catholic Christianity shares the common human experience of the Transcending Mystery, a being which stands at the base of every thing and everything. Everything in life shares the spiritual nature of this Transcending Mystery. To the great religions, he says:

> All the great religions reflect the common human experience of
> Transcending Mystery; they nourish the heart's desire for the
> largess of life. They share the conviction that the basis of
> everything, ourselves included, is the Transcendent – a Presence
> from beyond us and yet in our midst. Although life in the world
> may look very material, in fact it's deeply spiritual. What's more,
> the human spirit shares intimately in this Spirit Realm; it's our true
> home. For all the great religions, the Transcendent represents
> ultimate truth and goodness, justice and peace; thus people should
> so live. All the great religions propose religious practices and
> disciplines to sustain people in living out their human vocation as
> spiritual beings. All agree that we find more meaning and
> purpose, more hope and happiness by being anchored (*re-ligare*) in
> beliefs, ethics and rituals that recognize Transcendence. And
> though we live our spirituality in multiple ways, all of them

recommend *the way* of love. At its best, every great religion helps to turn people toward the neighbor with compassion.[66]

Aside from the 'great religions', he mentions in particular 'religions who believe in personal divinity.' He makes special reference to Islam. With *Islam*, he says:

> With religions that believe in a personal divinity, Islam for example, Christianity shares explicit faith in God, and that God embraces all humanity with unconditional love. Theistic traditions also believe that God is actively present within human history, revealing himself, inviting people into covenant (partnership), and caring for human well-being. These religions emphasize God's great compassion, expecting the same from every people of God, with special favor for those most in need. Likewise, they believe in an afterlife and that God, though merciful, respects our responsibility – even eternally – for our conduct in this one.[67]

With religions of theistic traditions, he counts faith in a loving and all-embracing God, in the divine presence in human history, in divine revelation, in divine-human partnership, and in working for well-being. In addition to that, he names the belief in afterlife and the compensation for human beings' good conduct in the earthly life.

Groome rightfully allots a separate discussion on the faith shared with the Jewish people, 'Christians' elder brothers in the faith of Abraham.'[68]   Among the points of sharing in matters of faith between Jews and Christians are the faith in a creator-provider God, in God's desire for *shalom*, in the integrity of creation, in the divine-human covenant of living the *shalom*, in the Ten Commandments (guidelines of the divine-human partnership and the governance of the world), in divine help or grace and in livening in a faith community. Thus, he says:

---

[66] *Ibid.*, 7.

[67] *Ibid.*

[68] Cfr. POPE JOHN PAUL II, *Address delivered to the Jewish people*, Synagogue of Rome, April 13, 1986.

> With Judaism, Christians share the same roots in Hebrew faith. […] Judaism and Christianity share faith in God as Creator and loving Sustainer of all things, as making people in God's very own image and likeness. Both traditions emphasize God's desire is *shalom*, a lovely and holistic word that includes justice and peace, love and compassion, freedom and fullness of life for all, and the integrity of creation. Further, they believe that God takes humankind into covenant to live as people of God according to the *shalom* that God intends. Jews and Christians revere the Decalogue – the Ten Commandments – as governing their partnership with God and their responsibilities in the world. Both believe that with God's help people can be faithful to the divine covenant, living their faith in daily life. Both emphasize membership in a faith community, convinced that God comes to us and we go to God most readily as a people – together.[69]

In his discussions, Groome always acknowledges the Hebrew roots of Christianity. He fails lightly however to explicitly demarcate the novelty of Christian thought.

2.3.2. Shared faith with all Christians

Most of all, Groome gives a special presentation on the common faith or core convictions shared by 'Christians of all stripe'. He gives value to the ecumenical efforts of started by the Second Vatican Council.[70] With the Protestants, he says that Catholics share the discipleship of Jesus within the Body of Christ, the commandment of love, the task of helping realize God's reign of peace, justice, holiness, and fullness of life for all. Moreover, he names the Bible as the inspired word of God and the basic profession of faith expressed in the Nicene and Apostles' creeds. Regarding the profession of faith shared by all Christians, we hereby

---

[69] GROOME, TH., *What Makes us Catholics….*, cit., 8.
[70] *Ibid.*, 2.

present what Groome has written in his *What Makes Us Catholic (2002).*[71] They are the following:

> We profess faith in God as loving Creator who takes humankind into partnership to bring about God's reign for all creation.
>
> We profess in Jesus as fully human and divine, and the promised Messiah – the Christ; whose life models the way to live as a Christian people of God; whose death and resurrection empower us to live and effects 'God's liberating salvation' in human history.
>
> We profess faith in the Holy Spirit as 'the giver of life,' who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified' – the third person of the Blessed Trinity; that the Spirit guides and graces persons and the whole Church to be faithful to their divine covenant, encouraging them to live in right relationship with God, self, others and creation.
>
> We claim the same baptism and vocation to become a Church that is one in charity and faith, holy by God's Spirit working through the lives of its people, catholic by its inclusivity and openness of mind and heart, and apostolic through its faithfulness to the foundations laid by Jesus.
>
> Together we aspire to enter the communion of saints; we rejoice in God's mercy that is always on offer; we hope for resurrection as whole persons – body and all; and we trust the promise of eternal life in God's presence.

<div align="center">***</div>

The exposition above of Groome's thought regarding Christianity at its best (a catholic Christianity), forms part of his general proposal – to present catholic Christianity as a spirituality. Th. Groome explicitly explains his use of catholic as 'universal'. However, in the course of his discussion, it becomes mixed with his use of Catholics (referred to Roman Catholics).

In any case, he considers Christianity as a way of living the universal religious restlessness found in every human heart. This

---

[71] *Ibid.*, 9-10.

'divine flame' innate in man is placed by God himself and is nurtured in particular by catholic Christianity. Christianity, in its function of nurturing that innate desire for God accedes to the official channels of divine revelation, that is, Scriptures and Tradition.

He did not make mention about the Magisterium (in his 2000-2010 writings). The Christian nurture then produces particular core convictions or concrete faith expressions. These core convictions (*creed* or *to which we give our hearts*) is in essence shared with 'believers' of other traditions. Following Th. Groome's mental framework, a Christian identity is forged through these core convictions *shared* with other believers.

The distinctive identity that Christianity emits from its *shared* core convictions and from its way of particular *interpreting* the innate desire for God common in all human hearts makes up 'what makes us catholic' or in this case, universal.

The problem is that Groome after affirming the meaning 'universal' in his use of catholic, he discusses about that which is distinctively Catholic with capital C (without explaining whether he still refers to the idea of universality or to Roman Catholics). He does not make a clear distinction between Roman Catholics and catholic Christians. Which has the 'universal' identity?

To make things simpler, we put it this way. Groome seems to affirm that the *core convictions* which Christians share with other *believers*, make Christians universal or distinctively catholic. If Groome is right, these convictions are the same ones which make believers of other religions catholic.

We accompany Groome up to his assertion that *Christianity is a spiritual matter.* We respect his opinion that there are *core values shared by or agreed upon by believers from different religions* and those shared values make whoever holds them *distinctively universal* (in order not to use the

term 'catholic').   However, we opine that what Groome does not comment about – the substantial matters of faith which differ Roman Catholics from other believers – are substantially important if one wants to live an authentic spiritual life.

<div align="center">***</div>

3. On faith, catechesis, and US American culture

On the occasion of the 100 years of the National Catholic Educational Association (1903-2003), Th. Groome contributed two essays which reflect his understanding of how the Catholic faith 'makes impact' in the realm of public life and culture. They are *Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: the Challenge for Religious Educators* (2003) and *For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education* (2003).

The *first* mentioned essay is about Religious educators' role concerning the identity of Catholics in the midst of American culture. American culture seems to be squarely in opposition to the core convictions on which the catholic identity is founded. The principal thesis of Th. Groome is that the faith on which Catholic identity is based has an impressive track record of being able to blend with any culture; while it enriches the particular culture to which it 'mixes', it is also enriched by the said culture on the process. In this essay, Th. Groome analyzes how Religious educators may help forge a mutually enriching dialogue between the two. The *second* essay is all about Catholic faith's possible influence on the public's common good, particularly the American public. The main thesis of Th. Groome here is that the Catholic faith, the 'motivating foundation' of catholic education is capable not only of educating Catholics to be good Catholics *(education for faith)* but also of persons (including Catholics)

to be good citizens *(education from faith)*. Th. Groome holds that this is precisely the charism of Catholic educational system.

3.1. Catholic identity and the American social culture

In *Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: the Challenge for Religious Educators* (2003), Th. Groome traces the remarkable feat of Catholic education in the 'safeguarding' of the Catholic identity since its coming to what is now USA until our times. Even if Th. Groome does not dwell at any moment in explaining that the identity of Catholics as *Catholics* is shaped or formed by their core convictions (also identified with *faith*), he presupposes the idea throughout the essay. Th. Groome uses catholic identity and catholic faith interchangeably. As it was shown in *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002), he demonstrated that that which constitutes Catholic *identity* is its faith, or if it can be permitted to say, *that aspect of faith which 'may be' shared by other believers*.[72]

With the 'over against paradigm' and 'total embrace paradigm' of Catholic stances before the US American culture,[73] Th. Groome presents a model of inculturation founded on 'the logic of

---

[72] As we have already indicated, Groome does not explicitly make distinction between being a Roman Catholic and being Catholic. It seems that in the first place he intends catholic for 'universal'. When associating the idea of 'being a Roman catholic' with 'being catholic or universal', he refers to Roman Catholics embracing the concept of universality, that is, of sharing or participating in a 'conviction' or a 'core value' which others also hold as such. Aware of this, one may read Groome 'with caution' (an expression he uses for reading the *GDC*).

[73] In this essay, Th. Groome, basing on the history of Catholics in America, identifies two contrasting catholic attitudes before the American culture. He describes the attitude of Catholics before American culture in the 1800 as of *total opposition* or 'over against'. On the contrary, he points out the Catholic attitude towards American culture in 1900 as *total acceptance* or 'over-embrace' (cfr. GROOME, TH., «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», cit., 27-28).

the Incarnation', an encounter of culture and faith in which one becomes truly Catholic while simultaneously truly American. After describing inculturation as the process of indigenizing Christian faith in a local culture,[74] Th. Groome writes:

> Through the word is of recent vintage, inculturation has been an issue for the Christian Church from the beginning. Indeed, inculturation was the logic of Incarnation. For God among us in Jesus took on the identity and culture of a first-century Palestinian Jew and expressed the foundations of Christian faith through the cultural milieu of his time and place. And though Jesus preached his Gospel in and through a consistent cultural context, within a few years it began to take on diverse expressions.[75]

He therefore moves on writing that in many ways, Christian faith continued to be appropriated according to its cultural contexts. He explains that the intent was to 'make flesh' again the Gospel message, not as something alien to the context and after is placed in it, but 'as indigenous to the culture and yet faithful to the Gospel'. To elaborate his point further, he uses the expression 'according to the mode of the receiver'. Th. Groome clarifies his idea of inculturation of the Christian faith in a particular context as 'authentic' when 'each people expresses Christ's message in its own way' and when there is a 'living exchange' between the Christianity and culture. He employs *living exchange* in referring to the mutual enrichment between the Christianity and culture.[76]

He further presented his key conviction regarding inculturation, thus:

> […] there is never a culture-less Gospel and there is never a God-less culture. In other words, Christian faith is always expressed through a particular culture – the customs of life and patterns of

---

[74] *Ibid.,* 28

[75] *Ibid.,* 28-30.

[76] Cfr. *ibid.,* 29.

meaning that distinguish a people; as noted, this began with the carpenter from Nazareth. By the same token, every culture has what Justin Martyr, writing about 160, perceptively called 'the seeds of the Word' within it, independent of its encounter with Christian faith. God's saving grace and self-disclosure are present through every culture; each has an affinity to receive the explicit 'Word' and is capable of its own unique expression to Christianity.[77]

How does this *living exchange* take place? He writes:

A living exchange between faith and culture implies a dialectical dynamic, with each side affirming, questioning, and enriching the other. So, upon entering a culture, Christian faith will affirm and build upon the 'seeds of the Word' already present; other aspects it will challenge, and it should change the culture to advance God's work of salvation. Likewise each culture should appropriate the beliefs, ethics, and sacraments of Christian faith in ways native to this particular people; this means affirming, questioning, and changing the cultural version of Christianity it receives. In a sense, each people will reject the cultural medium of the Christianity they first encounter and replace it with their own. What emerges will be a unique expression of Christian faith, enhancing the Church's catholicity.[78]

Th. Groome however is very clear that no cultural appropriation can change the core beliefs, morals and sacraments that are constitutive of Catholic Christian faith.[79] He adds that a culture's reception of Christian faith is a matter of 'highlighting an aspect of the Christian faith'.[80] Therefore, in his analysis of the 'living exchange' between Catholic faith and American culture, he points out the aspects of Catholic faith that American culture highlights and the aspects of American culture enriched by Catholic faith.

---

[77] *Ibid.*

[78] *Ibid.*, 30.

[79] Cfr. *ibid.*

[80] Cfr. *ibid.*

From the idea of 'living exchange', he identifies 'blessings' from American culture which would be enriching to catholic identity and vice versa. For the first he identifies, the rights and equality of persons, the spirit and practice of democracy, and public discourse and debate.[81] For the second, the together with his rights, person has also responsibilities, life is gracious and sacramental, sense of community and responsibility for the common good, treasuring of tradition, practice of distributive and social justice, charity to all, a spirituality characterized by its being communal, filled with consideration with others, and joyful.[82]

He mentions briefly about how religious educators may enhance this fruitful encounter between American culture and faith-based Catholic identity, making use the *content* and *method* of that lively exchange.[83] He sees in that exchange a 'countercultural' role of the faith-based Catholic identity. He refers to 'the Gospel of Jesus' and 'the core convictions of Catholic Christianity' (alluding to Catholic understanding of person as having both rights and responsibilities, its so-called sacramental outlook, its commitment to the common good of society, etc.) – taken as one – as the *content* (in singular) of faith represented in this dialectic with American culture. He calls this also the *Catholic Story*. In addition to the being faithful to the Catholic Story, he also calls for the proposal of the *Vision* to which the Catholic Story points: *the realization of God's reign*. God's reign refers to 'God's will of peace and justice, compassion and mercy, holiness and wholeness to be realized for all people and for the well being of all creation.'

---

81 Cfr. *ibid.*, 30-32.
82 Cfr. *ibid.*, 33-34.
83 Cfr. *ibid.*, 35.

As for the *method* of this living exchange, he first reiterates the end of a catholic religious education in America – being truly Catholic at the same time truly American - he hints of *an approach or method of teaching* that encourages students to attend reflectively to their own lives in the world (given their particular context), to have access to the whole story and vision of Catholic Christian faith and to make their own critical correlation between their lives the present context and their faith.[84] This method reflects much to the shared praxis approach.

3.2. Christian faith and the common good

In *For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education* (2003), Th. Groome confronts the issue of federal funding for Catholic schools. Th. Groome simply demonstrates that catholic education also serves the end of public education - common good – by how it *educates for faith* and *from a faith perspective*. For Th. Groome, *educating for faith* means to catechize. The meaning he endows with 'to catechize' is equivalent to forming exclusively the catholic identity in a person (through doctrine and practices).[85] *Educating from faith*, for him, refers to that general education which Catholic schools offer with a broader scope based on an educational philosophy deeply inspired by Catholic faith.[86]

Th. Groome, in this essay, first presents the long history of this style of teaching – education *for faith and from faith* (Part I: Educating Disciples and Citizens – for the Common Good); then he briefly exposes the extraordinary feat in educating for the common

---

[84] Cfr. *ibid.*

[85] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», cit., 180, 186.

[86] Cfr. *ibid*, 180, 182.

good of American catholic Education (Part II: American catholic schools and the Common Good); finally, he opens the idea of a symbiotic partnership (mutual) between catholic and public education (Part III: Catholic Education: A Partnership?).

For our interest, we may focus on some points. Th. Groome traces this catholic style of teaching – for faith and which extends to serve the common good - in the first Christian community's reflection of Jesus' earthly ministry itself.[87] He writes the first community had seen that in Jesus' salvific mission, education played an important role. He notes that the first community noted 'that Jesus intended to educate for faith'. He says:

> The four Gospels most frequently describe Jesus' public ministry as 'teaching'. People often called him 'teacher' and he seemed to welcome this address. They recognized him as 'teaching with authority' (Matthew 7:29) and eventually came to see him as incarnating 'the wisdom of God' (1 cor. 1:24). It is very evident that Jesus intended to educate *for* faith in himself as 'the way, the truth, and the life' (John 14:6). The knowledge he intended was that people 'might come to know … the only true God, and the one [God] sent, Jesus Christ' (John 17:4).[88]

According to his analysis, Th. Groome writes that such faith alluded by Jesus in his 'educating *for* faith' required living as a person of God according to Jesus' own way of life.[89] He means that the faith to which the persons Jesus was teaching necessarily includes discipleship or living Jesus' own way of life. What was the guiding vision of Jesus' way of life? Th. Groome writes, the reign of God. Therefore, for Th. Groome, *educating for faith* is closely related to discipleship or living the *life for God's reign* which was the life led by

---

[87] This educational perspective however, Th. Groome notes, was practiced by the Jewish culture (cfr. *ibid.*, 180).

[88] *Ibid.*, 181.

[89] Cfr. *ibid.*

Jesus himself.   Moreover, from the pair *faith-God's reign*, Th. Groome's idea of *educating from faith* (for the common good) follows. He writes:

> It is equally clear that such faith required living as a person of God according to Jesus' own way of life – as disciples. And the guiding vision for faith as Jesus modeled and preached it, was the reign of God. This was a deeply spiritual symbol for Jesus, inviting disciples to let God reign in our hearts. However, it was a profoundly social symbol as well, demanding that people do God's will of peace and justice, love and compassion, freedom and fullness of life for all 'on earth as it is in heaven'. His whole life-purpose was 'for the life of the world' (John 6:51), that people 'might have life, and have it to the full' (John 10:10). At least, as Catholic tradition has interpreted it, faith after the way of Jesus can never be a 'private' or purely personal affair; it always demands living for God's reign in the world – for the common good.[90]

Therefore, the first community has reflected Jesus' educating *for* faith and that his way of life showed in concrete *how* to live that faith to which he was leading the people. Following Th. Groome's explanation, we can say that the first community saw how Jesus preached and lived the *faith*; they noticed too how the *reign of God* was central both in his preaching and his life. Groome could have also added that Catholic tradition has understood that faith after the way of Jesus cannot be a purely personal affair but living for God's reign in the world, and living in such a way that all the people on earth may form in Christ the one family of God.

The community has also understood, Th. Groome writes, that Jesus wanted them to continue his teaching ministry.[91]

In sum, for Th. Groome, education for faith and from faith perspective is traced back to the first Christian community's

---

[90] *Ibid.*
[91] Cfr. *ibid.*

reflection of teaching and earthly life of Jesus himself. They have understood the following: (1) education *in faith* is closely related to the salvific mission of Jesus, (2) Jesus *lived* the faith which 'motivated' his *teaching* with an intimate connection with God's reign here on earth, and (3) Jesus left it clear that he wanted that his disciples continue his mission.[92]

Th. Groome proceeds tracing this teaching for faith and from a faith perspective for the common good of all from the life of the early Church up to the Vatican II years. He pointed out the tensions whether the Church should only educate for faith or include education from faith perspective. He likewise pointed out how the Church has adapted this perspective throughout various historical contexts and situations. He concludes then that the educational model she has which allies *education for faith* and *from a faith perspective* together is well tested by time. He rightly intuits the Church's effort in evangelization and human promotion in her educational apostolate.

He therefore proposes 'a two-way conversation' between American Catholic education and the American public education. Th. Groome is convinced that with its defining charism of 'educating for and from faith', Catholic education has something to offer to American public education. He too recognizes that Catholic education has something to learn too from American public education. Therefore Th. Groome indicates that Catholic education may fill the American public education's 'dire need for a spiritual foundation', and American public education may show American

---

[92] Cfr. *ibid.*, 182-190.

catholic education how 'to avoid sectarianism and every semblance of proselytizing'.[93]

For Th. Groome, the spiritual foundation which Catholic education offer to public education is constituted of core spiritual values which 'renew a humanizing and holistic vision for American education'[94], which 'fosters the human capacity and desire for the Transcendent'[95] and 'around which many of the great world religions and spiritualities can reach consensus'[96]. For Groome, this is equivalent to *the education from faith perspective* practiced by catholic education.

Concerning that which Catholic education may learn from public education, he writes that before the main objective of avoiding sectarianism and proselytizing, catholic education must recognize 'that education for faith and education from faith perspective need not be collapsed into each other'[97]. He means that while catholic schools will offer education for Catholic faith to catholic students, it could at the same time offer a holistic education from a faith perspective without the slightest hint of proselytizing.

---

[93] Cfr. *ibid.*, 191-192.

[94] Cfr. *ibid.*, 193-194.

[95] Cfr. *ibid.*, 192

[96] Cfr. *ibid.*, 195. He lists them as: (1) Human beings have equal dignity, rights and responsibilities. (2) Life in the world is a gift charged with purpose and meaning. (3) Our human identity is essentially communal; we need and must care for each other. (4) Living life well requires wisdom that encourages responsibility. (5) All the great spiritualities teach justice for all and compassion for the needy. (5) At their best, most spiritualities are universal in outlook, emphasizing the bonded-ness of all people. (6) All spiritualities are convinced that the human vocation is to live in 'right relationship' with god – however named – with oneself, others, and creation.

[97] Cfr. *ibid.*, 196.

Apart from the classes in catechesis, Th. Groome proposes a religion subject of curriculum for children. He considers it 'an opportunity of creativity'. Having in mind the particular situation in the USA, he writes:

> Taking it that the ethos and spirit of a school can be thoroughly Catholic, and provide a good education without catechizing its non-Catholic students, let us reflect briefly on an appropriate religion curriculum. At first blush, the religion curriculum seems a like a bit of a challenge, but I prefer to see it more as an opportunity of creativity. Let me reiterate, every Catholic school should offer a religion curriculum that teaches fully and faithfully the 'whole story' of Catholic Christian faith, with Catholic students expected to participate. But beyond teaching what is distinctively Catholic, a 'mixed' school can readily have a generic Christian curriculum – with lots of scripture, Christian moral formation, and nurture in good Christian values – that would be appropriate for students of any mainline Christian denomination. By the middle grades, the curriculum could also introduce children to great world religions. And where numbers warrant, there could be offerings in what is specific to other Christian traditions or in other religions [...]. American Catholic colleges have been doing as much for years. With a bit of imagination, and without at all watering down a thorough religious education in catholic faith, we could craft an ecumenically sensitive religion curriculum for our grade and high schools as well. At worst, non-Catholic parents could opt to have their children do 'study hall' instead of participating in the school's religion curriculum.[98]

4. Summary and Evaluation

Th. Groome is laudable not only in his attempt to integrate various catechetical stances (such as catechesis understood as socialization and catechesis as informative religious education), but also of his original contribution. It is clear for him that the task of education in faith is not purely a pedagogical matter but an

---

[98] *Ibid.*, 197-198.

educational space which is also 'contaminated' by the non-empirical dimension of 'faith'. Th. Groome's attention to the element 'faith' in catechesis influences enough the direction towards which the cart US catechesis is pulled. Some demands or consequences flow from faith's very nature.

The *first* consequence of his 'attention to faith', is the felt need for the enriching partnership between *catechesis aimed at identity formation* and *religious education eschewed more towards religious and cultural information*. He writes that both are dimensions in one single reality which is *catechetical education* (the term he employs for education in faith). The necessity of those two dimensions in catechetical education is, for Th. Groome, a demand by faith. This is the *first* consequence of his attention to 'faith'.

Second, that faith, for him, is closely associated with God's reign and therefore has to inevitably influence society, culture, historical context, the ways of life, life-perspectives, etc.. Because education relies much on that faith, catechesis (education in faith) cannot but have concrete repercussions in life's existential dimension. Th. Groome, therefore, shows trust on the capacity of the faith to contribute to the betterment of the world at hand. He showed how catholic education may remain faithful to the Catholic faith and at the same time, contribute to the common or public good. With his formula *educating for faith - educating from faith*, he demonstrated that education in faith is not against but may even meet the same end of public education, that is, the common good.

In addition to that, he likewise manhandled the complicated subject-matter of inculturation. He held a paradigm which is mutually enriching to both faith and culture through a dialectic encounter. An application of Th. Groome's dialectic encounter paradigm to faith's encounter with the present global technological

culture is an interesting field worthwhile to be developed. As the Holy Father once pointed out, the contemporary digital cultureis not only a challenge to the task of expressing the evangelical message in today's language, but most especially, an occasion to think in a more profound way the relationship between faith, the life of the Church, and the changes man is experiencing.[99] Groome however has not entered into the discussion the contemporary culture of technology.

Third, the communal context and the integral dimensions of education in faith are likewise natural demands of that faith. Education in faith or catechesis, as demanded by faith, must be integral, permanent and on-going. It should not focus only on a certain age-bracket. It is also a work of the whole community and within the community. Th. Groome, to express this point, coined the phrase 'the whole church is catechetical'. He refers to what he calls 'community agents' the parish, programs, school, and families. He does not mention however the ecclesial movements, religious communities and other institutions. However, in his writings, there is *silence* concerning the part of the Ordained in the Church's *teaching function*, or when mentioned, a negated presence. The term 'parish' in Th. Groome's writings refer to a kind of central office tasked to organize various educational programs.

It is however in that same 'faith' that, in our opinion, the 'risks' of Groome's doctrine may be observed. *First*, education in faith for Th. Groome is based on faith, in particular, on its 'shared' dimension, that is, on that aspect in agreement with other believers.

In more occasions than one, he made distinctions between substantial and accidental aspects of faith, or other times, he draws faith back to the level of spiritual wisdom, in order to reach the point

---

[99] Cfr. BENEDICT XVI, *Address given to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications*, Vatican City, 28 February 2011.

of balance with other believing entities. We have to admit that this is not totally wrong; the expressions of faith may vary without damaging the same faith's essence, as Pope John XXIII once explained in his discourse on the occasion of the opening of Vatican II.[100] As this is a legitimate point of cooperation between religions, this also brings with it the risk of not attributing to the true faith its capacity to unite.

A *second* risk we observe also, related to the first, is the necessary mediation he attributes to the Church in relation to 'teaching' the faith. Precisely with the aim, among others, of transmitting the faith in its integrity (therefore, free from any form reductive interpretations or perspectives), a *magisterium united to pastoral authority* was instituted by Jesus Christ in His Mystical Body.

This fact does not in any way diminish the magisterium common to all baptized. Endowing the lay faithful or theologians *sufficient* playing time in the exercise of the teaching dimension of the Church does not necessarily mean suppressing or diminishing the playing time of the official teaching office of the Church or the Magisterium. They are different forms of exercising the same ecclesial act. The local bishop preaching against the evils of abortion and a devout Catholic engineer teaching his son how to make the sign of the cross before going to bed, in the end, form one single ecclesial 'teaching' act.

---

[100] Cfr. JOHN XXIII, Allocutio *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, 11 October 1962, in *EV 1*, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 26-69.

PART 3: CHURCH, MISSION AND EVANGELIZING CATECHESIS

Part III is composed of two chapters. Chapter V is about Marthaler and the development of catechesis. Chapter VI is Warren and the pastoral ministry of the Church. Both authors have upheld the preservation of the use of the term 'catechesis' to refer to the educating task of the Church in the Boston College Symposium in 1977.

In the 2000-2010, both authors anchor the catechetical act to the Church itself. Marthaler through the concept of evangelization roots catechesis to the very core of the Church herself. Warren, on his part, firmly sets any catechetical enterprise in the Church on its broader pastoral ministry.

CHAPTER V. MARTHALER: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CATECHESIS

Berard Marthaler is one of the major proponents of the idea of catechesis as a socialization process. He has also been a famous commentator of documents of the Holy See about catechesis aimed at the adaptation into the USA context. In his writings in the first decade of the 21st century, B. Marthaler combines these two tasks by demonstrating the development of the nature, tasks, and goals of catechesis throughout these years analyzing the documents of the Church magisterium – both by the USCCB and by the Holy See, which have been published throughout these years.

He has two major writings published in this decade: *Sowing Seeds: Notes and Commentary on the General Directory for Catechesis* (2000) and *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry: A Digest of Recent Church Documents (*2008). In these two books, he focuses on the development of catechesis throughout the years. In the *Sowing Seeds* (2000), somewhere, he compares the revised edition *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997) with its original edition, the *General Catechetical Directory* (1972) – 26 years between. Within the comparison, he mentions of *a further clarification of the nature of catechetical ministry*. In *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008), he demonstrates the development of the nature, tasks, aims, and scope of the Church's catechetical ministry since Vatican II up to our times.

1. GCD to GDC: from "ministry" to "evangelization"

Since the publication of the General Catechetical Directory in 1971, so many events within the Church itself significant to its catechetical ministry have taken place. The revision needed was

finally met with the publication of the General Directory ofr Catechesis in 1997. M. Marthaler was again tasked to make a commentary of the new directory in view of the US American public. In *Sowing Seeds. Notes and Commentary on the General Directory for Catechesis* (2000),[1] he is able to trace the developments in the understanding of the nature of catechesis, its tasks, and its goal. His commentary to the document is composed of *three major* parts: *first*, Marthaler's own introduction of his commentary; *second*, the commentary proper of *GDC*'s five parts; and *third*, an index of the notes and explanations of the terms or expressions used in the *GDC* which he deems unfamiliar to the US context. All in all, there are 112 of those notes and definitions.

1.1. Marthaler's introduction and summary of his commentary

TWO PARABLES: SOWING THE SEEDS AND REAPING THE HARVEST[2] is the title of Marthaler's introduction to the *Sowing Seeds*

---

[1] *Sowing Seeds: Notes and Comments on the General Directory for Catechesis* (henceforth Sowing Seeds) is the title of the supplementary or resource that Marthaler wrote with the clear purpose of facilitating USA readership of the *GDC*. The initiative comes from the NCCB/USCC. In 1999, its Department of Education commissioned Rev. Berard L. Marthaler, OFMConv., assisted by Michael Scarpato (secretary and research assistant), to materialize the said project. Rev. Marthaler, following the structure of the *GDC* provided a paragraph-by-paragraph commentary of the document. He likewise offered notes – placed in shaded boxes – of specific words of phrases selected from the document which he thinks need explanation for the American reader. By April 2000, Sowing Seeds had its first printing.

[2] In this Introduction, Marthaler begins commenting on the two parables in which *GDC* employs to start (Mk 4:3-8) and to end (Mk 4:26-29) the document. These two parables which *GDC* employs both offer an agricultural image to the diffusion of the Good News. The first parable (used in *GDC*'s Introduction) offers the image of sowing seeds and the second parable (used in the Conclusion), the image of reaping the fruits. Marthaler says that the 'agricultural' parables were employed as main metaphors in order to transmit its message: to present a detailed and inspiring picture of the nature, goals, and tasks of catechesis. He adds that

(2000). While this introduction gives a general panorama of the contents of the revised *Directory*, the commentator is able to drive home the what he thinks as *GDC*'s main contribution to Church's catechetical ministry: *its further clarification of the nature, goals and tasks of catechesis.*

GDC's understanding of the nature, goals and tasks of catechesis, according to Marthaler, is best captured by pointing out first two general features that characterize the 1997 *Directory* in comparison to the 1971 *Directory*. The *first* general feature lies in the subtle change of the title - form *General Catechetical Directory* to *General Directory for Catechesis*. According to him, the 1971 Directory placed its emphasis simply on the defining the nature of catechesis, while the 1997 *Directory*, on its general directives.[3] Here comes his point. Marthaler says that this means that 'the generalities (in *GDC*) pertain to the guidelines and directives and not to the nature and tasks of catechesis'. Marthaler concludes that the new *Directory* limits itself to giving general directives while it emphasizes the 'the task of national and regional directors to adapt the guidelines and general directives to local circumstances.' He therefore says that the change of title, or better, the change of emphasis observed in the titles, gives an idea of how the Church understands catechesis and how it should be conducted in diverse circumstances. The *second* general feature which

---

these two images 'capture the spirit and purpose of the catechetical ministry in a way that no theological treatise or list of directives can'. It shall be noted that Marthaler uses 'catechesis' and 'catechetical ministry interchangeably in his commentary.

[3] Marthaler seems to point out that while 'the most notable feature of the 1971 *GCD* was its promotion of catechesis as a form of ministry of the word that is distinct from but closely allied with evangelization, liturgical preaching, and theology,' the 1997 GDC, by the way it banners its title, puts its emphasis the noun 'directory', that is, to the new indications and directives related to catechesis (but which are general in nature).

according to him helps further clarify the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry lies in the 1997 *GDC*'s incorporation of new documents directly and indirectly related to catechesis. As Marthaler puts it, the new *Directory* noticeably cites the texts of 1971 *GCD* while moves beyond it. Marthaler points out three major developments that occurred after the publication of the 1971 *GCD* and that were included in the 1997 *GDC*: *(1)* the close ties between liturgy and catechesis presented by *RCIA* published in 1972, *(2)* Pope John Paul II's consistent preaching of catechesis' importance in the *new evangelization*, and *(3)* the publication of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC). Thus, in recognizing the normativity of the *CCC* in catechetical ministry and the importance of liturgy and sacraments, Marthaler says that *GDC* has offered a 'further clarification' of the nature, goals and tasks of catechesis in our times.

After pointing out the abovementioned general features of the new *Directory* in comparison with the one published in 1971, Marthaler proceeds with discussing in particular how the *GDC* completes 'the task of clarifying further' the nature, tasks, goal of catechesis in our times.

Firstly, Marthaler demonstrates how *GDC* takes on the theme of evangelization as emphasized in various magisterial documents published after 1971 (*GCD*'s year of publication). He points out therefore how *GDC* holds evangelization as main theme and how it (*GDC*) eventually links catechesis to evangelization. According to him, *GDC* first summarizes the assertions of post-Conciliar magisterial documents *Evangelii Nuntiandi, Catechesi Tradendae* and *Redemptoris Missio* especially the idea regarding evangelization as the principal mission and ministry of the Church, and shows how catechesis is configured due to its close linkage to evangelization. He goes on saying that catechesis is intricately bound up with each element of evangelization that no single definition does it justice.

Secondly, thereafter, Marthaler brings forward *various descriptions of catechesis* based on this 'intricate bonding' between indeed catechesis and evangelization. The *first description* then that Marthaler cites *GDC*'s understanding of catechesis in relation to the ecclesial nature of the Gospel message (diffused obviously in the Church's task of evangelization). He says *GDC* affirms that in the evangelization process, *initiatory catechesis*[4] is very important. Catechesis here, according to him, refers to the 'process of transmitting the Gospel, as the Christian community has received it, understands it, celebrates it, lives it and communicates it in many ways'.

Marthaler however further points out that, as a 'comprehensive and systematic formation in the faith', even though it includes instruction; it eventually includes 'apprenticeship of the entire Christian life' wherein the persons being evangelized are wholly permeated – mind and entire person – by the word of God.

The *second description* he points out that as provided by *GDC* in the part regarding effectively on the nature, object, and purpose of catechesis. He says that in this description, *GDC* takes on the 1971 *Directory*'s description of catechesis, that is, as a form of ministry of the word. Marthaler says that *GDC*'s affirmation of catechesis as a form of ministry of the word leads eventually to understanding it as an essentially ecclesial act, thus citing *GDC* § 78. He says that this ecclesial character indeed defines the nature, tasks, and goal of the catechetical ministry.

Hereafter, he indicates the consequences of the idea of catechesis as an ecclesial act. The handling over and the giving back, according to Marthaler, demonstrates that the Church's faith is a

---

[4] Initiatory catechesis is a technical term which GDC employs to refer to the catechetical activity that takes place in the initial part of evangelization which is usually general and orientative in nature.

shared faith, again citing *GDC* § 78. The ecclesial character of catechesis, Marthaler further explains, clarifies its goal, that is, 'to prepare the faithful to live in community and to participate actively in the life and mission of the Church'.

Marthaler's indicates *GDC*'s *third description* of catechesis: *its relation to the catechumenate*. Marthaler says that *GDC* shows great appreciation of the patristic period by the frequent references it makes to the experience of the Church in that period and the testimonies of the Fathers.

Marthaler points out *two important things*: *first*, the bishop's and the community's role in this 'richest period of the catechumenate' and, *second*, the baptismal catechumenate modeled on that of the early Church as inspiration of contemporary catechesis.

Marthaler goes on commenting more on *GDC*'s concern on the catechumenate. He says that it considers catechumenate as 'the concentration of the various means to accomplish the goals of catechesis'. He says that *GDC* insists again and again of baptismal catechumenate as being the 'inspiration' of contemporary catechesis perhaps due to its integrate aim: it promotes education in *knowledge of faith* and in the *life of faith*.[5]

The *fourth* and *fifth descriptions* which Marthaler reduces from the *GDC*'s paragraphs are both related to the communal or ecclesial aspect.

The *fourth* description is *GDC*'s emphasis of the Christian community as 'the source, *locus*, and means of catechesis', that is, the community as the place where catechesis rightly takes place, develops, and progresses. In Marthaler's word, catechesis is

---

[5] For the elaboration of these two elements promoted by catechumenate according to Marthaler, cfr. *ibid.,* vii-viii

community-based.[6] Marthaler further says that *GDC* gives utmost importance to the catechumenate and group-catechesis because, other than the didactic aspect, 'the Christian group is called to be an experience of community and a form of participation in ecclesial life' (*GDC* § 159).

The *fifth description* of catechesis as interactive is related to adult catechesis. The interactive characteristic of catechesis –refers to the dynamic wherein the community catechizes its members and its members catechize its community. Marthaler says that this description applies most especially to adults. He points out that in this point *GDC* re-takes the 1971 *Directory*'s idea that 'catechesis for adults must be considered the chief form of catechesis'. Marthaler notes that *GDC* adds the reason behind: 'it deals with persons who are capable of a [commitment] that is fully responsible'[7].

In addition to that, Marthaler highlights the following points from *GDC* regarding adult catechesis: *(1)* adults make their own contribution to catechesis by 'pointing out the most effective ways of understanding and expressing the message'[8], and *(2)* adult catechesis as 'the *organizing principle*, which gives coherence to the various catechetical programs offered by a particular Church' and 'the axis

---

6 Marthaler using expressions from the GDC explains this saying: "As the locus of catechesis, the Church presents a corporate witness to the faith, provides a stable environment in which its members can grow in faith, and gives them a sense of belonging to the family of God. Most Catholics experience Christian community at the parish level. As a means of catechesis, the community mediates the gifts of the Holy Spirit and becomes a support for its individual members. Catechesis must therefore be attentive to involvement of the community 'so that it may be welcoming and supportive environment' (*GDC* § 174). Although catechesis is concerned with the needs of individuals, it should not overlook that 'the recipient of catechesis is the whole Christian community and every person in it' (*GDC* § 168)"(*ibid.* viii).

7 Cfr. *ibid.*, ix.

8 Cfr. *ibid.*

around which revolves the catechesis of childhood and adolescence as well as that of old age'[9]. Organizing principle here means that the programs leveled to every age level must form one single whole with the adult catechesis as reference point. This is exactly what distinguishes the catechesis of adults from adult catechesis.[10]

Thirdly, after the various descriptions of catechesis seen in its intrinsic relation to the Church's principal activity of evangelization, Marthaler points out two other themes which *GDC* touches and which, he deems, clarificatory of the nature, goal and tasks of catechesis in our times. They are the topics of *divine pedagogy* and *inculturation*.

Concerning divine pedagogy, Marthaler highlights *GDC*'s emphasis on divine element involved in the whole process of catechesis aimed at the maturity of faith. He says that *GDC* holds up 'the pedagogy of God' as the source and model of the pedagogy of faith. As the divine pedagogy in revealing His plan of salvation is gradual and uses various methods to communicate that plan taking of course in consideration the background and readiness of the people to whom revelation is addressed, similar things happens in catechesis. Marthaler, paraphrasing *GDC* §147, says that the movement whereby the mind, heart, and memory of individuals and cultures are permeated and configured to the Gospel message can need a certain

---

[9] Cfr. *ibid.*

[10] He says: "The catechesis of adults is not the same as adult catechesis. In the sense that it 'concerns [all] persons who have the right and duty to bring to maturity the seed of faith sown in them by God,' adult catechesis is the reference point for catechesis at every stage of life. Adult catechesis 'must systematically propose the Christian faith in its entirety and in its authenticity, in accordance with the Church's understanding,' and all catechetical programs must be coordinated so that ultimately Christians 'assume the responsibility for the Church mission' and give witness in society (GDC § 175) (*ibid.*).

period of time. That is why he says that *GDC* speaks of 'stages of gradual maturity' referred always to catechesis (§ 289).

Finally concerning inculturation, Marthaler says that *GDC* in reality affronts the problem of inculturation throughout, not only in the end part. He notes that *GDC* cites the incarnation as the 'original *inculturation of the word of God*' and the model of evangelization (§ 109).

He also explains that there is more to the external adaptation designed to make the Christian message more attractive, an element involve in inculturation. He vies for the idea of inculturation as a means of presenting the Gospel in a way that it touches the lives of individuals at the deepest level of their existence and penetrates the very center and roots of their culture. Thus citing *GDC* § 109, Marthaler says that the Christian community must discern which cultural 'riches' are compatible with the Gospel and which need to be purified and/or transformed.

In addition to that, Marthaler recalled a series of directives initiated already by the US Catholic Bishops concerning inculturation. He names *Sharing the Light of Faith* (1979), the 1986 national statutes concerning the establishment of the catechumenate in all parishes in USA, *Go and Make Disciples* (1993), *Communities of Salt and Light* (1994), *Called and Gifted for the Third Millennium* (1995), *Our Hearts were Burning Within Us* (1999), *Renewing the Vision* (1997) and *Sons and Daughters of the Light* (1997). He says that *GDC* speaks of the drawing up of local catechisms which respond to the demands of different cultures and which present the Gospel in relation to the hopes, questions and problems which these cultures present.

Also, he mentions the particular case of USA in which there is a present need to revise its national directory published in 1979, the *Sharing the Light of Faith: National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of the United States*. He ends his introduction with the hopeful tone of

the *GDC*, a brief description of its main parts, and with the mention of bishops, Episcopal conferences, every adult and the whole Christian community as addressee of the document. He hopes that his commentary will lead to further reflection of the Church's evangelizing mission in today's world.

For the COMMENTARY PROPER, Marthaler starts his commentary on *GDC*'S PREFACE [§ 1–13] (written and signed by the Pro-prefect and the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy). According to him, the Preface has the following contents: *(1)* a report on the recent development of catechesis since the Second Vatican Council [§ 1-6], *(2)* a short history of the present revision, that is, from the 1971 *General Catechetical Directory* to the 1997 *General Directory for Catechesis* [§ 7-8], *(3)* the purpose of the *GDC* (§ 9), and *(4)* the GDC's authority and the audience to which the document is addressed (§ 10-13). However, his commentary of the contents of this section be focused on three specific objectives: *first*, give a word about the nature and purpose of the Directory as expressed in *GDC* § 9; *second*, supply historical and other information pertinent to the making of the *GDC* in § 1-6, 7-10; and *third*, comment about *GDC*'s English translation. In reality, he adds and comments a *fourth* topic, about the intended audience of the *GDC* as stated in § 11-13.

Marthaler, commenting on *GDC*'S INTRODUCTION [§14-33],[11] notes that like every major part of the *GDC*, its *Introduction* is prefaced by a passage from the Sacred Scripture and in this instance,

---

[11] GDC's *Introduction* has three subheadings or sections, namely, (1) *"The Field that is the World"*, (2) *"The Church in the World"*, and (3) *"The Sowing of the Gospel"*. He says that the *firsts section* [§ 16-23] is all about the general principles Christians use in evaluating their external milieu. The *second section* [§ 24-30] is all about intra-ecclesial 'conditions and attitudes' affecting evangelization and catechesis. The *third section* [§ 31-33] is all about the recent achievements of the catechetical movement and about the problems yet to be addressed.

the Parable of the Sower. He interprets it as *GDC*'s calling to one's attention the importance of taking into consideration 'the field to which the seed is sown' in the Church's pastoral task. As a way of founding his interpretation, he cites Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Exhortation *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* 35.

In the *first section – "The Field that is the World"*, Marthaler says that the Church in her evaluation of the external social milieu in which she exists and moves, her guiding principles are founded on three elements: *(1)* human dignity and the external factors that may inhibit or advance its development, *(2)* cultural elements that may facilitate or obstruct the task of evangelization, and *(3)* the religious and moral elements inherent cultures.

In the *second section – "The Change in the Modern Word"* -, Marthaler singles out four groups with their identifying characteristics and which need for a new evangelization (paraphrasing *GDC* § 24-28). The four groups are *(1)* 'non-practicing Christians' (those who have been baptized but lead lives divorced from Christianity), *(2)* 'simple people' (those who express their deep faith in popular devotions but insufficiently knowledgeable of fundamental Christian principles), *(3)* 'highly educated but poorly catechized Christians' (those whose religious formation never advanced beyond that which they received in childhood) and *(4)* 'reticent Christians' (those who are publicly reticent in giving witness to their life of faith). Marthaler, in his commentary, presents a table of the problem areas of catechesis referred to in these numbers discussed in other parts of the *GDC*. The table includes cross-references or indications in which paragraph in the *GDC* a specific problem is mentioned and how *GDC* suggests tackling it.[12]

---

[12] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds…*, cit., 9.

Finally in the *third section – "The Sowing of the Gospel"*, Marthaler comments specifically § 31-33 in which *GDC* speaks about 'the reading of the signs of the times on the part the workers'. He affirms that the Church values the data provided by human sciences but 'goes beyond' them. He specifies that the Church analyzes the significance of events within the perspective of salvation history, and then that same analysis made by the Church guides herself in the direction of her missionary activity.

1.2. Catechesis in the evangelizing mission of the Church

Commenting on *GDC*'s PART I CATECHESIS IN THE CHURCH'S MISSION OF EVANGELIZATION [§ 34-91][13], Marthaler writes that the main idea of the part focuses on *GDC*'s incorporation of catechesis into the Church's principal task of evangelization.[14] According to him, this move has profoundly conditioned the meaning (nature, objective, purpose, scope, etc.) of catechesis.[15]

---

[13] GDC's Part I has three chapters. The first chapter [§ 36-59] is all about revelation and its transmission as presented by Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, Dei Verbum. The second chapter [§ 60-76] is all about the forms of ministry of the word in the Church; one of which is catechesis. The third chapter [§ 77-91] is all about the ecclesial nature of catechesis, its goal [communion with Christ] and its catechumenal character. Marthaler's commentary follows the sequence of these chapters.

[14] Marthaler notes that the emphasis on the Church's evangelizing mission or evangelization, highlighting diverse aspects, on the part of post-conciliar magisterial documents, and which later the new Directory incorporated, has enriched the understanding of catechesis. As he notes, citing GDC § 35, "one's concept of catechesis profoundly conditions the selection and organization of its contents … identifies those to whom it is addressed and defines the pedagogy to be employed in accomplishing its objectives" (cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds*…., cit., 11).

[15] *GDC* § 35 mentions of a 'semantic evolution' of the term or the reality 'catechesis'. Marthaler's note over this expression is the following: "This phrase alludes to the rich connotations that the term 'catechesis' has acquired over time.

Marthaler groups the ideas of the *first chapter*, thus accommodating his commentary, as the following: § 36-37, § 38-39, § 40-41, § 42-45, § 46, § 47-49, § 50-52, § 53-55, § 56-57, and § 58-59. The notes and definitions he makes on some phrases and words in some paragraphs of the first chapter are the following: 'a semantic evolution' [§ 35], about the footnote 28 and the phrase 'that complex, rich and dynamic reality which is called evangelization' [§46], the phrase 'the sacraments and their ministers' [§ 47], the phrases 'the primary proclamation' and 'theology needs to confront philosophical forms of thought' [§ 51], the words '*metanoia*' and 'heart' [§55], the phrases 'from a theological point of view' and the 'fundamental option' [§ 56], about the footnote 102 [§ 58], and the phrase 'baptismal catechumenate and catechumenal formation' [§ 60].

Summarizing *GDC* § 36-37, he says that the *Directory* cites *Dei Verbum*, specifically its description of revelation as 'the action by which God makes himself known to human beings and invites them to share in his divine nature'.

He says that *GDC* § 49 singles out three elements in God's plan – *(1)* the Revelation of God's innermost Truth and the true vocation and dignity of the human person, *(2)* the divine will to save everyone from sin and death, and *(3)* the call to gather all peoples in the unity of God's kingdom, thus establishing communion among peoples. In commenting *GDC* § 38-39 – introducing the notion of divine pedagogy, that is the progressive and gradual way of God's

---

Its origins are rooted in the Greek verb katechein: to teach, to instruct. At first 'catechesis' referred primarily to oral teaching, but it came to describe the rites and rituals associated with Christian initiation, the traditio and redditio symboli – the presentation of the Creed to candidates for baptism and their response by way of reciting and affirming it. In recent centuries some authors restricted catechesis to the question-answer approach found in catechisms for children. Clearly, the *GDC*, following post-conciliar magisterial documents, understands it in a more inclusive sense" (cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., 11).

teaching *verbis gestisque* and adapted to the human way of learning - Marthaler anchors the mode of divine pedagogy to the mode of doing evangelization and catechesis.[16]

Marthaler expounds catechesis' centeredness on Christ presented in *GDC* § 40-41. He says that more than a doctrine alongside others, the doctrine on Christ is the center 'from which all the others [doctrines] flow and 'illuminates all others [doctrine]'. He says that it is therefore the task of catechesis to explain the identity of Christ as shown in his life and ministry – and thus the importance of the Gospels (*GDC* quoting *CCC*) - and to present the Christian faith as communion with his person.

In *GDC* § 42-45, Marthaler denominates as 'traditional position of the Church' *the doctrine of the universal will of God to lead all men to the truth in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, guarded and proclaimed by the Church*. He points out that *GDC* affirms this 'traditional position' and further emphasizes *the mediation of the Church through evangelization* in concrete in the diffusion of the divine revelation.[17]

---

[16] We quote his own words: "Just as revelation is communicated by words and deeds, so are evangelization and catechesis. Evangelization 'is at once testimony and proclamation, word and sacrament, teaching and task.' Catechesis […] also proclaims and hands on the words and deeds of revelation, expounding the profound mysteries they contain. Moreover, 'catechesis not only recalls the marvels worked by God in the past, but also, in the light of the same revelation, it interprets the signs of the times and the present life of man ….' (MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds*…., cit., 12).

[17] *Ibid.* We wish to indicate the importance Marthaler gives over this point. First, he himself makes the cursive of the term evangelization. Second, he explicitly denominates the GDC footnote 28 as 'worth quoting in full for its implications for evangelization in general and catechesis in particular'. Third, he further added GDC footnote 28 which effectively he quotes in full goes this way: "Dei Verbum and the Catechism of the Catholic Church (§ 50-175, English edition) speak of faith as a response to Revelation. In this context, for catechetical pastoral motivation, it is preferred to associate faith more with evangelization than

He further makes a side comment on faith as a response to the word of God as it is proclaimed and witnessed, taught and lived in concrete circumstances by the Church.[18]

In *GDC* § 46, Marthaler repeats and explains the paragraph's citation of Pope Paul VI's idea: *the Church exists to evangelize*. He shows that *Evangelium Nuntiandi* considers proclamation, witness, teaching, sacraments, and love of neighbor as essential elements in the work of evangelization; and that all these elements are necessary for an integral concept of evangelization.

In *GDC* § 47-49, Marthaler points out that the new *Directory* returns to the topic of 'revelation as divine pedagogy'. However, this time, he says that the new *Directory* emphasizes diffusion of the divine message as 'structured in stages'. This evokes according to him the 'stages' mentioned in *Ad Gentes*, such as Christian witness, dialogue and loving presence, then comes the proclamation of the Gospel and the call to conversion, the catechumenate and Christian initiation, the reception of the sacraments, and all the various types of ministry.

He indicates that in these paragraphs, § 48 is worth noting, for *three* important points: *(1)* it explains each stage, *(2)* it adds that the community nourishes the gift of communion by ongoing education in the faith and other forms of ministry of the word, the sacraments, and the practice of charity, and *(3)* it says that the work of evangelization is self-perpetuating because it seeks to inspire missionary zeal in all faithful. Marthaler further notes that according

---

with revelation insofar as the latter, in fact, reaches man normally by way of the evangelical mission of the Church (*GDC* footnote 28)."

[18] Marthaler seems to highlight in these paragraphs 42-49 the transmission of revelation through evangelization. he seems to point out the relation that *GDC* indicates between faith and revelation. The revelation to which faith is a response reaches the person through the evangelizing activity of the Church. Catechesis has an important role to play in that work of evangelization.

to the new *Directory* those 'stages' mentioned are equally essential and may occur in different sequences.

Explaining the differences of approaches to missionary activity the sequence of the stages of evangelization, he reiterates the idea of *Ad Gentes*: the differences of approaches to missionary activity occur *due to the variety of circumstances and conditions of the local Church where the supposed activity is made.*[19]

In commenting *GDC* § 50-52, Marthaler says that these paragraphs show the continuity *in spirit and in letter* of the new *Directory* to the 1971 *GCD*, particularly on the idea of the *ministry of the word as a fundamental element of evangelization.* He says that both *Directories* emphasize two things: *(1)* the Word's presence here and now though the human word and *(2)* the Church' mission consists in presenting God's message in a language that speaks to every culture. He comments that the various forms of the Ministry of the Word in the Church occur, again, *due to the need to adapt the 'one message' to 'the situation of faith of each persons or group of persons in their concrete situations.'* He further says that the new *Directory* indicates the following as 'important forms': *the missionary preaching or first announcement, pre-baptismal and post-baptismal catechesis, the liturgical forms, and the theological forms.*

---

[19] As mentioned somewhere, missionary activity is directed to non believers and the religiously indifferent; initial catechesis to yet-to-be-baptized persons and to already-baptized individuals yet insufficiently catechized; pastoral ministry to Christians of mature faith. Marthaler adds that one of these may be needed in a determined moment depending on the spiritual maturity of each individual or of the community as a whole (cf. B. MARTHALER, Sowing Seeds, p. 14).

He notes however that although these forms are related to specific functions,[20] a form may assume more than one function. In commenting *GDC* § 53-57 - *all about evangelization and conversion -* Marthaler *first* comments § 53-55 paraphrasing its ideas such as the following: *(1)* evangelization calls people to conversion and faith, *(2)* it implies a free and total submission of the whole person to God revealed in Jesus Christ, *(3)* that submission is concretized in discipleship, *(4)* it involves *metanoia*, a profound transformation which touches every level of the Christian's being, *(5)* a conversion that comes from the heart, and *(6)* Mary is the model of faith. In *GDC* § 56-57, he follows the new *Directory's* focus on 'continuing conversion which lasts for the whole life'. He says that from 'a theological viewpoint', the new *Directory* presents and comments several important moments of this process, such as: *interest in the Gospel, conversion, profession of faith, journey towards perfection*.

Finally, in commenting *GDC* § 58-59, he says that here the new *Directory* identifies *three basic situations* that each require *a particular and precise response*. Marthaler says that the situations the new *Directory* refers to are the following: *(1)* the socio-cultural contexts in which Christ and the Gospel are not known, *(2)* the places where there are Christian communities with adequate and solid ecclesial structures that sustain the faithful in Christian living and nurture commitment to the Church's universal evangelizing mission, and (3) countries of established Christian traditions where entire groups of baptized have lost a living sense of faith, or even no longer consider themselves members of the Church.

---

[20] For a structured list of the various forms of catechetical ministry of the word with their corresponding function, cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., 15.

To the first, he says that *GDC* places *missio ad gentes*, proclamation and catechesis within baptismal catechumenate; *to the second*, well-articulated Christian initiation and ongoing catechesis, with a special type of catechesis for adults; *for the third*, new evangelization giving priority to proclamation and basic catechesis. However, in our times, two or more situations may co-exist at the same time in one place. He says that the new *Directory* further affirms that *missio ad gentes* is 'the exemplary model' for the Church's missionary activity and the baptismal catechumenate 'the model for all catechesis'.

The *second chapter* of this part is entitled *"Catechesis in the process of Evangelization"* [§ 60-76].[21] Marthaler says that *GDC* § 60 presents the summary of the entire chapter. The paragraph presents the chapter's two general ideas: *(1)* how catechesis, as an element of evangelization, relates to other elements of evangelization, and *(2)* the new *Directory*'s description of the objectives (goals), the basic structures (means), and the characteristics of catechesis.

GDC's discussion is developed under the three headings: *(1)* Catechesis as first proclamation, *(2)* Catechesis as initiation, and *(3)* Catechesis as ongoing formation. Marthaler notes that this chapter ends with a discussion of catechesis' relationship with the teaching of religion in schools and on the formation of children and young people in the home.

---

[21] Marthaler groups the paragraphs of this chapter as the following: § 60, §61-62, § 63-64, § 65-66, and § 67-68. He makes his emphases and commentaries according to this grouping. The notes and definitions he make on some paragraphs are the following: about institutional program of primary proclamation [§ 62], about initiatory catechesis [§ 64], about *GDC* footnote 18 and 'Traditio' [§ 66], and 'circumstantial or occasional catechesis' [§ 68].

Effectively, evangelization starts with the proclamation of the Gospel, followed by the call to conversion, and should evolve into catechesis (§ 60).

In *GDC* § 61-62 which describes catechesis' varied functions depending on the need of the situations[22], Marthaler says that the function of catechesis varies from its normal place in the natural flow of evangelization. Marthaler comments that although in situations where the catechesis may function dually (as *proclamation* and *initiation* at the same time), the particular Church in which this situation takes place still has to promote an institutionalized program of primary proclamation.

In *GDC* § 63-64, Marthaler simply paraphrases the points presented by these paragraphs. They are: *(1)* catechesis is located within the Church's mission and within the dynamic process of evangelization, *(2)* the priority of initiatory catechesis being the necessary link between missionary activity and pastoral activity, and *(3)* initiatory catechesis as a laying of the foundation for the building of faith. In these paragraphs, he says that the place of catechesis in evangelization is made explicit.

GDC § 65-68 is all about catechesis at the service of the first proclamation and the initiation into the sacramental life of the Church. Here catechesis is called 'initiatory catechesis' or 'baptismal catechesis'. Marthaler comments that catechesis assumes an important role within the evangelization's end to baptize people and bring them into the Church's sacramental life. He says that the new *Directory* describes initiatory catechesis as 'authentic catechesis' and the 'orderly and systematic initiation into the revelation of God in

---

[22] Here Marthaler mentions the situations involved in missio ad gentes together with the situation involved with new evangelization (cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds*…., cit., 19).

Jesus Christ stored in the Church's memory and in the Sacred Scripture, handed down from one generation to another by a living active traditio'[23]. The comprehensive and systematic formation provide as a means of deepening the individual's relationship with Christ distinguishes initiatory catechesis from the other forms of ministry of the word. Marthaler adds that it emphasizes the 'common' tradition without entering into complicated theological controversies or becoming itself a form of theological investigation. The richness of the baptismal catechumenate, he says, should inspire other forms of catechesis.[24]

GDC § 69-72 is all about catechesis at the service of continuing formation in the faith. Marthaler rephrases the contents of these paragraphs saying that in order for the newly converts to be sustained from the faith received through the initiatory catechesis, a follow-up formation in the faith within the community, the group of disciples nourished and sustained by the word of God and the Body of Christ.

He says that the new *Directory* highlights forms of catechesis that contribute to the continuing formation in the faith. He names the *(1)* exploration of Scripture, *(2)* liturgical catechesis, *(3)* occasional catechesis, *(4)* homily, *(5)* theology and *(7)* the catechesis on the social teaching of the Church (which is absent in the 1917 *Directory*).

Finally, *GDC* § 73-76 is all about catechesis as ongoing formation. Marthaler pinpoints two things in these paragraphs: *(1)* that there is a need to distinguish catechesis from the religious instruction in schools as *The Religious Dimension of Education in the Catholic Schools* indicates, and *(2)* the need to see the complementarity

---

[23] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., 20.
[24] Cfr. *Ibid.,* 21.

between catechesis and academic religious instruction and other formation in the faith of children and young people at homes. The new *Directory* says, according to Marthaler, that religious instruction complements catechesis in two ways: *(1)* it presents the Christian message and the Christian event objectively and in depth, and *(2)* it engages other disciplines in dialogue on such issues at the world's origin, the meaning of history, ethical values, religion in culture, human destiny, etc.   He comments that this arrangement now depends on the type of institution where the instruction is made. In United States, he says, religious instruction and catechesis are left to the church and church-sponsored schools.

At last, the *third chapter* is all about the nature, object, and duties of catechesis (§ 77-91).[25] Marthaler denominates this chapter as the heart and soul of the *Directory*. He says that building on the two preceding chapters, the present chapter deepens all the more the ecclesial nature of catechesis. In this way, the chapter is able to emphasize the fundamental objective of catechesis, that is, communion and intimacy with Jesus Christ (§ 80-83). It is also able to show the specific tasks in order to meet the objective.   He indicates that this chapter ends with a description of the gradual nature of catechetical process that takes inspiration from baptismal catechumenate.

---

[25] Marthaler groups the ideas of the paragraphs of this chapter as the following: § 77, § 78-79, § 80-83, § 84-85, § 86, §87, §88-89, and § 90-91. He also brings forth descriptions and definitions of some words and phrases in this chapter like the following: 'duties and tasks' [§ 77], about the phrase 'ecclesial act' and the latin phrase 'traditio-redditio symboli' [§ 78], about the phrase 'communion with Jesus Christ' [§ 81], the distinction between *fides quae* and *fides qua* and about the handing on the Our Father [§ 85], the word 'ecumenism' and the phrase 'interreligious dialogue' [§ 86], and the phrase 'baptismal catechumenate' [§ 88-91].

1.3. The message of the Gospel

For *GDC*'S PART II THE GOSPEL MESSAGE [§ 92-136][26], Marthaler introduces his commentary explaining the distinction of faith as *fides qua* and faith as *fides quae*. He says that the first (*fides qua*) refers to 'the dynamics of the act of faith itself' and that is what was explained in *GDC*'s Part I. The second (*fides quae*) refers to 'what is believed', and that is the topic of *GDC*'s Part II. Part II is therefore all about the content of the faith. How does Part II discusses the 'what is believed'? In its *first* chapter, Marthaler says that it develops the general norms and criteria for presenting the Gospel Message. In the *second chapter*, it presents the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and sets down guidelines for the redaction of local catechisms.

In his commentary of the *first* chapter, Marthaler makes a distinction between *source* and *sources* of catechesis. The only source is God's Word while the sources refers to: *(1)* the sense of faith of all the people of God, *(2)* the sacred Liturgy, *(3)* the life of the Church,

---

[26] Part II is all about the content of the Christian faith. It is composed of two chapters. Chapter I is entitled *Norms and Criteria for presenting the Gospel Message in Catechesis* [§ 94-118] and Chapter II is entitled *This is our Faith, this is the Faith of the Church* [§ 119-136]. He organizes the ideas of the paragraphs of this chapter as follows: for Chapter I, § 94-96 and § 97-118; for Chapter II, § 119-124, §125-130, § 131-132, and § 133-136. He includes descriptions and definitions of some terms and phrases found in the paragraphs of this chapter, namely: the phrases 'the sense of faith of all people of God' and 'genuine religious and moral values' [§ 95], the phrase 'documents of the faith' [§ 96], 'immanent and escathological' [§ 102], the phrase 'liberation from sin' [§ 103], 'salvation history' [§ 108], 'intensive integrity and extensive integrity' and 'criterion of authenticity' [§ 112], 'the hierarchy of truths' [§ 114], 'hierarchy of values' [§ 115], 'organic synthesis' [§ 121], the latin phrase *lex orandi, lex credenda* [§ 122], 'literary genre' [§ 124], 'deposit of faith' [125], 'an explication of the Creed' [§ 128], the expression 'expressions of life, of celebrations and of thought which are Christian' [§ 133], about the two different types of catechisms in relation to the redaction of local catechisms [§ 134], and the phrases 'the catholicity of the Church' and 'episcopal collegiality' [§ 136].

(5) theological reflection and *(6)* genuine religious and moral values.[27]
He proceeds enumerating the *five general norms* that guide catechesis in
finding, formulating, and presenting the content of the gospel
message.

They are the following: (1) Christocentricity of the Gospel
Message which eventually introduces the Trinitarian dimension of the
same message; (2) the proclamation of the kingdom of God centers
on the Good News of salvation, which brings with it a message of
liberation from sin and domination of the evil one; (3) the Church's
confession of faith which leads catechumens and others being
catechized to make their own profession of faith in union with the
great community of believers that is not limited by space or time; (4)
Christ's incarnation, by which he 'committed himself to the particular
social and cultural circumstances of times in which he lived, is the
model for evangelization by the Church; and (5) the harmonious
vision of the gospel message that reveals both 'the image of the
invisible God' and the ultimate meaning of life.[28]

Again, Marthaler says that *GDC*'s presentation of these
criteria does not mean an imposition of a specific order to be
followed at the moment of the exposition of the Gospel. He
reiterates that the new *Directory* itself affirms the diversity in particular
order of presentation and pedagogical method employed as dictated
convenient by concrete circumstances of those to which the
catechesis may be addressed.

For *Chapter II*, Marthaler says that the title of the chapter is
taken from the *Rite of Baptism for Adults* (RCIA) and therefore shows
the new *Directory*'s consistent emphasis on the importance of the

---

[27] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., 28.
[28] Cfr. *ibid.,* 29-32.

sacraments of initiation'. He also adds that catechisms have been important instruments for handling on the faith. In Marthaler's words, 'they enjoy the privilege to be *official instruments* that summarize the faith in a systematic and orderly fashion.

Regarding Catechism of the Catholic Church, his observations fall on the following topics in the *GDC*: *(1)* the notable difference of the presentation of this topic in the 1971 *GCD* and in the 1997 *GDC*,[29] *(2)* some general information aimed at facilitating the understanding of the *CCC* and its role in the *Directory*,[30] and *(3) CCC*'s vital importance to catechesis for the clarifying two important questions.[31]

Regarding the guidelines in redacting local catechisms, Marthaler reiterates fundamental thoughts. In commenting *GDC* § 131-132, he first clarifies the status of the *CCC* in the making of local catechisms.[32] Marthaler then proceeds to the 'guidelines' for the

---

[29] The first this subject is titled *The More Outstanding Elements of the Christian Faith* while the second defines *CCC* as the norm for doctrinal content. Both *CCC* and *GDC*, he further notes, present a holistic approach to the Church's catechetical ministry (cfr. *ibid.,* 33).

[30] Marthaler says that *GDC* does not attempt to summarize the contents of the *CCC*; it simply tries to facilitate the understanding of the Catechism. These information are about *CCC*'s nature and purpose, structure, inspiration, and literary genre (cf. Table, *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., 34). Marthaler explains that *GDC*'s attempt to facilitate the understanding of the contents of the CCC: the constant need to present the ever-the-same gospel message and church teaching to the needs of the time (cfr. *ibid.*).

[31] Marthaler says that *CCC* is fundamentally at the service to the pure and integral proclamation of the Gospel and teaching of the faith. *First*, it keeps catechesis permanently linked to Scripture and Tradition hence giving it (catechesis) a biblical, evangelic spirit; *second*, CCC maintains catechesis' link to the life of the Church witnessed and lived by the Fathers (cfr. *ibid.,* 35-36).

[32] His points are points: (1) *GDC* says that *CCC* (as doctrinal reference) encourages the redaction of local catechisms (taking into consideration the various situations and cultures); (2) Local catechisms likewise possess three traits that characterize the *CCC* – official approval, the possession of the organic synthesis of the faith, and as reference point for catechesis. (3) However, *GDC* says that local

creation of local catechisms found in *GDC* § 133-136. Reiterating therefore the new *Directory*, he says that *local catechisms* must: [1] incorporate the adaptations and efforts the inculturation already made by the local church; [2] present the Christian message in a way that is meaningful to the mentality of the lived experience of those for whom it is intended; [3] be attentive to the way religion is actually lived; [4] treat with great care the relationship between belief and science; [5] address problems arising from social, economic, and political conditions, drawing inspiration from the social teachings of the Church; and, [6] refer to the concrete ecclesial situation that provides context for catechesis.[33]

Marthaler says that parallel to this, local churches 'must exercise mature creativity' in catechetical activity with two conditions emphasized: with the guidance of the Holy Spirit and within the parameters outlined by the *CCC* (as doctrinal reference) and the new *Directory* (the manner of expressing or handing on).

To end, Marthaler indicates *GDC*'s emphasis on the theological significance of both local and universal catechisms: together they manifest the catholicity of the Church, Episcopal collegiality, and a true symphony of faith.[34]

---

catechisms are neither mere summaries of the *CCC* nor purely methodological strategies in presenting the faith; they present the Christian message in particular given circumstances with a certain inspiration of the divine pedagogy, or in Marthaler's expression "they actualize the divine pedagogy in actual circumstances".

[33] *Ibid.,* 37.

[34] Cfr. *ibid.,* 38.

1.4. On faith's pedagogy

For SOWING SEEDS ON *GDC*'S PART III THE PEDAGOGY OF THE FAITH [§ 137-162][35], Marthaler underlines the important points of the two chapters. For the *first chapter*, entitled *"Pedagogy of God, source and model of the pedagogy of faith"*, Marthaler focuses on *two* general ideas of the new *Directory*. *First*, he explains the continuity of the catechetical pedagogy of the Church (in view of putting people in communion with God) to the pedagogy of Christ, and eventually to God's pedagogy. *Second*, he explains the twofold fidelity at the foundation of catechesis (to God and to man) and how this reality configures its methodological approaches.

Therefore, commenting *GDC* § 139-141, Marthaler says that catechesis works on the keeping persons in communion with God 'by modeling itself on the pedagogy of God, of Christ, and of the Church.' He indicates characteristics in these 'pedagogies' that are worth considering. He underlines, for instance, the pedagogy of God implying both instruction and formation. On the pedagogy of Christ, he underlines its inclusion of the invitation to live a life sustained by faith, hope and charity and its use of resources of interpersonal communication (silence, word, metaphor, images, etc.). On the

---

[35] In Marthaler's notes and commentary on Part III, he follows its *two* general or principal parts, namely, the *first chapter* (§ 137-147), about the some general principles concerning the catechetical pedagogy; and the *second chapter*, about methodological approaches (inductive and reductive method [§ 150-151], the consideration of the human experience, [§ 152-153], the memorization in catechesis [§ 154-155], and other elements of methodology (agents of catechesis [§ 156-159] and the mass media [§ 160-162]. He says that the new *Directory*, particularly on this part, 'leaves more detailed guidelines to the local directories and other catechetical instruments of the local churches'. For this part, he offers some notes and commentaries on the following phrases: 'in the nature of a Sacrament' (§ 141), 'progressiveness of revelation' and 'pedagogy of signs' (§ 143), 'documentary pedagogy' (§ 149), 'inductive and deductive method' and 'knowledge of intelligible things by means of visible things' (§ 150), and 'the first aeropagus' (§ 160).

pedagogy of the Church, he underlines the Church's sacramental identity of Christ's presence and mission and its possession of a treasury that enriches the memory of the community the witness of the saints and catechists themselves, the diverse manners and imaginative forms of religious communication, and a rich heritage of catechetical teachings). All these somehow give form to the so-called 'pedagogy of the faith' which source if the 'divine pedagogy'. In commenting *GDC* § 1412-147, after mentioning the primacy of the Holy Spirit, the real protagonist in any activity aimed at drawing someone closer to God, he reiterates *GDC* saying that catechesis must simultaneously be faithful to God's revelation and respect the liberty and promote response from the catechized person. It seems that for Marthaler, genuine catechesis has these two fidelities.

For the *second chapter*, entitled *'Elements of Methodology'*, Marthaler says the new *Directory* underlines the correlation between content and method in the transmission of the Gospel message. He says that while it recognizes several methods adapted by the Church, it cautions however against *(1)* playing method and content off one another, *(2)* artificially separating them, and *(3)* thinking that one method is as good as another.

Commenting on the *inductive and deductive methods* in catechesis [*GDC* § 150-151], Marthaler highlights the following points: the advantages of each methods and their complementarity of both. He further explains that in the context of catechesis, the mentioned methods are understood in another sense. Deductive method refers to the kerygmatic approach or descending approach in which it begins with the proclamation of the message expressed in the Bible, Liturgy, and in Magisterial documents and ends with its practical life application. Inductive method or existential or ascending approach starts from human experience and moves to its analysis in the light of the word of God. He says that both are legitimate approaches.

Regarding *human experience in catechesis* or those 'profound human experiences linked with the great questions of life' [*GDC* § 152-153], Marthaler comments catechesis teaches individuals to see their own basic experience in concrete situations as place where God touches them with grace and saves them.

Regarding *memorization in catechesis* [*GDC* § 154-155], Marthaler comments that it is part of the learning mode involve in the process of handing over (*traditio-redditio*) of the faith. Memorization is usually identified with mere mechanical or rote memorization. Marthaler makes two clarifications.

First, in the case of the Christian faith, the so-called 'process-of-handing-over' involves and deems important the active part of the one catechized. In the pedagogy of faith, the 'mechanical' memorization involved is linked with other steps in the whole learning process (such as spontaneous reaction and reflection, moments of dialogue and silence, and oral and written exercises). *Second*, the formulae of the faith – coming from biblical texts, doctrinal definitions, liturgical texts, common prayers, etc. - are given enough consideration in catechesis because 'they form the *language of faith*'. He adds however that these memorized formulae need to be interiorized and understood so as to be digested into life.

Regarding *the other elements of methodology* (agents of catechesis, *GDC* § 156-159, and the mass media, *GDC* § 160-162), *first*, Marthaler comments on the importance of the community as principal agent in the faith formation of its members not only in terms of the of the formal organized instructions it may provide to people of common interest, but on the experience of community and participation in ecclesial life; *second*, he says that *GDC* indicates two points – *(1)* the message must be integrated into the new culture created by modern communications (not only make use of the mass

media), and *(2)* in the use of the mass media, there is a need for a high level of professionalism and a critical sense animated by passion for truth, respect for the dignity of individuals, and desire to enrich culture on the part of its users.

1.5. On the recipients of catechesis

In *GDC*'S PART IV THOSE TO BE CATECHIZED [§ 163-214],[36] Marthaler comments following the Directory's outline. *Regarding the general aspects of adaptation and inculturation* [§ 167-170], Marthaler after reiterating the general aspects given by *GDC*[37], he simply comments

---

[36] As its general title reveals, the new *Directory*'s Part IV is all about the recipients of catechesis. Marthaler comments that in order indeed to determine the fitting approach to be employed (in adapting the Christian message) in a determined situation, there is a need to have a minimum knowledge about the prospected recipients and their concrete circumstances. This part addresses: *(1)* the general aspects of adaptation and inculturation [§ 167-170], *(2)* catechesis based on age [§ 171-188], *(3)* catechesis for special situations, mentalities, and environments [§ 189-192], *(4)* catechesis in socio-religious contexts [§ 193-201], and *(5)* catechesis in socio-cultural contexts [§ 202-214]. These topics correspond to the five chapters which constitute Part IV and which Marthaler follows in his 'exegetical' task. Marthaler makes some notes and commentaries on some phrases and words found in the paragraphs corresponding this part, namely: the phrase 'the maternal action of the Church [§ 169], 'primary socialization', 'accepted tradition/Christian initiation', and organic formation [§ 178], 'a negated age-group' [§ 181], 'in the context of the wider pastoral care' [§ 184], 'old age' [§ 186-187], 'environmental catechesis' [§ 192], an explanation about popular piety [§ 195], on religious instruction [§ 198], on the special care to the Jewish religion [§ 199], the phrase 'a martketplace to be evangelized' [§ 201], about the word 'humus' [§ 203], the phrase 'infiltrated by syncretistic elements' [§ 205], and lastly, on cultural areas denominated 'modern *areopagi*' [§ 211].

[37] These are how Marthaler summarize the GDC norms that must guide to all catechesis in the 'adaptation' activity: (1) Every baptized person has a need and right to adequate catechesis – complete and without compromise. (2) The recipients of catechesis are 'concrete and historical persons', rooted in particular circumstances and 'influenced by pedagogical, social, cultural, and religious conditioning.' (3) Recipients cannot remain silent and passive. They must take an active and conscious part in the process, being co-responsible for their own

about the distinction between *adaptation* and *inculturation* that new *Directory* makes. Both terms are defined based on the manner attention is given to the audience or recipient of catechesis. While *adaptation* refers to the attention given to individuals including his background and social standing, *inculturation*, centers more on the cultural context of the group of people being catechized. Marthaler says that this distinction used in official church documents is the key to understanding *GDC*'s Part IV.

Regarding catechesis based on age [§ 171-188], Marthaler follows the classification the new *Directory* makes: *(1)* catechesis of adults [§ 172-174], *(2)* catechesis of infants and young children [§ 177-180], *(3)* catechesis of young people [§ 181-185], and *(4)* catechesis of the aged [§ 186-188].[38] Marthaler points out *two* fundamental principles concerning catechesis according to age-group based as presented by the new *Directory*.

First, adult catechesis is the reference point of all catechesis. *Second*, the stages of catechesis according to age are interrelated to each other. On *catechesis of adults* [§ 172-174], Marthaler has emphasized the following: *(1) GDC* identifies those Christians who live their faith and are desirous of deepening it as the primary recipients of adult catechesis.[39] *(2)* In order indeed to be able to deepen their faith, adult catechesis must take into account the baptismal vocation to holiness of the laity. *(3)* Adult catechesis must

---

catechesis. (4) The recipient of catechesis is both the whole Christian community as well as the individual who belong to it. (cfr. *ibid.,* 45).

[38] GDC identifies seven stages from infancy to old age, each with their corresponding mode of learning.

[39] Marthaler says that GDC identifies several broad groups – Christians who live their faith and are desirous of deepening it, adults who have been baptized but not sufficiently catechized or have fallen away from the faith, non-baptized adults, adults who were baptized in other Christian confessions (Cfr. *ibid.,* 46).

propose systematically the Christian faith in its entirety and in its authenticity.

On *catechesis of infants and young children* [§ 177-180], Marthaler has emphasized the following: *(1)* the Directory's general observations about primary socialization and elementary education instead of going into the details of the differences between early infancy and childhood *(2)* the importance of this stage because it is during which primary socialization (into the ways of family, school and Church) begins *(3)* the importance of this stage for being the endpoint of Christian Initiation and the starting point of the child's entry to the sacramental life of the Church *(4)* the importance of the formation in the family and the opportunities in schools for greater intellectual, affective, and behavioural development *(5)* catechesis of children as excellent occasion for adult catechesis *(6)* the need to provide catechesis to children who have neither the occasion for receiving catechesis in family nor school.

On *catechesis of young people* [§ 181-185], Marthaler simply reiterates three basic ideas of GDC in these paragraphs. They are *(1)* the *GDC* is aware of great challenge the catechesis of young people faces – on one hand, youth are usually the first victims of the spiritual and cultural crisis of the world; on the other hand, they represent the future. *(2)* He notes of *GDC*'s attention to *pre-adolescence* since it is then that Christian initiation formally ends and thereupon many virtually abandon the practice of the faith. *(3)* He says that GDC pushes for the revitalization of youth catechesis.

On *catechesis of the aged* [§ 186-188], Marthaler simply emphasizes the equal need of the aged to receive catechesis and their importance as 'natural' catechists in the community with the witness of their life.

Regarding catechesis for special situations, mentalities, and environments [§ 189-192], Marthaler has almost nothing to comment. He just enumerate *GDC*'s groupings with special needs – individuals with physical or mental handicaps and other disabilities, the marginalized in society, workers, university students, professionals, scientists and artists. He notes however that *GDC*'s use of the term 'environment' does not refer to ecology or earth resources but to ambiance and life contexts.

Regarding catechesis in socio-religious contexts [§ 193-201], Marthaler reiterates the ideas of the new *Directory* in the in some chosen paragraphs – about popular piety [§ 195-196], about the ecumenical dimension of catechesis [§ 197-198], about catechesis and the dealings with Judaism [§ 199] and in context where Christians are a minority [§ 200], and about the dealings with the cultural and religious relativism in society today [§ 201]. The catechesis in this environment, he says, works in *two* fronts: *internal* and *external. Internal catechesis* means that catechesis is characterized for its effort above all in imparting a sense of identity as members of the Church to the persons catechized. *External catechesis* would be the effort to encourage the faithful to externally manifest their vocation and apostolate. Finally, *regarding catechesis in socio-cultural contexts* [§ 202-214], Marthaler brings forward *GDC*'s ideas regarding inculturation. Basing on the *GDC*, he emphasizes *three* ideas. *First*, paraphrasing *GDC* § 203-205, he emphasizes the need for catechesis to be inculturated and mentions the tasks of an inculturated catechesis as indicated by *GDC. Second*, Marthaler brings forward *GDC*'s emphasis on *(1)* the agents (whole people of God), *(2)* privileged forms (liturgical catechesis), *(3)* language (the use of traditional formulae and language that society today understands), *(4)* means (mass media and local catechisms), and *(5)* the place and cultural context (family, school, workplace, places of recreation, circles that shape the values

and lifestyles and where cultural tendencies have greatest impact) in the task of inculturation.[40]   *Third*, he highlights *GDC*'s idea of inculturation as principal task of the local church.[41]

1.6. Catechesis in local churches

For *GDC*'S PART V CATECHESIS IN THE PARTICULAR CHURCH [§ 215-285][42], Marthaler comments on its *four* chapters. On the *first chapter*, all about the role of the 'agents' of catechesis in the particular Church [§ 217-232], Marthaler organizes the paragraphs and paraphrases them in the following manner: § 217-219, § 220-231, and § 231-232. In this chapter, he makes the following notes and definitions: 'the particular church' [§ 217], on the phrase 'ministry of catechesis' and 'a unique service' [§ 219], on ecclesial mandate [§ 222], 'presbyterate' and 'ministerial priesthood' [§ 244], 'parish priests' [§ 225], the phrase 'domestic church' [§ 227], and 'formator of disciples' [§ 231].

For *GDC* § 217-219, Marthaler emphasizes the 'corporate responsibility' of the entire Christian community for the catechesis carried out by its members in the name of the Church and in communion with the bishop. He likewise point out the unity of the diverse modes or features of doing catechesis by the groups *GDC*

---

[40] Cfr. *Ibid.,* 55-56.

[41] Cfr. *Ibid.,* 56.

[42] *GDC*'s Part V is all about *how* the principles and guidelines elaborated in the previous chapters are to be implemented in the particular Church. Thus, as Marthaler says, this part reflects on the role of the 'agents' of catechesis in the particular Church [§ 217-232], describes the formation of catechists [§ 233-252], outlines the setting and means of catechesis [§ 253-264], and studies catechetical structures and organizations [§ 265-285]. The above-mentioned elements correspond to the *four* chapters which compose the entire part. As a simple note, Marthaler indicates that this part is understood only by referring to Part I, that is, where catechesis is closely associated with the evangelizing mission of the Church (cfr. *ibid.,* 57).

mentions (priests, deacons, religious and the laity). For *GDC* § 230-231, Marthaler simply reiterate one point of the *GDC* in these paragraphs: the importance of the specific responsibilities of distinct members of the community (bishop, priests, parents and, educators) by reason of their office or role in the Church. He likewise simply mentions 'the ecclesial mandate to be catechist'. He observes that even though these paragraphs do not cite the *Codex Iuris Canonici*, the new *Directory* follows closely the canons regulating the ministry of the word in the Church.[43] *GDC* § 231-232 is all about the vocation of the laity to catechesis and the various types of catechists particularly necessary in our times. Marthaler comments on catechetical ministry simply as a vocation. He does not specify it as 'of the laity' as *GDC* 231 does. He emphasizes on one hand catechetical ministry's being a vocation (and therefore, the levels of commitment to this ministry) and at the same time, the Church's part to discern and to confer.

On the *second chapter*, all about the formation for the service of catechesis [§ 233-252], Marthaler groups, summarizes and comments on the following paragraphs: § 233, § 234-245, and § 246-252. In this chapter, he makes the following notes and definitions: 'a more balanced distribution of catechists' and 'animators of catechetical activity' [par. 233],'teachers, educators, and witnesses' and 'orthodoxy and orthopraxis' [§ 237], 'beginning of the pastoral year' [§ 247d], and on 'ordinary' catechists' meaning in the US context [§ 249].

GDC § 233 is about pastoral care of catechists in a particular church in order to ensure the work of the catechetical ministry. It mentions various concrete efforts. In his commentary on this paragraph, Marthaler emphasizes the 'absolute priority' of the formation of *lay catechists* and *the catechetical formation of priests*, topics which are found in *GDC* § 234. He does not however mention the

---

[43] Cfr. CIC § 774-780.

specification that *GDC* mentions about the formation of priests *both at the level of seminary formation* and *at the level of continuing formation*. For *GDC* § 234-245, all about the formation of catechists, Marthaler simply organizes and paraphrases general idea about the importance, purpose and nature, inspiring criteria, and specific dimensions of their formation.[44] For *GDC* § 246-252, Marthaler reiterates that in these paragraphs, the new *Catechesis* identifies three kinds on centers of formation for catechists – the Christian community, the schools for catechists, and institutes of advanced study. While he simply brings forward the ideas of the new *Directory* in this group of paragraphs, he gives *two* comments – on schools for catechists and the institutes for advanced study. On the *first*, he stresses among others that the schools better 'not become absorbed in particular problems'. On the *second*, he says that international advanced catechetical institutes may be an instance of cooperation among poor and rich local churches.[45]

Marthaler organizes the *third chapter* – entitled *Loci and Means of catechesis* [§ 253-264] – as the following: § 253-254, § 255, § 256, § 257-258, § 259-260, § 261-262, and § 263-264. In this chapter, he makes the following notes and definitions: 'communion' [§ 253], about the catholic school in USA as an important locus of catechesis [§ 259], 'associations, movements and groups' [§ 261], some information about basic ecclesial communities and a definition of the phrase 'always suitable place to receive those who have concluded a catechetical journey' [§ 264].

He says that this chapter names *some settings or loci of catechesis* where Christians are born into faith, educated in it and live it. They

---

[44] Cfr. *ibid.,* 63, Table of Role of Catechists and Dimensions of Formation.
[45] Cfr. *ibid.,* 64.

are the family, the parish, the catholic school, Christian associations and movements, and basic ecclesial communities.

He further adds that even though the aim of catechesis is one and the same, each locus somehow shapes catechesis according to its own needs. Marthaler simply reiterates *GDC*'s ideas for § 255, about baptismal catechumenate, and § 256, about the parish. Of the four guidelines that *GDC* mentions in order for the parish to be effective in its task of evangelization, Marthaler does not include the *fourth*, the indispensable catechesis for children, adolescents and young people. In *GDC* § 257-258 (regarding the parish) and *GDC* § 259-260 (on catholic schools), again Marthaler summarizes the ideas of the new *Directory*.

However, he notes of the US Bishops' statement *In Support of Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools*, which recognizes most especially the indispensable role of catholic schools in USA in evangelization, catechesis and moral formation. Same is true with *GDC* § 261-262 (about associations, movements and groups) and *GDC* § 263-264 (about basic ecclesial communities): Marthaler makes a gist of *GDC*'s main ideas in these paragraphs. He explains however that the phrase 'associations, movements, and groups' refers to all kinds of associations; not simply the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, widely known in parishes in USA.[46]

Moreover, he likewise offered some notes about basic ecclesial communities. He indicated its provenience from Latin America and described a little about its activities. On *GDC*'s phrase where it says that many of 'those who have completed the catechetical journey', he says that it refers to those who have completed the formal stages of catechumenal process, very common

---

[46] Cfr. *ibid.,* 67.

in Latin America, and who finds the small Communities as 'a means of ongoing mystagogy'.[47]

Finally concerning the *fourth chapter* – entitled *The organization of catechetical pastoral care in the particular Churches* [§ 265-285], Marthaler says that it is divided into *three parts*, namely: *(1)* the organization and collaboration of catechetical activities at the diocesan and inter-diocesan levels [§ 265-268, § 269, § 270-271], *(2)* the coordination of catechesis with other programs and pastoral activities [§ 272-273, § 274-275, § 276-277, and § 278], and *(3)* on some responsibilities proper to the catechetical ministry [§ 279-280, § 281, and § 282-285].

Based on these grouping, he makes his comments. He makes the following notes and definitions: 'instruments for catechesis', 'basic cells', and 'vicariates forane' [§ 266], about the Congregation for the Clergy [§ 271], on the § 265-271 as synthesis of the chapters 1, 5-6 of Part VI of the 1971 *GCD*, US Catholic Bishop's *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: Pastoral Plan for Adult Faith Formation in the United States* (1999) [§ 275], and 'Prior Approbation of the Apostolic See' [§ 285].

Regarding *the organization and collaboration of catechetical activities at the diocesan and inter-diocesan levels* [§ 265-268, § 269, § 270-271], Marthaler simply reiterates and summarizes GDC's thoughts about the responsibilities (and possible ways of collaboration) of the local Ordinary and his catechetical staff, of Episcopal conferences and that of the Holy father through the Congregation for the Clergy. He notes that in the United States, Bishops often delegate to diocesan staffs the responsibility of overseeing the curricula and texts used in institutions are in conformity with the Church's teaching and the vision of catechesis outlined in the *CCC* and *GDC*.

---

[47] Cfr. *ibid.,* 68.

Regarding *the coordination of catechesis with other programs and pastoral activities* [§ 272-273, § 274-275, § 276-277, and § 278], Marthaler focuses on reiterating *GDC*'s ideas on the theological significance (the unity of faith) of coordinating the catechetical efforts and activities,[48] the coordination of the catechesis for diverse age groups with the adult catechesis as organizing principle,[49] the need to coordinate and link catechesis with the other elements of evangelization,[50] and the need to coordinate the diverse *loci* of catechesis or in which education in faith takes place – family, parish, schools, and other programs[51].

Finally, regarding *some responsibilities proper to the catechetical ministry* [§ 279-280, § 281, and § 282-285], Marthaler outlines these 'responsibilities' as follows: *(1)* undertaking a thorough analysis of the situation, *(2)* formulating a concrete plan of action, and *(3)* utilizing practical means, including local catechisms and catechetical directories.

For *GDC*'s CONCLUSION [§ 285-291], Marthaler indicates again the directory's distinct way of beginning and ending with the parable related to sowing and reaping. The conclusion uses the parable of the Kingdom of God which is like a seed scattered on the ground and which grows and matures without the full knowledge of the sower (*cf.* Mk 4:26-29). He says that together the parables of the *GDC*'s Introduction and that of the Conclusion summarize the five parts of the present *Directory*. Though absent in his special mentions the *Conclusion*'s invocation to the Blessed Virgin, he however brought up the its emphasis on the following: *(1)* the addressee, *(2)* the

---

[48] Cfr. *ibid.,* 70.

[49] Cfr. *ibid.*

[50] Cfr. *ibid.,* 71.

[51] Cfr. *ibid.*

Directory's focus on the nature, tasks and purpose of catechesis, and *(4)* the silent work of the Holy Spirit.[52]

2. Vatican II to NDC/USCCA: from "instruction" to "cultural evangelization"

The second significant writing of M. Marthaler, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008),[53] though no longer a

---

[52] Cfr. *ibid.,* 73.

[53] This book is a digest of thirty (30) post-Vatican II documents which Marthaler deems relevant to the Catholic Church's catechetical ministry. The list consists of papal documents, documents issued by pontifical congregations, USCCB documents, and other documents written by agencies recognized and approved by the USCCB. The book is foreworded by the Archbishop of Washington, Most Rev. Donald W. Wuerl, DD, STD, expert on adult catechesis and is recently elevated to the dignity of cardinal.

The book has 13 chapters. Chapter 1 is about the nature, task and scope of catechetical ministry seen from the perspective of the documents of Vatican II. The chapters 2 to 13 present those 'catechetical' documents according to chronological order of publication and according to themes.

Chapter 2 presents the *First Generation of Post-Conciliar: Directory and Code.* Chapter 3 concentrates the documents emanated immediately after Vatican II by the US Bishops. Chapter 4, titled *Towards Maturity*, is all about the *USCCB* documents which deal with growth and development of faith in the life of Christians.

Chapter 5 is all about, as its title suggests, *Liturgy and Catechesis.* Marthaler here presents the revised books of rites and rituals and concentrates on its prefatory notes and their importance to catechesis. Chapter 6 focuses on the Synods of Bishops which were held after Vatican II, their special attention to catechesis and evangelization as read in the post-synodal apostolic exhortations of the Supreme Pontiff.

Chapter 7 bears the name *Documents of the Millennium* for obvious reasons. Here, Marthaler presents the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1992)*,* the *Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church* (2004)*,* and the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (2004). Chapter 8, entitled *Evangelizing Catechesis*, is solely dedicated to the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997).

Chapter 9, entitled *Catechesis in the American Context*, is a presentation of the *National Directory for Catechesis* (2005). In Chapter 10, entitled *Addressing American*

commentary of a particular document but a digest of documents significant to the history of the catechetical ministry in the USA, maintain the same thesis: that the understanding of the nature of catechesis and the multiplication of its tasks and goals have undergone a great deal of development. With a time frame between Vatican II up to the first decade of the 21st century, M. Marthaler presents how catechesis has developed from being merely a type of instruction to an evangelizing catechesis.

2.1. Introduction with three disclaimers

In the *Introduction*, Marthaler establishes the point of departure of this book's reflection regarding the nature, tasks, and scope of catechetical ministry: Vatican II. He presents documents concerning catechetical activity from Vatican II up to the recent times with a special attention on the development of the understanding of catechesis, the multiplication of catechetical tasks and the widening of the scope of catechesis throughout these years. Anticipating the greatness of the said objective, he uniquely introduces the *Digest* with three disclaimers. The *first* disclaimer says

---

Culture, Marthaler presents and explains the significant points regarding the publication of the *US Catholic Catechism for Adults*.

Chapter 11 focuses on the ecumenical and inter-faith dialogue and indeed bears such title. He presents and elaborates here some documents emanated by the Holy See and which USCCB had a special reception due to the American context. Chapter 12 occupies a rarely touched aspect in catechesis, the catechetical personnel. Marthaler presents and explains the then Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith's *Guide for Catechists* (1993) and the document produced jointly by lay organizations but approved by the USCCB, the *National Certification Standards for Lay Ecclesial Ministers* (2006). Finally, chapter 13 deals with the classical topic about the relation between religious education and catechesis. He highlights and elaborates some points of the Congregation for Catholic Education's *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*.

The *Digest* presents no conclusion. *Note:* since chapter 8 is more or less similar to the Sowing Seeds, we opted not to repeat its detailed presentation.

that like any digest, the present one does not substitute the original Church documents. It does only focus on the main points of the texts of the documents chosen and sometimes provide some useful information about its background.[54]

The *second* disclaimer states that the present one is not a complete catalogue of the significant documents concerning with Catholic religious education that have been emanated since Vatican II.[55]

The *third* disclaimer states that the present digest is not a commentary. He clearly writes that other than brief words introducing a particular document that provide some background

---

[54] MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry: A Digest of Recent Church Documents*, Washington DC: National Catholic Education, 2008, 1.

[55] The second disclaimer, aside from being the longest of the three, is a precious though modest documentation of catechesis before the Second Vatican Council. Here Marthaler is able to present a general back draft of catechesis before and from there demonstrate the great catechetical developments of catechesis from Vatican II and thereafter.

In his second disclaimer in the Introduction of the Digest, Marthaler says that authoritative statements regulating the teaching of Christian doctrine promulgated by the Holy See before Vatican II were very few. He recalls and exposes Pius V's *Ex debito pastoralis officio* (1571), Clement XIII's *In Dominico agro* (1761), Pius IX's *Nostris et nobiscum* (1849), Pius X' *Acerbo nimis* (1905) and *Uniformitas* (1905), Pope Pius XI's *Orbem catholicum* (1923) which established the Sacred Congregation of the Council, the Sacred Congregation's *Provido sane consilio* (1935), and Benedict XIV *Etsi minime* (1947).

Worthy of mention also are the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* or *Roman Catechism* and the 1917 *Codex Iuris Canonicum*. Even though Marthaler's list of catechetical documents does not pretend to be exhaustive, (as he noted), he successfully present the pre-Vatican II catechetical panorama. For the discussions of each document, cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 1-8.

and therefore set the document in context, it is the intention of the to let the documents speak for themselves.[56]

2.2. Catechesis in Vatican II and the immediate years (Chapter 1-3)[57]

The vitality of the modern catechetical movement already starting closely before Vatican II was a by-product of the interaction of many apparently unrelated factors and events. Marthaler refers to these factors and events, for instance, as 'the hunger of the faithful to know more about their faith, the zeal and vision of catechetical leaders who recognized that more is involved in handing on the faith than rote memorization of traditional formulas, and official directives from popes, Vatican congregations, and bishops stirred by pastoral concerns'[58].

With the ground prepared for reform, among other aspects, in catholic religious education, Vatican II gave the renewal 'a new impetus'. Marthaler says that Vatican II documents and other subsequent documents by Roman congregations, episcopal

---

[56] Cfr. *ibid.*, 8-9.

[57] The Digest's Chapter 1 is about the nature, task and scope of catechetical ministry according to the documents of Vatican II. The chapters 2 to 13 present those 'catechetical' documents according to chronological order of publication and according to themes. Chapter 2, titled *First Generation of Post-Conciliar: Directory and Code*, highlights in effect the *General Catechetical Directory (1971)* and the *Code of Canon Law (1982).* Chapter 3, titled *Post-Conciliar Catechetical Documents in the United States*, presents documents emanated by US Catholic Bishops immediately after Vatican II – *To Teach as Jesus Did: A Pastoral Message on Catholic Education (1972), Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education (1973), Sharing the Light of Faith: National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of the United States* (1979), and the *Guidelines for Doctrinally Sound Catechetical Materials* (1990). The main focus therefore of these three chapters is the catechetical insights of Vatican II as brought forward and developed further in many post-Vatican II catechetical documents.

[58] *Ibid.*, 11.

conferences, the prefatory notes of many newly revised liturgical books, tally the 'development and progression' of the understanding of the nature, tasks, goal, and scope of the Church's catechetical ministry.[59] He further observes that earlier documents 'touch on every aspect of catechesis' and treats 'a variety of subject matters, from goals to strategies, methods to media', while the more recent ones highlight the importance of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (as primary doctrinal reference).[60]

In the Digest's *first chapter*, Marthaler speaks of the nature, tasks and cope of catechetical ministry in the documents emanated by the Second Vatican Council. In this chapter, Marthaler tries to give a general reflection over the nature, tasks and scope of catechetical ministry from the perspective of the documents emanated in Vatican II. For Marthaler, the documents of Vatican II ignited the reform as well as indicated concrete points which later subsequent documents – emanated by the Holy See or elsewhere in the world – followed and eventually developed. Thus here Marthaler's elaborations and indications of significant points found in the Vatican II documents serve, as he says, as *an introduction […] to the catechetical ministry as it has developed in the post-conciliar Church*[61].

The flow of his discussion begins with considering Vatican II as 'the great catechism of modern times'. He shows its general

---

[59] *Ibid.*

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] *Ibid.* In this Digest therefore, the discussion of Chapter I – about the constitutions, decrees and declarations of Vatican II – only serve as 'point of departure' while the main body of the Digest focuses on post-conciliar documents. As post-conciliar documents, he refers to 'exhortations of Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II; publications of the various Roman dicasteries; statements issued by the American Episcopal conference elaborating on principles found in the council documents, updating and adapting them to the concrete circumstances that shape the catechetical ministry' (cfr. *ibid.*, 12).

intention and the documents it emanated are strongly imbued with pastoral, catechetical and evangelical spirit.[62]   After that, he thus concentrates on the centrality of the theme of evangelization in all its documents and the importance of the task of catechesis in that evangelizing mission of the Church.

After nominating the Vatican II's 16 documents, he says that the Council was 'an exercise of global evangelization'. He said that the 3,000 church leaders who gathered from all over the world for the Council showed the 'dynamics of catechesis' in a way that they proclaimed and expressed the Gospel 'in ways that excited the interest and imagination of a world audience that was watching the proceedings on television and reading them in secular as well as religious press'.

He notes that the abundant use of the media in press releases and news conferences as well as in formal pronouncements not only made this global catechesis possible but in itself was a catechesis.[63]

He puts forward a reading of the four constitutions (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Lumen Gentium*, *Dei Verbum*, and *Gaudium et spes*) in the light of the so-called 'four signs of catechesis' which namely are: the Church, the Bible, the Liturgy, and Christian Living. They are considered source and means of catechesis. Thereupon, he says that basing on the principles and norms laid out by the 4 *Constitutions*, the *decrees and declarations* consequently affirm 'that

---

[62] Quoting Paul VI, he says that Vatican II was a great catechism of modern times. He explains that the great Council was pastoral in the sense that the Fathers sought to attend to 'the deepest aspirations of the human heart and to transform society into a kingdom where peace and justice prevail'. He adds that it was also catechetical because it concentrated 'on the interior life of the Church, seeking to renew its vitality by reaffirming the importance of living the evangelical message' (cfr. *ibid.*, 12).

[63] Cfr. *ibid.*, 13-14.

catechesis must be biblical, liturgical, rooted in the life of the Church, and guided by the Magisterium.'[64]   In a word, Marthaler shows the *catechetical spirit* breathe by the Vatican documents in general.

He further underlines the theme 'evangelization' in *Lumen gentium* and *Ad gentes*. According to him, these documents identify evangelization as integral part of the very nature, missionary nature, of the Church. For that reason, the Council boldly faces the 'great impediment' to her missionary efforts: the division in the Church. He makes mention therefore of *Unitatis redintegratio*. In the same fashion, he continues, the Council showed a positive approach to non-Christian religions in the Declaration *Nostra aetate*. These, according to him, were facts not indifferent to the development of catechesis.

Marthaler however affirms that it is on Vatican II decrees, *Gravissimum educationis* and *Christus Dominus*, that the Council pronounces directly regarding catholic religious education. He cites the first in referring to the *tasks* of catechesis while he cites the second for the *nature* and *goals*.

The decree *Gravissimum educationis* mentions the importance of schools in catechetical instruction (*GE 4*), the parents' principal responsibility for their children's education (*GE 3*), and the Church's responsibility to teach Christian doctrine (*GE* 7). The 'chief task of catechetical instruction' that the document underlines according to Marthaler is: *illumine and strengthen the faith, develop a life in harmony with the spirit of Christ, stimulate a conscious and fervent participation in liturgical mystery and encourage people to take on active participation in the apostolate* (cf. *GE* 4).[65]   *Gravissimum educationis* specifies that its indications be fully

---

[64] *Ibid.,* 14.
[65] Cfr. *ibid.,* 16.

developed by a special post-conciliar commission and be adapted to the different local circumstances by Episcopal conferences (*GE*'s preface), while the other Vatican II document, *Christus Dominus*, suggests ways how bishops realize those tasks in the exercise of their *munus docendi*.[66]

Marthaler refers to the 'nature and goals of catechesis' as being explained by *Christus Dominus*. The quoted this part of the document which says:

> Its function is to develop in women and men a living, explicit, and active faith, enlightened by doctrine. It should be very carefully imparted, not only to children and adolescents but also to young people and even to adults. In imparting this instruction, the teachers must observe and order and method suited not only to the matter in hand but also to the character, the ability, the age, and the lifestyle of their audience. This instruction should be based on holy scripture, tradition, liturgy, and on the teaching authority and life of the church.[67]

Furthermore, he underlines *CD*'s association of catechetical instruction together with the homily in the Holy Mass. According to him, *CD* considers both as holding a 'pride of place always' in the bishop's exercise of *munus docendi* (*CD* 14). He further emphasizes two points in another paragraph of the document, that is, *the reestablishment or improvement of adult catechumenate* and *a creation of a directory for catechetical instruction of the Christian people*.[68]

All these Vatican II documents, which later were assimilated to the 1971 *General Catechetical Directory* and the 1983 *Codex Iuris canonicum*, continued to inspire the life of the Church and made influence on the catechetical ministry immediately after the Vatican II era and even up to our times. The *second chapter* is all about these

---

[66] Cfr. *ibid.,* 17.

[67] *CD* 14.

[68] *CD* 44.

two documents published immediately after the great Council. As shown in the discussion in the first chapter, Marthaler presented Vatican II's 'fresh look at the Church's mission in the world' embedded in its constitutions, decrees and declarations. He adds that however the details of how to organize the concrete embodiment Vatican II's vision in different and diverse circumstances where the Church is present is left to the various commissions and Roman congregations under the Pope's direction.[69]

That seems to explain the series of directories that were emanated by Roman congregations in the post-Conciliar years. The importance therefore of the first documents that were published immediately after Vatican II, to catechesis or to any field, is that they contain the 'freshness of the visions of the Council'.[70]

Marthaler describes for instance the 1971 *General Catechetical Directory* (and all the other directories emanated immediately after the Council) as 'a new genre of canonical document that lays down norms and prescribes policy and practice' […] 'without introducing new legislation as such'.[71] He introduces the same idea for the 1983 Code of Canon Law, that is, it 'assimilated the principles in the Vatican II documents'.[72]

Containing the Council's 'fresh look at the Church's mission in the world', the two first generation post-conciliar documents, Marthaler says, served as 'foundational documents that gave impetus

---

[69] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry…*, cit., 19.
[70] *Ibid.,* 21.
[71] Cfr., *ibid.*
[72] *Ibid.*

to' and also 'shape' the catechetical ministry in the years following the Council.[73]

In his commentary to GENERAL CATECHETICAL DIRECTORY (1971)[74], Marthaler makes a connection between the 1971 *GCD* to the Council's decree *Christus Dominus*. The catechetical directory, among the series of directories which were published after Vatican II, describes the nature and purpose of catechesis and provides practical guidelines for those engaged in catechetical ministry. Marthaler says that *GCD* was the first document ever issued by Rome for the universal church that treated catechesis in a comprehensive and systematic way.[75]

For *GCD*'s *Part One - The reality of the problem: The world. The Church*, Marthaler summarizes and present the general ideas of the content of this part.[76] He says that after *GDC* has affirmed the Church's essential mission to proclaim and promote faith in contemporary society, it proceeds to identify the features and characteristics of the present age. The positive and negative features *GCD* identifies in the world are: (1) the non-mediation of the present society and culture on the handling on of the faith (unlike before), (2) the presence of pluralism, (3) the diversion of people's attention from spiritual matters caused by science and technology,

---

[73] *Ibid.*

[74] It was divided into six parts that described the context and nature, the contents and methods, and the audiences and agents of catechesis. The six parts are: Part One - The reality of the problem: The world. The Church; Part Two - The Ministry of the Word: Revelation. The Pastoral Mission of the Church; Part Three - The Christian Message: Norms or Criteria. Outstanding elements; Part Four - Elements of methodology; Part Five - Catechesis according to age levels; Part Six - Pastoral activity in the Ministry of the Word; and finally, Addendum: Norms for the First reception of the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist.

[75] Cfr., *ibid.* 20.

[76] Cfr., *ibid.* 20-21.

industrialization and urbarnization, and (4) the dissemination of faulty opinions and errors about the faith and the Christian way of life among adults caused by the media. In the end, Marthaler insinuates *GCD*'s mention of Vatican II's call for renewal of the ministry of the word to be in crisis in particular cases wherein the heart of the gospel is reduced into a social manifesto.

For *GCD*'s *Part Two - The Ministry of the Word: Revelation. Pastoral Mission of the Church*, Marthaler says that its two chapters outline the directory's fundamental premise – catechesis as a form of ministry of the Word.[77]

He says that Part Two's *first chapter* begins with some notions quoted from Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum*.[78] Then it lays down the forms of the ministry of the word - evangelization, catechesis, liturgical preaching and theology – which are governed respectively by its own principles but closely linked with each other in practice. More specifically, he says that here that in relation to other forms of ministry of the word, catechetical activity takes on various forms and structures depending on circumstances but all the same, whatever form of catechesis it is, it performs the role of evangelization.

Furthermore, Marthaler says that when *GCD* insists on the renewal of catechetical instruction, the document explains that such a renewal has to do with a continuing education in the faith, not only for children but likewise for adults. Here Marthaler observes the

---

[77] Cfr., *ibid.* 22-23.

[78] Among the points GCD quotes from DV as pointed out by Marthaler are: (1) divine revelation is mediated in words and deeds, (2) Jesus embodies the fullness of revelation, (3) the ministry of the word give voice to the living tradition that mediates revelation in today's world, (4) the ministry of the word is rooted and nourished by the Scriptures and (5) humans moved by grace respond to revelation in faith.

importance *GCD* gives to adult catechesis.[79] He says that this fact reflects the momentous shift in pastoral ministry initiated by Vatican II. He says that *chapter one*, citing *CD* 14 and *AG* 14, ends with the admonition of the better adaptation of the instruction of adult catechumens.

Commenting Part Two's *second chapter*, Marthaler says that it contains another description of catechesis which clarifies that more is involved in catechesis than instruction of individuals. He summarizes the contents of *GCD* 23-30 stating how catechesis contributes to the attainment of individual and communal maturity of faith and how catechesis takes part in the community's efforts for ecumenical unity.

For *GCD*'s *Part Three - The Christian Message: Norms or Criteria. Outstanding elements*, Marthaler observes that in view of maturity in faith, *GCD* emphasizes the role of catechesis together with (or following) the proclamation of the Christian message (evangelization). He says that this part of the *GCD* is a description of the content of that message or simply put, the faith that we hold. As known, this part is composed of two chapters. Part Three's *chapter 1* outlines the norms and criteria that guide catechesis in the exposition of its content. He notes that these norms and criteria are the same ones used by the cardinals and bishops that compiled the Catechism of the Catholic Church.[80] Chapter 2 deals with the contents itself of the faith that must be present in catechesis.

The norms and criteria presented in *chapter 1*, as mentioned by Marthaler are, among others: (1) catechesis must strive to promote

---

[79] Marthaler brings into his text *GCD* 20 stating adult catechesis as the chief form and the point of orientation of all other catechesis.

[80] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 23-24.

a greater accord between the possible formulations of the divine message and the various cultures and diverse languages of peoples; (2) catechesis' object is to present the mystery of salvation as an organic whole; (3) Christocentricity of the gospel message; (4) the *sources* of catechesis: '*God's word, written or handed down, celebrated in the liturgy, illumined by saintly witnesses*, and in some way, *known from genuine moral values embedded in human society*', and; (5) the task of catechesis: to explain the how the mystery of Christ, as interpreted and defined by the Church, is center of each doctrine.

Marthaler summarizes Part Three's *chapter 2*, on the *Most Outstanding Elements of Christian Message*, as follows: parr. 47-54, *on the Christo-centric and Trinitarian focus of creation, redemption and sanctification*; parr. 55-59, *on the notion of sacrament as well as individual sacraments*; parr. 60-64, *on Christian anthropology*; parr. 65-67, *on some selected points of Lumen gentium*; par. 68, *on Mary*; and finally, par. 69, *on the last things*. Marthaler says that the list *GCD* presents is just 'a broad outline' and 'not a model for ordering truths according to an objective hierarchy'.[81]

For *Part Four - Elements of methodology*, although very brief (parr. 70-76), Marthaler has noted the following: (1) *GCD* acknowledges social sciences' role in advancing the art of teaching and contribute to more effective ways in the catechetical task. (2) *GCD* reminds catechists that the catechized' adherence to the faith does not depend on the methodology. (3) Some comments of deductive and inductive methods, and the use of traditional formulae of the faith. (4) *GCD*'s concern to both individual and communal experiences. (5) *GCD* encourages an active style of teaching to stir faith response (get involved in the life of the Church, induced to the practice of charity, and express the faith in their own words). (6)

---

[81] Cfr. *ibid.,* 25.

Affirmation of group dynamics as an occasion of ecclesial life experience.[82]

For *Part Five - Catechesis according to age levels*, Marthaler comments that *GCD* recognizes the different methods and programs of presenting the Christian message according to the needs of the audience, but leaves to national and regional directories the task of providing specific norms (in accordance with concrete local condition and needs). It shows in concrete in how this should be done, it gives some general principles of a catechesis adapted to various age levels. For its divisions, Marthaler notes: parr. 78-81, 82-91 focus on adolescence, parr. 92-96 catechesis for adults and the aged, and par. 96, special forms of catechesis.[83]

For *Part Six - Pastoral activity in the Ministry of the Word*, Marthaler says that this part gives a series of directives and guidelines that Episcopal conferences should follow in forming a 'plan of pastoral action'. He paraphrases *GCD* saying that while it acknowledges that the structures and procedures, it recommends that those cannot be implemented in the same way in every country.

Each of the 8 chapters composing this part addresses different aspects: chapter 1 on survey, chapter 2 on goals and norms of catechesis, chapter 3 importance of catechesis, chapter 4 chief working tools for catechesis, chapter 5 the need for diocesan, regional and national structures, chapter 6 the coordination of pastoral catechetics with all pastoral work, including social action, chapter 7 importance of scientific study and broad areas of research,

---

[82] Cfr. *ibid.,* 26-27.
[83] Cfr. *ibid.,* 29-30.

chapter 8 international cooperation and relations with the Apostolic See.[84]

Finally for the *Addendum: Norms for the First reception of the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist*, Marthaler comments that this issue was much debated during that time and has almost threatened to overshadow the then new document itself.[85] The norm vetoed by the *GCD* was to continue the common practice that introduces children to the sacraments in question at the age of discretion.

The other document published after Vatican II which Marthaler holds important for 'giving a new impetus to the catechesis and shaping the whole ministry in the years following the Council is the CODE OF CANON LAW (1983). He says that among other important matters, the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* has assimilated the principles in the Vatican II documents, more particularly on its treatment of catholic education in Book III-IV.

According to Marthaler's observation, Book III (756-761) reflects the primacy Vatican II gave to the ministry of the Word, and it draws heavily on three other post-conciliar documents which are imbued with the same Vatican II spirit, namely, *GCD*, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, and *Catechesi Tradendae*. Book III according to him is divided as follows: The Ministry of the Divine Word (about preaching and catechetical instruction) (§ 762-772), Missionary Action of the Church (evangelization is the responsibility of the people of God) (§ 781-792), Catholic education (about the administration of personnel in schools, universities and institutions of higher learning) (§ 793-821), Instruments of Social Communication and Books in particular (includes catechisms and

---

[84] Cfr. *ibid.,* 31-33.
[85] Cfr. *ibid.,* 20.

textbooks) (§ 822-832), The Profession of Faith and lists of persons obliged to make such a formal profession (§ 833).[86]

Book IV is all about the munus sanctificandi of the Church (§ 834-1253). It is divided in three parts: sacraments, divine worship, and sacred times and places. The main idea is that the sanctifying function is fulfilled chiefly on sacred liturgy; and in other ways by prayer and works of penance and charity. Each member of the community has a role to play in this mission and a special responsibility or the fruitful celebration of the sacraments.

After discussing the main ideas of Vatican II on catechesis which were brought into practical directive in the life of the Church, Marthaler turns into the specific documents that were published in USA on the immediate years after Vatican II. *What are they? What do they say? Any development from what the Holy See says? Which point is continued afterwards?*

In the immediate years after the closure of Vatican II, there were documents emanated by the Episcopal conference of US Bishops that had already dealt with the practical and intellectual dimensions of religious catholic education in USA. The interesting thing with these US documents is that they were already on the process of being published almost simultaneously as that of the Congregation of Clergy's *GCD*.

The Digest's chapter 3, referring to all these documents, focuses on *GCD*'s adaptation to the US context, that is, the *Sharing the Light of Faith: National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of United States* (1979). Years prior to the working of this adaptation, the Episcopal conference has addressed concrete aspects of catechesis in USA with documents which later were just incorporated to the

---

[86] Cfr. *ibid.,* 34-39.

national directory. The documents that the Digest's chapter 3, therefore, presents are the following: *To Teach as Jesus Did: A Pastoral message on catholic Education* (1972), *Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education* (1973), *Sharing the Light of Faith: National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of United States* (1979), and one which is most posterior, the *Guidelines for Doctrinally Sound Catechetical Materials* (1988).

Marthaler highlights the *third* document – the national catechetical directory or *SLF*. Its importance lies on the fact that it is the first US catechetical document that seems to respond to the petition of Decree *Christus Dominus* and of the *General Catechetical Directory* for 'specialized directories that will provide guidelines for nations, regions and particular groups'. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, it incorporated the two other documents the Episcopal conference published previously, *To Teach as Jesus Did* and *Basic Teachings*. The *first* is on catholic education in general and the *second*, on orthodoxy. A decade later after the publication of the *Sharing the Light of Faith*, says Marthaler, the Bishops were prompted to publish *Guidelines for Doctrinally Sound Catechetical Materials* (1988).

For the document TO TEACH AS JESUS DID: A PASTORAL MESSAGE ON CATHOLIC EDUCATION (1972)[87], Marthaler writes that

---

[87] Marthaler notes that this document confirms the US bishops' commitment to Catholic education. *To Teach as Jesus Did* (*TTJD* henceforth), as can be observed, is published a year after the *General Catechetical Directory* (1971) and some years before *Sharing the Light of Faith* (1979). However, Marthaler discloses that the plan and the process of creation of *TTJD* push way back to 1967. He says that in the mid-1960s in USA, there was a growing popular pessimism towards Catholic education on the part of Catholics. Hence in 1967, fresh from Vatican II's closure, the catholic bishops published a statement reaffirming the indispensability of catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States and with a promise to issue at 'a later date' a more comprehensive statement regarding Catholic education that would apply the norms of Vatican II's *Gravissimum educationis* to the US conditions. Why the delay? As the *TTJD* itself would reveal, it was 'a product of protracted and broad consultation with every

it is basically all about 'those agencies and instruments that are commonly recognized as having educational objectives' such as schools, youth programs, and adult education. However, Marthaler notes, it also mentions and acknowledges the important roles of the family and the programs of the Church's educational ministry, the role of the media and liturgy, even though these are not the main focus of the document.

According to Marthaler, its *Chapter 1 To Teach as Jesus Did: Message, Community, Service* outlines the organizing principle of the whole document, that is, the Church's educational ministry is an integrated ministry embracing *didache* (the proclamation of the Message of Salvation), *koinonia* (growth in communion in the community) and *diakonia* (service in the community) and these three elements or tasks are 'interlocking' and 'mutually dependent'. He further notes that the national catechetical directory will later assimilate this principle.[88]

Its *Chapter 2 A World in transition: Faith and Technology*, according to him, can be stated in two points. *First*, he rephrases the document's mention of 'distressing paradox'[89]; *second*, he points out the Church's response, as stated by the documents itself.

---

segment of the US Church'. In addition to that, Marthaler notes that the work coincided with the 'fitting into' of the autonomous offices of the old NCWC to the newly organized Department of Education of the likewise new USCC. The document is divided into a Preface, five chapters with study questions, and a comprehensive index. These chapters are: *To Teach as Jesus Did: Message, Community, Service* (Chapter 1), *A World in transition: Faith and Technology* (Chapter 2), *Giving Form to the Vision* (Chapter 3), *Planning the Educational Mission: An invitation to cooperation* (Chapter 4), and *A Ministry of Hope* (Chapter 5).

[88] Cfr. *ibid.,* 43-44.

[89] Therefore, he says that the document observes a distressing paradox in the current US society: while there is an advance in science and technology which has facilitated unity or has introduced a very high level kind of living, paradoxically

For its *Chapter 3 Giving Form to the Vision*, Marthaler considers this part 'the heart of the document'. It deals with the *educational ministry to adults and to youth* and suggests ways how this two forms and structures of Church educational ministry 'can foster knowledge of doctrine, build community, and encourage commitment to service'. *Regarding the Church's educational ministry to Adults*, Marthaler observes *GCD*'s influence in the importance this document gives to adult education. This particular part describes marriage preparations, the education for families, the role of parents as educators, the appropriate handling of education in sexuality to children, and about the higher education in United States and the theology departments in universities. *Regarding the Church's educational ministry to youth*, Marthaler says that the document emphasizes the integration of intellectual education to the life of faith and commitment to service. It likewise mentions of programs for young people who do not attend Catholic schools, of the distinguishing feature of catholic schools, that is, the integration of life and religion reflected in the teachers' lives, of catholic schools common programs with public schools, of quality education for the poor and the disadvantaged, of new forms of schooling, of the formation given by youth ministers and the formation provided by catholic schools, and of peer group ministries.[90] Finally for its *Chapter 4 Planning the Educational Mission: An invitation to cooperation* and *Chapter 5 A Ministry of Hope*, Marthaler simply reiterates the two chapters' respective principal messages: the

---

the same progress 'uprooted people from tradition and history and destroy ancient patterns of life' or has made possible 'violence and destruction on an unheard of scale'. The bishops believe that educational ministry has to contribute to the balanced discernment about the situation in place of simplistic solutions and sees the whole situation as 'an opportunity of proclaiming the Gospel of Christ in our times (*Ibid.,* 44)

[90] Cfr. *ibid.,* 44-47.

involvement of the entire catholic community in the church's educational mission and the exhortation to hope.[91]

For BASIC TEACHINGS FOR CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION (1973)[92], Marthaler has fixed his commentary on the similarity and differences between *Basic Teachings* and the *GCD*'s section 'The Most Outstanding Elements of Christian Message'. He observes three differences.

First, Marthaler says something regarding the title and the content. He says that while *GCD* uses the terms 'catechesis' and 'catechetical' all throughout and describes catechesis as a form of ministry of the word, *Basic Teachings* adopts the Anglo-American term 'religious education'. In addition to that, *Basic Teachings* acknowledges the formational aspect (existential) of religious education or catechesis, as emphasized on the contrary by *GCD*, but it underlines more on the instruction and teaching of the doctrine.

Second, Marthaler says that *Basic Teachings* highlight the themes 'prayer, participation in liturgy and Bible Study' in religious education in view of the pastoral realities of the United States; *GCD* on the

---

[91] Cfr. *ibid.,* 47.

[92] *Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education* (1973) (*Basic Teachings* henceforth) is another document which has seen light in the same ambience as that of *TTJD*. Its composition was already on the process when *GCD* was published in 1971. Marthaler records that the initiative was voiced by John cardinal Krol of Philadelphia in the meeting of catholic bishops in 1970. This document is an outline of basic doctrines in religious education programs and that it would serve as guide for religious educators and publishers in making syllabus and publishing textbooks, respectively. The oversight committee with its chair, Archbishop John Whealon of Hartford, decided to pattern this document to *GCD*'s section titled 'The Most Outstanding Elements of Christian Message'. Marthaler observes that although *Basic Teachings*' 25 headings seem at times to be paraphrases of the mentioned section of the *GCD*, this document offers somehow a notable elaboration on some specific teachings on Morality (*Ibid.*, 47-48).

contrary, he says, simply presumes the three themes as fundamental to catechesis.

Third, *Basic Teachings* has two unique appendices (which *GCD* does not have). Appendix 1 is the Decalogue and the Beatitudes. Marthaler comments that the document considers the two of special importance in teaching the specifics of morality. Appendix 2 is the 7 Precepts of the Church. Of the 6 precepts mentioned in the Baltimore Catechism, *Basic Teachings*, aside from giving them a pastoral spirit, adds the seventh precept which is the joining into the missionary spirit and apostolate of the Church. Marthaler notes that both appendices were, among others, incorporated to the national directory.[93]

For SHARING THE LIGHT OF FAITH: NATIONAL CATECHETICAL DIRECTORY FOR CATHOLICS OF UNITED STATES (1979)[94], Marthaler's immediate attention goes to the document's

---

[93] Cfr. *ibid.,* 48-49.

[94] The national directory, aimed as an adaptation of the *General Catechetical Directory* (1972) to the United States scene, can also be said to be a product of agglomerated previous documents of published by catholic bishops of United States almost in the same moments the *GCD* was being made. Marthaler notes that a year before the official publication of the *GCD* in 1972, the catholic Bishops of the United States, in their November 1971 annual meeting, have already established an ad hoc committee chaired by Bishop Joseph McKinney, auxiliary bishop of Grand Rapids, Michigan, to devise a plan with procedures for creating a national directory. Marthaler presents the three guiding principles outlined by the committee, namely: (1) That the board of directives of the General Catechetical Directory be adopted to the needs and conditions of the United States; (2) Taking into consideration established principles of sacred Scriptures, the human sciences, contemporary theology and the teachings of Vatican II, the national directory should give priority to pastoral concerns. It should give prominence to liturgy; and, (3) The national directory should be the fruit of the widest consultation feasible, so that the process by which it is developed has an educational value, and at the same time creates an environment that will assure broad acceptance of the finished product. By April 1972, the plan was voted. The extensive and intensive work has finally run its course in November 1977. The NCCB submitted the text

incorporation of two previous US documents – *Basic Teachings* and *To Teach as Jesus Did*. As a general observation, Marthaler puts his attention to the new chapters added by *SLF* and to the documents' authority. *Regarding the additions of the SLF*, Marthaler says that while it adapts *GCD* to the US reality, it adds a chapter on liturgical catechesis and another on catechesis for social ministry. *Regarding clarification of the SLF's authority*, it says: (1) not all parts are of equal authority, (2) on specific parts such as on the Church's teaching regarding revelation and the Christian message, they must be held by all, (3) on article 47, norms of criteria, must be observed, and (4) on human development, methodology, catechetical roles and training, organizing structures, resources, etc.: they are subject to change.[95]

For its *Preface*, Marthaler simply reiterates its contents. He says that *Sharing the Light of Faith*'s Preface explains the connection of the present document to *GCD*, it describes the development that shaped contemporary catechesis up that time, it presents the lengthy consultation behind the creation of the national directory and the collaboration between Eastern and Western Catholic Churches in the United States, it cites contemporary problems, and finally, it mentions lay involvement, the emergence of adult catechesis and the

---

to the Congregation of Clergy on October 1978 for review and final approval. The *Sharing the Light of Faith: National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of United States* (*SLF* henceforth) was finally published in 1979 (*Ibid.*, 49). The 11 chapters the national directory are: Some Cultural and Religious Characteristic Affecting Catechesis in the United States (Chapter 1), The Catechetical Ministry of the Church (Chapter 2), Revelation, faith and catechesis (Chapter 3), The Church and Catechesis (Chapter 4), The principal Elements of the Christian Message for Catechesis (Chapter 5), Catechesis for a Worshipping Community (Chapter 6), Catechesis for Social Ministry (Chapter 7), Catechesis toward Maturity in Faith (Chapter 8), Catechetical Personnel (Chapter 9), and Organization for Catechesis (chapter 10) and Catechetical Resources (Chapter 11).

[95] Cfr. *ibid.,* 50.

use of electronic media in communicating the Gospel as 'hopeful signs'.[96]

For *Chapter 1 Some Cultural and Religious Characteristic Affecting Catechesis in the United States*, Marthaler simply says that *SLF* takes cue from *GCD* and reiterates the four headings which summarizes the cultural and religious characteristics affecting catechesis in the United States which namely are: (1) racial, ethnical, cultural and religious diversity (2) the opportunities and dangers presented by the advances in science and technology including communications media and unclear armaments (3) a brief profile of US Catholics with reference to their devotional life, attitudes towards the Church and church teachings and (4) the importance of the home and the changing family structures.[97]

For *Chapter 2 The Catechetical Ministry of the Church*, Marthaler notes that this chapter was inserted due to an observation from some catholic bishops of the absence in the draft text of an explanation about the nature and aims of catechesis and its relation to other forms of ministry of the word. The whole idea of chapter two, according to Marthaler, is to describe catechesis as a form of ministry of the word whose task is to foster maturity of faith. Furthermore, he observes that the document opts for the term 'catechesis' and with consistency (instead of the anglo-saxon word 'religious education' as used in *Basic Teachings*).

Chapter 2 has the following subheadings: Catechesis – A Form of Ministry of the Word (Part A), Forms of Catechesis (Part B), Sources and Signs of Catechesis (Part C), and Catechetical Criteria (Part D). Marthaler summarizes the contents of the four

---

[96] Cfr. *ibid.,* 51.
[97] Cfr. *ibid.,* 52.

subheadings saying that Part A and B explain the relation of catechesis to the other forms of ministries of the word (pre-evangelization, evangelization, liturgy, and theology). He notes that Part A ends with a catechesis on Morality. While Marthaler simply summarizes the contents of Part D as 'certain norms that guide all sound catechesis', he gives more attention to Part C, about *the source and content of catechesis.* The document says that the source and content of catechesis in God's word revealed in Jesus and at work in people's lives through the Holy Spirit and celebrated in many ways in the liturgy, manifested in the lives of saints and in the moral values in society and in every instance of God's presence. Here, Marthaler focuses on the *NCD*'s acknowledgement of what he calls 'development of contemporary catechesis'. He refers to *the principal four signs of catechesis*, namely, the Bible, doctrine, moral teaching and liturgy. He says that they are considered signs inasmuch as they point to a deeper reality: God's communication to the world. He says that Vatican II expanded this sense of 'sign' to 'creation' and 'signs of the times'. In other words, they too point to God's communication or mode of speaking to the world. Thus Marthaler says that *NDC* adopting that language speaks of biblical signs (creation and covenant), liturgical signs (sacramental celebrations and liturgical year), ecclesial signs (doctrines and witness of Christian living) and natural signs.[98]

For *Chapter 3 Revelation, Faith and Catechesis*, Marthaler says that this part relies on some points from Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum* and *GCD*'s Part 2 Chapter 1 (about revelation). He simply says that here, revelation is used *in a strict sense.* He explains strict sense as 'that divine public revelation which closed at the end of the apostolic age'. Thus he observes that for intending

---

[98] Cfr. *ibid.,* 52-54.

revelation *in a general sense*, *NDC* uses the words 'manifestation' and 'communication'. According to Marthaler, *NDC* describes faith as the grace-inspired human response to revelation. In addition to that, Marthaler reproduces the guidelines *NDC* presents for a catechetical approach to revelation and faith.[99]

For *Chapter 4 The Church and Catechesis*, Marthaler summarizes its contents describing it as an outline of catechetical principles and guidance regarding (A) the Catholic church's mission and (B) its relationship with (1) other Christian Churches and communities, (2) with the Jewish people, (3) with other major religions, and (4) with those who profess no religion at all. Marthaler squarely states the premise on which this chapter is based: catechesis is a ministry carried on by the Church and is integral to the Church's own mission. Thus the whole chapter is imbued, as Marthaler intricately pointed out in his commentary, with practical directives regarding ecclesiological principles, the practice of ecumenism, sensitivity in relating with the Jewish people and other persons with a different religious outlook, cooperation in scholarship and social action programs, collaboration with others in promoting spiritual and moral values, acknowledgement of the diversity and very rich tradition of the Eastern Church, etc.[100]

For *Chapter 5 The Principal Elements of the Christian Message for Catechesis*, Marthaler puts his attention of the chapter's footnote which makes reference to *Basic Teachings* and *GCD* nn. 47-69. As pre-stated somewhere above, the concern towards the insistence of the teaching of fundamental doctrines of Christianity in catechesis was a theme of priority either for the drafters of *GCD* or for the catholic bishops who made the *Basic Teachings*. Marthaler notes

---

[99] Cfr. *ibid.,* 54-55.
[100] Cfr. *ibid.,* 55-56.

however that the text here is not a word-for-word repetition of the documents published beforehand. The principal elements of the Christian message for catechesis discussed here are: The Mystery of the One God (A), Creation (B), Jesus Christ (C), The Holy Spirit (D), The Church (E), The Sacraments (F), The Life of Grace (G), The Moral Life (H), Mary and the Saints (I), and the Last things (Death, Judgment and Eternity) (J).

Marthaler says that A, B, and C summarize the revealed doctrine about the mystery of God, creation and Jesus Christ. D is about the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church. E introduces several articles dealing with hierarchical structures that were absent in *Basic Teachings*. Although F makes short statements regarding the sacraments, they are lengthily commented in *SLF*'s Chapter 6, about the catechesis for a worshipping community. Aside from being strikingly taken from *GCD* and *Basic Teachings*, G and H incorporates two documents: *To Live in Jesus Christ*, a pastoral letter on the life of grace and the Church's moral teaching by the *NCCB* published in 1976, and *Declaration on certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics*, published by the *Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith* in 1975. I and J are respectively about Mary and the saints, and the Last Things. In addition to these, the document incorporates the 7 Precepts of the Church as among the specifics of Christian living. Marthaler ends with a comment saying that the national directory, in presenting the principal doctrines of the Christian Faith, subtly maintains the balance between catechesis and pastoral ministry.[101]

For *Chapter 6 Catechesis for a Worshipping Community*, Marthaler brings to mind one of the 'guiding principles' which governed the drafting of the national directory – that it should give prominence to the liturgy. Marthaler says that the principal sources of this chapter

---

[101] Cfr. *ibid.,* 57.

are Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and other decrees and instructions dealing with sacramental practice that were issued after the Council. He adds that the prenotanda or prefatory notes of the revised rites were very useful in the writing of this chapter.

The contents of this chapter are: Liturgy and Catechesis (A), Sacraments/Mysteries (B), Prayer (C), Sacred Art and Sacramentals (D). Marthaler makes his commentary of this chapter mentioning the three challenges the writing of this chapter faced and how in effect it has resolved through the discussions in each headings/subchapters.[102]

For *Chapter 7 Catechesis for Social Ministry*, Marthaler says that this chapter builds on Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes*, and on *Justice in the World*, the statement of second assembly of the Synod of Bishops. The chapter is in general divided into three parts, namely, (1) the foundations of Catholic Social Teaching, (2) its development, and (3) guidance on how to address social issues.[103]

In commenting *Chapter 8 Catechesis toward Maturity in Faith*, Marthaler says this is the longest part of the document. It has in effect four principal parts. Part A is all about the relationship between life of faith and human development. Marthaler calls Part B as the centerpiece of the chapter; it is all about the various characteristics of life stages from infancy to old age and their influences in a person's moral and sexual development. Part C explains the need to adapt catechesis to the cultural background and

---

[102] Cfr. *ibid.,* 58-62.
[103] Cfr. *ibid.,* 62-64.

special needs of certain individuals. Finally, Part D describes some significant factors affecting catechetical issues in the United States.[104]

Chapter 9 Catechetical Personnel is composed of two parts. Part A is about the ideal qualities of catechists; Part B about catechists' varied roles and the preparation required. Marthaler makes a clarifying distinction of the meaning of catechists used in the document. He says that all members of the community share in the catechetical ministry of the Church, therefore all are catechists in a broad sense. But some are 'called to exercise' more specific roles. He refers to parents, teachers, principals in catholic schools, coordinators and directors of religious education, deacons, priests and bishops. He says that the national directory uses 'catechist' in abroad sense, meaning, 'those who participate formally or informally in the catechetical ministry'.[105]

Marthaler summarizes the contents of *Chapter 10 Organization for Catechesis* saying that the chapter is all about the need for organizational structures in the Church's catechetical ministry. Part A, he says, describes the general guidelines with regards to planning, evaluation and research (to ascertain the needs and to develop models for local use). Parts B to F discuss the parish, diocesan, regional and national structures, the higher education, and some other structures in other settings.[106]

In *Chapter 11 Catechetical Resources*, Marthaler reiterates the chapter's idea of the catechetical efficiency using good tools in the hands of skilled catechists. He enumerates the tools in common use during that time, namely: human and organizational resources, the communications media, textbooks, and audiovisual materials. He

---

[104] Cfr. *ibid.,* 64-68.
[105] Cfr. *ibid.,* 68-70.
[106] Cfr. *ibid.,* 71-73.

says that the principles the documents lay down in relation to the use of these resources remains to be valid in our days although the technology has advanced too far in creating new innovations.[107]

Finally, for GUIDELINES FOR DOCTRINALLY SOUND CATECHETICAL MATERIALS (1990)[108], Marthaler describes in general the parts of the document. *Regarding the Introduction*, Marthaler summarizes his description in two principal points: *first*, it mentions earlier documents on which it is based such as Vatican II, *GCD*, *Sharing the Light of Faith* and others; and (2) it outlines the 'principles and criteria' of catechetical materials that are doctrinally sound. These principles and criteria serve as foundations on which later the 'guidelines' are based. Marthaler adds that the specific criteria are based on two principles. To quote, they are:

> (1) that the presentation of the Christian message be both *authentic* and *complete*: that is, it must be in harmony with the doctrine and traditions of the Catholic church; and it must be presented in its entirety and in a balanced way; and (2) the recognition that the message of faith is *incarnate* and *dynamic*; that is, 'God's creative power is mediated in the concrete experience of life, in personal development, in human relationships, in culture, in social life, in

---

[107] Cfr. *ibid.,* 74-75.

[108] After some years in which the Conference was composed no longer of bishops who were present at the Vatican II and those who drafted the earlier documents *To Teach as Jesus Did*, *Basic Teachings* and the national directory, another need arose in the late 80s: certain directives about doctrinally sound catechetical materials. Therefore, this document, *Guidelines for Doctrinally Sound Catechetical Materials*, was published in November 1990. According to Marthaler, these guidelines were created by a task force of catechetical leaders representing different parts and groupings of the Church in United States. The Chairman of the group is Bishop John Leibrecht of Springfield-Cape Girardeau. As to the motive of drafting the guidelines, Marthaler notes that the document provides norms and standard criteria that can help in presenting the Church's doctrine on faith and morals.

science and technology, and in signs of the times' (*Guidelines*, 3-8)"[109]

Regarding the Guidelines themselves, Marthaler limits himself on giving general comments. He says that the document presents *two set* of guidelines. The *first set of guidelines* outlines the core teachings. The first set lists 68 specific themes under the headings: General Doctrinal Content; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; Church; Mary and the saints; Liturgy and Sacraments; Life of Grace and Moral Issues; Death, Judgment, and Eternity. He observes that most of the doctrinal directives reference the *GCD* and/or *NCD*, documents of Vatican II, papal documents or on some episcopal instructions. The first set of guidelines emphasizes that catechesis must present the Church's teaching correctly and in its entirety. The *second set of guidelines*, titled "Guidelines for Presenting Sound Doctrine", is a restatement of the documents mentioned earlier above (*GCD*, *SLF*, etc.). The second set recognizes for catechesis to be effective it is equally important to present Church doctrine in ways that are attractive, appealing, and understandable by individual and communities to whom it is directed.[110]

As Marthaler says, indeed, 'the list of Church documents published in the wake of the Council records the development and progression of thought regarding the nature and tasks of catechesis.'[111] What are those developments? At a 'universal' level

---

[109] Cfr. *ibid.,* 76.

[110] Cfr. *ibid.,* 78.

[111] He refers to the documents published by Roman Congregations and Episcopal conferences, praenotanda to liturgical documents, pastoral letters, catechetical directories, and guidelines. They touch every aspect and a variety of issues. He made special mention of the CCC with its claim as 'the centerpiece and primary reference as to the what of catechesis'. All these, according to Marthaler, helped shape today's understanding of the nature, tasks and scope of catechetical ministry (cfr. *ibid.,* 11).

(referring to the documents from the Holy See), there is an observable development.

While indicating that *GCD* and *The Code of Canon Law* reiterates the ideas of the document of Vatican II,[112] he implicitly underlines *GCD*'s being 'the first document ever issued by Rome that treated catechesis in a comprehensive and systematic way',[113] or referring to directories in general, 'a new genre of canonical document that lays down norms and prescribes policy and practice'.[114]

In other words, the indications of the documents of Vatican II were made into concrete policies and therefore a certain legislative weight that binds and demands certain obedience from all who are bound by that policy. The case of the *Code of Canon Law* and its assumption in Book III and IV of the Church's educational affair is clearer. Moreover, it is enough to say that *GCD* has elaborated the simple indications of the documents of Vatican II regarding catechetical instructions.

At the level of US catechesis, it is enough to indicate for now the 'merging' of *TTJD* and *Basic Teachings* with the *GCD* in *SLF*. The theoretical and practical understanding of catechesis in the US context that would emerge from this 'merge' may without doubt be considered a 'progress' which needs a closer attention and careful study.

---

[112] Cfr. *ibid.,* 19.
[113] Cfr. *ibid.,* 20.
[114] Cfr. *ibid.,* 19.

2.3. Catechesis for diverse settings and age levels in USA (Chapter 4)[115]

Among the early concrete initiative which catechesis in USA has taken - aside from the adaptation of the general principles and indications prescribed by the Holy See and combination with its already written documents the same subject - was on the aspect of catechizing according to the diverse levels of age and settings of those who receive the catechetical formation.

For the first document, A VISION OF YOUTH MINISTRY (1976)[116], Marthaler writes that it is 'the document that did most to shape youth ministry in the post-Vatican II years' in the United

---

[115] The *Digest*'s Chapter 4, titled *Towards Maturity*, is all about the USCCB documents which deal with growth and development of faith in the life of Christians. In this chapter, Marthaler comments on the following documents: *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), *The Challenge of Adolescent Catechesis: Maturing in faith* (1986), *Renewing the Vision: A Framework for Catholic Youth Ministry* (1997), *Adult Catechesis in the Christian Community* (1990), and *Our Hearts Were Burning within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States* (1999). In this chapter Marthaler presents and describes the documents which he deems dealing in general with catechesis adapted the different age levels. Following and in fact citing in the introduction on this chapter *GCD* 77-97 and the *SLF*'s chapter 8 – parts of documents previously treated which deal with the recipient of catechesis according to age levels – he indicates that the documents he presents in this chapter points out 'the centrality of adult catechesis' and the 'maturity of faith' as aim of all catechesis.

[116] It was published by the Department of Education of the USCC in 1976. The document is the result of the 'in-depth study of the developing field of youth ministry' commissioned by USCC's advisory board for Youth Activities in 1975. Describing the document in general, Marthaler wrote the following points: (1) it is all about the Christian community's response to the needs of the young people and the young people's sharing of their unique gifts to the larger Christian community; (2) the basic principle underlying the document: any description of youth ministry must grow out of and be confirmed by the lived experience of the persons who exercise this ministry on a daily basis and; (3) this document offers a focus for the work of youth ministry and outlines its major components as seen by those who are closely involved in youth ministry (cfr. *ibid.*, 81-82).

States.[117] He summarizes the contents of the document nominating its three principal parts and giving a general comment for each part. He says that the *first part* gives an overview of the mission and ministry of the Church; the *second part*, the meat of the document, a vision of youth ministry (under five headings)[118]; and the *third*, incorporates some observations made by representatives at the abovementioned in-depth study or convention of national catholic youth organizations in 1975. Marthaler concludes pointing out the strength and weakness of the document. The strength and weakness of the document lies in one reality: it is based on the lived experience of the persons who exercise the youth ministry on a daily basis. He explains that as strength, it presents a comprehensive overview of the situation as it appeared to them at that time, but it did not acknowledge and draw lessons from successful efforts in youth ministry in the past. However, Marthaler says that the document was

---

[117] Cfr. *ibid.,* 81.

[118] The five headings are: Dimensions, Goals, principles, Context and Components of Youth Ministry. Under "Dimensions', Marthaler writes youth ministry is to, with, by and for youth. Under 'Goals', there are two: (1) foster the total personal and spiritual growth of each young person, and (2) draw young people into the life, mission, and work of the faith community. For 'Principles', there are six: (1) The physical, psychological and social growth is more concentrated during the teen-age years than in any comparable span of life. (2) concern for the total person entails sensitivity for the concrete living of individuals – social, cultural, developmental and spiritual. (3) Relationships that allow a mutual opening to challenges and willingness to grow are of utmost importance. (4) Youth ministry is most effectively carried out in small settings. (5-6) An essential dimension of youth ministry: the potential to minister others is awakened in an individual when his or her personal worth and gifts are recognized. Under 'Context', the document, according to Marthaler, names 'peer pressure's positive and negative influences' and 'the faith community's prophetic witness against the false values often presented by the general culture. Under 'Components', Marthaler says that the document list Word, Worship, Creating Community, Guidance and Healing, Justice and Service. (Cfr. *ibid.,* 82-83)

a timely reminder that youth ministry in an integral part of Church's life and mission.[119]

In Commenting THE CHALLENGE OF ADOLESCENT CATECHESIS: MATURING IN FAITH (1986)[120], here are the principal observations that Marthaler makes: (1) the focus of the document is that aspect of catechesis that is systematic and intentional and that can be planned, (2) the aim of the youth ministry, according to the document, is to sponsor youth toward maturity in the catholic Christian faith as a living reality, (3) recognizing the different maturation process in various age levels, he says that the document presents a framework outlining the 'faith themes' (Jesus Christ, Scripture, Church, Prayer, interpretation, and critical reflection) according to the learning needs of younger (11/12 to 14/15 years old) and older (14/15 to18/19 years old) adolescents, (3) the principles the document proposes apply to catechesis for Confirmation at whatever age it is administered because catechesis is lifelong and the community has the obligation to provide opportunity for continuing growth in faith, (4) adolescent catechesis is a task of the whole community and those which have specialized roles in it, (5) the document refers many times to *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976) and John Paul II's apostolic exhortation *Catechesis Tradendae* (1979).

In commemoration of the 20th year of the publication of *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), USCC's Department of Education

---

[119] Cfr. *ibid.,* 83.

[120] This document, published in English and Spanish, was addressed to leaders in ministries with youth and in catechetical ministry in parishes, catholic schools and diocesan offices. This was developed by three organizations: National Federation for Catholic Ministry, Inc., National Conference of Diocesan Directors of Religious Education, and the youth desk of the USCC's Department of Education. The document is composed of an introduction, its six parts, and a conclusion.

emitted RENEWING THE VISION: A FRAMEWORK FOR CATHOLIC YOUTH MINISTRY (1997)[121] Marthaler's basically points out *four* observations: (1) about the two things this document credits *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), (2) the novelty of the present document, (3) his observation regarding the emphasis made by the document's Part II The Goals for the Ministry with Adolescents, and (4) the importance of the document's Part 3 Themes and Components for a Comprehensive Ministry with Adolescents.

Regarding the first, Marthaler says that *Renewing the Vision* (1997) credits *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976) with two things: (1) it initiated transformation in the Church's thinking and practice, and (2) it served as catalyst for a dramatic increase in new and innovative pastoral practice with adolescents.[122]

Regarding the second, Marthaler says that *Renewing the Vision* (1997) identifies three new challenges which confronts the Church's ministry to young people: (1) the consequences of social and economic changes, including the wide ranging influences of the media, (2) the new research into the factors which make for healthy adolescent development (elaborated in Part III of the document), and (3) the Church's more expanded and holistic understanding of ministry (including youth ministry).[123]

Regarding the third, Marthaler says that while *Renewing the Vision* (1997) basically reiterates the goals for the ministry with adolescents

---

[121] In his presentation, Marthaler goes directly to commenting the principal points which he deems important. It has four parts: Part 1 The Growth and Development of the Church's Ministry with Adolescents, Part 2 The Goals for the Ministry with Adolescents , Part 3 Themes and Components for a Comprehensive Ministry with Adolescents, and Part 4 A Guiding Image for the Ministry with Adolescents.

[122] Cfr. *ibid.,* 85.

[123] Cfr. *ibid.*

as stated in *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), it emphasizes on 'catechesis as an essential component of youth ministry'.[124]

Finally regarding the fourth, Marthaler considers Part III as the heart of the document. Starting its discussion with the vision of youth ministry set out by the 1976 document, *Renewing the Vision* (1997) does not recommend a single model or program because, Marthaler explains, ministry with adolescents is flexible to the changing needs and life situations. After that, Marthaler mentions the 8 fundamental ways to minister effectively with adolescents (advocacy, catechesis, community life, evangelization, justice and service, leadership development, pastoral care, prayer and worship) and in which he adds 'vocational discernment'.

Marthaler likewise observes the documents account of *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and *General Directory for Catechesis* but indicates *Renewing the Vision* (1997)'s separate treatment of evangelization and catechesis (CCC and GCD considers evangelization and catechesis a unity).[125]

For ADULT CATECHESIS IN THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY: SOME PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES (1990),[126] Marthaler launches his observation to the sub-title and to the three sections composing the document. *Regarding the sub-title*, Marthaler says that the document does not intend to be an exhaustive treatise nor present a paradigm for adult catechesis. However, he points out that the document's contribution is its assertion of the importance of adult catechesis as 'a

---

[124] Cfr. *ibid.*

[125] Cfr. *ibid.,* 85-86.

[126] This is a document developed by the International Council for Catechesis (COINAT) resulting from the group's 1988 meeting in Rome with the theme, Adult Catechesis in the Christian Community. The drafting of the document is attributed to Cesare Bissoli, SDB, the secretary general of the Council.

preferential option' for the growth of the whole community's faith journey.[127]

Regarding the first section, Marthaler reiterates its acknowledgement of the difficulties and sufferings that adults face in the contemporary setting, the need to investigate more for its causes, and the need for new approaches in adult catechesis.[128]

Regarding the second section, Marthaler focuses on the fundamental and specific rationale of adult catechesis. He says that according to the document, the fundamental rationale of adult catechesis is based on the right and obligation of all Christians to be catechized. Its specific rationale is bound up with the adults' responsibilities in public life, in the family and in the workplace, and in the Christian community. In addition to that, he observes that the document takes into account (1) the integration of liturgical catechesis and catechesis for social action as integrated to adult catechesis, (2) the treatment of adults as adults, and (3) the secular character peculiar to the laity. He likewise made mention of the document's difficulty of giving a fixed definition of adulthood.[129]

Regarding the third section, Marthaler says that this section repeats, underscores and expands on the principles mentioned in the previous two sections such as the need to build adult Christian communities, the importance of taking the widely diverse experiences of adults into consideration, the fundamental importance of the dialogical approach in adult catechesis, the recognition of the

---

[127] Cfr. *ibid.,* 86.
[128] Cfr. *ibid.,* 87.
[129] Cfr. *ibid.,* 87-88.

emergence of lay *adult catechists*, and the involvement of the whole community in adult catechesis.[130]

For OUR HEARTS WERE BURNING WITHIN US: A PASTORAL PLAN FOR ADULT FAITH FORMATION IN THE UNITED STATES (1999), Marthaler's word on this document is strikingly short. This is a document signed by both *USCC* and *NCCB*. He records that the publication of this document was authorized by *NCCB* at the urgings of the USCC's Department of Education and the National Advisory Committee on Adult Religious Education.

He comments that while *Our Hearts Were Burning within US*, like COINAT's *Adult Catechesis in the Christian Community: Some Principles and Guidelines* (1990), puts faith on the centrality of ongoing adult faith formation in all catechesis, it likewise 'sketches out a concrete plan to be implemented in USA', something which the COINAT document did not do.[131] He refers to the *third* and *fourth parts* of the document.

Marthaler does not go into details in his commentary on the document. In general terms, he describes the contents of the four parts. He says that the *first part* describes the concrete challenges and opportunities that shape adult faith formation; the *second part*, the qualities of mature adult faith and discipleship; the *third*, sets goals, outlines guiding principles, identifies content areas and recommends approaches to sound and diversified faith formation, and; the *fourth part*, focuses on the parish and on parish culture, and leadership as well as diocesan support.   He quotes the affirmation of the

---

[130] Cfr. *ibid.,* 88-89.
[131] Cfr. *ibid.,* 89.

document saying that the total fabric of parish life or the parish itself is an adult faith formation program.[132]

2.4. Liturgical Reform and its reception in USA (Chapter 5)[133]

Elsewhere in the Digest's chapter 1, Marthaler wrote about the various factors and events which preceded the reforms given a new impetus by Vatican II.[134] He continued saying that the documents published at the wake of the council records the development and progression of thought regarding the nature and tasks of catechesis. Among these factors, the reform in the liturgy embedded in the *prenotanda* of the revised liturgical books, is the main topic of the Digest's chapter 5.

Marthaler starts this chapter citing 'Vatican II's call for general restoration of sacred liturgy that would help make both texts and rites more expressive of the holy things they signify' (*LG* 21). He says that while the Constitution on Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* set down general norms for the said restoration, the Post-Conciliar Instruction *Inter oecumenici* was for the implementation of those directives. He further says that the aim of the Instruction was the formation of the faithful and the pastoral activity whose summit and source is the liturgy. He then mentions the work of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy in the translation of the rites and texts of the 'restored' or 'new' Rites for the

---

[132] Cfr. *ibid.,* 89-90.

[133] Chapter 5's title *Liturgy and Catechesis* gives an obvious hint as to what documents are treated in this chapter by Marthaler. They are: *The Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults* (1974, provisional text, and 1988)*, Christian Initiation for Children of Catechetical Age* (RCIA 1974 [chapter V],RCIA 1988 [Part II, Chapter I]) and the *Directory for Masses with Children* (1973).

[134] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….,* cit., 11.

celebration of the sacraments and sacramentals. He cites that the prefatory notes, which outlines the principles that guided the changes and some explanations of the rites themselves, provide a basis for a catechesis of the faithful's active participation in the celebrations.

For THE RITE OF CHRISTIAN INITIATION OF ADULTS, Marthaler traces a connection between the liturgical renewal inspired by Vatican II and the immediate operative consequences in the revision of the RCIA. He comments that the 'Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults with the restored catechumenate' is the model for all sacramental catechesis because it combines 'instruction based on the scriptures, liturgical participation, prayer, and bonding with ecclesial community'.[135] The 1974 *RCIA* itself, says Marthaler, explains the reason of the centrality of catechesis for adults. Marthaler, quoting freely *RCIA*, writes:

> Catechesis is concerned chiefly with the shaping of a Christian outlook, Christian values, and Christian behavior. It has two-fold goal, the individual's conversion – a change of lifestyle – and an interactive bonding of the catechumen with the Christian community, the Church. The principal means is a grounding in 'the basic fundamentals of the spiritual life and Christian teaching gained through meditation on the Scriptures during these early stages of the catechumenate and through the liturgical rites in final stages. The principal agents are the pastoral ministers […] acting in the name of the Church because in final analysis it is the local community that forms the outlook, values, and behavior of its members.[136]

He writes further that those lines in the prefatory notes of *RCIA* quoted above explain the nature and goal of all catechesis, the principal means by which it is achieved and its ecclesial character. In addition to that, Marthaler says that the third statement above is central to all catechesis: the involvement of the whole community on

---

[135] Cfr. *ibid.*
[136] Cfr. *ibid.,* 92-93.

the Christian initiation of an individual (which includes the catechetical formation).

For THE CHRISTIAN INITIATION FOR CHILDREN OF CATECHETICAL AGE, he comments that aside from the Baptism of Adults, Vatican II likewise provided for a revision of the rite of baptism for children. The prefatory note of the revised rite elaborates on the importance of the baptism of infants and small children (nn. 2-3), the role of the community and of the parents (nn. 4-7), the time and place for the event (nn. 8-14) and the baptismal rite itself.[137] Marthaler observes the change of location for the baptism of children in the rites. He says that in the 1974 *RCIA*, the chapter on infant baptism was on chapter 5 and titled 'Rite of Initiation for Children of Catechetical Age'.

In the 1988 *RCIA*, this subject is found in Part II Rites for Particular Circumstances, specifically its Chapter 1 Christian Initiation of Children Who Have Reached Catechetical Age. Marthaler observes that in both editions, the baptism of infants follow the general outline of the process for adults.[138] Marthaler emphasizes the elements in the *RCIA* present in the rite adapted to the baptism of children such as the step by step process 'enriched by liturgical rites', the groupings, the adaptation of the prayers to the candidates understanding, the active part of the community, the suitable place in the Church in which the rite would take place, the focus on penitential rite, the celebration at the Easter Vigil or at a Sunday Mass, and so on.[139] In this way, Marthaler shows how the RCIA adapted to the circumstance wherein the one to be baptized is

---

[137] Cfr. *ibid.,* 94.
[138] Cfr. *ibid.,* 94.
[139] Cfr. *ibid.,* 95.

an infant likewise follows that of Adults and hence, the centrality and paragon-ability, as it were, of baptismal catechumenate.

Finally, for the DIRECTORY FOR MASSES WITH CHILDREN, Marthaler in the beginning of his commentary says that the scope of the document, which at first glance is dedicated to 'baptized children yet to be fully initiated through the sacrament of Confirmation and Eucharist' as well as 'those children recently admitted to the holy communion', is all encompassing. He explains that almost every paragraph in the prefatory chapter presents important thoughts concerning 'the role of ritual in the life of the family and the local church'.[140]

He says that the *first chapter*, all about basic principles, seems to apply to catechesis for children who have not yet reached 'pre-adolescence' and may also be applied, with the necessary adjustment, to mentally handicapped children. Here, Marthaler emphasizes the role of the community in the Christian and liturgical education of the little ones. He simply mentions that the *second chapter* is all about adult Masses in which children are present. Concerning the *third chapter*, Masses celebrated primarily for children, Marthaler focuses on the adaptations that should be made as mentioned by the same document, like the possibility of an adult present other than the priest to deliver 'a homily to the children after the Gospel, especially if the priest has difficulty in adapting himself to the mentality of children' or the use of 'recorded music'.[141]

---

[140] Cfr. *ibid.*
[141] Cfr. *ibid.,* 97.

2.5. The doctrine and mission of the Church (Chapters 6-8)[142]

Another milestone in the development of catechesis is indicated on the aspect of doctrine, on the concept of the church and her missionary nature, the centrality of (new) evangelization and the eventual publication of formidable doctrinal references. As Marthaler rightly observed, all these has decisively shaped catechesis, catechetics and catechetical practice in the contemporary times.[143] Concerning the post-synodal apostolic exhortations, especially the first ones, Marthaler values their chronological vicinity to Vatican II as well as their focus on evangelization and catechesis.

For the apostolic exhortation on evangelization *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975), a result of the 1974 Synod of Bishops, Marthaler observes in *EN* 44 its balance treatment of catechesis as instruction and concrete life formation, and thereby marks it as a description of *the nature, content, and agents of catechesis.* For *EN*, catechesis is instruction whose efficiency remains not *in the ambit of notions* but when transformed into *patterns of Christian living.* In addition to that, the same paragraph mentions of situations that makes *catechesis of young people and adults in the form of catechumenate* urgent. Later in par. 47, Marthaler says that evangelization is described to aim towards the

---

[142] The *Digest* 's Chapter 6, titled *Synodal Documents: Evangelization and Catechesis*, presents the documents which came out from the ordinary and extraordinary synods, namely Paul VI's *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975), John Paul II's *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979), *Familiaris consortio* (1981) and *Reconciliatio et paenitentia* (1984). Aside from the emphasis on the unity of evangelization and catechesis of some post-synodal apostolic exhortations, there are two other observable characteristics in Marthaler's commentaries on the post-synodal documents: (1) its emphasis of the 'democratic' proceeding of the making of those documents and, (2) the frequent citation of the involvement of everyone in the Church's mission according to his or her state in life.

[143] MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….,* cit., 15-16.

maturity of faith of believers and catechesis is an important help in achieving that objective.[144]

For *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979), a result of the 5th Synod of Bishops held in 1977 with the theme, Catechesis in Our Time, with Special Reference to the Catechesis of Children and Young People, he indicates that even though there is a specific reference to children and young people, the bishops widened the object of the synod to all who are necessary to be catechized. He writes further that the church's evangelizing mission guided the Synod in exploring the nature, goals, and outreach of catechesis as a fundamental activity of the whole Church to proclaim the Gospel in today's world. Marthaler recalls that the bishops emitted a 'Message to the People of God' as an effort to share their deliberations and concerns and encourage the entire Christian community to enter into discussion.[145]

As mentioned earlier above about Marthaler's emphasis on the democratic aspect of the Synod, here he recounts how the bishops 'entrusted their 34 propositions and some other 38 particular topics on which the pope should write about in his post-synodal apostolic exhortation. He likewise points out the parts numbered 12, 19, 39 and 67 of the document as quasi *in toto* repetition of the interventions of Pope John Paul II in the synod (then as Archbishop of Krakow).[146]

For the apostolic exhortations *Familiaris Consortio* (1981) and *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia* (1984), Marthaler's points are brief enough. He says that the *first* (in relation to catechesis) highlights the right and duty of parents to educate their children in the faith received.[147]   In

---

[144] Cfr. *ibid.,* 99-100.
[145] Cfr. *ibid.,* 100.
[146] Cfr. *ibid.,* 101.
[147] Cfr. *ibid.,* 102-103.

the *second*, Marthaler says that it points out catechesis, among others, as cause of the confused state of the people regarding reconciliation and penance and therefore names catechesis as the 'first means to be used' in the formation of right conscience of people. He says that *RP* does not only provide excellent guidelines but in itself a good catechetical resource.[148]   At the end, he mentions *Christifidelis laici* (1987), *Patores dabo vobis* (1990), *Vita consecrata* (1994), and *Pastores gregis* (2002) as apostolic exhortations that couple catechesis with evangelization.[149]

The series of important events which provided impetus to the doctrinal development especially to catechesis reached its apex with the publication of what Marthaler terms in his book's chapter 7 as *Documents of the Millennium.* Here, Marthaler presents the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1992)*,* a product of the 1985 Synod of Bishops, the *Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church* (2004)*,* and the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (2004).

Marthaler briefly traces the historical development of the making of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC), the *Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church* (C-CCC) and of the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (C-SDC). At the end he says that the present chapter briefly examines and comments the three documents, but will only give a general outline to the CCC and the C-SD.

In commenting the CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH (CCC), Marthaler, *first*, draws descriptions from *Fidei depositum*[150]; *second*, he gives a general outline, its four principal parts.   In the

---

[148] Cfr. *ibid.,* 103.

[149] Cfr. *ibid.*

[150] Marthaler underlines FD 3 in which the Holy Father declares the CCC to be 'a sure norm for teaching faith' and 'a valid and legitimate instrument for ecclesial communion' (cfr. *ibid.,* 105).

second, he does not however go deeply into the discussions of the doctrines of faith, instead 'highlights, where applicable, the guidelines it offers for teaching the doctrine'.[151] Marthaler give some words to the *CCC*'s Prologue, Part I The Profession of Faith, Part II The Celebration of the Christian Mystery, Part III Life in Christ, and Part IV The Christian Prayer.

For *CCC*'s Prologue, Marthaler says that it contextualizes catechetical ministry in the Church's life and mission. He points out to whom the Catechism is directed, that is, 'primarily to bishops' and through them, the redactors of catechisms, to priests and to catechists, and for the useful reading of the Christian faithful. In addition to that, Marthaler points out the *Prologue*'s practical indications for the Catechism's use, as the numbered paragraphs, the different sizes of fonts used, the brief summaries at every end of the Part, and so on.[152]

For *CCC*'s Part I The Profession of Faith, Marthaler simply enumerates and paraphrases its contents. After mentioning the CCC's general description of divine revelation, Marthaler gives some historical elaborations of the profession of the Christian faith and particularly the faith in the Most Holy Trinity. In the article on God the Father, he underlines the mystery of creation. He comments that the passage regarding 'the first three chapters of Genesis' has a unique place for they 'remain the principal source for catechesis on the mysteries of the beginning' (cf. *CCC* 289). In the article on Jesus Christ, Marthaler says that the transmission of the Christian faith and the very core of catechesis is proclaiming Christ and his work, his entire life. In the article on the Holy Spirit, Marthaler makes mention of the unity of the mission of the Holy Spirit with that of Christ, an

---

[151] Cfr. *ibid.,* 106.
[152] Cfr. *ibid.,* 106-107.

explanation of belief in the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, and the laity's participation in the priestly, prophetic and kingly office of Christ.[153]

For *CCC*'s Part II The Celebration of the Christian Mystery, Marthaler emphasizes the importance of the liturgy and liturgical catechesis in relation to the whole catechetical ministry of the Church. In addition to that, he mentions the sacraments and the sacramentals, and other forms of piety and other devotions popular among the faithful as objects of catechesis.[154]

For *CCC*'s Part III Life in Christ, Marthaler says that it is catechesis' task to 'reveal with clarity the joy and demands of the way of Christ. Basing on this task, he lists down the elements of a catechesis for the 'newness of life' such as a catechesis of the Holy Spirit, a catechesis of grace, a catechesis of beatitude, and so on. He also explains in few lines the contents of the two sections of Part III (I – Man's Vocation: Life in the Spirit; II – The Ten Commandments).[155]

Finally, for *CCC*'s Part IV The Christian Prayer, Marthaler points out the use of the so-called 'languages of prayer' in teaching how to pray in the Christian tradition. By 'languages', he refers to iconography, music, words, melodies, etc. Furthermore, in commenting the Lord's Prayer, he emphasizes its importance in the liturgy and especially in the catechumenate.[156]

For the COMPENDIUM OF THE CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, he emphasizes three points: (1) the Compendium's close connection with the Catechism (2) on the additional feature of the

---

[153] Cfr. *ibid.,* 108-110.
[154] Cfr. *ibid.,* 110-112.
[155] Cfr. *ibid.,* 112-113.
[156] Cfr. *ibid.,* 114-115.

Compendium which is absent in the Catechism: an appendix at the end of common prayers and a list of Catholic formulae (3) the dialogical format of the Compendium.[157]

For the COMPENDIUM OF THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH (C-SD), Marthaler starts his commentary on the grave importance of Church's social doctrine (citing *GDC*, *CCC* and Pope John Paul II). He says that the *C-SD* is an indispensable companion to the *CCC*.

He summarizes and comments the three principal parts of the document: Part I God's Plan of Love for Humanity (chapters 1-4), Part II The Family, the Vital Cell of Society (chapters 5-11), and Part III Social Doctrine and Ecclesial Action (chapter 12).

For the *first part*, Marthaler says it elaborates on the fundamentals of the Church's social teaching – the foundation, principles and values. Thus Marthaler speaks of the following: the love of God and of man as revealed by Jesus, the value of the dignity of every person, the wounded human dignity, the dimensions of the human person (the unity of body and soul whereby the person is the subject of moral acts, the openness to transcendence and the uniqueness of the person, the freedom of the human person, the equal dignity of all people, and the social nature of human beings), and about human rights and the Church's promotion of it.[158]

For the *second part*, Marthaler simply reiterates the content of Chapter 5 and presents some few words on the contents of chapters 6-11. Chapter 5, according to Marthaler's summary, speaks of the importance and centrality of the family in the social discussion. Always summarizing the contents of the chapter, he further mentions

---

[157] Cfr. *ibid.,* 115-116.
[158] Cfr. *ibid.,* 116-118.

the current issues that touch the family: responsible parenthood, the characteristics of marriage, the reproductive techniques, the parents' primary role in the education of their children, and the economic life of families. He simply says that chapter 6 is all about dignity and rights of workers, chapter 7 about the moral responsibility of economic and business institutions, chapter 8 the foundation of the political authority and its responsibility to safeguard the freedom and civil rights of individuals and institutions, chapter 9 the value of international organizations against poverty, chapter 10 the common responsibility towards the environment, and finally chapter 11, a sort of a conclusion of this second part and some mention of peace, war and reconciliation.[159]

Finally for the *third part*, Marthaler points out four ideas, namely: (1) that bringing the significance of the Gospel, especially concerning man and is dignity, to the social sphere is the Church's main contribution to the building of community; (2) that there is a need to diffuse more the social teaching of the Church and to be given more attention in the formation of Church members; (3) that there is a need to form lay people for the difficult yet noble art of politics and that educational institutions contribute to the inculturation of the Christian message to various branches of knowledge, and; (4) that the C-SD, according to his view, put greater emphasis on the role and commitment of the lay faithful although it mentions the entire people of God as subject of the Church's social mission.[160]

At the end of the chapter, Marthaler provides a paragraph titled 'Conclusion'. This somehow reveals Marthaler's perspective regarding the universal catechism and the two compendia. He says:

---

[159] Cfr. *ibid.,* 118-120.
[160] Cfr. *ibid.,* 120-121.

> These three documents […] provide a compilation of the Church's authentic teaching that is to shape and guide all that takes place in catechesis. They do not provide the totality of what is to be addressed in catechesis, but they do establish the foundational content that would be required in a life-long process of faith formation.[161]

He therefore attributes to the Catechism and the compendiums the task of providing the doctrinal foundation. However, for him, it is not all in catechesis; there are still other important aspects that need attention. He assigns the task of guiding the specifics of catechesis to the general and national directories.

<center>∗∗∗</center>

As a result of these developments in the universal level, of doctrinal reference and emphasis on evangelization, catechesis is obviously not left unaffected. Thus the revision of the catechetical directory of 1972 became a felt need. Marthaler, highlighting the two great aspects mentioned beforehand – doctrine and evangelization – titles the Digest's chapter 8 as *Evangelizing Catechesis*. This chapter is dedicated solely to newly-revised catechetical directory, the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997).[162]

Marthaler describes first in general the parts of the *GDC* and then proceeds with indicating some emphases on its principal parts.

---

[161] Cfr. *ibid.,* 121.

[162] He says that the said this document seeks to balance two principal requirements, namely, (1) the contextualization of catechesis in evangelization, and (2) the appropriation of the content of the faith as presented in the *CCC*. Within the 30 years span between Vatican II and the third millennium, Marthaler points out that the emphasis made by the Holy Father together with the bishops from all over the world (through the Synod of Bishops) on evangelization and the timely publication of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* have both occasioned the revision of the 1972 *General Catechetical Directory (*cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….,* cit., 123). For a detailed presentation of the contents of the GDC, refer to our presentation of the *Sowing Seeds* in the first part.

He says that this document retain the basic structure of the 1972 directory, that is the five principal parts, except for the new additions – the Introduction and the Conclusion, parts absent in the old directory. Before describing and commenting the *GDC*'s five principal parts, noteworthy is the emphasis and attention that Marthaler gives to (1) the basic intention of the *GDC*, (2) the importance of the determining the nature and end of catechesis as indicated by the *GDC* and (3) the authority of *GDC*'s parts.[163]

He says that the *basic intention* of the *GDC* is to offer reflections and principles and not to suggest applications or practical directives. He adds that defects and errors in catechetical materials can be avoided if *the nature and end of catechesis*, as well as the truths and values that must be transmitted are correctly understood.

He likewise reiterates *the unequal authority* of *GDC*'s parts. The parts that deal with Divine Revelation, the nature of catechesis, and the criteria over the proclamation of the Gospel message are universally valid.

Those which concern present circumstances, methodology and the manner of adapting catechesis to diverse groups and cultural contexts are simply suggestions and guidelines. In fact he says that according to *GDC* itself, its immediate objective is to assist the making of local catechetical directories and catechisms.[164]

Marthaler is clear, however, that these doctrinal references indicate some general principles in the doing of catechesis but leaves

---

[163] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….,* cit., 124.

[164] As noted before, we refer the reader to the *Sowing Seeds* for the Marthaler's detailed presentation of the GDC.

to the local Churches the particular and specific adaptations to their own circumstances and traditions the doctrine of the Church.[165]

2.6. Catechesis in USA (Chapter 9-10)[166]

In presenting the NATIONAL DIRECTORY FOR CATECHESIS, Marthaler first gives a historical background of the making of the *NDC*.[167]   After that, Marthaler show the vastness of the scope, the concerns and tasks of catechesis in USA today by presenting a brief

---

[165] MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry…., cit.,* 123.

[166] Akin to the domino effect, the catechetical developments in the universal level affect two major aspects: first, *the catechetical activity in USA context* and second, *the catechizing of the USA culture.* The catechesis in the USA context is the main concern of the *United States National Directory for Catechesis* or the *NDC,* while catechizing the USA culture, of the *United States Catholic Catechism for Adults* or the *USCCA.* The *Digest*'s Chapter 9, titled *Catechesis in the American Context,* present the *National Directory for Catechesis* (2005). Its Chapter 10, titled *Addressing American Culture,* presents the significant points of *US Catholic Catechism for Adults* (2006).

[167] Marthaler notes that by 1992, the US bishops have entertained revising *SLF* (1979). However, he says, the Holy See advised the suspension of the work until the *GDC* could be published. By 1997, *GDC*'s official year of publication (together with *CCC*'s editio typica latina), the plans to update *SLF* was resumed. By 2003, the revised material was approved by the bishops and submitted to the Holy See for its *recognition* and the following year, 2004, *NDC*'s publication. The Holy See's *recognitio* came with 18 suggested changes in the document. Marthaler simply mentions the following concrete changes suggested by the Holy See: (1) one which is general, that is, 'most were concerned with protecting the prerogative of the bishops and pastors on specific matters', and (2) one which is specific, that is, the removal of various references to the practices of Eastern Churches so as to leave it clear of their right to create their own directory. Marthaler moreover emphasizes three things: (1) *NDC*'s being a product of two nation-wide consultations; (2) its citing of 'more than a dozen of documents' published by USCCB itself in the past; and (3) its continuity with the *CCC* (on the concept of catechesis) and the *GDC* (on its practical indications concerning the consideration of the concrete situation in local Churches in inserting the faith) (cfr. *ibid.,* 169-170).

summary of each of the ten chapters. In his summaries, he takes occasion, as in other moments, to emphasize one or two points.

Chapter 1 Proclaiming the Gospel in United States, Marthaler says, is all about the social and cultural conditions that catechetical ministry faces in USA. He reiterates NDC's mention of USA's major cultural features (religious and economic freedom, interest in science and technology, and mobility, among others). Likewise, he says it mentions about the religious, ethnic and regional diversity in USA. Marthaler makes special mention of the alarming concerns related to marriage, the family and divorce in USA.[168]

Chapter 2 Catechesis within the Church's Mission of Evangelization describes the importance of catechesis in the evangelizing mission of the Church. He indicates that the chapter begins with the universal will of God to save mankind by letting them know the truth. Here he emphasizes the 'two integral dimensions' of man's response: *the content of Divine Revelation which one believes* and *the grace, a gift, by which an individual is moved to give assent of the intellect and will to it.* He proceeds with evangelization, its stages, conversion as its purpose, the importance of the Ministry of the Word, and the stages through which the progress of evangelization passes through the Ministry of the Word *(missionary preaching, mystagogical or post-baptismal catechesis, permanent or continuing catechesis)*. Marthaler further emphasizes that *NDC* identifies two other forms of ministries of the Word at the service of evangelization, namely, *liturgical catechesis* and *theological catechesis*. Before entering into the topic of the principal source of catechesis (the Word of God in the Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition) and evangelization as an ecclesial act (that is, the Church is the setting or locus and goal of catechesis), Marthaler points out *NDC*'s indication regarding the urgency of focusing on the American

---

[168] Cfr. *ibid.,* 170-171.

culture and its diverse social and religious contexts by encouraging the study of the pastoral principles laid out by the document *Go and Make Disciples: A National Plan and Strategy for Catholic Evangelization*.[169]

He also brings to mind the fundamental task of catechesis as mentioned by the *NDC*, that is, the formation of disciples of Jesus Christ, and he adds that *NDC six complementary tasks* in accomplishing the mentioned fundamental task.[170] Again, Marthaler points out *NDC*'s insistence on the importance of the concrete situation, in particular the American culture, the need to adapt the faith to it, and therefore the importance of catechesis as instrument of inculturation. He says that this chapter concludes making the point that catechesis is so central to evangelization that without it discipleship in Christ would not mature.[171]

Chapter 3 This is Our Faith; This is the Faith of the Church is the classic part that deals with *fides quae*, the faith which we believe. Marthaler goes with the emphasis that *NDC* makes. It deals not with the profound discussion about the contents of the faith but it focuses more on laying down *nine norms and criteria for the authentic presentation of*

---

[169] This is a document by the Bishops' Conference published in 1992 about the plan and strategy for catholic evangelization in USA. Marthaler extracts its fundamental objectives, namely, the personal conversion to Jesus Christ in word and action, greater knowledge in Scripture and Tradition, parish renewal and the implementation of the RCIA, liturgical renewal, the making explicit in Sunday Eucharist the evangelical and social justice dimension, the integration of daily prayers (the praying the Rosary and the Liturgy of the Hours), and the accessibility of Catholic institutions especially the parish (cfr. *ibid.,* 172).

[170] They are: the promotion of knowledge of faith, the promotion of knowledge of the meaning of the liturgy and the sacraments, the promotion of moral formation, the teaching how to pray with Christ, the preparation to live in community and actively participate in the life and mission of the Church, and the promotion of the missionary spirit that prepares the faithful to be present as Christian in society (*Ibid.*, 171).

[171] Cfr. *ibid.,* 171-175.

the Gospel message in USA. Before summarizing the said *norms and criteria*, he indicates the link of the *NDC* to *CCC* and *GDC*. He notes that *NDC* has no mention of the *USCCA* (it was published the year after) but makes frequent reference to *Our Hearts were Burning within Us* (1999).

The nine norms and criteria are: (1) that catechesis presents the history of salvation with reference to the person of Jesus Christ and his teachings, (2) that it emphasizes the Trinitarian character of the Christian message, (3) that it helps the Christian faithful to situate Christ's proclamation of salvation and liberation from sin at the center of the Good News, (4) that it owes ecclesial character to the fact that it originates in the Church's confession of faith and leads to the profession of faith of individuals to their fortification as members of the one Body of Christ, (5) that it stresses the distinctively historical character of the Christian message, (6) that catechesis has an important role to play in the inculturation of the Christian message (appropriate methods and resources), (7) that catechesis be made in a manner that in its presentation of the truths of the Christian message observe their hierarchical character and be organized around the central truths, (8) that it affirms man's natural desire for God and the presentation of the Christian message communicates the profound truth about man's true nature and eternal destiny, and (9) that catechesis foster a common language of the faith that faith may be lived and prayed in words familiar to all the faithful.[172]

In *Chapter 4 Divine and human methodology*, Marthaler reiterates the chapter's principal points: (1) God's revelation in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit though creation and historical events (the divine pedagogy) as norm for all catechetical methodology (or model

---

[172] Cfr. *ibid.,* 175-177.

for all human methodologies), (2) catechetical methodology that is able to harmonize the divine message and the liberty of man (personal adherence and active response on the part of the one catechized), (3) the employment of methods that takes into consideration the personal circumstances of the people to be addressed, and (4) catechetical methodologies' consideration of the revolution in communications technology. Marthaler dwelt a little longer on the discussion of the legitimacy of both *inductive* and *deductive* methods and cites some concrete instances.[173]

Chapter 5 Catechesis in a Worshipping Community, Marthaler says, is the longest chapter in the *NDC*. Marthaler makes an account of its contents saying that after the chapter explains the rites of the church as identified with the Paschal Mystery of Christ, it proceeds with explaining the relationship between catechesis and liturgy, personal and liturgical prayer, catechesis for sacramental life, sacred time and space, sacraments, popular piety, and popular devotions. Marthaler says that *NDC* makes precise that catechesis both precedes and springs from liturgy and at the service of individual prayer life.[174] The chapter is divided into *four* sections. The *first section*, about sacraments in general, assumes the norms and guidelines in the prefatory notes of the *Rites of Christian Initiation of Adults*, the *Directory for Masses with Children*, and other documents.

Marthaler summarizes also the four stages of baptismal catechumenate and make these significant passing comments: (1) the baptismal catechumenate is a fruitful blend of instruction and formation in the faith, and (2) the baptismal catechumenate reflects the gradual nature of catechesis, provides model for the whole

---

[173] Cfr. *ibid.,* 178-180.
[174] Cfr. *ibid.,* 180-181.

Church's catechetical efforts, and emphasizes the need for lifelong catechesis.[175]

The *second section*, the discussion of the individual sacraments, Marthaler goes pointing out the adaptations the *NDC* makes of the celebration of the sacraments to the USA situation and the personal conditions of the recipients of the sacraments. In the sacraments at the service of communion (Holy Order and Matrimony), he dwells more and longer on the catechesis on Christian marriage.[176]

In the *third section*, about the sacred time and space, Marthaler dwelt more on pointing out the need to consider the customs and traditions of the diverse ethnic groups in USA.[177]

In the *fourth section*, about sacramentals and popular devotions, he points out the great diversity of devotions in USA brought by immigrants as occasion of catechesis and evangelization.[178]

For *Chapter 6 Catechesis for Life in Christ*, Marthaler summarizes the general content of the chapter saying that it describes the new life in Christ lived by individuals or by the community, and it also lays down catechetical principles and guidelines for the moral formation of both. Regarding the challenges that degrades human dignity – dominant secular culture, materialism and ethical relativism – he says that *NDC* provides that catechesis must uphold the right to life from conception to natural death, present the Christian understanding of human freedom, promote public expression of faith in the formation of social policy, encourage concern for and action on behalf of the marginalized of society, help the faithful make practical and moral

---

[175] Cfr. *ibid.,* 181-182.
[176] Cfr. *ibid.,* 182-186.
[177] Cfr. *ibid.,* 186-187.
[178] Cfr. *ibid.,* 187.

decisions in light of the Gospel, and teach that power, utility and productivity must be guided by moral values.[179]

Moreover, he says – reiterating the *NDC* – in order for catechesis to communicate the Church's moral teachings, it must help restore the sense of the sacred and transcendent in life and reassure that God offers grace to everyone, help live in harmony with God and the created order, and assist in developing men's capacity to discern God's will and in deepening their personal relationship with Christ.[180]   Marthaler likewise points out *NDC*'s reference to the teaching of the social doctrine (the seven themes) of the Church as indicated by the American bishops and *CCC*'s teachings about the Decalogue and the Beatitudes.[181]

In summarizing the contents of *Chapter 7 Catechizing the People of God in Diverse Settings*, Marthaler brings home the whole focus of the chapter pointing out that, from the beginning, the Church is both the principal agent and primary recipient of catechesis. In fact the chapter indicates the conditions involved in the catechetical task and some principles in catering the Gospel to groups of different age levels (adults, older adults, young adults, and children), to persons with disabilities, and catechesis in the context of ecumenical and interreligious dialogue. *Regarding catechesis to groups of different age levels*, Marthaler imparts more space to the discussion of catechesis for adults and young adults. Regarding the third, *catechesis in the context of ecumenical and interreligious dialogue*, he points out *NDC*'s adaptation of the indications given by the *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* and USCCB's *God's Mercy Endures Forever:*

---

[179] Cfr. *ibid.,* 188-189.
[180] Cfr. *ibid.,* 189.
[181] Cfr. *ibid.,* 190-191.

Guidelines on the Presentation of Jews and Judaism in Catholic Preaching, and consequently their adaptation in catechesis.[182]

NDC's *Chapter 8 Those who Catechize*, according to Marthaler, simply describes the roles and responsibilities of all who participate in the Church's catechetical efforts. He thus gives a summary of the specific roles of the bishop, pastors and priests, parish catechetical leaders, youth ministers, campus ministers, catechists, catholic schools and the parents and families in the Church's catechetical ministry. Marthaler underlines *NDC*'s mention of the need for the formation as catechists especially of the lay catechists and the need to incorporate the study of the *CCC* in their formation.[183]

Chapter 9 Organizing Catechetical Ministry is all about the coordination in organizing catechetical ministry and its general principles. As Marthaler's description says, this chapter starts with the overall pastoral plan with surveys and evaluations, and catechesis as key element in the pastoral plan of the diocese. Then it proceeds with the naming the agencies and the involved offices and their respective tasks (diocesan catechetical office, parish and its catechetical programs, home schooling, baptismal catechumenate, small Christian communities and other structures). Likewise, as Marthaler presents, it calls for the collaboration between the catechetical offices or its corresponding unit responsible for such ministry in different region in USA, the *USCCB* at the national level, and the Roman dicasteries.[184]

Chapter 10 Resources for Catechesis simply indicates the principles, guidelines, and criteria for the production, use, and evaluation of catechisms, textbooks, and other instructional

---

[182] Cfr. *ibid.,* 191-197.
[183] Cfr. *ibid.,* 197-201.
[184] Cfr. *ibid.,* 201-206.

materials.   Marthaler points out *NDC*'s mention of the Sacred
Scripture, *CCC*, the textbooks for children and young people, teacher
manuals, guides for program leaders, the incorporation of the
electronic media in teaching, the continuing importance of the print
media, internet, and the *NDC* as valuable resources for catechesis in
USA.[185]

For the *Conclusion New Millennium, a Renewed Passion for
Catechesis*, the last part, Marthaler copies one line which mentions the
US Catholic bishops' commitment for the new evangelization and
renewed catechesis in the dioceses and parishes of the USA.[186]

For the UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CATECHISM FOR
ADULTS[187], Marthaler describes first its general physical features and
proceeds with a simple brief narration of its 36 chapters grouped
according to *CCC*'s four pillars of creed, sacraments, moral life and
prayer. *Regarding the physical description*, Marthaler focuses on *USCCA*'s
practicability, that is, the general format that not only facilitates the
reading of the catechism but of the typically American elements

---

[185] Cfr. *ibid.,* 206-210.

[186] Cfr. *ibid.,* 210.

[187] The plan, its approval, and the drafting of the *United States Catholic
Catechism for Adults* (henceforth *USCCA*) started in 2000. With the committee
headed by His Eminence Most Rev. Donald Cardinal Wuerl, then bishop of
Pittsburgh, and assisted by Alfred McBride, O.Praem., the final text was approved
and confirmed by the American bishops and eventually by the Holy See in 2004,
and by July 31, 2006, it was published. The adaptation process to the USA culture
of the developments of catechesis in the universal level and as mapped out by the
NDC in view of the concrete situation in USA, is very evident in the bishops'
objective in the making of a national catechism – a catechism that would preserve
the unity of faith and fidelity to the Catholic teachings as presented by the
Catechism, and that would be used in the instructions related to the *RCIA* program
(pre and post baptismal instructions) much in vogue now in various dioceses and
parishes in USA. According to a recent survey, those who undergo this program
are mostly young adult Catholics of the Latin rite with incomplete education in
faith (*Ibid.*, 213).

found in presenting the teachings. He says for instance that the format followed throughout is an introduction of a particular Church teaching or practice with a biographical sketch of a prominent US American Catholic – a canonized saint or a person with a saintly witness. It has also sidebars with different functions: one type of sidebar leads to a further consultation of the *CCC* and another type, with explanations of some specific points.[188] *Regarding the brief summaries of each chapter*, Marthaler has almost limited himself to reiterating the contents of each chapter and has left the document to speak for itself, as he himself says.[189] However it is worth knowing the general content of the 36 chapters in order to have a glimpse of the long way catechesis in USA has walked since the Vatican II era.[190]

Marthaler says that *USCCA*'s *Preface* establishes its *scope*, that is, on one hand, presents a synthesis of the contents of the *CCC*; on the other hand, it seeks to be an instrument for evangelizing American culture. As Marthaler writes in one part, "the interface of Church teaching with issues in American society is a thread that runs through the USCCA […]".[191] *USCCA*'s *Part One the Creed: the Faith Professed*, in particular, its first four chapters, corresponds to the first section of *CCC*'s *Part One*, observes Marthaler. *USCCA*'s Chapter 1 is all about US culture's ambivalent functions in man's life: while it provides meaning to the natural human religious anxiety, it also 'corrodes faith in practice'. Chapter 2 elaborates on the relationship between culture and the Gospel. Chapter 3 is about the transmission

---

[188] Cfr. *ibid.,* 213-214.

[189] In the beginning of his presentation, Marthaler writes: "Since the USCCA closely follows the structure and outline of the Catechism the following 'digest' highlights the points in each of the chapters that give it a specifically American flavor" (cfr. *ibid.,* 214).

[190] Cfr. *ibid.*

[191] Cfr. *ibid.,* 215.

of God's revelation through Sacred Scriptures and a warning of literal interpretations diffused in American circles. Chapter 4 is about faith as response to God's revelation and the challenge coming from US culture which delimits the practice of faith in the private realm.[192] Marthaler summarizes the contents of *USCCA*'s *Chapters 5 to 13* as 'emphasizing the work of the Holy Trinity' (Creed) and which corresponds to the *second section* of *CCC*'s Part One. He lists down the biographical introductions to various aspects of Church's teaching regarding creation, redemption, and sanctification found in these chapters.[193]

Marthaler observes that USCCA's *Part Two The Sacraments: The Faith celebrated*, aside from following the pattern of presentation of *Part One*, corresponds to some parts in the *CCC*. In concrete, *USCCA*'s *Chapter 14* elaborates on the nature of liturgy, its general principles, and its relationship with life.

Chapters 15 to 22, about the seven sacraments and devotional practices, corresponds to *CCC*'s second section. Marthaler again recounts the biographical introductions of US American figures (John Boyle O'Reilly, St. Frances Cabrini, Carlos Maria Rodriguez, St. John Nepomucene Neumann, Fr. Patrick Peyton, and so on) and then gives the summary of each chapter.[194]

In *Part Three*, about Christian Morality, both *CCC* and *USCCA* coincide, observes Marthaler. *USCCA's Part Three* is titled *Christian morality: The Faith Lived* (Chapter 23 - Chapter 34).

A *first section* of this part elaborates on the Christian principles of Christian morality and *a second section*, on the Decalogue. This part

---

[192] Cfr. *ibid.,* 215-218.
[193] Cfr. *ibid.,* 216-217.
[194] Cfr. *ibid.,* 218-221.

brings up many moral issues flagrant in USA as named by the USCCA itself such as those related to the so-called cult of the body in American culture, the financial scandals, the ravages of poverty, the organized desecration of human life, etc.[195]

For *Part Four Prayer: The Faith Prayed* (Chapters 35-36), Marthaler summarizes its contents saying that this part explains the call to prayer and lays down practical auxiliary guidelines for praying. At this point, Marthaler indicates a personal observation saying that each chapter of the USCCA suggests a thought for meditation and the text of a short prayer for one reason – sound catechesis is inseparable from prayer, the soul of truth.[196] Marthaler says that USCCA's Conclusion emphasizes the living of faith in the public arena and transform society with it thus challenging the view of USA founding fathers, that is, seeing religion as a purely private matter.[197]

2.7. Other catechetical matters: ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, lay catechists, and school issues (Chapter 11-13)

Marthaler cites other aspects in the Church's life which has a special significance for catechesis in USA, such as the relationship with persons of creeds or practice different or slightly different from the Roman Catholicism. He refers to the issue of ecumenism and interreligious dialogue (*Chapter 11*), to the rise of lay catechists and their needs (*Chapter 12*), and the issue regarding catholic schools (*Chapter 13*).

The Digest's *Chapter 11* focuses on the ecumenical and inter-faith dialogue and indeed bears such title. He presents and elaborates here some documents emanated by the Holy See and which *USCCB*

---

[195] Cfr. *ibid.,* 221-224.
[196] Cfr. *ibid.,* 224-225.
[197] Cfr. *ibid.,* 225.

had a special reception due to the American context. They are: Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity's *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* (1993), *The Ecumenical Dimension of Formation of those who are engaged in Pastoral Work* (1998), *Guidelines and suggestions for implementing the conciliar declaration 'Nostra Aetate'* (1974), and the *Notes on the Correct Way to present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis* (1974).

With those who share the same Christian faith, Marthaler presents and comments on the documents *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* (1993), and *The Ecumenical Dimension of Formation of those who are engaged in Pastoral Work* (1998).

The *first* document, *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* (1993), is authored by the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of the Unity of Christians and is an updated result of two anterior documents, the *Directory Concerning Ecumenical Matters*, first published right after the Great Council, in 1967, and updated in 1970. It is composed of *five* chapters. Marthaler's short description of the contents of each chapter gives a glimpse of the totality of the message of the document and may situate the role of catechesis in the church's ecumenical efforts.[198]　　Before that however, it is important to point out that Marthaler presentation of each document

---

[198] Marthaler writes that *Chapter I The Search for Christian Unity* affirms the Church's ecumenical commitment of stated in Vatican II. *Chapter II Organization in the Catholic Church at the Service of Catholic Unity* presents the persons and institutions involved in this commitment. *Chapter III Ecumenical Formation in the Catholic Church* elaborates on the persons to be formed, methods, aims, activities involved in the ecumenical formation. *Chapter IV Communion in Life and Spiritual Activity among the Baptized* is a clarification of the communion that exists between all baptized persons and the principles concerning the collaboration between baptized persons *Chapter V Ecumenical Cooperation, Dialogue and Witness* presents principles and norms for collaboration between Christians. Marthaler underlines chapters 3-5 as significant to catechesis.

with historical account concerning its origins attempts to relate the ecumenical activity to Vatican II and thereupon has crossed ways with catechesis.

What are therefore the points that this document indicates relevant to catechesis (as observed by Marthaler)? Citing the points of chapter 3, Marthaler points out the following: (1) the formation and pedagogy adapted to concrete situations and that is required by ecumenism includes, among others, catechesis (2) the document following *Catechesi Tradendae* defines catechesis as both 'teaching doctrine' and 'initiation into the Christian life as a whole'[199] (3) it considers the parish as 'place of authentic ecumenical witness' and the homily in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist a help in forming the community's ecumenical spirit, and (4) it mentions of ecumenical educational programs for candidates to the priesthood as also adaptable to the formation of catechists, teachers and other lay collaborators. Citing chapter 5, Marthaler underlines the documents mention of collaboration in catechesis or educational formation between Christians or what Marthaler mentions as 'a common witness to the truth of the Gospel'.[200]

The *second* document, *The Ecumenical Dimension of Formation of those who are engaged in Pastoral Work* (1998), still of the *Congregation for Christian Unity*, indicates explicitly practical directives, the settings and means for ecumenical formation, observes Marthaler. While the document reaffirms the *APNE* – on the involvement of all who are into the educational formation (catechists, teachers, directors, etc.) into the ecumenical formation, catechesis among others as principal

---

[199] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 229-230, for the details of how catechesis helps forms the so-called 'genuine ecumenical attitude'.

[200] Cfr. *ibid.,* 228-231.

means for the ecumenical formation, and so on – it also provides 'important guidelines to ensure that an ecumenical dimension permeates every subject taught, and for a specific course of study in ecumenism'.

Its *first chapter* explains *three key elements that should be included in every theological discipline* (hermeneutics, the hierarchy of truths, and the fruits of ecumenical dialogue) and outlines *a fundamental ecumenical method* (elements that Christians hold in common, the points of disagreement, and the results of ecumenical dialogues to be used in the teaching of each discipline). The *second chapter* elaborates on the contents of a study in ecumenism. In a *first stage*, the study in ecumenism should focus on clarifying that the aim of ecumenism is 'the restoration of full visible unity among all Christians'. In a *second stage*, the study underlines more on the biblical and doctrinal foundations of ecumenism. Marthaler points out that at the end of the document, it again emphasizes the intellectual and practical dimension of ecumenical study.[201]

With dialogue with the Jews, Marthaler presents the documents *Guidelines and suggestions for implementing the conciliar declaration 'Nostra Aetate'* (1974), and the *Notes on the Correct Way to present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis* (1974).

On the first document, *Guidelines and suggestions for implementing the conciliar declaration 'Nostra Aetate'* (1974),[202] Marthaler underlines the *third part*, concerning teaching and education, the formation of educators and instructors, and that its mention of the study and the research of scholars, among other things, have contributed to a better understanding of Judaism and its relationship to Christianity.

---

[201] Cfr. *ibid.,* 232.
[202] Cfr. *ibid.,* 232-233.

The content of this *third part* is later elaborated in *Notes on the Correct Way to present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis* (1974), notes Marthaler.[203] He brings up the six headings of the document and underlines some points relevant to catechesis.

In the *first* heading, *Religious Teaching and Judaism*, Marthaler underlines the documents mention of the closeness 'to the level of identity' of the Jews and Judaism to Christianity and that they should therefore occupy an important place in catechesis. In the *second* heading, *Relationship between the Old and New Testament*, Marthaler underlines the vision elaborated in the chapter that, transmitted by catechesis, would teach young Christians to not only dialogue but cooperate with the Jews. In the *third* heading, the *Jewish roots of Christianity*, Marthaler reiterates its contents with no explicit mention of catechesis. In the *fourth* heading, *The Jews in the New Testament*, Marthaler reiterates and underlines the document's point of being prudent in dealing with presenting the Jews in our times and the Jews in the time of Jesus. The document emphasizes *less* of the Jews of Jesus' times and *more* of the sins of each and every one, as the cause of the Lord's death. In the *fifth* heading, *The Liturgy*, Marthaler's brief note emphasizes the Jewish parallels of Christian liturgical practices.

Finally in the *sixth* heading, *Judaism and Christianity in History*, Marthaler underlines *two points* in relation to catechesis, namely: (1) that catechesis must help people understand the meaning for the Jews the extermination during the years 1939-1945 and its consequences; and (2) that it should be concerned with the problem of racism, still active in different forms of anti-Semitism.   In sum, the point that Marthaler underlines is that on the part of the Catholic Church, a positive move towards a better knowledge of the Jews has been made and that this has begun in Vatican II.

---

[203] Cfr. *ibid.,* 233-239.

The Digest's *Chapter 12* occupies a rarely touched aspect in catechesis, the catechetical personnel. Marthaler presents and explains the then Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith's *Guide for Catechists* (1993) and the document produced jointly by lay organizations but approved by the USCCB, the *National Certification Standards for Lay Ecclesial Ministers* (2006).[204]

In presenting the *first* document mentioned above, Marthaler mentions Vatican II's *Ad gentes*, especially the importance its gives to catechists in the Church's missionary activity, thus again linking this main theme to the Great Council. This link is further corroborated with his mention of the first 'draft' of *Guide for Catechists* published few years after the end of the Vatican II, that is, 1970 as its year of publication, to be exact. The document focuses on full-time lay catechists in mission lands, but as Marthaler puts it, the document's description of their roles has universal validity.[205]

The *Guide* has three parts. *Part One – An Apostle Ever Relevant* is all about the principal aspects of the catechist's vocation and the missionary and pastoral tasks of catechists; *Part Two – Choice and Formation of Catechists*, about the selection and training of lay catechists; and the third, *Part Three – The Responsibilities Towards Catechists*, their remuneration. Marthaler notes that the document deals with general directives and therefore concludes that specific directives according to the requirements and possibilities of individual Churches are left to local bishops.[206]

---

[204] The USCCB has elaborated on the rationale for the authorization and certification of lay ministers in its own pastoral letter published also in 2006, *Co-workers in the Vineyard of the Lord: A Resource for Guiding the Development of Lay Ecclesial Ministry.* Marthaler has not incorporated this document in his Digest.

[205] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 241.

[206] Cfr. *ibid.,* 242.

Marthaler underlines these points in *Part One*: the definition of the identity and task of catechists,[207] their spiritual life and piety (prayer life, openness to the Word of God, deep devotion to the Mother of God), the character as of prime importance in selecting catechists, their training, their role in bringing communication and communion in the community, their important role in the inculturation of the Gospel message, their role in the promotion of human development, their role in promoting ecumenical spirit in the community and in making the community realize and put into practice Church guidelines for inter-religious dialogue, and their particular suitability in counterattacking sects.[208]

He underlines these points in *Part Two*: the aim for candidates of high quality, the general formation, integration of spiritual life with their secular life and the requirements of their apostolic life, the pursuit of higher religious education, the theoretical, practical and missionary dimensions of their training or pastoral course, the eminently ecclesial character of the role of catechists, and their basic training period and ongoing formation.[209]

Finally, Marthaler underlines these points in *Part Three*: the proper and just remuneration of catechists (with special consideration of their conditions [with a family to support or advanced in age or already sickly]), their place of honor in the community, the responsibility, attention, and esteem towards them

---

[207] Marthaler says that the document speaks here of those catechists in missionary territories. He says that the documents points out that aside form their task of catechizing, they collaborate in a very special way to the building up of the Church, and that their identity is different from that in older Churches. He likewise brings up the list of tasks that the document enumerates (cfr. *ibid.,* 242-243).

[208] Cfr. *ibid.,* 242-245.

[209] Cfr. *ibid.,* 245-248.

from the part of the local Ordinary, the pastors and priests, the future priests, and from the formators of catechists.[210]

Regarding the second document, *National Certification Standards for Lay Ecclesial Ministers* (2006), Marthaler seem to emphasize the following points:[211] (1) the document, being formulated by various national lay organizations, presents an outlook, which is from lay people themselves, concerning their own ministry in the church and its mission, and (2) the document having identified core and specialized competencies, help shape the field of Church ministry.

Marthaler simply presents its Introduction and, as he says the heart of the document, its five certification standards. The *first* certification standard deals with the minister's maturity – personal and spiritual – in ministry with God's people. The *second* standard refers to the minister's clear idea of lay ministry as 'a vocation rooted in baptism'. The *third* standard deals with the minister's ability to integrate knowledge of Catholic faith with ministry. The *fourth* standard refers to the minster's engagement in pastoral activity that promotes evangelization, faith formation, community, and pastoral care with sensitivity to diverse situations. The *fifth* and last standard refers to the minister's leadership, administrative, and service skills. The document deals with the USA situation.

The Digest's *Chapter 13*, titled *Religious Education and Catechesis*, present the Congregation for Catholic Education's *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School* (1988). Marthaler principally underlines two things.

---

[210] Cfr. *ibid.,* 249-250.
[211] Cfr. *ibid.,* 251-155.

First, the concern's link to Vatican II by tracing the document's relationship to *Lay Catholics in Schools: Witness to the faith* (1982)*, The Catholic School* (1977) – documents of the Congregation for Catholic Education - and Vatican II's *Gravissimum educationis* and 'every document of the Second Vatican Council which emphasizes the Church's role as teacher'.

Second, he emphasizes the clarification that the document makes between religious instruction and catechesis. Marthaler says, citing the document, that even though the two are complementary, religious instruction in Catholic schools aims at systematic knowledge of the nature of Christianity and Christian life, and catechesis on lifetime journey to maturity (spiritual, liturgical, sacramental and apostolic) within the local community.[212]

Moreover, Marthaler likewise points out the aspect in which adaptation to local situation and concrete particular circumstances is needed, such as *the general character of the directives in this document*, and *the document's explicit awareness of situations of Catholic schools with students who are not Catholics* (therefore its insistence on the respect of religious freedom and personal conscience).

The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School (1988) has five parts, namely, *The Religious Dimension in the Lives of Today's Youth* (Part One), *The Religious Dimension of the School Climate* (Part Two), *The Religious Dimension of School Life and Work* (Part Three), *Religious Instruction in the Classroom and the Religious Dimension of Formation* (Part Four), and *A General Summary: The Religious Dimension of the Formation Process as a Whole* (Part Five).

Marthaler's summary of the document's Part One reveals less of the religious dimension of the youth's lives but of the difficulties

---

[212] Cfr. *ibid.,* 257.

and other factors that are certainly obstacles to considering the religious dimension of one's life. He mentions however in passing symptoms of today's youth's indifference to Christian life and practices.[213]

In his summary of Part Two, Marthaler underlines the document's mention of the community or familial aspect of the school where permeated by Gospel values – both in facilities and in the conduct of individual and the whole - young people feels 'at home'.[214]

In summarizing Part Three, Marthaler underlines the integration of all aspects of school life such as *relationship between teachers and between teachers and students* and *the knowledge of culture and sciences promoted by the school to the Catholic faith*.[215]

In his summary of Part Four, Marthaler emphasizes the following points: the distinction and complementarity that the document makes between religious instruction and catechesis, the document's suggested syllabus which mentions among others Christology, Christian anthropology, ecclesiology, the teaching of the Last Things, Christian ethics and social ethics, the Church's social doctrine, and Christian perfection or holiness.

Marthaler likewise reiterates the documents emphasis on the centrality of religion teachers in achieving the educational goals of Catholic schools.[216]

In Part Four, a view of religious instruction in Catholic schools in the religious dimension of the formation process as a

---

[213] Cfr. *ibid.,* 258-259.
[214] Cfr. *ibid.,* 259-260.
[215] Cfr. *ibid.,* 260-263.
[216] Cfr. *ibid.,* 263-266.

whole, Marthaler underlines the Catholic schools' need to present a Gospel-permeated goals, the need to create the necessary climate to achieve such goals and the collaboration and participation of other institutions such as the families, the local church and the civil society, and the necessary interaction between students and teachers.[217]

3. Summary and Evaluation

What are the significant points about catechesis that Marthaler has enunciated in the first decade of the 21ˢᵗ century? Our detailed presentation in the previous pages seemed to be a long answer. We simply attempted to present the ideas of the writings of Marthaler in the last 10 years with that lengthy response.

Indeed the answer to the aforementioned question is composed of: (1) a resource for the easy reception of the *GDC* in the US context, another (2) a digest of recent catechetical documents, and (3) various articles he wrote in *The Living Light* (in the last ten years). The first source, the *Sowing Seeds* (2000) presents a reflection which embraces 25 years of Church's catechetical activity since the publication of the *GCD* (1972). The second, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry: A Digest of Recent Church Documents* (2008), focuses on an ampler period of time, that is, from the era of the Vatican II up to the recent times. In catechesis, the recent times is characterized by the publication of the *GDC*, *CCC*, the Compendiums of the *CCC* and the Church's social doctrine, and the publication of the *NDC* and the *USCCA*. The last source of Marthaler's thought, his forewords in *The Living Light*, cover only from 2000 to 2004. We therefore attempt create a brief outline of

---

[217] Cfr. *ibid.,* 267-268.

our author's approach and synthesize his principal ideas on catechesis.

Both books – *Sowing Seeds* (2000) and *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008) - have the same thesis: catechesis in the Church, in general, and in USA, in particular, has developed since Vatican II, in its nature, tasks, goals and scope. In *Sowing Seeds* (2000), he vies for a 'further clarification of the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry',[218] while in *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008), he affirms 'the development and progression of thought regarding the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry' recorded by Church documents published in the wake of the Vatican II, or of 'a new understanding of the nature, tasks, and scope of this ministry of the word [catechesis]'[219].

Marthaler identifies the circumstances auxiliary to the observed progress. Within an ampler temporal framework in *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008), he points to Vatican II as that which ignited the 'renewal impetus' already loitering in the corridors of time contemporary, or even earlier, to the great Council.

He says that the Council inspired catechesis *to be liturgical, to be world/society-directed, to be animated by the Scriptures,* and *to be ecclesial.* In addition to that, he also indicated the seed-impulses *of global evangelization, of ecumenism* and *of inculturation* which later also influenced the direction of catechetical progress. With the Council's *pastoral* inclination, it influenced catechesis' *shift* from being a *cognitive* matter into an *integral, wholistic* and *real human-existence* affair.

---

[218] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….,* cit., v.
[219] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….,* cit., 11.

Thereupon, the development of catechesis started. While *GCD* (1971) systematized the inspiring claims of Vatican II for catechesis, the *Code of Canon Law* (1983), especially in its Books III-IV, made them binding for the whole Latin Church. In the mean time, the waters of US catechesis began to be agitated not only by *historical concrete circumstances of its own* but also by the *inspirations* of the recent-concluded Council. *TTJD* (1972) and *Basic teachings* (1973) systematized catechesis through the four pillars: *service, community, message, (and liturgy)*. The synthesis came with the national directory, *SLF* (1979).

As he indicates in *Sowing Seeds* (2000), the embers of reform was enlivened by 'three major developments that have further clarified the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry' and which namely are: (1) the promulgation of the *RCIA* in 1972 which hailed back the ties between liturgy and catechesis, (2) Pope John Paul II's *EN* which made catechesis an important element in the new evangelization, and (3) the publication of the *CCC* in 1992.[220]

US catechesis on young people is an amazing example. Since *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), the most influential document on the formation of young Catholics in the USA, formation of youth has been clearly manhandled towards maturity of faith, or adulthood in faith, concretely manifested in *a lived faith in the community*. In the Bishops' pastoral plan for the third millennium, *Our hearts were burning within Us* (1999), adult faith formation became the expressed priority of all catechetical endeavors and, in 2005, *United States Catechism for Catholic Adults*, the US Catechism, is meant to be its doctrinal guide and reference.

---

[220] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds…*, cit., v-vi.

The significant progress in the *liturgical aspect* with the reforms of the *RCIA* (1972 and its eventual revisions) uncovered the necessary link between catechesis and liturgy. With a scientific survey of the efficiency of *RCIA* in the US parishes, the Bishops' claim of adult faith formation as priority, as stated above, is formidable.

In an earlier stage, liturgical catechesis, true to its socialization model, has functioned efficiently in interpreting or *deciphering of the rituals and symbols of faith*. With the present liturgical progress, that is, catechesis linked with liturgy in the formation of adult faith, catechesis is perhaps on its way towards helping Catholics *see through faith* God's actions-made-efficient through sacred symbols and rites.

In the 'popularization' of the evangelization or new evangelization and the eventual self-knowledge of the Church of the mission as integral to her nature, Marthaler well marks the 'job promotion' of catechesis, from being *one of the forms of Ministry of the Word* to being *an indispensable part of the Church essential expression*, that is, in *mission* and *evangelization*. In other words, the *evangelization progress* placed catechesis into the heart of the Church's essence or nature (mission and evangelization *being of the Church's nature*). There is even an emerging idea of 'evangelizing catechesis'. Pulling the cart in this same direction would later allow catechesis to claim its place as an integral part of the *evanggelium*, the Good News, itself.

Part of the so-called *evangelization progress*, or the other way around, is the awareness of the ecclesial dimension of catechesis. Catechesis' true place is the ecclesial community – its setting, agent and end. Later ahead, Marthaler would extend catechesis' important role in US Church's efforts in ecumenical and inter-religious dialogues, as well as to the concern for the spiritual and humane needs of catechists. Worthy to mention are the concern for the

remuneration/professionalization of their office and the 'vocation' of the figure of the catechist. Another important aspect of this progress or development, especially distinctive in US context, is the consideration of important of human sciences in catechesis. The human sciences have always supported the 'experiential plane' of catechesis.

With the publication of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, and perhaps, of the its compendium, the compendium of social doctrines, a progress in catechesis gradually became palpable. While Marthaler contextualizes the use of Catechism and all its 'genre' in the total efforts of the Church's catechetical ministry, he has always affirmed its being 'a sure doctrinal reference' and guide in the creation of local catechisms and directories.

Most Reverend Donald Cardinal Wuerl has clearly indicated the catechetical progress in USA in reference to the publication of the CCC. He mentions of 'a re-direction of catechesis'. Since its publication, an emphasis on the authentic and integral presentation of the doctrines of the Catholic faith has been observed (*manifest in the creation of orthodoxy oversight committees, the requiring of Declaration of conformity to the CCC, the making of the NDC and the USCCA, etc.*).

Somewhere, Marthaler has likewise mentioned of 'signs of *concern for orthodoxy* that observable in the recent years'. Within this complicated search for the identity in the midst of the rapid development and progress in catechetical scope, task, aims, the 'catechism and the compendium genre' – more than just being a doctrinal sacrosanct but speculative reference (with some practical indications) of catechesis and of new catechetics, or being a guide to the drafting of inculturated catechisms and directories – plays a decisive part in the dramatic discovery of the true identity of the Catholic Church's catechesis.

CHAPTER VI. WARREN: CATECHESIS IN THE CHURCH'S PASTORAL PRACTICE

One of the most important American authors who helped mould the present shape of the catechesis in USA is Michael Warren. Together with Berard Marthaler, he vied for the use of the traditional term 'catechesis' in favor of the anglo-american 'religious education' in referring to the educational practice of the Church. He is very clear that catechesis is a Church chore that includes a special aim, that is, *to imbue social realities with the values of the Gospel.*

M. Martorell, tracing the intellectual foundation of US catechesis, included Warren among her chosen authors. Among others, she indicated Warren's then ongoing tendency to emphasize catechesis as an important tool for social liberation. As indeed part of the nature-mission of the church - which for him has something to do with social liberation – catechesis aims at forming its members to counter attack the many aspects in society which is against the nature-mission of the community of disciples. His ideas are applied concretely in his work with youth ministry and in his writings about culture.

Warren has dedicated himself in these last ten years, on one part, to the study of culture, particularly on its possible influences to the local church, and on the other, on the formation of young people. His writings in this decade deal with either of the two themes. The most important among Warren's recent publication related to catholic catechesis are: *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church (2000),*[1] *A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry (2000),*[2]

---

[1] WARREN, M., «Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church» in WARREN, M. (ed.), *Changing Churches….,* cit..

Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look (2001),[3] *Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis (2004),*[4] *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse (2004),*[5] *The Imagination of Youth (2008),*[6] *Youth Ministry in an inconvenient Church (2008),*[7] and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis (2008).*[8]

1. Local church and confrontation with culture

WRITING THE GOSPELS IN THE STRUCTURES OF THE LOCAL CHURCH (2000) is an essay included in the book *Changing Churches. The Local Church and the Structures of Change* edited by Warren himself (with 12 other contributors).[9] Warren summarizes that the themes

---

[2] WARREN, M., «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», in *TLL* 37/1 (Fall 2000) 6-14.

[3] WARREN, M., «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look», in ROEBBEN, B.-WARREN, M. (eds.), *Religious Education as Practical Theology*, Leuven: Peeters Publishers 2001, 125-144.

[4] WARREN, M., «Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis», in *TLL* 40/4 (2004) 18-26.

[5] WARREN, M., «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», in *Revue Lumen Vitae* LIX/2 (2004) 199-212.

[6] WARREN, M., «Imagining an Inconvenient Church», in MAHAN, B., WARREN, M. AND WHITE, D. (eds.), *Awakening Youth Discipleship*, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008, 41-60.

[7] WARREN, M., «The Imagination of Youth», in MAHAN, B., WARREN, M. AND WHITE, D. (eds.), *Awakening Youth Discipleship,* cit., 61-74.

[8] WARREN, M., «Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis», in PARTNERSHIP ON ADOLESCENT CATECHESIS (ed.), Sourcebook for Adolescent Catechesis, 1, Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2008, 37-42.

[9] The book is a product of Warren's interest on culture and its unavoidable influence on the local church (which practices another kind of culture mandated by its sacred texts or religious convictions). The break came when St. John's University awarded him a summer study stipend to research recent writings on the contemporary problems of the local church. The Lilly Endowment has funded a conference on the local church in New York City. The symposium was to examine

that buoyed from the essays are culture, maintenance of meaning, embodiments and specificity in localness. He adds that these themes are interconnected.

The book is all about the local church and the elements that shape it. Its editor refers to it as the 'material conditions of the local church'. They are: (1) implicit meanings (social location based on class and the social identification of its people, their underlying assumption about life in general, about living religion in particular, etc.), (2) explicit meanings (its considered sacred texts, written set of official doctrines, customs, etc.), and (3) concrete embodiments (refers to the corporate life structure institutionally embedded in programs, succession of leaders, management, etc).

The aim of this gathering was to overcome the disconnection between meaning and action and to unite the details of local

---

in a systematic way the question of how local communities of religious people actually live out their purpose, and to suggest lines of thought helpful for reconfiguring life in these communities. It is there that Warren was able to eye other authors interested in the topic. The present book is the result. In this book, twelve authors examine critically their own and one another's traditions to describe how cultural changes over the past century open up new needs and possibilities for local churches in a new century. They point out what the church needs in order to survive or flourish in the future. They are: Michael Warren (Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church), Joseph Komonchak (Culture and History as the material conditions of the local church), C. Ellis Nelson (Congregational Reorientation), Martin Kennedy (New tracks for a new civilization: a view of the Irish Roman Catholic Church), Marianne Sawicki (Going to Church, a parish biography), Edward Farley (Local Learning, a congregational inquiry), Paul Lakeland (Raising Lay consciousness, the liberation of the local church), Rosemary Lulin Haughton (What does a local church look like?), Stanley Hauerwas (In defense of cultural Christianity, reflections on going to Church), John Barett (The Liturgy, Preaching and Justice), and Dorothy C. Bass and Craig Dykstra (Christian Practices and Congregational Education in Faith).

corporate life with the vision of living found in our sacred texts, he says.[10]

Warren's introduction of the book helps understand the rationale behind this collection of studies and of each of the articles, including his own. According to Warren himself, this book is a product of his interest on the influence of culture in the formation of persons or of their lives. He discloses in the book's introduction that he studies culture, not via anthropology, but via sociology and semiotics with special attention to Raymond Williams' theory (that is, a social order's signifying system is able to shape the consciousness and behavior of all within it). He describes a *signifying system* in the following terms: *if culture shapes the attitudes of all, then it shapes those who enter the sacred space of worship, most often, in ways outside their awareness.* In his interest on culture however his concern focuses on churches or local congregations.[11]

Warren believes that the church or the local congregation is the key bearer of the possibility of Gospel practice. It has its own signifying system. However, the members of that congregation or the congregation itself move in a concrete cultural context. Therefore, he is interested in studying here the unavoidable influence of culture of the extra-ecclesial society.

His article here, *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church*, is about Christian living in the future. It is divided into *six* sections.

In the *first* section (1), Warren focuses on the cultural horrors such as which took place in the 20th century. He says that any

---

[10] Cfr. Introduction by M. Warren in WARREN, M. (ed.), Changing Churches – the Local Church and the Structures of Change, cit., 3.

[11] *Ibid.*, 4.

Christian concerned with his past (tradition) and with the future cannot but wonder about the significance of these horrors on gospel-oriented groups or communities that confess faith in Jesus, communities then and in the future. Warren lays down the picture of Jesus, as the first century Jew who reacted to the social injustices of his time. Therefore, anyone who pledges fidelity to the first century Jesus cannot but take these horrors or any horror in whatever era with a grain of salt. These horrors also urge Christian assemblies to be concerned with the conditions - creating or maintaining them – in order avoid obfuscating the ideals shown by Jesus and the illuminations given by the Risen Christ.

It is surprising that Warren after having pinpointed the meat of the problem – that is the need to struggle for the clarity of the teachings of the Gospel, to embody and put them into practice – shifts to secondary elements such as the 'forms of communication and decision-making currently in use in local churches'. These elements are conditioned by cultural shifts that have taken place in certain longer span of time. In any case, it is his area of concern. He quotes Metz for his criticism on theology's silence about Auschwitz. He seems to say that theology has not tried to provide enough light regarding suffering. Lamenting about unjust suffering is something 'of the Judeo-Christian tradition'.

He says that Metz calls this reaction as anamnetic reason, a 'reason which resists forgetfulness and, instead, attends carefully to the silence of those who have disappeared, as a way of being attentive to God.' Therefore, in this section, Warren ends suggesting the idea of the need for local assembly to be able to maintain its 'traditional' state of being attentive and ready-to-act before a situation (even still imminent) of unjust suffering.

In the next *three* sections (2-4), Warren points out some diagnosis of how a certain imagination is formulated. His concern is that the society with its way of manipulating the kind of social imagination for its people influences enough those who practice the gospel-culture.

The *first* of these diagnoses (which composes these sections) presents religious production as a discernible process.[12] It means that a religious attitude – towards sufferings, oppressions or social poverty, for example – may not be totally identified with God's revelation, rather a reality which can be processed. According to Warren, the sacred is communicated through religious tradition. For him, religious tradition refers to the network of attitudes, outlooks, rituals, etc., like culture. As he puts it, 'while God may be unfathomable, a religious culture's ways can be measured and chartered – and examined for appropriateness'.[13]

The *second* diagnosis is all about patterning perception electronically. He discusses here about culture's power influence on persons serving as points of reference or standard for their basic options, or as he puts it 'norms of behaviour'. Codes which constitute a particular culture may be constructed, communicated, shifted and re-focused. However, Warren's concern is the 'progressive or endless newness' of these codes made possible through electronic means. He says that the norms of consumerist culture influence persons are there and are continually there but

---

[12] Warren cites a certain religious sociologist named Robert Wuthnow who theorizes about religious production as the intentional production of religious insights, convictions, commitments, rituals and patterns of response. Wuthnow founds his thoughts on the distinction between religion and the sacred, 'with religion being a network of humanly devised procedures and with these sacred being religion's inner core, which if of God' (cfr. Cfr. WARREN, M., «Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church», cit., 14-15).

[13] Cfr. *ibid.*, 16.

remain unnoticed. He says that this silent and implicit character has more influence on shaping the imagination of a person than the social order constituted by religious codes.[14]

The *third* diagnosis deals with judgment, decision, behavior and exclusions. Basing on the thought of the social philosopher Albert Borgmann, Warren made various distinctions of many types of decisions. He however fixed his attention on (1) a person's general decisions which conditions the context of the smaller decisions he makes during the day, and (2) the collective encompassing decisions which may condition personal decisions of the individuals forming part of that collective group. He says that 'churches would do well to consider the implications of this point for their own group life.[15]

In the final *two* sections (5-6), Warren presents two prescriptions. The first is all about *phronesis* as skill in communal action and second, *practice guided by vision*. He asks here how shall the resources of a committed religious group move toward living the gospel?

Basing on Joseph Dunn's examination of *phroenesis* in the writings of Aristotle, Warren, *in the first prescription*, describes it as a kind of practical (non-technical) knowledge which guides the activity of praxis. It is all about knowledge which deals with coordinating practice or activities. The agent is involved in the action and its result.

Warrens point is that Dunn's reflections help in understanding the teaching praxis in the church. He says that 'in our time, many more engage in teaching as a product-related activity than

---

[14] Cfr. *ibid.*, 20-23.
[15] Cfr. *ibid.*, 26.

as a practical, self-involving and other-involving process of coming to know and to be'.[16]

In the second prescription, Warren underlines the importance of a vision or a 'rule' which guides the practice of the words and ways of Jesus by a community in a specific time and concrete situation.[17]

2. The Church's pastoral ministry

In A NEW PRIORITY IN THE PASTORAL MINISTRY (2000), Warren comments about the novelty in terms of pastoral goal of two magisterial documents, the Sacred Council for the Clergy's *General Directory for Catechesis (1997)* and the US Bishops' pastoral plan for adult formation *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us (1999)*. He says that the two documents have built into them 'significant reorientations for the way we understand the part of discipleship and the way we follow that path'.[18]

Warren points out two important points from the *GDC* (1997) and which he says which are carried on by *Our Hearts were Burning within Us* (1999). They are: *the church life as primary communicator of gospel living* and *the bishops' ownership of the of the needed adult faith formation of the community.*

Concerning the importance of the church or the community, Warren says that *GDC*, more than in *GCD*, gives emphasis the on the local church's gospel practice as the 'primary communicator of the gospel message'[19] or simply, the catechetical dimension of the church. He further underlines *GDC*'s views of the church's struggle to be

---

[16] Cfr. *ibid.*, 28-33.

[17] *Ibid.*, 34-42.

[18] Cfr. WARREN, M., «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», cit., 6.

[19] *Ibid.*, 7.

effective, like the sower in the parable, in 'discerning the most diverse social situations as potentially marked by the creative activity of God' or what he calls, the church's 'way of being in the world'. He says that this existential condition demands the church to interpret day to day happenings from a gospel perspective.[20]

Warren describes this task of the church 'unifying the primary ecclesial doctrine with the secondary ones'. Primary doctrines, according to Warren are those 'about how to be a person in the world based on a Gospel imagination of life's purpose'; the secondary doctrines, those 'doctrines about doctrines' or the dogmas.

He admits that secondary doctrines rules the community well being, but he warns that if at their espousal (of the secondary doctrines), they lose contact with the primary doctrines, 'the community's inner life and outer coherence are endangered and compromised'.[21]

In this task of 'unification', he says that the local church serves as 'the sacrament of the human encounter with the living Spirit of Jesus'. It is then from this perspective that Warren says, commenting *GDC*, that the real agent of catechesis or 'of the enfleshing of the Gospel', is the local community,[22] and not individual catechists.

He furthers comments that the abovementioned *GDC* insight is owned and pushed through by the Bishops themselves in the *Our Hearts Were Burning within Us* as they compromise to be involved in the faith formation of the adults.[23]

---

[20] *Ibid.*
[21] Cfr. *ibid.*, 7-8.
[22] Cfr. *ibid.*, 8-9.
[23] Cfr. *ibid.*, 9-10.

As a consequence, Warren points out that the above-mentioned perspective 'suggests that parish catechetical directors and the catechists working with them cannot understand their own efforts without seeing them as directed to the witness of the life of the local church'. He indicates that individual catechists primary task is 'fostering the gospel life of the ecclesial body itself'. As he says, individual instructional efforts of catechists, without the back-up of a convincing communal practice, will be 'like a whisper in the blare of traffic'.[24] He therefore says that *GDC* vies for 'a pastoral strategy of effective living signs'.[25]

Warren points out that the vision of the *GDC* is carried forward by "*Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us* (1999), that is, quoting Warren, 'that the chief carrier of the living message of Jesus is an assembly of disciples who regularly do the inconvenient tasks the Gospel demands'.[26]

3. Catechesis and RE: its distinction

CATECHESIS AND/OR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: ANOTHER LOOK (2001) is an essay Warren's contribution to the book which he edits with B. Roebben, the *Religious Education as Practical Theology*.[27]

---

[24] Cfr. *ibid.*, 8.

[25] Cfr. *ibid.*, 9.

[26] Cfr. *ibid.*, 13-14.

[27] This book is meant to honor the Belgian scholar Herman Lombaerts. Lombaerts was dedicated to a conceptual analysis of the social and cultural context in which people live and learn. The articles in this book are built upon the design on the relationship between theology and religion based on Lombaert's societal and cultural analysis of contemporary religious education. In the introduction, Roebben-Warren says that there are three key elements noteworthy in the reading of this book, namely: (1) the self-agency of the learner, (2) the hermeneutic communal interpretation of religious traditions in the teaching of religion, and (3) the radical imagination of Christian theology relying on this new model of religious

The essay is about 'the effective means of fostering Christian faith'. He departs from the 'abrupt severance of ties with the church and of religious initiation among young and adults alike' in Canada and Ireland between the second half of the 60s until the first half of the 70s.

His assumption in this essay, he says, is that 'erosion of religious affiliation is also a failure of pastoral ministry, particularly of the ministry of the word'. He identifies pastoral ministry of the word as catechesis, and distinguishes it from schooling. In other words, for Warren, those erosions from religious affiliation are failures of catechesis, not of schooling. He further elaborates this insight saying that in many places today, schools are expected to bear a burden of communicating the Word of God in a full and final way that schools of their very nature are unsuited for and unable to bear.[28]

---

educational praxis. Here are the authors with their essays: Rosemary Crumlin (Prologue: Remember the skin), Anton Bucher (Happiness of the Children, a task for the pedagogics of religion?), Roland Campiche (Youth of the Eighties, Parents of 2000, Sociological observations), Graham Rossiter (Reasons for living, Religious Education and young people's search for spirituality and identity), Hans-Georg Ziebertz (Empirical Orientation of Research in Religious Education), Michael Warren (Catechesis and/or Religious Education, another look), Kieran Scott (To teach religion or not to teach religion, is that the dilemma?), Catherine Dooley (Catechesis and Religious Instruction in Catholic Schools, perspectives of the General Directory for Catechesis [1997]), Flavio Pajer (Multi-faith education in the Europe of tomorrow, a civic responsibility for universities and schools), Norbert Mette, (Identity before or identity through familiarization with plurality? The actual discussion concerning school based religious education in Germany), Bert Roebben (Religious Education through times of crisis: reflections on the future of a vulnerable school subject), Maureen O'Brien (Disciplined conversations, faithful practices, practical theology and the theological education of lay ecclesiastical ministers), Tjeu van Knippenberg, Competence for Spiritual Guidance in Pastoral Ministry, a theological educational program), and Herman Lombaerts (Epilogue: Christ in the Desert).

[28] Cfr. WARREN, M., «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education», cit., 125-127.

The essay of Warren proceeds in *two* steps. In the *first step*, he clarifies the relationship and distinction between religious education and catechesis through the proper use of categories and procedures. In the *second step*, he further clarifies the distinctive characters of religious education and catechesis by examining respectively their origins.

For Warren, a clear distinction between religious education and catechesis may contribute to the avoidance of a catechetical failure (which may result to a dramatic severance from religious affiliations like in Ireland and Canada).

In what he calls as the *first step*, titled *Finding the Proper Categories and Procedures*, Warren laments the interchangeable use of *religious education* and *catechesis* because, as he says, 'they are not two species of a common genre of education, but two species of separate genres'[29]. He says that catechesis is a species of the genre pastoral ministry while religious education, a species of the genre education. By that he is clear that their goals, origins, their desired outcome and the identities of their participants are different.[30]

He therefore cites as a *categorical* error, for example, the use of catechetical language in conversations about religious education. This may lead to erroneous practices. He points out as a *procedural* error, for instance, employing catechetical means with the desire of obtaining an outcome proper to religious education. Warren therefore says that catechesis is aimed basically 'at the transformation

---

[29] *Ibid.*, 127.
[30] *Ibid.*

of sensibility and practice' while religious education 'at clarification and enlargement of understanding'.[31]

In addition to this, Warren considers a procedural error considering catechesis as the key form of religious teaching in Catholic schools.[32]

In the *second step*, titled *Education and Catechesis in Antiquity*, Warren departs from the distinction and great differences Henri Marrou makes between *paideia* and school instruction in the ancient Greek world. Then he proceeds with discussing catechesis in antiquity and the origins of initiation. H. Marrou underlines paideia's broader objective of forming the whole person and its non-measurability by statistical or technical evaluations like that of schooling.[33]

Warren therefore says that the idea of paideia is useful for understanding the role of the churches as different from schools.[34] His main point in his discussion concerning church catechesis and the catechumenical process of becoming a follower of Jesus is that 'the whole community is the chief educative element inviting the young to a whole way of life, pursued through the whole course of life'[35].

---

[31] He cites Republic of Ireland's new RE curriculum. Before, RE refers to the instruction in schools of Roman Catholic doctrines or in other words, catechesis. The new revised curriculum, still using the term RE, corrects this procedural and categorical errors; it now refers to the exposition and examination of the features of religion in general and of particular religions. He points out that if Ireland begins to use the RE parlance in reference to the education in religion in schools, it must likewise start relocating catechesis to its proper place, the parish community, the key carrier of catechesis (cfr. *ibid.*, 128-130).

[32] *Ibid.*, 130-131.

[33] Cfr. *ibid.*, 131-136.

[34] *Ibid.*, 136.

[35] *Ibid.*

Warren shows distinctive features of catechesis in its origins and applies them to contemporary catechetical practice. He says that in the beginning, entering into the circle of disciples of Jesus was a dangerous and difficult decision due to societal pressure. Within the centuries, there evolved a more elaborated process of catechumenate for those who seek baptism. He speaks of 'initial conversion and the pursuit of lifelong' in terms of entering deeper into circles within circles.[36]

He therefore points out the following distinctive characteristics of catechesis compared to schooling: (1) Catechesis was meant to be an *option* but not a causal option; (2) Catechesis is *an initiation* to a new sensibility, a new way of perceiving the world and of being in that world; (3) catechesis is a lifelong *process* and the community is its agent; and (4) the church is not *perfect*.

Regarding the first distinctive feature, Warren emphasizes the fundamental importance of the candidate's freedom in wanting to be catechized. Without it, catechesis is not worthy of that name. He scrutinizes the case of catechetical procedures in church-related schools. Regardless of the varied types of students receiving, may it be catechesis or an instruction on religion, Warren opines that as a general rule personal freedom be respected.[37]

Regarding the second distinctive feature, Warren emphasizes the importance of acquiring the Christian sensibility, the experience within the group of those who embody the life of Jesus, and the learning of the ways distinctive of a Christian before diverse situations. Thus he points out the importance of the community's

---

[36] *Ibid.*, 137-138.
[37] Cfr. *ibid.*, 138-140.

judgment based on the candidate's exhibited actions (not the candidates claim) whether he or she is already a disciple.[38]

Regarding the third distinctive feature, Warren underlines the importance of maintaining the 'converted mode' of the disciple. This maintenance is a lifelong process. Its agent is not a single person, rather the whole community.[39]

Regarding the fourth distinctive feature, Warren underlines that the community reserves a place 'for those who fell and wants to start anew; it is not 'a circle of pure ones but rather of those who are called to be more than their worst impulses'.[40]

In his conclusion, Warren points the importance of strengthening the family, folk and religious cultures, schools and churches and their fostering humanization as antidote to the alarming worldview of consumerism imbuing society nowadays.[41]

4. Catechesis and the "corporate memory" of the ecclesial community

The article, TOWARDS AND ANAMNETIC CATECHESIS (2004) appears in the issue of *The Living Light* issue which features the role of memory in catechesis. Here, Warren talks about "anamnetic" catechesis, a sort of transmitting the faith through life and practices of the community and inside the community. He keeps on citing the Holy Eucharist as the paragon practice for anamnetic catechesis.

---

[38] Cfr. *ibid.*, 140-141.
[39] Cfr. *ibid.*, 141-142.
[40] Cfr. *ibid.*, 142.
[41] Cfr. *ibid.*, 143.

Anamnetic catechesis suggests of a catechesis based on memory, or a teaching based on events which is stored or 'embodied' on one's memory. Warren affirms that *all types of memory* have a place in catechesis. In this article however he focused on the so-called *embodied* and *ecstatic memories*.

By *embodied memory* Warren refers to those stored memories in peoples' lives that shape their way of being and living. He exalts the local Church as a sacrament of encounter with the Spirit of Jesus through its corporate way of life or *embodied memory*.[42] Such dominant form of ecclesial being founded on its 'stored' memory means many things for its comprehension.

By *ecstatic* memory, Warren refers to those things which we cannot forget even though we made no efforts to retain them in our minds. It is perfectly called ecstatic for its relation to its sentimental enforcement. It is also referred to as anamnetic, Warren says, for its biblical sense, that is, its *effective* presence in a new situation where it becomes real again in the *here and now*.

Now, anamnetic catechesis is based on those two memories. Anamnetic catechesis, as opposite to mindless repetition of formulae that have lost significance for individuals, is a natural way of talking about the wonders of God. It is more spontaneous, free, and in a communal assembly. He says that Pope John Paul II and Cardinal Ratzinger's thoughts regarding the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (as reference text) encourages anamnetic catechesis.[43]

He largely comments on the Holy Eucharist. He then talks about it as the anmnesis par excellence of the Last Supper. He gives *four* condition for Eucharist to become reality in the here and now:

---

[42] Cfr. *ibid.*, 19-20.
[43] Cfr. *ibid.*, 21-24.

(1) a community is attuned to the significance of what it does, (2) it is able to enter into the ritual prayer and actions, (3) it itself does the ritual out of its own truth as a loving gathering of disciples and, (4) it offers itself the way Jesus offered himself.[44]

5. Contemporary culture, catechesis, and RE

In FINALITÉS ET CONTENUS REPRÉCISES POUR LES COURS DE RELIGION ET LA CATÉCHÈSE (2004), Warren proposes the rethinking of the aims and contents of catechesis and the teaching of religion in schools due to various contemporary social factors that affect learning in general. At the end, he presents the problem as a matter of sensibility.

He begins pointing out the fundamental difference between the teaching of religion in schools and catechesis. The former, he says, is under the context of obligation, while the latter, of option or choice. The subject 'Religion' is mandated by an authority and which incompliance corresponds a punishment. Warren therefore, quoting Michel de Certeau, says that, in most cases, students adapt certain *strategies of resistance* to which the teacher, instead of countering with an imperious disposition, should engage with it first before he or she can reach the authentic 'self' of the student. Quoting Pierre Babin's studies on ancient catechumenate, he says that catechesis is absent in the presence of any form of coercion. Moreover, he also underlines that the school instruction on religion focuses on doctrinal development while catechesis, more on behavior or way of living.[45]

---

[44] Cfr. *ibid.*, 21.

[45] Cfr. WARREN, M., «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», cit., 199-202. Moreover, he claims that catechesis enriches religious instruction. Citing the studies of Josephine Egan and Leslie Francis, he

In the first subtitle, *La culture mediatique aujourd'hui*, Warren describes the *first factor* which has to be taken into consideration in the rethinking of catechesis and religious instruction: the media culture. According to Warren, the *media culture* deeply influences all learning (including catechesis) nowadays. He points out media communications' capacity for continuous bombardment of information (*always and everywhere*) regardless of their importance. He says that this create a certain 'subconscious' in persons. Even if this 'world of subconscious' does not pass to conversation or practice, it has a deep influence on one's behavior, especially that of consumption.[46]

Another factor which he describes is what he calls *La rationalite instrumentale* (second subtitle). He says that according to this way of perceiving things, nothing in life has value in itself (except as a means to an end or purpose). One has to be calculated or manipulated if it has to be useful for something.[47]

Another contemporary behavior which is formed by the economic system based on consumption is the loss of the sense of service. The system transmits a simple message: *a support network does not exist, you are all alone*. Warren somewhere explicitly says that this is a problem of sensibility and must be addressed by a catechesis faithful to the Gospel and a religious instruction devoted to human sciences.[48]

The weakened ability of many students to reflect on what they perceive and to understand the reality of what they see is another factor that Warren discusses. There is then the need to help

---

says that most students from families who are practicing Catholics record a better performance in religious instruction in schools.

[46] Cfr. *ibid., 202-204.*

[47] Cfr. *ibid.*, 204-206.

[48] Cfr. *ibid.*, 206-207.

students 'to focus on what is before their eyes, whether textual or visual form' and 'to develop their inner life, has become aware of their way to assimilate what they see and what they read'. He however affirms that according to his experience as a teacher, young people seem *to pay attention to practical information on the functioning of the imagination, the power of metaphors, etc..*

Warren points out as another important factor in re-considering the aims and contents of catechesis and religious instruction, the 'pedagogical culture-the culture of a particular school' reality. The point he wishes to drive at is that there is a social order at large (general pedagogical culture) which tries to transmit social values through the particular educational institutions. Warren emphasizes that there is *a need to evaluate or even disagree to the values tried to be passed on by the general culture.* This refers to a good critical sense. Accepting bad agenda and systems without question may add to the problem.[49]

At the end, as mentioned earlier, Warren that all these is a problem of sensibility. To illustrate his point, he brings forward once again Christian William's distinction between primary and secondary doctrines, and which catechists and educators must respect.

His point is that since secondary doctrines 'only' governs the development of primary doctrines (those which serve as the *sacred* foundation of a community's being), any attachment to them (secondary doctrines) must be avoided; otherwise the 'inner life' and 'external coherence' of the community is 'threatened' and 'compromised'.[50]

---

[49] Cfr. *ibid.*, 208-209.

[50] Cfr. *ibid.*, 209-211. Warren knows well that the creeds and dogma give identity to the community. They further serve as windows for a better understanding and adhesion to faith. Caution must therefore be considered in

6. The church's mission and youth catechesis

In the book he wrote with Brian J. Mahan and David F. White, *Awakening Youth Discipleship: Christian Resistance in a Consumer Culture* (2008), Warren writes two essays, THE IMAGINATION OF YOUTH and YOUTH MINISTRY IN AN INCONVENIENT CHURCH.

6.1. The Church's paradigm about the youth

THE IMAGINATION OF YOUTH is divided into the following subtitles: Introduction: The Imagination in Youth Ministry, Paradigms About Youth, Questioning the Critique, Another Example of the Standard Account: Young Adults, Richness of the Assembly of Youth, Misuses of Erikson's Notion of Identity in Youth Ministry, The Market Economy and Youth Ministry, and Conclusion: Fidelity, Eucharist, and Human Dignity.

In *Introduction: The Imagination in Youth Ministry*, Warren highlights the importance of imagination in youth ministry. He first names *three convictions* which, according to him, serve as 'rationale' in any gathering of the youth organized by the church.[51] After

---

reading Warren. For Warren, the destructive 'attachment to secondary doctrines (dogmas)' refers, not to the original value of dogmas or creeds in themselves, but on moments when dogmas and creeds are kept but not understood well, and thus becomes hindrance to community living.

[51] They three rationale of youth gatherings are: *fidelity*, *Eucharist* and *dignity of persons*. *Regarding the first rationale*, Warren is convinced that when a group gathers, it is primarily because of *'its fidelity to Jesus of the gospel'*. He underlines that this conviction must be clear to those young people who come to the gathering because, according to him, 'living out fidelity can be complicated'. He adds that the church is a community committed to the transformation of persons and social systems in the light of the wisdom of Jesus. Such wisdom is concerned with both the character of work and how the conditions of work can heal (or harm) the self who works. *Regarding the second rationale*, Warren says that the prototypical assembly of people wishing to follow the Jesus' Way is *the Eucharistic Assembly*. He explains

mentioning the Catholic tradition of directing imagination to be directed to Christ, Warren laments that unfortunately nowadays those who have greater influence in young people's imagination are no more religious persons, rather business-minded specialists. The mentioned convictions, according to Warren, raise questions about what happens when a group of young people gathers in the name of the church for any kind of event.[52] Warren considers individual imagination 'a powerful directive force in a person's life'.[53] He points out 'the power of a society's unifying myth', or 'worldview' or 'paradigm' in creating a social imagination. Warren says that whether we are attentive to it or not, 'a paradigm (or master-narrative) is a feature of the imagination of every person the church reaches out to in its ministries, including youths and young adults, but also those who do the reaching out'.[54] Thus he underlines the need that agents of catechesis of young people must have a clear paradigm based not on other things but 'one about a devout Jew killed for his protests against injustice'.[55]

---

that the community in search of fidelity to the teachings of Jesus gathers to remember their failures, to ask for forgiveness, to remember his life, death and resurrection, and to proclaim him as a sign of God's goodness. Without the Eucharistic assembly, gatherings are without a core. Warren's emphasis on the centrality of the Eucharist means 'that when the Eucharistic assembly does gather, it is a gathering joined in the Spirit of Jesus Christ – an intergenerational assembly struggling to discern, over bread and wine, its deeper call to fidelity'. *Regarding the third rationale*, Warren explains that youth gatherings are 'a way of recognizing *the dignity of each young person*, while inviting each, with all the delicacy implied by a true invitation, to move deeper into the circle of faith'. For Warren, youth ministry includes the fostering of self-esteem of young people but at the same time they are 'challenged to deepen their commitments to God and neighbor' (cfr. WARREN, M., «The Imaginations of Youth», cit., 41-42).

[52] Cfr. *ibid.*, 42.
[53] Cfr. *ibid.*, 45.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Ibid.*

In *Paradigms about Youth*, Warren says that his main interest in the essay is 'with the way Christian adults imagine the world of youth' or with 'fitting them (youth) into a story about life in general'.[56] He points out and criticizes a certain approach in ministering the youth which departs from seeing the world of youth as 'the world of interior struggle for identity, the world of psychological integration, an inner world of psychic tasks one must face as a self.'[57] He calls this view as *the standard account*.

He further recognizes the presence of the 'standard account' approach in some church documents about youth ministry. The assumption of this approach is that before doing 'real' apostolate with the youth, that is, leading them to authentic religious transformation, the church has to confront this condition of psychological struggle for one's identity in which young people are presumed to be into. While accepting that there may be social issues which may be closely related to psychological conditions, he points out standard account's inadequacy and considers making it as a starting point in ministering the youth as 'getting off on the wrong foot'.[58] Warren prefers starting apostolate with youth considering their *social status* than their *psychological state*. The psychological state as basis is less consistent, according to him, than to social conditions.

In *Riches of the Assembly for Youth*, Warren presents what it is that the church really does with the youth. He speaks of 'a human

---

[56] *Ibid.*

[57] *Ibid.*, 46.

[58] Cfr. ibid., 45-52. He cites the documents The Challenge of Adolescent Catechesis: Maturing in Faith (1986) by the National Federation of the Catholic Youth (NFCY) and Sons and Daughters of the Light: A Pastoral Plan for Ministry with Young Adults (1996) by NCCB/USCC. Moreover, Warren theorizes that the psychological foundation of the standard account seems to misuse the notion of identity posted by Erikson (for a further discussion of this issue, vid. *ibid.*, 54-58).

flourishing' or 'a journey to humanization by prizing the sacredness of others' as the objective of church ministry with persons including that of young people. He says that 'the church gathers to remember the dangerous life and cruel death of a Galilean Jew, and the continuing presence of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.'[59] He further describes how 'persons live in the Spirit of God', that is, 'when they feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the imprisoned, shelter the homeless, forgive debts, and offer the poor the Good News' (Mt. 25:34ff).[60] In other words, the church invites people to an arduous life of gospel practice.

Clear with the difficulty of the life to which a disciple of Jesus should live, Warren says that 'the church does not ask for a full, all-at-once commitment', rather a 'gradual, invitational but self-implicating' invitation.

He further describes such an invitation 'as welcoming, and not manipulative like a marketing strategy'.[61] Thus learning the life in the church is like apprenticeship. The community embodies the teachings and ways of Jesus while the apprentice, whether he judges that kind of life as desirable or arduous, sees and learns from it.[62]

In *Market Economy and Youth Ministry*, Warren underlines that the church is not alone in having the youth as object of its apostolate. He warns that both youth catechists and the youth themselves are not unaffected by the manipulations designed by marketers. He says:

> If they wish to invite young adults to consider seriously the option of the gospel, they may have to introduce these people to a set of 'commitments and identifications' they may not have yet

---

[59] *Ibid.*, 52.
[60] *Ibid.*, 52-53.
[61] Cfr. *ibid.*, 53.
[62] Cfr. *ibid.*

considered. These proposals are often unsettling, even to those who propose them. One of the most difficult 'developmental tasks' will be the often gradual of proposing a gospel framework embodied in relationships, in work, and in attitudes toward money.[63]

In the conclusion, Warren first points out the often entertainment-related rationale of youth gatherings in USA and then returns to the three convictions or rationales which guides the church in whatever assemblies – fidelity to the good news Jesus proclaimed to the poor and to the way of living embodied in Jesus' own life, the Eucharist as the prototypical assembly of Christians, the recognition of the dignity of young persons. He calls for a gospel sensibility among young people in their 'being in the world'.[64]

6.2. Youth catechesis in the church's mission

In YOUTH MINISTRY IN AN INCONVENIENT CHURCH (2008), Warren focuses on the arduous dimension of the life lived by the community of disciples.[65] For him, youth ministry includes directing young people to that 'inconvenient' kind of life.

Warren begins offering two concepts which may help in understanding well church ministry. The two concepts referred to are mission and manners (culture).

Related to the first concept, Warren says that the mission of the church or any of its ministries can be correctly understood inside the frame of Jesus' mission itself, especially its 'laborious' and

---

[63] *Ibid.*, 58.

[64] Cfr. *ibid.*, 59-60.

[65] The essay is divided into the following subtitles: Youth Ministry and Discipleship, Looking to the behaviors of Gospel Practice, Consumeristic Gestures and Gospel Gestures, Skills in General and the Skills of Discipleship, A Specific Example, and Practices of a Community of Disciples.

inconvenient character. Like Jesus and his doing of his mission, the Church expresses its own identity doing her likewise 'arduous' and inconvenient mission (through different ministries depending of time and place).

In relation to the second, doing her mission or ministering is not possible without 'taking into consideration the manners or culture of the present time or place'. The mission includes articulating the teachings and the way Jesus lived his life in a concrete particular time and place. This presupposes awareness and knowledge of the present culture in which the church has to influence or confront. Warren drives at the idea that ministries in the church should be expressive of its real identity, its interior life. He alludes to 'expressing without icings in its ministries the inconvenient character of the identity of the church'.[66]

In *Youth Ministry and Discipleship*, Warren denounces the lack of the inconvenient character in many youth ministry in today's churches (referring to churches in USA). He calls it 'a ministry of enticement by way of fun', instead of 'a youth ministry in a church of radical discipleship'. In confronting this insight, he offers the distinction of primary and secondary doctrines as guide. As we have already recalled, for Warren primary doctrines of a church are 'about how to be a person in the world based on a religious imagination of life's purposes'. They form our basic stance in life before the life in the world. Secondary doctrines are those which 'govern the development of the community's larger body of doctrines. Here are the points Warren drives at with this distinction:

[1] It is possible for someone to have a solid grasp of the secondary doctrines (doctrine of doctrines) but little grasp of the

---

[66] Cfr. WARREN, M., «Youth Ministry in an Inconvenient Church», cit., 61-63.

habits of the heart and basic gestures and behaviours fostered by the primary doctrines. Primary doctrines only become truly primary not so much when we grasp them as when they grasp us and determine which of the secondary doctrines we see as most important.

[2] When the community's espousal of its secondary doctrines loses touch with its primary doctrines, the community's inner life and its outer coherence are endangered and compromised.

[3] He quotes William Christian: if we had to choose between *secondary doctrines* (doctrines about doctrines) and *proposals about courses of action*, he would opt for the second. This is to imply the danger about the secondary doctrines displacing the primary ones.[67] Primary doctrines refer to the life of the community itself, while secondary doctrines, to the set of codes or doctrines which govern the community proceedings. Christian uses the term dogmas and doctrines. This needs further clarification however. In the Christian religion, Christian life comes before dogmas. However, it does not hold them to be compromising or obstructive, rather 'something enlightening' for the authentic living of the Christian faith.

In *Looking to the Behaviors of Gospel Practice*, Warren discusses on how the Christian convictions be transmitted to its members, in this case, the youth. He speaks of 'convictions that are meant to direct the church' which are 'the teachings and practices of Jesus whom we name Christ, and of the Jesus-tradition'.[68] He seeks therefore, specifically in the youth ministry in the church, how to transmit these convictions.

Here Warren confronts the common dilemma of the insufficiency of doctrinal instructions. He points out the importance

---

[67] *Ibid.*, 64.
[68] Cfr. *ibid.*, 65.

of some conditions which may help 'religious ideas to migrate from being concepts to being convictions that intelligently guide one's life'. He mentions of a practice-oriented ways of fostering Christian virtue'.

Discussing about a practice-oriented learning, he introduces the idea of *sapience*. He says that it is 'an engaged knowledge that emotionally connects the knower to the known'. Sapience, in Warren's mind, is characterized by emotional engagement.[69] He says that conversing about Christian living is important; however it is generally insufficient condition in its real living out. He therefore vies more for an emotionally engaged coaching or directing those behaviors to persons. This coaching includes, according to him showing in actions those gospel-inspired gestures or 'gestures of discipleship'.[70] On the part of the receiver, Warren says, the learning of those virtues requires the skills of discipleship'.[71]

---

[69] Cfr. *ibid.*, 65-66.

[70] Warren identifies gestures of discipleship and contrasts them with those gestures of consumerism. For the gestures of consumerism: closed fist, 'the flip' or the obscene finger gesture, 'the scowl'. They characterize a way of being in the world, a stance. They also point to an unpleasant imagination of our connection to others. For the Gospel gestures, on the contrary, or 'the gestures of those who accept Jesus' imagination of what it means to be a human' are open hand that offers food for the hungry or comfort to those in pain, the embrace, the helping gesture of raising up, and the smile of joy. He says that there are gestures that are characteristically Christian while not distinctively Christian. The former refers to gestures which are used by Christians (but are not distinctively theirs) and that they only employ in their imitation of the gestures of Jesus (cfr. *ibid.*, 66-67).

[71] He speaks of 'skills of discipleship appropriate to a self who has moved beyond childhood' He likewise preoccupies on how the community of discipleship exhibits them in such a way that the young might imitate them. Thus he asks for criteria for one to follow in order to know whether one is already acting outside the skills (as inspired by Jesus) corresponding to his age. He speaks about need for skills in general: athletic skills and academic skills, technical skills. He says that society has successfully taught them and nobody questions these convictions of need for skills. Unfortunately, there are other areas in which many consider

7. Parish pastoral activities and humanizing youth catechesis

REFLECTIONS ON PARISH AND ADOLESCENT CATECHESIS (2008) is Warren's essay which is included in the first of two volume collection of articles concerning the Catholic adolescents published by the Partnership for Adolescent Catechesis (PAC).[72] As Ms. Diana Dudoit Raiche, Exec Director of the Department of Religious Education, NCEA, summarizes Warren's main idea in this article with the thought, 'good pastoral practices lead to effective youth ministry'.[73]

After Warren reasons out that a renewed youth ministry must be necessarily tied to the local congregation's ongoing struggle for a Gospel-imbued way of life,[74] he offer the following points of reflections: (1) Catechesis was originally meant to be *an option* but *not a causal option*. When and if it loses that optional character, it risks becoming authentic catechesis.[75] (2) Catechesis is an initiation into a

---

without the need of skills which are in reality the most important, namely: *love relationships*, *parenting* and *religion* (cfr. ibid., 67-71).

[72] This coalition of organizations committed to the formation of young people in USA, composed of the National Federation for Catholic youth Ministry (NFCYM), the National Catholic Educational Association, and the National Conference for Catechetical Leadership (NCCL), was formed in 2003. The PAC initiated the gathering of essays contained in the two volumes to begin a national conversation among the members of the three organizations regarding US American adolescents.

[73] PARTNERSHIP ON ADOLESCENT CATECHESIS (ed.), Sourcebook for Adolescent Catechesis, I, cit., 2.

[74] He calls this position 'a sacramental claim'. As a sacrament is characterized by the visible pointing to the invisible, the Spirit of Jesus, and the actions of the Holy Spirit, the congregations life exhibits the little vibrant gospel living backs up catechesis (cfr. WARREN, M., «Reflections on Parish and Adolescent Catechesis», cit., 37).

[75] Warren's idea of catechesis as a free choice of the one who undergoes it derives from his reflection of the catechumenate of the first Christian communities. The 'applicants' then were adults. Warren here clearly refers to the

new sensibility, a new way of perceiving the world and of being in that world – in Greek terms, a distinctive *paideia*. (3) Catechesis is a lifelong process and the community is its agent. (4) The community is not perfect. (5) Humanization must be at the heart of today's adolescent catechesis. These points were the same with those of *Catechesis and/or Religious Education: Another Look* (2001), except for the fifth, that *on humanization*.

On the first point, Warren underlines the need 'to allow room for the adolescent to choose to believe'. He says that this character of catechesis must be taken seriously especially in terms of catechizing young people. He explains that catechesis is used to be given to persons who have asked to join the community walking 'in the way of Jesus-faith'. It is given only after the Christian community or its representatives have examined thoroughly the motives of the applicant. There is a possibility that one is disqualified by reason of insufficient motives. Catechesis for him begins when a person responds to God's grace. It is therefore an exercise of freedom and choice.

He says that while Christian living is not an option for those wishing to be disciples, the process of catechesis itself never loses its character as a willing self-involving process. Whenever it loses that character, it ceases to be catechesis.[76]

This feature – option – of catechesis raises questions in church-related schools. He cites *GDC* (1997) and *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School* (1988) clearly distinguishes the school as the zone of education in religion and catechesis as the zone of believers seeking nourishment (pursuit of the faith). This

---

free choice of adults or young adults in being catechized. In case of children, the free option of their parents is necessary.

[76] *Ibid.*, 38.

leads him to say that as a general rule in obeying a mandate to teach religion as in the case of religion teachers in schools, it is wise to respect all hesitations of students about religiousness.[77]

On the second point, Warren underlines that *paideian* feature of catechesis, that is, of education which includes instruction and experience life within the *ekklesia* or local community. He says that the 4th century catechumenate consists of a gradual immersion into the Jesus-Way of life. Warren's description goes this way:

> It took time to come to see other persons as proxies of Jesus, and to see Jesus as God's covenant with the poor, and even more time to master the skills of the Jesus-Way. Tied to the new sensibility were habitual ways of responding to situations involving care for the sick, the imprisoned, the physically and mentally impaired, the hungry, those lacking shelter – and also *those named as enemies*.[78]

The actions of the applicant are the indicator whether he or she is exhibiting enough the Jesus-Way of life. Moreover, Warren considers the home and parish as locale where such learned behaviors or actions may take place.[79]

On the third point, catechesis as a lifelong process, Warren underlines the importance of the maintenance of 'the state of conversion' with which the neophyte freely decided to be educated in the secrets of the Jesus-Way of life lived in the community. He adds that the agent of that 'maintenance' is not a single catechist but the community or the *ekklesia* itself. Warren talks of 'a conversion that takes place through a carefully planned process'. He says that it is 'an achievement of intentionality on the part of both the seeking person and the welcoming community'.[80]

---

[77] Cfr. *ibid.*, 37-39.

[78] *Ibid.*, 39.

[79] Cfr. *ibid.*, 39-40.

[80] Cfr. *ibid.*, 40.

On the fourth point, the community as imperfect, Warren underlines the idea of the community as a sacred space for the repentant, for those vacillating in the faith, or those uncertain in their way. He however clearly points out that this must not be an excuse for doing little in the catechesis of young people; instead it must be the motor for youth agents of doing their work seriously.[81]

On the fifth point, Warren vies for humanization as something that should be fostered by the Church in young people and be maintained until adulthood. Humanization for him is the antidote for today's world imbued by the culture of consumerism. Humanization for him is the ability to recognize others as fellow creatures of God. it represents a sensibility that is deeply attuned to the human, to what fosters the *humanum* and what diminishes it.[82]

In his conclusion, Warren describes the young people as 'young disciples in training to be adult disciples of Christ'. He says that the ministry of catechesis must therefore focus on how to invite the young people 'to choose discipleship, teach them the Christian way to perceive and be in the world, and help them to begin a lifelong process of formation in and with a faith community'.[83]

8. Summary and Evaluation

The general framework of Warren's catechetical doctrine has developed in the years before 2000-2010. He started with siding with the socialization understanding of catechesis. But, since the beginning, his attention on the concrete historical manifestation of the Good News to which the catechetical task is closely related, has

---

[81] Cfr. *ibid.*, 40-41.
[82] Cfr. *ibid.*, 41.
[83] Cfr. *ibid.*, 42.

always been obvious. More than a *ministry of symbolic* or *life structures*, he attributed to catechesis the task of 'liberation', the freeing from the 'orchestrated' conditions or factors which obfuscate the vision or impede the practice of Jesus' way of life. In other words, in this context, *catechesis*, for Warren, *has the task of clearing a space in which the Jesus-way of life promoted by the Church may thrive and eventually perform its transformative function in the world.* That perhaps explains Warren's large interest on culture, signifying systems, theories of the mind's assimilation of external factors, etc.. It must be said also that, in all these, Warren has no second thoughts in exploring and using scientific theories in presenting his positions in catechesis.

The conceptual frameworks or even categories (catechesis of liberation, material conditions, signifying system, culture, etc.) which Warren often employs in his catechetical doctrine are still present in his 2000-2010 writings. His insights, however, is more stable and mature. Warren is clear that catechesis works in a wider context which is the Church's *pastoral* function. In concrete, he terms it as 'discipleship'.[84]   Within this general context, Warren distinguishes catechesis from another noble religious undertaking, that is, religious education. He has been consistent in maintaining that catechesis deals with *transforming sensibilities and practice*. This includes *doctrinal deepening through practice* (but also through reason and study). He adds that its aim is behavior, life-practice. He extends catechesis pre-

---

[84] It is enough to read the first lines of his essays in order to capture his general context, especially the following: *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church* (2000), *A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry* (2000), *Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis* (2004), *Imagining an Inconvenient Church* (2008), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis* (2008).

occupation with maintaining the *'right environment'* in which 'discipleship' may be put into life.[85]

In addition to that, Warren has interested himself also to *the internal factors* and *external material conditions* that may greatly influence the achievement of Church's pastoral aim.[86] *Regarding the external material conditions*, he hypothesizes that *external culture* forms a *signifying system* that subtly influence the *fundamental personal decisions* of those *persons who enter the sacred space, by shaping the context of their daily decisions.*

The social external conditions *either* form a way of thinking squarely contrary to the Gospel *or* its way of manipulating realities ('media bombardment', for instance) may be adapted by the Church system itself.

Regarding the internal factors, he has traced how the internal human powers (memory, intellect, senses, etc.) put into practice or form a way of life under the *subtle coercion* of the external environment. Warren's more intelligible language would show how the *social imagination* influences the *religious culture* or *the norms of behavior* through *patterning perception electronically* (construction, shift, re-focus of images). In other words, Warren, recognizing the catechesis' very important role in contemporary Christian living, bestows it a faculty to counter *manipulated cultures* that are simply contrary to the Gospel.

---

[85] Warren's writings that underline this point are the following: *Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look* (2001) and *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008).

[86] Warren employs various scientific theories, *vid.*, WARREN, M., «Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church», cit.; WARREN, M., «Imagining an Inconvenient Church», cit., 41-60; WARREN, M., «The Imagination of Youth», cit., 61-74; WARREN, M., «Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis», cit., 18-26; WARREN, M., «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», cit., 199-212; WARREN, M., «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look», cit., 125-144.

It is indeed true that Warren's analysis present a negative outlook on culture. He wrote less about how external factors (like society's culture) may help in the better understanding and the living of the Gospel. The current "digital culture" does not only offer an opportunity of transmitting the Message of the Gospel, but also of reflecting more deeply the relationship of faith and the life of the Church to the changes man is facing in the contemporary times.[87]

However, it is admirable how Warren flawlessly communicates his catechetical positions employing the 'US catechetical parlance', that is, a way of communicating through *technical terms* used by social sciences. It must be written that in his employment of *conceptual categories* from social sciences in catechesis, he chooses and uses them critically.

Despite the abundance of scientific categories (which perhaps manifest his greater interest) in Warren's catechetical discussions, in the essays - *A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry* (2000), *Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look* (2001), *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2004), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), *Youth Ministry in an inconvenient Church* (2008) and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis* (2008) – he deals slightly with the nature of catechesis. It is interesting to note – even though he needs to perhaps write another book – his indication that catechesis is a task which has something to do with a fundamental and essential reality: Christian discipleship which takes place in the ecclesial community.

From the point of view of social sciences and his 'liberation' orientation, Warren's understanding of the *ekklesia* (local church) and of the Holy Eucharist is understandable. In his writings where he makes explicit reference to the Church and the Holy Eucharist -

---

[87] Cfr. BENEDICT XVI, *Address given to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications*, Vatican City, 28.

Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church (2000), *Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis* (2004), *Finalités et contenus représes pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2004), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), *Youth Ministry in an inconvenient Church* (2008) – the local community more or less serves as a storekeeper of memories or of practices which resuscitate practical response to the *sequel Christi*. But he also consistently affirmed that the community is always the first and fundamental subject of catechesis and permanent formation.

The Holy Eucharist, on its part, is presented with emphasis *on its being a sign* and less of its *being an effective sign.*

He interestingly points out catechesis' main interest on the transformation of behavior, of way of life, of practice, etc.. If he were to push through with that insight, an interesting catechetical paradigm shift will possibly happen: from his concern on "redefining the content of catechesis" to "a catechesis with a defined content".

PART 4: SYNTHESIS AND EVALUATION

This is the last part of the thesis. It has only one chapter. We attempt here to present a total evaluation of theological aspects of the writings of the proponents of the American catechetical movement, 'new catechetics'. It is convenient to recall the context provided by the new catechetics and, through the light of that context, examine the 2000-2010 writings of the principal American authors representing the USA catechesis.

CHAPTER VII. A SYNTHETIC ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE US CATECHESIS IN 2000-2010

After a detailed discussion of the catechetical doctrines held by our principal American authors exposed in their writings in 2000-2010, it is but proper to present now a synthesis and an short evaluation. This synthesis and evaluation includes the historical and theological background provided by the new catechetics movement in the USA (Chapter I), as well as the main ideas of the principal American authors in their recent writings (Chapter II-VI).

1. An anthropological and experiential insinuation of the 'new catechetics': a historical and theological background of the catechesis in the USA

In Part I, *The Historical and Theological Context of the Catechesis in the USA*, with only one chapter (*Chapter I The New Catechetics and the attention to human experience*), we have attempted to provide a historical and theological background to the catechesis in the USA in the first decade of the 21st century. This historical and theological background is necessary to understand the main focus of our work in the succeeding chapters: some theological aspects in the writings of principal US American catechists representing the US catechesis.

We figured out an important moment in the catechetical movement in the USA in the immediate years after Vatican II, the so-called 'new catechetics'. We then started our historical re-composition of the US catechesis from the said phenomenon with a special focus on the catechetical doctrines of the said movement's principal proponents.

It has to be noted that in this present work, despite of the many other important US American catechists at present, we have opted to maintain our focus on the main protagonists on the *new catechetics* and their writings in the first decade of the 21st century. In that way, we were able to trace and evaluate concretely the progress of the US catechesis, in particular the doctrines of principal American authors. The American authors we refer to are Gabriel Moran (University of New York, New York), James Michael Lee (University of Alabama, Birmingham), Thomas Groome (University of Boston, Boston), Berard Marthaler (Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.) and Michael Warren (St. John University, Jamaica, New York).

We figured out that *new catechetics* is associated with what authors consider as the 'Americanization' of the modern catechetical movement in the late 60s.

In our analysis, we indicate at least *four* general characteristics of the *new catechetics* in relation to the catechesis in the USA in general. *First*, the *new catechetics* has influenced the direction of catechesis in the USA towards giving ampler attention to the *anthropological-experiential dimension* of the reality of divine-human relationship. *Second*, it has anchored its study of the human reality to the human sciences such as sociology, pedagogy, psychology, and anthropology. *Third*, it explicitly presented a criticism on the traditional instructional method (cognitive centered) of catechesis and even the presentation of the *kerygma*. It proposed that catechesis extend its attention to making faith be palpable in and within the service of the community. Finally, *fourth*, the proponents of the *new catechetics* (at least those which we have taken up) proposed the modification of the understanding of the traditional catechesis (cognitive catechesis, memorization, etc.). Some, while recognizing traditional catechesis' efficiency during the first centuries of the Church, proposed a new form of educating in

faith, the so-called *religious education*. Religious education was designed to be ampler and more fitting to the culturally pluralistic social context of the present USA. Religious education was designed to incorporate the findings of human sciences and "speak" the language of the modern secular society. Some proponents also proposed the maintenance of the traditional name "catechesis" and offered a deeper understanding of the Church's catechetical task. By *deeper understanding*, we mean a catechesis which is directed to the reflection of Christian life through the Church's own catechetical traditional resources, that is, its practices, rites and symbols. All these, in any case, were attempts to overcome the then diffused perspective catechesis as a pure school instruction activity.

The *new catechetics* accompanied the eventual opening of the US catechetical reflection to all that which defines human situation – culture, society, and symbols. Thereupon, catechesis in the USA assumed what experts call 'a hermeneutical function towards experience'. Catechesis moved from being what was called 'a carrier of theological formulae' to being a key element to understanding the human reality enveloped by the divine. In reality, catechesis properly understood and done always aims towards maturity in Christian life. However, there was a certain tendency in the previous centuries to identify catechesis with 'mere learning doctrinal formulae', as so perceived by the modern catechetical movement.

We can therefore say that the *new catechetics* program in the USA set the transformation of the USA catechesis' understanding of the catechetical task from "instruction" to something which has something to do directly with living the Christian life. We reiterate that in reality, catechetical erudition is compatible with serving God in practical life. Anyway, the absence of a common term that may refer to the catechetical ministry of the Church among *new catechetics* authors is more than a semantic problem.

1.1. Moran: "the present relationship between man and God" as the object of catechesis

G. Moran criticized the instruction and memorization method of in the traditional catechesis and even the then popular kerygmatic catechesis. He contended that kerygmatic catechesis, like the traditional catechesis, *solely emphasized* the words and actions of Jesus *in the past*. He vied instead for an educational task concerned with the *present* action of the Jesus who has already resurrected from the dead, that is, the action of the Spirit-filled Jesus here and now in individual persons. The proposal of G. Moran concretely consisted in a 'religious education' focused on every human being's dynamic *experience of the divine*. He used the term 'revelation' in reference to that experience. He explained that such a *human* experience (of the divine) derived from the experience of the humanity of Jesus Christ on the cross (together with the Lord's resurrection), wherein the communion of the human and the divine was inaugurated.

In concrete, he sustained that there is a continuous revelation/communication between God and man. In *Theology of Revelation* (1966), Moran writes that (1) the contents of revelation are inseparable with the act of revealing, that is, God is one with his revealing act, and (2) the Jesus Christ in his passion and death (with his human body dying on the cross and rising from the dead) inaugurated this *continuous* divine-human communication or *revelation*. Moran therefore proposed a catechesis based on that concept of revelation, instead of "merely teaching doctrines and formulae". Hence, in *Catechesis of Revelation* (1966), Moran criticized the catechetical praxis of the then practiced kerygmatic catechesis and proposed a "catechesis" which was at the service of the 'ongoing revelation' phenomenon.

First, kerygmatic catechesis gave importance to catechesis in general in the knowledge of God. Moran, without denying that fact, sustained that even without catechesis, man may know God, because knowledge of God is first and foremost a divine initiative.[1]

Second, the kerygmatic catechesis considered as its sources liturgy, scriptures, doctrine and testimony or the so-called *four signs of catechesis*. Moran, on his part, sustained that there are more. He further pointed out the inadequacies of each *sign* in the contemporary times.[2]   Concerning *liturgy*, Moran comments that kerygmatic catechesis has limited itself to explaining religious symbolisms ignoring their significance to the children's contemporary experience. Concerning the *Bible*, Moran presents it as a narration of the people of Israel and of the apostles which documents their *privileged* experience with God; but according to him, it is not the only source of revelation. Regarding *testimony*, Moran comments kerygmatic catechesis interprets the narrations of the bible according to the human experience, instead of explaining human experience in the light of what the Bible says. Regarding doctrine and teachings,   he comments that kerygmatic catechesis holds dogmas more important than the inter-subjective relationship between man and God (revelation).

Third, he criticized kerygmatic catechesis' concept of history of salvation. Moran writes that kerygmatic catechesis understands history as a series of past events. Moran proposed instead of an idea of history as "man's self-awareness in time". Therefore, he proposed that history of salvation be understood or include the idea of "an

---

[1] MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit.*, 93-94.
[2] *Ibid.,* 94-95.

encounter of God and man in man's consciousness here and now". He added that any catechesis must depart that human experience.[3]

Fourth, he underlined the *freedom* of the students. In Moran's view, catechesis should serve as an interpreter of the divine-human experience present in each individual. Authors refer to this function as "the hermeneutical function of catechesis", that is, the clarifying of 'ongoing-revelation' experiences of individuals.

He clearly viewed a catechesis more attentive to the anthropological dimension, or to the divine-human communion. He called his proposal "religious education".

As G. Moran moved to the ecumenical and even more to an interreligious plane,[4] he seemed to extend such an intersubjective divine-human experience to all men and women. Thereafter, the Catholic's *catechesis*, in his perception, became a sort of a particular *intermediary activity* to the 'broader' religious education (as he understood it).[5]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, 95-96.

[4] Moran's interreligious interest may be traced even before the 1980s. See for instance, *Design for Religion: Towards Ecumenical Education* (1968) and *Catechesis, RIP* (1970), *The Intersection of Religion and Education* (1974), and his intervention in the 1977 Symposium in Boston College (about the new catechetics). They already carried the symptoms of Moran's *amplification of interest* in the 1980s.

[5] In *Religious Education Development. Images for the Future* (1983) and *Religious Education as Second Language* (1989), he considers catechesis as an intermediary state of the "broader" religious education. It seems that in his perspective, Moran saw the religious phenomenon as a broader field. In this religious field, each religion or "particular groups" (who holds a religion) does a sort of religious education. Religious education, in his view, consists of a "concretization" of this general religious experience common to all men. In this "process of concretization", particular customs (or the material expressions of subjective faith) called "beliefs" are necessary. Moran's perspective of catechesis as an intermediary of religious education may be understood in this context. Moreover, Moran considers religious

Within that interreligious context, Moran, in his writings in the 90s, developed amplified towards the practical consequences of his proposed concept of revelation. This time, he focused on (1) the field of ethics/morality, (2) on the practical concept of revelation in inter-religious dialogue, and (3) on the field of education.[6] It is interesting to note that in the first decade of the 21st century, Moran collates these *three principal themes* together with some variations in his re-proposal of his concept of *revelation*.[7]

---

education more adequate (than catechesis) to the pluralistic reality of contemporary society (cfr. *ibid.* 109-113).

[6] In the field of *ethics or morality*, he offered a concept of *responsibility* that is a moral consequence of revelation. For Moran, responsibility is basically the *ability of the person to respond* (response-ability). In this case, Moran focuses on the man's attitudes or reactions in front of the revealing God. he inserts his concept of freedom in this context. His book, *A Grammar of Responsibility* (1996), offers an exhaustive discussion. His main idea is: the *responsibility of every person over his or her actions* is determined by *the present relation he or she has with God* (revelation), and not by the demands of *human codes* or *prescriptions*.

In the field of the *dialogue with other religions*, Moran presents the idea of inclusive uniqueness. The main idea is that Christians may be different but not indifferent to other religions. Any religious may claim uniqueness but without excluding others. He claims that the concept of inclusive uniqueness is a consequence of looking at Christian life as a present relationship with God (revelation). His book *Uniqueness. Problem or Paradox in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (1992) exposes enough this idea.

In the field of *education*, particularly in *Showing How: The Act of Teaching* (1997), Moran, develops the idea of education as a metaphor of the God's dealing with man. His concept of revelation refers to the present divine-human interaction. As a metaphor of that divine-human interaction, the educating reality becomes a participation of God's act of educating.

[7] See for example *Both Sides* (2002), especially, Chapter 6 Responsibility and Revelation (133-161), Chapter 7 The Logic of Revelation (162-187), and Chapter 8 Revelation as Teaching and Learning (188-214). This is repeated in *Believing in a Revealing God* (2008), especially in Chapter 4 A responsible Church, Chapter 5 Christian Interpretation of Divine Revelation, and Chapter 7 Revealing-Believing as Teaching and Learning.

To conclude, with Moran, the *new catechetics* restored to catechesis its real focus: *Christian life*, or in G. Moran's intuition, *the present relationship between the God and man*. It deepened and expanded the object of catechesis – not only the *kerygma* in itself but the *kerygma at work in the present lives of persons*.

We must however say that his concept of *revelation* is not the same with what the Catholic tradition holds. The Catholic tradition understands "revelation" in a *proper* and *wider* sense. That is, revelation, properly speaking, had its *fullness* in Jesus Christ and was closed in the apostolic times. The Church recognizes other "revelations of God" in nature, in the wise men of old, or in the lives of holy men and women, but uses another term for it – *manifestations* or *communications* - in order to avoid confusion. His use of "revelation" however reminds the concept of *semina Verbi*, a patristic term which was employed to designate, in fact, truths found in other cultures. The Church later employed the expression to refer to the truths the Holy Spirit left in other religions.

Moran seems to avoid saying that Jesus Christ works today in the Church through the Holy Spirit. He seems to prefer the affirmation that Jesus works today in individual persons (revelation) through the Holy Spirit. His concept of present revelation is more or less based on it. However, he seems to have difficulty in admitting that the words and actions of Jesus of Nazareth, preserved by the Church in the Scriptures and Tradition, is revelation. We therefore ask: was Jesus of Nazareth God or not? Was the Holy Spirit at work only after the resurrection of our Lord?

1.2. Lee: the "empirical dimension" of the human-divine relation and the use of human sciences in religious instruction

John Michael Lee IV, on his part, had pushed through in attending to the anthropological reality with the employment of

social sciences. In particular, Lee devised a social science method capable of detecting the empirical progress of the practice of faith in Christian life (as he claimed).[8] Furthermore, it is no surprise that at the moment of determining the identity of the teaching of the catholic faith in the contemporary times, he stands in favor of 'religious education' than in the traditional 'catechesis'.

In *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (1971), Lee lays down the *rationale* for his opted approach. M. Martorell writes that in this book, Lee presents a religious instruction based, not on theology, but on social sciences,[9] on the nature and methods of improving the *teaching act* (and the other factors that condition learning).[10]

If in the first book, Lee highlighted the teaching-learning activity as the central point in the social science approach to religious instruction, in *The Flow of Religious Instruction. A Social Science Approach* (1973), he sought to explain the process of "learning" religion through instruction. Giving valuable importance to the centrality of experience in the process of learning, he considered teaching a task of configuring human experiences. This is realized through the selection of experiences adequate to the *four variables* which composes the single teaching-learning activity (teacher, student, subject, and conditions of learning). In the case of religious education, the experience being dealt with is the *faith-experience* of students. Since the beginning of the process, *the act of religious instruction* modifies

---

[8] JM Lee's macrotheory, the social science approach to religious education, is systematically exposed in three books published within the decades of 70s-80s. The following writings of JM Lee present his fundamental ideas on religious education: *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (1971), *The Flow of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1973), and *The Content of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1985). It is not difficult to imagine how much influence his approach had to many educators and catechetical leaders in USA within this period and after.

[9] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Catequesis en Estados Unidos…., cit.,* 117.

[10] Cfr. *ibid.,* 120-126.

'faith' in the process and the other variables that intervenes in its (faith's) development. A new reality is created at the end: *faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting.* Here the new reality (faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting) is qualified as an experience. Inasmuch as it is composed of set of experiences or acts (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), it is further qualified as a *lifestyle.* That *lifestyle* is conditioned by psychological, sociological, and physical factors. In this case faith seems to be *a psychological product*, or in Lee's terms, *a 'construct'.* Citing Lee, Martorell explains that a *construct* is a concept which has the added meaning of having been deliberately invented or consciously adopted for particular purpose. It is functional by nature. In addition, Martorell notes that the *construct of faith* is necessarily inexact, probable and mutable.

Parallel with Lee's systematization of social sciences at the service of religious instruction is his total detestation of theology. He considers theology as purely cognitive and the religious education based on theological sciences incapable of reaching the same results obtained through social sciences. According to Martorell's view, Lee holds modern catechesis to be still dependent on a rationalist theology. Unfortunately, nobody in our times hold such a concept of theology anymore. Theology is not a purely cognitive science. It is *sapience* or wisdom, a science which affects the cognitive, affective, experiential, and social dimensions of reality.

In any case, for Lee, the theological approach seems to remain in the cognitive dimension and less (or nil) in the practical or experiential dimension. The educational approach - then imbued by the advances of other social sciences as psychology, pedagogy, sociology, together with the Marxist leaning educational ideologies common in those times – foments the experiential dimension in teaching religion. It deals with elements which are verifiable, measurable and modifiable (behaviours, intellectual constructs,

thinking patterns, and the like). From the educational point of view, Lee's approach deals scientifically well the experiential dimension of teaching-learning in the teaching of the faith.

However, we think that the positive treatment of experience of the social science approach brings with it an innate difficulty. Lee's religious instruction deals with phenomena or behaviors or experiences. We hold however that those phenomena, behaviors or experiences involved in religious instruction do not have only empirical dimension (and therefore measureable or verifiable more or less by scientific processes); they also bring in themselves something *coherently divine* visible through the eyes of faith. In other words, religious education deals not only with modifiable *intellectual constructs*, but of *mysteries of the faith*.

Again in 1977 at the Boston Symposium, Lee summarized his principles regarding the nature of catechesis or religious education in a speech titled *Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction* (1977).

Like Moran, he vied for the relinquishment of the traditional term 'catechesis' in favor of the anglo-american term 'religious education'. He singled out that "catechesis" originally formed part of an educational system (*kerygma-catechesis-didascalia*) in the primitive Church. In that educational system, catechesis only referred to a tiny part: the 'oral' and 'cognitive' instruction imparted to beginners 'about the rudiments of the Christian religion'.

Lee therefore intuited that "catechesis" is distinct from the total educational task of the Church. With that intuition, Lee wanted a broader name for the Church's task of educating in faith and which may include within it the cognitive and instruction focused "catechesis". He thus proposed the *religious instruction*. In addition to

that, he judged to be outdated that the intramural term "catechesis" in the pluralistic and ecumenical academic ambiance.[11]

Second, Lee reiterates the fundamental elements of religious instruction mentioned in his anterior works. Referring specifically to teaching religion, he applies the four basic elements in an 'instruction event', namely, the teacher, the learner, the substantive content, and the environment.[12] Moreover, he endows a role of mediation to *the teaching act* in the processing of the student's *experience of faith*.[13]

Third, M. Martorell notes that Lee seems to simply reduce faith into mere human experience processed or elaborated into an *intellectual construct*.[14] Inasmuch as it is a human behavior, it is understood to be composed of cognitive, affective and psychomotor operations. As an *experience*, Lee defends the fittingness therefore of social sciences – neither the theological sciences nor the Magisterium - as that which should study and systematize those individual faith-experiences.[15]

Lee's approach to religious education seems to fall short in a theological evaluation of the *experience of faith*. He dedicated the third book of his trilogy, *The Content of Religious Instruction. A Social Science*

---

[11] *Ibid.*, 43ff. (cited from MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 132-133.

[12] LEE, J. M. IV, «Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction», cit., 291.

[13] *Ibid.*, 291ff (cited from MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 120-121).

[14] Cfr. *ibid.*, 136-137.

[15] Cfr. *ibid.*, 122-123, 136-137. *Vid.* also NEWELL, E. J., *"Education Has Nothing to Do with Theology": James Michael Lee's Social Science Instruction* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series), Princeton: Pickwick Publications, 2006. This is the most recent study concerning JM Lee's doctrine. In this book, Newell focuses, in particular, JM Lee's view on the relationship between theology and social science in religious education.

Approach (1985), to the discussion of the "substantive content" of religious instruction, that is, religion, or faith transformed into practice, into day to day life.

In *Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always* (1988)[16], he discussed the relationship of the Church and its educational task to faith. Here, Lee closely identified catechesis with the Catholic Church's pastoral activity.[17] Lee attributed education to the pastoral solicitude of the Church; however, instead of seeing the hierarchy's tie with the teaching action of the Church as a service, as Christ intended it, Lee viewed the hierarchy as a sort of an entity extrinsic to faith and therefore, its relation to the teaching ministry, a sort of a manipulation.[18] For him, religious instruction was a science governed by principles deriving from *faith-elaborated-by-experience*. From this perspective, catechesis, being governed by an external authority, that is, the Church Magisterium, stood outside the category of religious instruction.[19]

Despite of his apparent biases regarding the ecclesiastical authority over catechesis and its disqualification for being an authentic religious instruction, Lee recognizes a certain dosage of catechesis necessary for the Catholic Church and for its members' initial stages.[20] He is however convinced that the maturity of Church members lies not in catechesis but in religious instruction.[21] We opine the contrary: religious education and catechesis do not exclude

---

[16] LEE, J. M. IV, «Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always», in MARY, M. (ed.), *Does the Church Really Want Religious Education. An Ecumenical Inquiry*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1988, 32-66.

[17] *Ibid.,* 37.

[18] Cfr. *ibid.*, 59-60.

[19] *Ibid.*, 43.

[20] Cfr. *ibid.*, 64.

[21] *Ibid.*

each other, but need each other to attain the maturity in faith of the Church's members.

We have two observations. *First*, we observe that in Lee's perspective of faith, *God's part* remains unelaborated. *Second*, we note that the Lee's interpretation of the Magisterium as a 'manipulator' because of its 'external location' to the teaching act is too simplistic. Any teacher may 'manipulate' the *substantive* and *structural* contents of teaching towards a desired end, the truth. In this case, the Magisterium seeks the same truth (converted into charity) which the Holy Spirit promotes *from the interior* of the Christian's soul. But the fact that the Holy Spirit may act upon the soul *from the outside*, that is, through the Magisterium, does not mean that the same Holy Spirit is 'extrinsic' to the Christian. The Christian forms part of the living Church, the mystical body of Christ, who is animated by the Holy Spirit.

Lee went further asserting that faith is facilitated and caused by religious instruction.[22] Before giving a judgment, it must be mentioned that Lee made the assertion from the perspective of his social science theory (which considers faith as an intellectual construct). From the theological point of view, Lee's assertion was not Roman Catholic. Faith is a gift from God.

We opine that Lee could have been consistent to his social science theory stance. The empirical manifestations of living faith may be detected by human sciences. He ascertained it. However, claiming that social sciences may cause faith is squarely in opposition to the truth: God grants faith, not the catechist nor a religious education founded on the best scientific methods. In addition to

---

[22] LEE, J. M. IV, «Facilitating Growth in faith Through Religious Education», in LEE, J. M. IV, (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1990, 264-302.

that, any authentic science deals and at the same time respects the nature of religion.

Religion, even if it has empirical aspect (the beliefs, the practices, the number of followers, etc.), is an affair with deals with non-empirical realities (divine truths). Religious instruction may therefore deal directly with religion's empirical dimension, and indirectly and respectfully, its non-empirical aspects. Theology, on the other hand, deals with divinely revealed truths held by a religion. Theological and human sciences study religion from different planes, but they need each other in the educational task, like catechesis or religious education, aimed at maturity in Christian life.

Furthermore, Lee seemed not to take seriously the ecclesial dimension of faith. The Christian experience is not merely a personal experience. It is always an experience *within* a community, within a 'living body', the 'historical subject' we usually denominate as Church, People of God, Mystical Body, Temple of the Holy Spirit. The Church is the mystery of communion living in time (and therefore with a structure) in order to be a universal sacrament of salvation.

1.3. Groome: the "sharing" within the community of the human-divine experience or "praxis"

With *christian religious education*, Thomas Groome offered another alternative model of education in faith. It was an education characterized by (1) a "sharing" or mutual exchange of (2) "praxis" or faith-filled experiences.[23] There are two ideas which are

---

[23] M. Martorell presents Th. Groome's shared praxis approach to catechesis as an *alternative*, something that may possibly substitute catechesis. Synthesizing Th. Groome's three principal writings of the late 70s up to the 90s - *Christian Education for Freedom. A "Shared-Praxis" Approach* (1977), *Christian Religious Education.*

principally involved in Groome's proposal: a community as place of mutual exchange *(sharing)*, and a faith which lived and a life imbued with faith *(praxis)*.

For Th. Groome, therefore, *educating in faith by way of shared praxis* is [1] applying one's faith traditions, convictions, symbols (and the like) to day to day living, [2] within a community of *primus inter pares*, and [3] as a community, they resolve how to apply the 'faith' shared by all in the concrete here and now.

Groome shared the "popular" prejudice of those times which considered the Church's traditional catechesis as purely an instruction-cognitive activity. For him, catechesis is basically *oral* teaching (informative in nature) suited and effective in the context of the ancient Church. He thinks that filling it with formative and experiential dimension in order to adjust it to the contemporary times would be equal to destroying its efficacy.[24] He was well aware of the "knowing-being dichotomy" prevalent in pedagogical sciences during that time which dominated also even in catechesis. In line

---

Sharing Our Story and Vision (1980), and *Sharing Faith. A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry* (1991), M. Martorell comes up with the following description of how *the teaching of the faith through shared praxis* should take place.

As a pedagogical approach, it has the following characteristics or moments: (1) there is one common theme or an activity which is suppose to capture the interest and involve those present (generative theme), (2) each one gives his or her critical assessment on the generative theme, (3) a *christian story or vision* is made accessible to all, (4) a dialectical comparison of the *christian story or vision* with the actual praxis will be made, and (5) the community decides to compromise to plan of action geared towards the fulfillment of God's reign.[23] Th. Groome employs the so-called 'Christian Story/Vision' to refer to the Christian version of living or practicing the universal religious phenomenon. Moreover, that Christian way of realizing the religious phenomenon present in all cultures is characterized by its concrete objective (vision) – the furthering of God's reign here on earth and in the next.

[24] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 163.

with the rising interest of religious education on human experience, Groome made *praxis*, a concept which reconciled knowledge and action, as the main element in the education-sharing activity of the community.

In addition to that, he simply did not agree to the idea of updating the "traditional" catechesis for the simple reason that, in his view, it is effective in the historical context in which it was invented, that is, in the first centuries of the primitive Church. He vied instead for a "new" way of teaching the faith apt for our times which incorporates the contributions of sacred sciences (Scripture, Theology, etc.), and of human sciences (pedagogy, psychology, sociology, etc.).[25]

Groome's *praxis* is a principal idea for understanding his understanding of *faith*, *revelation* and even of the understanding of "vision", "horizon" of education-sharing task. He refers to "God's reign" as the "political" program of the education-sharing task. For him, the *faith* involved in the education-sharing task had a necessary consequence, that is, *the furthering of God's reign* here and now.[26] It consists of the establishment of *God's desire of peace and justice, love, order, etc.* for man, starting now here on earth until the afterlife.

The theological setbacks of this proposal lie, *first*, in its concept of a community without an official teaching authority; the value of the teaching act of each member is radically equal. This idea is squarely distinct from a hierarchically structured Church. *Second*, there is therefore no Magisterium, which may "officially" hold what the community holds as "its" truth or may "authoritatively" interpret

---

[25] Cfr. *ibid.*, 165-168.
[26] Cfr. *ibid.*

Scriptures and Tradition. *Third*, the contents of the faith "shared" or the praxis are simply not clear.

According to M. Martorell, Th. Groome distinguishes *faith* from the *Christian faith*.[27] On one hand, faith, for Groome is the *a priori* 'gift from God' which disposes a person towards relationship with the divine. Christian faith, on the other hand, refers to the *specific faith tradition* to which the Christian community nurtures its members. With the philosophical foundation exposed above in mind, Th. Groome seems to consider these two 'faiths', not as different and separate kinds but two *dimensions* in the exercise of *one single reality* called 'faith'.[28]

In M. Martorell's observation, Th. Groome identifies the *Christian faith* - the specification of that general understanding of *religious* faith – with the *Christian story and vision*.[29] The term 'Christian Story' refers to one particular version of the universal story of religious phenomenon. Its descriptive word 'christian' associates that Story with a distinctive inseparable Vision, that is, the furthering of God's reign from this moment up to hereafter.

Faith in general, distinct from Christian faith (discussed above), seems to be more related to his concept of *divine revelation*. Such a faith refers to the general attitude or disposition for "divine revelation". For him, revelation refers to God's entrance into time to encounter man; it is therefore a divine-human encounter in time/world.   But unlike Moran who only emphasizes God's revelation at present and puts aside revelations in the past, Groome

---

[27] Cfr. *ibid.*, 147.

[28] GROOME, TH., *Sharing Faith…*., cit., 18 [quoted by MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis…*., cit., 148].

[29] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis…*., cit., 148-149.

holds that in revelation's *historical* realization, God's 'entrance in time' in the past has *an intimate relation* with his revelations at present.

For Groome, the divine revelations which happened in the past are those which are recorded in sacred beliefs, symbols and customs. He considers them as "useful reference tools" in interpreting revelations that occur at present. He considers Scripture and Tradition as 'normative in guiding the collective discernment of the divine designs' here and now.

Conversely, past divine revelations are re-interpreted with the 'new' revelations taking place at present. There is therefore an intimate relation between the revelations in the past and those which happens at present. In addition to that, he believes that every divine revelation (may it be that in the past or that which has taken place at present) is *open* to re-interpretations.

In any case, he does not mention about the fullness of revelation which culminated in Jesus Christ and which is sealed in the apostolic times, as the Christian tradition holds.

Finally, for Th. Groome, the task of interpreting revelation or what he calls "a hermeneutical mediation" is crucial. Revelation has to be mediated. Groome endows the role of hermeneutical mediation to the Church. The Church is the official interpreter of God's communiqués to mankind. But what does he intend for Church? He intends for "church" as a community of disciples of Christ, a community which exercises a transforming influence in the world.[30] In addition to that, Groome sustains that a church is an

---

[30] Th. Groome basis this axiom on E. Troeltsch's classification of predominant social forms of Christianity: church, sect and mysticism. According to that classification, mystical type of church refers to an agglomeration of individual persons driven by 'inner spiritual experiences and dispositions' but without a formal religious structure whatsoever. A sect, on its part, is a group of

inclusive community of partnership, inclusive discipleship of equals.[31]   Despite of Th. Groome's evident difficulty of emphasizing the importance of the lay faithful and participation in the teaching mission of the Church (without undermining the part of the hierarchy), *his model of the church* encourages dialogue, community life and dynamic relationship among members.   Moreover, in that ecclesial model, the *services* of ordained ministers appear to be an appointment from God enacted through the lay people's consensus.

M. Martorell rightly notes Th. Groome's ecclesial model repercussions in his understanding of *the teaching dimension* of the Church.   As a Church among equals, Th. Groome distributes the teaching authority *equally* among three entities: (1) *the official teaching office associated with pastoral authority* (to pronounce officially the faith consensus of the community), (2) the *theologians* (their researches and investigations), and (3) the *sensus fidelium* (the discernment of the

---

persons characterized by their common desire to strictly observe Christian values apart from a hopeless world. The church type is a community of persons characterized by its openness to all, its dependence on God's grace, and its social influence in whatever context it is formed. It is on this third sense that Th. Groome affirms the community of disciples to be a church (cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis…*, cit., 156).

[31] M. Martorell writes that Th. Groome's concept is inspired by E. S. Fiorenza's *inclusive discipleship of equals* (cfr. *ibid.*, 157). This perspective sees in another light the nature of the Church, its mission, its structures and functions. Th. Groome in fact, in order the sustain that radical equality employs the *designated Christian ministry* (a function entrusted by the community and corresponding to a gift of the Spirit) and the *Christian universal ministry* (a prerogative of all members of the church by virtue of being members of the body of Christ and therefore co-responsible for Christ's mission) to explain the various offices in the Church. As M. Martorell rightly observes, such a distinction has a negative consequence to his understanding of the hierarchical constitution of the Church as well as of the Holy Orders (especially in matters like the gift of celibacy and the traditional masculine priesthood) (cfr. *ibid.*, 159).

people).[32] Again, here, an effort to explain the shared responsibility of all baptized in the teaching mission of the Church where everybody belongs is evident. While his emphasis on the part of the researches of theologians and the teaching role of the lay faithful may indeed help discover their fundamental right to exercise the prophetic function, he elaborates less of its relationship to the ordained ministers' exercise of the same teaching function.

Groome continued to advance his concept of educating in faith in a Church without a hierarchical role. At the end of the 20th century, he focused his attention on task of educating in faith, especially *of* 'non-clerical' educators (parents and teachers). He centered on the philosophy of education of parents and teachers which is based on spiritual values. Those spiritual values according to him are constituted of convictions emanating from *faith*. We must say that despite of the geniality of Groome's philosophy of education based on faith-inspired spirituality, his concept of *faith* continued to be in need of theological clarification.

In *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent* (1998), he therefore proposed a spiritual vision which

---

[32] M. Martorell comments that Th. Groome tends to limit the function of the Magisterium to the mere confirmation of the *sensus fidelium*. She also observes that Th. Groome positively recognizes the work of theological experts in the shaping of what the Church holds as her faith. Th. Groome holds a so-called *hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed*, that is, of those who are directly involved in the works of promoting justice and peace, those who are combating the plague of hunger and sickness, etc.. He attributes them a sort of *knowing better* in the practical dimension of reality which the Church confronts. Th. Groome underlines the contribution of each of *his* three sources the Church's magisterium. In our opinion, his thought needs to be completed with a specific discussion of the exercise of that teaching authority by the bishops of the whole world in communion with the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and customs (LG 23, 25) and of the Roman Pontiff's exercise of it as Vicar of Christ and Pastor of the whole Church (LG 23).

permeates the education agent's soul and his teaching. It was an educational philosophy founded on Catholic religion's *substantial* spiritual outlook. He further claimed that like other philosophies, it is *humanizing* (helping the students to be more human) and *universal or catholic* (may be adapted by teacher of whatever religious or denominational background).

Having in mind his shared praxis approach, Th. Groome pairs this proposed philosophy of education with a *humanizing* pedagogy which permits the *spiritual character* of his vision to influence into concrete reality. This intent is embedded in his famous phrase – *to bring faith to life and to bring life to faith* or *an overall dynamic of from Life to Tradition to Life, to Tradition to Life to Tradition.*[33]

Therefore, Th. Groome postulated that Catholicism's *substantial* characteristics or *core convictions* may offer a spiritual vision on which an educational philosophy may be founded. It had to be noted however that Th. Groome, in his writings, used the term 'catholic' to mean primarily as 'universal', regardless whether one is a Roman Catholic or a Christian protestant.

For the interest of our study – the theological aspects – we may focus more on those characteristics which Th. Groome considers substantial of Catholicism (and relevant to education not only in within the religious realm, but also in the realm of *life*) and less on his discussion on how to make them operative in the teaching activity. He therefore believed that Catholicism has (1) a positive perspective of man (*positive anthropology*), (2) a perspective of the world (*a sacramental consciousness*), (3) a perspective of *community life* which fosters commitment to relationship and community, (4) a perspective

---

[33] This *touch of reality* characteristic of his pedagogical process is a cycle. It involves 'an endless and creative exchange of between learners' own lives in the world and the legacy those before and around them' (cfr. *ibid.*, 429-440).

of *time and history* which fosters appreciation for tradition, cultivating for reason and wisdom of life, and (5) the *three* principal (or he terms it *cardinal*) *commitments* of fostering holistic spirituality, formation in social justice, and inculcating a catholic world view. All these *four perspectives* (*speculative* in nature) and the *three practical* commitments of Catholic Christianity, Th. Groome holds, forms a spiritual vision on which his proposed educational philosophy may be grounded.[34]

The *first* claim, that is, that Catholicism offered a *positive anthropology*,[35] Th. Groome, through the term *person*, presented man as 'an agent who initiates one's own actions and yet finds human identity in relationships'.

For the *second* claim – that Catholicism offers a cosmological perspective, or what he calls, *a sacramental consciousness*[36] - Th. Groome departed from, what he claims to be catholic conviction, that 'God mediates Godself to humankind' through the world He created 'directly or in partnership with humankind'. Therefore, he continued that man, on his part, receives God's grace and discovers God's desire for him through, *in his words*, 'nature and the created order, through human culture and society, through our minds and bodies, hearts and souls, through our labors and efforts, our creativity and generativity, in the depth of our own beings and through our relationships with others, through the events and experiences that

---

[34] The distinction *perspectives-commitments* are important to note. Th. Groome hints that they function in a different mode. Perspective refers to Catholicism's mental framework while commitment, to its operational framework. See Th. Groome's explanation in Chapter 7 where he starts with the first commitment, that is fostering holistic spirituality (GROOME, TH., *Educating for Life….*, cit., 322).

[35] Cfr. *ibid.*, 67-116. This covers chapter 2 of the book, titled *A Good People: "God's own Image and Likeness"*. Th. Groome's perspective of man is completed with chapter 4 (chapter 2-3 included). While chapter 2 focuses on man as a person in a community, chapter 4 underlines the community as composed of persons.

[36] Cfr. *ibid.*, 117-170.

come our way, through what we are doing and what is 'going on' around us, through everything and anything of our world'.

This therefore, he continued, encourages and forms *the sacramental imagination or consciousness*. Somewhere, he simplified his explanation of sacramental consciousness as 'to see God in everything' or 'to encounter and to respond to God through the medium of the world'.

For the *third* claim – that Catholicism has a sociology which encourages *commitment to relationship and community* - Th. Groome claimed that Catholicism affirms the individuality of persons but at the same time believes that the community is, in his words, *the primary context for being saved* and *becoming human*. These two elements of the communal context – *being saved* and *becoming human* – led Groome to affirms that, for Catholicism, the Church as a community of persons, works for *God's reign* here and now and for the society's *common good*. The Church's working for God's reign, he wrote, is made concrete through specific tasks or ministry – *koinonia* (a *welcoming* community), *kerygma* (a *word-of-God* community), *leitourgia* (a *worshipping* community), *diakonia* (a community of *welfare*), and *marturia* (a *witnessing* community).

For the *fourth* claim – a Catholic perspective of time and history – Th. Groome wrote, basing on the previous claims that Catholicism fosters, what he calls, a *critical appreciation* of tradition and an occasion of exercising *human agency* in handing on the tradition (by discerning what is God's reign here in now). Here, Th. Groome, went back to his idea that Catholicism regards history as a privileged locus for the human-divine encounter. As he wrote in the previous chapters, God mediates his divinity through the world; man in his turn discovers, and eventually responsibly responds, the divine plans in that same world. Therefore, he claimed that this perspective

fosters a certain attitude towards things of the past – tradition – that is not purely passive but of *critical appreciation*. With his human agency, man has the task *to evaluate and discern* in tradition the elements of God's reign and *to appropriate* them to the present with view of the future.

This attitude towards tradition permeated by the Catholic core convictions, Th. Groome believed, clarifies three important realities: *the natures and relationship of Scripture and Tradition*, *the blending of faith and culture*, *Catholicism's long time commitment to humanizing education*.[37]

According to Th. Groome's observation, the Church has the tendency to overemphasize Tradition and thereby falls to authoritarianism. He therefore vied for a *real partnership* of the two *primordial media of God's revelation*. He believed Scriptures provide Tradition 'the guidance of an original identity to which it (Tradition) must be faithful', while Tradition on its part 'lends vitality' to the Scriptures.[38] Tradition animates Scripture provided that Tradition itself must be continually revitalized by being reinterpreted according to contemporary understanding and living of biblical faith, and he adds too, 'in the light of changing circumstances and contemporary consciousness'[39].

Th. Groome commented on the absolute authority given to Tradition (to the depreciation of Scripture) in the Church's teaching

---

[37] Taking up *the natures and relationship between Scriptures and Tradition*, we begin recalling that for Th. Groome, tradition is a legacy of history; history is a medium of divine revelation; therefore, tradition carries with it *sparks* of divine revelation. Man therefore (in this framework) may *respond and appreciate* God's revelation which he discovers in tradition and, by his human agency, may *creatively* appropriate it to the 'needs of the present times', thus continuing the weaving of tradition. In this framework, Th. Groome considers Scriptures and Tradition as the 'original' and 'cumulative' symbols of God's self-disclosure over time (cfr. *ibid.*, 242-245).

[38] *Ibid.*, 238.
[39] *Ibid.*, 242.

activity and to the teaching authority of the Church itself. He underlined that the teaching authority of magisterium cannot be limited to the 'institutional magisterium' but 'to the whole community of the body of Christ, including all the baptized Christians'.[40] In addition to that, while he appreciated the importance of Tradition's authority in the Church's teaching task, he vied, on the other hand, for the constant re-interpretation or a sort of a constant updating of Tradition so as to avoid the pitfall of authoritarianism.[41]

The other two themes to which Th. Groome traced his concept of tradition are *in Catholicism's inculturation* and *its consistent commitment to humanizing education*. For the humanizing education, he simply presented the Church's tradition (small *t*) of favoring in its education curricula the study of humanities, arts, and sciences.

For inculturation, Th. Groome pointed out the Catholic faith's 'strong disposition' to blend with culture, or faith's capacity to be a way of life. He claimed that the usual tendency of inculturation is *encouraged* by Christians' (including therefore *Catholics*) 'strong position on the reality of Incarnation'.[42] He added in that 'sentiment to inculturate Christian faith' the support of 'a positive anthropology, the principle of sacramentality, and emphasis on community'.[43]

---

[40] Once again, he revoked his three cooperative sources of teaching and learning in the Church – the research of the scholars, the discernment of ordinary people of faith, and the official magisterium of the papacy/episcopacy (cfr. *ibid.*, 241-242). Here he underlines the *cooperation* of the three and the official magisterium's role as *consensus builder*, and that authority in the church must 'always leave room for freedom of conscience', without specifying in which *state* the conscience is found.

[41] Cfr. *ibid.*, 242-245.

[42] Cfr. *ibid.*, 224

[43] For the explanations of these terms, please refer to the four *claims* discussed previously.

Discussing *the cardinal commitments* of fostering holistic *spirituality*, formation in *social justice*, inculcating a *catholic world view*, Th. Groome explained that these three define the identity of Catholicism by 'helping compose the esprit de corps that makes Catholic Christianity distinctive' and that 'each is significant to a philosophy and spirituality for teachers and parents'.[44]

The characteristics of Christian *spirituality* are (1) it originates from God, (2) it is a human desire toward God, a human affinity to turn toward God (which God himself implanted in man), (3) it is a human-divine partnership, (4) it is a God-conscious way of life in relationship, (5) a necessity for human wholeness, (6) it is a call to holiness with justice and compassion, (7) it is the way of living discipleship with Jesus Christ, (8) it is a way of living in solidarity with everyone in the whole, (9) it is a work of the Holy Spirit.

Th. Groome in commenting the Church's distinctive commitment to justice underlines, among others, the following characteristics: it is done after the example of Jesus' promotion of God's reign, done with a special favor for the poor, done as partners in God's intentions of shalom by living a faith that does justice for peace, for the common good.[45] For the Church's commitment to have a universal point of view, Th. Groome underlines the radical treatment without distinction that the Church should have, the idea which he has in an inclusive community of disciples.[46] The context of this idea is what he claims as sectarian and parochial mindsets still present in the Church. His insistence on the radical equality among members of the Church has allowed himself to discover the 'right and responsibility' of *lay people* (he does not use the term) to catechize

---

[44] Cfr. *ibid.*, 322.
[45] Cfr. *ibid.*, 360-378.
[46] Cfr. *ibid.*, 395-413.

or to educate in faith by reason of their baptism. A downside of his ecclesial paradigm is the putting aside of the 'share' of those who received Sacrament of Holy Orders in the Mystical Body's teaching function.

1.4. Marthaler and Warren: catechesis as a socialization process

Another social science-filled proposal for understanding an anthropological-experiential catechesis was the so-called socialization process. Its first Catholic proponents were Marthaler and Warren. There are many socialization models. In any case, catechesis as socialization theory deals with the managing of the group's own liturgical symbols and belief system with the specific aim of forming a particular religious identity. Catechesis as socialization process would include the so-called world-maintenance or the maintenance of the ambiance conducive for fomentation of religious identity.

1.4.1. Marthaler: catechesis as the nurture of Christian life (human-divine experience) within the community

Catechesis, for Marthaler, was a matter of managing "beliefs" or "symbolic". The focus on belief system than on doctrines or practices may have been advantageous. The realm of beliefs, *on one hand*, intensifies the holding on to unchanging doctrines; *on the other hand*, it in a way animates the doing of religious practices. The realm of beliefs does not deal directly with doctrines, a general catechetical prejudice associated with the traditional catechesis. Neither it did deal directly and purely with practices and social religious activities. Marthaler at times use the term 'catechesis of symbolics'.

Among the books and essays he wrote in the 70s, there are two essays which Marthaler presented in the CTSA which presented the main his main thoughts on catechesis as a socialization process. In *Catechesis and Theology* (1973), the paper he presented to the CTSA

in 1973, Marthaler presented *GCD*'s definition of catechesis as one of the forms of the Ministry of the Word. He wrote that catechesis 'ministers' the Word, not systematizing and analyzing it (as theology does). It (catechesis) simply presents the Word (not excluding, of course, theological rigor). Marthaler however accurately indicated that the 'catechetical presentation' of the Word aims not only to man's *cognitive dimension* but to the whole person. It is noteworthy that as early as this point, *Marthaler already indicates catechesis 'going beyond' the kerygmatic catechetical approach.* He claims that *GCD* – while adopting the framework of the kerygmatic approach – gives catechesis an identity of its own: *a move in the direction of the so-called 'anthropological catechesis'.*[47]

As such, he therefore underlined the importance both of *theological and human sciences* in catechesis. In addition to that, he also pointed out *the importance of the role of the community* that *GCD* gives in the introduction or familiarization of catholic individuals to its symbols and rituals which 'communicate the meaning and values of the gospel message'. For him, community is the keeper of tradition

---

[47] MARTHALER, B., «Catechesis and Theology», cit., 262. He vied for Lonergan's idea of 'functional specialties' in understanding catechesis' role towards the Word. Basing on it, catechesis and theology are considered as specialized functions in the one service or ministry to the Word. *Vid.* LONERGAN, B., *Method in Theology* (1972), for the 8 functional specialties in theology (research, interpretation, history, dialectics, foundations, doctrines, systematic, and communications).   According   to   Marthaler,   catechesis   is   found   in 'communications', which means, it moves in the theology's *external* relations (with history culture, art, media communications, etc.). With the Lonergan framework, catechesis pretends to go beyond the task of theology (characterized with 'managing' the foundational symbols necessary to communicate the Gospel message).

and meaning of the common faith, and it is in that believing community that catechesis best functions.[48]

Again, in a paper presented to the CTSA in 1976, *To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith* (1976), Marthaler made clear that catechesis is concerned also with "learning" the contents of faith (but not like the way theology does) through the "familiarization" of the community's rites, formulae, symbols which "provokes" and "confirms" adhesion to the contents of faith. He likewise added that in this bi-polar schema (learning and socializing) the importance of human sciences in catechesis, especially in relating 'learning doctrines-socialization into rituals and practices' to 'the concrete conditions of human existence'.[49]

In his essay delivered in Boston College in 1977, Marthaler aimed among others at determining the nature of the Catholic Church's catechetical ministry (in the USA) in the contemporary times. He defended the theory that maintains catechesis as socialization of its members to the Catholic Christian religion.

Basing on M. Martorell's careful study of Marthaler's socialization model, we lay down three general points here of Marthaler's doctrine.

First, catechesis forms part of the Catholic Church's pastoral ministry. In his defense of catechesis as socialization of the Church's members to its creeds and traditions, Martorell indicates that Marthaler together with M. Warren defends the Church's primary responsibility

---

[48] As can be alluded, Marthaler associates catechesis with the idea of socialization. If in Boston Symposium in 1977, he talks already of catechesis as socialization, well in this point of time, Marthaler writes of 'catechesis as an *aspect* of socialization' (*Ibid*, 265).

[49] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., «To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith», cit., 232-233.

to educate her members in the faith entrusted to her by the Lord. This idea is basically traceable to *GCD* 10-35, that catechesis is one of the Church's services to the Word. From his commentary of the *GCD*, that is, in *Catechetics in Context: Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory* (1973), Marthaler maintained this idea in subsequent writings. Indeed, after the entrance of a person to the Church, a deepening in knowledge and practice of the faith he or she received in baptism is realized through catechesis. Catechesis rightly corresponds to the natural human need to know more about Jesus Christ after having been initiated member or Jesus' community or family. Thus, in the Church total effort to transmit, lead, and form her members, catechesis forms an important part.

Second, catechesis is, in concrete, how the Church socializes its members into the Catholic faith. For Marthaler, catechesis is a process of social formation in which personal faith is awakened, nourished and developed through dialectical relationship with the community's institutionalized faith.[50] It is a sort of a community education in which the neophyte slowly assimilates the Christian *beliefs.* Quoting Marthaler, Martorell writes that inasmuch as catechesis in the primitive Church was an intentional process, socialization was traditionally called "catechesis".[51] Martorell continues that Marthaler admits that in our days, the usage of the catechetics, which Marthaler synonymously uses with religious education and education in faith, has extended its meaning thus including kerygma, the preparation for

---

[50] *Vid.* also Marthaler's other writings about the catechism: *Catechetics in Context. Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory Issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy* (1973), *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Traditional Themes and Contemporary Issues* (1994), and *The Catechism Yesterday and Today. The Evolution of a Genre* (1994).

[51] MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….,* cit., 181, 184,191.

the sacraments and the ongoing formation which nurtures the life of faith of Christians.[52]

In this socialization theory, Marthaler holds that any beginner in the faith finds an already "objectified" or organized set of Christian practices, creeds and symbols (*beliefs*) – a complex system which was "exteriorized" by previous generations who shared a common Christian faith. For Marthaler, beliefs are specific expressions of personal faith, and therefore, assume an intermediary function between personal faith and its meaning. Catechesis, as a socialization process, in his mind therefore, moves more in the plane of *beliefs* than directly in faith. It is clear that maturation in faith comes about in the dialectic interaction between personal faith and the community's faith.

Marthaler therefore delineates three objectives in the education of faith, namely, (1) growth in personal faith, (2) religious affiliation, and (3) the maintenance and transmission of a religious tradition.[53]

From this point of view, catechesis appears to be the preparation of the terrain, the cultivation of the seed of faith, or the familiarization of the road signs of the catholic religion. Through the language of *socialization*, Marthaler is able to transmit the idea of the Church's formation in the Catholic faith of every Catholic. From a socialization theory perspective, a baptized person is initiated and further made familiar with the fundamental convictions, the common rituals proper to the Catholic religion, and its basic Christian practices and traditions.

---

[52] Cfr. *ibid.,* footnote 316; MARTHALER, B., *Catechetics in Context*…., cit., 1973, 75.

[53] *Ibid.*, 197-205.

Even though the socialization theory dwells more on the 'external or social factors' – or the so-called 'symbolics of faith' -, nevertheless, Marthaler's choice of it excellently brings home the point: catechesis as formation in the larger group's faith and which is fundamental to any member.

Third, catechesis is closely associated with the proclamation of the Word, service in the community, with the celebration in liturgy. Aside from the *GCD*'s emphasis on catechesis as a Ministry of the Word which thus closely associates catechesis to it, Marthaler's idea of the close relation of catechesis with service in the community and liturgy is evidently influenced by his commentary work with *Sharing the Light of Faith* which has this main principle (taken from *To Teach as Jesus Did*). This idea will continue to be observable among the emphases that Marthaler develops in his commentary to official church documents published in the third millennium.

With those basic principles mentioned above, it is easier to understand his positions in the catechetical issues which arose in the decades of the 80s and 90s, such as the identity of religious education, liturgy and sacred symbols in catechesis, catechesis in community, and the pitting of the catechism and the directory.

1.4.2. Warren: defending the nurture of "testimony of Christian life" from cultural aggressions

Warren on his part, another sustainer of the view of catechesis as a socialization theory focused on the maintenance of the religious environment necessary for the nurture of faith. In the socialization theory parlance, this idea is called "world maintenance".

Warren endowed catechesis the task of emancipating the Christian message from actual cultural frameworks which are by nature simply destructive of the pleasant religious environment, or

are adverse to the growth of Christian religious identity. The socialization process, instead of focusing on the education act, teaching act or the catechetical act, placed its weight on the *agent* of that action, the ecclesial community as a whole.

In *Evangelization: a catechetical concern* (1973), Warren argued about the importance of *testimony of life* in the task of evangelization and catechesis, citing the Church's *historical commitment* as pronounced in the International Catechetical Week in Medellin in 1968.[54]

In *Catechesis: An enriching category for Religious Education* (1981), he underlined how the modern catechetical movement amplified religious education from its limited educational language. Warren claimed that the modern catechesis, through socialization, linked religious education to a richer way of learning, that is, *through ecclesial experience*.

Since 1984, Warren advanced his stance of "catechesis as a socialization process" to "catechesis as a social liberation activity".[55] M. Martorell observed that the term 'catechesis of liberation', became a frequent phrase in his writings and which signify more than *a socialization process*.

Martorell added that this advancement is due to Warren's encounter with the social insights of Raymond Williams. Williams theorized a cultural materialism which moulds human perception or philosophy. As a culture, it appears as a truth and dominates people's way of thinking.

---

[54] Cfr. WARREN, M., «Evangelization: a catechetical concern», in WARREN, M. (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics*, I, cit., 333. This is the re-published edition of the article written 10 years ago.

[55] See, for example, Warren's writings: *Faith Culture and Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church* (1989), *The Worshipping Assembly: Possible Zone of Cultural Contestation* (1989)

Warren, with Williams' outlook, evaluates the dominant culture of our times (US setting), that is, the consumerist culture, and considers it as incompatible and a even stumbling block for people to understand the values of the Gospel.[56] *On one hand*, he observes a dominant culture which is a hindrance for the appreciation of the Gospel values, and *on the other hand*, the Christian message which pits the community against the dominant consumerist culture. Warren then calls role of catechesis in this given situation as *ministry of life structures*, that is, the cementing of profound structures on which the disciple of Christ's action proceeds.[57] He describes liturgy, for instance, as a moment of ministry of life structure (more than an effort of making understand what is it).[58] In short, he marks catechesis with *a counter-cultural character*.[59]

If Marthaler is interested in the study of *symbolic systems* (those which help maintain and transmit the faith or *symbols* in the future generations) because of the strong cultural context of a given period of time in which the Church exists, Warren is rather more concerned on *how* to maintain and transmit such faith or *symbols* or what he calls 'symbolic of practice' or 'life practice symbols', through a process he calls 'hermeneutical dislocation'.[60] Warren, maintaining a socialization theory inspired by William's neomarxist sociological ideas, conceives catechesis as a pastoral ministry specifically concerned with the formation *life structures* shaped by the Gospel and confronting cultural hegemonies squarely opposed or which hinder

---

[56] MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 233.

[57] *Ibid.*, 225.

[58] *Ibid.*, 227.

[59] Martorell traces this idea as an influence of the French neo-marxist sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 234).

[60] *Ibid.*

the formation of Gospel-inspired life-structures. More than rational discussion of divinely revealed truths, for Warren, catechesis is more concerned with *the testimony or the faithful practice* (of the Gospel) *of the believing community*, or more particularly, to the *life structures*.[61] Warren, says Martorell, curiously observed that liturgy for instance coincides with catechesis in this matter: creating life structures through confrontation or familiarization with Christian symbols or embodiments of the Christian faith, or simply, through Christian practice or testimony of the community.[62] The end of catechesis is transformation of one's life according to the demands of the Gospel. It further extends its end in the criticism of the dominant hegemony or the consumerist culture which, in his opinion, is in radical opposition with the Gospel values and therefore, either hinders its assimilation in the life of individuals or totally eradicates a Christian environment.[63]   Therefore, as Martorell affirms, for Warren, catechesis or Christian formation in general must be counter-formation, that is, leveled against the hegemony of consumerist culture.[64] More than just the maintenance of one's religious world and the transmission of community practices or of *symbolics*, Warren goes beyond the socialization theory with his idea of 'the

---

[61] Life structures condition our perception of reality.   Martorell, summarizing Warren's explanation in Faith, Culture, and the Worshipping Community. Shaping Practice of the Local Church (1989), says that life structure is a habit, emphasis or a stable model through which behaviors, actions or personal conduct are governed.   It is acquired unconsciously and configured through influence of culture (cfr. *ibid.*, 225).

[62] Cfr. *ibid.*, 226-230. In this, Martorell notes Warren's priority of practice over contents in catechesis.

[63] Warren, says Martorell, establishes two dialectical tensions: (1) the consumerist society opposes the sense and practice of the Gospel, and (2) the Gospel confronts the liturgical assembly or the local church against the dominant culture at hand (cfr. *ibid.*, 223-224).

[64] Cfr. *ibid.*, 234.

transmission of life practice symbolic through a hermeneutics of dislocation'.[65]

Warren is however clear that such 'a ministry of life practice symbolic through a hermeneutic dislocation' is an ecclesial task. In the same work, *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church* (1989), Warren clearly outlines catechesis as one of aspects of the Church's Ministry of the Word.[66] Martorell says that for Warren, ministry of the word is ecclesial action.[67]

In the 90s, Warren gave more attention to *culture at hand* and its influence on the current Christians especially at the hour of *doing* their Christian faith (inside the Church or in their day to day lives).[68] This led to the publication of *Communications and Cultural Analysis (1992)* and which was revised and published later as *Seeing through the Media: A Religious view of Communications and Culture Analysis* (1997). Other writings which manifest the Warren's more mature catechetical thought are *The Local Church and Its Practice of the Gospel: The Materiality of Discipleship in a Catechesis of Liberation* (1993), and *At This Time, In This Place. The Spirit embodied in the local assembly* (1999).

***

To end this synthesis of the contextualization of the 2000-2010 writings of the principal American authors in the US catechesis, we affirm that the attention of catechesis in the USA towards *human experience* had opened a whole field of catechetical opportunities.

---

[65] Hermeneutics of dislocation, explains Martorell, consists in a critical process or discernment (judgment, reflection, discourse) which is facilitated through forging bonds with the poor and the marginalized of society (cfr. *ibid.*, 237-238).

[66] Cfr. WARREN, M., *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community….*, cit., 12.

[67] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 213.

[68] Cfr. WARREN, M. (ed.), *Changing Churches – the Local Church and the Structures of Change*, OR: Pastoral Press, 2000, 1.

As seen above, with Moran, *new catechetics* had contributed to US catechesis' to take an "anthropological" direction, or as Pope John Paul II would put it, "man is the way of the Church in this world". This way opened by Moran has pioneered the succeeding pedagogical-catechetical improvements in the US catechesis. With JM Lee, human sciences re-discovered its place in the educational activity aimed at the maturity in Christian life. The eventual professionalization and competence of catechists from the point of view of the employment of human sciences may be traced from Lee's initiative.

Three things may be pointed out with Groome: *first*, he contributed to attributing human experience with a theoretical-practical value; *second*, he underlined the "shared" character of Christian life in the community, and; *third*, he named "God's reign" as the horizon of a lived faith. Groome's ideas certainly had contributed to the determination of the role of the lay people in the "education-sharing" task in the Church. In addition to that, he has also contributed to the development of the idea of the interplay of the classical ministries and church programs in the Church's "education-sharing task" (though this may be rightly attributed to Maria Harris).

With Marthaler and Warren's understanding of catechesis as a socialization process, *new catechetics* contributed to a deeper reflection of the importance of the ecclesial community (with its rich liturgical symbols, practices and belief system) in the nurture of Christian life, and the awareness of the external cultural factors aggressive to the growth of Christian living. In addition to that, we must mention Marthaler's frequent citation (among many) of the incorporation the "social horizon" to the distinctive mark of a mature faith (the goal of catechesis). Indeed, in our opinion, conceiving catechesis as a socialization process, the Roman Catholic Church in the USA

advanced in its educational task taking advantage the rich resources it had within (its rich liturgical symbols and the catechumenate, the Sacraments, the Creed, its very organized institutional structure, its rich tradition, its catechisms and directories, etc.) and the advances of human sciences, the multi-cultural context of the USA, the values priced by US democracy, etc.

The analysis on the works of concrete American authors were important because behind their concrete proposals which indeed contributed to the opening of the US catechesis to its present development,[69] there were many elements that were interesting theologically as well as elements that needed theological evaluation and clarification.

The tremendous pedagogical advances pioneered by *new catechetics* must have been accompanied by a theological reflection. It is true that catechesis in our times cannot do without the help of human sciences; they (human sciences) anchor catechesis better to human reality. However, it is likewise important to recognize that a necessary parallel theological reflection is necessary, because first and foremost catechesis deals with Christian life imbued by faith in God. This is therefore what we have tried to do in this present work's Part II *Revelation, Culture and Hermeneutical Catechesis*, and Part III *Church, Mission and Evangelizing Catechesis*. In reality, the discussion in the first chapter, we have already pointed out many theological aspects that, in our observation, continued to be in need of reflection in the writings first decade of the 21st century of the same authors.

---

[69] Cfr. ELIAS, J., *A History of Christian Education ….*, cit., 214-216.

2. Catechesis of Christian life within the Church: the insight of the main proponents of 'new catechetics' in the first decade of the 21st century

The historical description traced above was more or less the catechetical picture which *new catechetics* was attempting to draw three decades ago. The influence of *the new catechetics movement* in the renewal of the US catechesis is undeniable. But we may ask: how far have the insinuations of new catechetics had come?

In general, we observe an ecclesial focus in catechesis in the writings of the principal authors of the US catechesis in 2000-2010. The nurture of Christian life within the Church continued and developed until this first decade. To cite an example, the participation in and service to the community as a mark of the mature faith (as explicitly indicated by B. Marthaler and the *GCD*) appeared throughout until this first decade of the new century. In addition to that, we note that there is likewise a growing interest around the necessary "extra-ecclesial orientation" (dialogue with other believers and the secular culture) of the faith that is mature.

Moreover, another striking characteristic of the writings of those authors is the general vision of catechesis in the USA. This presented an advantage and at the same a disadvantage. A general view of the US catechesis saved us from the arduous task of composing the historical pieces of the complicated web of the US catechesis. This simultaneously presented a disadvantage. As in any field, "a general historical outlook" limits itself in merely indicating clues of theological aspects which principal authors had themselves treated. Catechesis has a genetic affiliation with theology: strictly speaking, they deal with the same object of study: God. Therefore, it has necessarily rich theological aspects worthy of study. In the case of the US catechesis (here represented by the principal authors), the

object of study of catechesis is articulated in *the human-divine dialogue* (with an ample consideration of the anthropological side).

Therefore, we presented almost the same authors with their writings in the first decade of the 21st century. In Part II entitled *Revelation, culture and hermeneutical catechesis*, we highlighted the theological ideas in the catechetical doctrines of G. Moran, JM Lee and Th. Groome. We dedicated chapter II to the writings of G. Moran, chapter III to JM Lee, and chapter IV to Th. Groome. In Part III, *The Church, its mission and evangelizing catechesis*, we analyze the writings, published in the decade 2000-2010, of Marthaler in chapter V and Warren in chapter VI.

2.1. Moran and a comprehensive religious education

In Moran's 2000-2010 writings, Moran has commented about religious education in *three* contexts: (1) the religious education in the interreligious field, (2) the religious education needed by the general public, and (3) the religious education in the Catholic Church.

The theological aspects interesting to take note in Moran's doctrine are his concept of the divine-human communion which he calls "revelation", his concept of the a church as "church-people", his view of the action of the Holy Spirit in the Risen Christ (but not in the words and actions of Jesus now conserved in the Scriptures and Traditions of the Church), and his concept of the official teaching authority of the Church or the Magisterium as a hindrance (instead of a service or an instrument though which the Holy Spirit works) to the "common magisterium".

2.1.1. Comprehensive religious education based on "revelation"

Now, for Moran, religious education is the meeting point in which the two great elements of life meet – religion and education.[70] From this perspective, he distinguished between *the religious educations done by particular religions* (Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, etc.) and *the religious education needed by the general public*.[71] The *religious educations done by particular religions*, refers to the religious education aimed usually at religious socialization and fortification of one's religious identity. The religious education in the Catholic Church context may be included here, but we prefer to discuss it further, since Moran himself has dedicated another separate instance to explain his views.[72]

The *religious education needed by the general public*, for Moran, may be promoted by the State for the cultural formation of its citizens, and will focus mainly on the belief system and traditional customs and practices of particular religions. He holds that this *second type* is likewise complementary and necessary in particular religions.[73]

G. Moran envisions that religions education in the 21st century, referring to religious education in general, will be *international, interreligious, inter-institutional* and *inter-generational*.[74] He notes that in today's world, the use of the term 'religion' is ambiguous. 'Outsiders' refer it (the term religion) to the *institutional aspect* of any particular religion. For 'insiders', it is more than being a

---

[70] Cfr. MORAN, G., «Building on the Past», cit. 34.

[71] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Speaking of Teaching*, cit., 121-138.

[72] See for instance, two of Moran's 2000-2010 books: *Fashioning a People Today* (2007) and *Believing in a Revealing God* (2009).

[73] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Speaking of Teaching….*, cit., 132.

[74] Cfr. MORAN, G., «Building on the Past», cit. 148-153.

member of a religion or a church. The current use therefore does not totally describe the 'religious' reality.[75]

What exactly happens in that 'religious' reality? Here enters the idea of revelation he is proposing and in which education reflection, for him, must depart from. In Moran's perception, a man who is into a religion experiences a sort of a conversation or communion with the revealing God.[76] Like in a school of thought, one enrolls in it, participates in it, involves oneself in it and takes an indispensable role in that divine activity. He uses the metaphor of apprenticeship, or the 'showing how' aspect of teaching-learning activity.

In his discussions within the interreligious and secular context of religious education based on "revelation", Moran does not clearly explain how other religions come to have a "revelation". He simply cites it as a fact that the idea of a "revelation" (from which the comprehensive religious education must be based) is not unique to Christianity. We observe that in this ambit, Moran's use of the term 'revelation' is different the Catholic tradition's *proper* use of it. Moran's use of "revelation" instead seems to equate with what Catholic tradition refer to as the "religious sense". This religious sense is proximate to the patristic idea of the *semina Verbi* which the Holy Spirit sows on human wisdom. Later, the Church has applied moderately the idea of *semina Verbi* to religions with the thought that every religion may contain aspects or elements of truth or goods of salvation.

---

[75] Cfr. *ibid.*, cit. 149; MORAN, G., *Speaking of Teaching*…., 132.
[76] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Both Sides*…., cit. 10-18; 188-216, 219-225; MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God*…., cit. 3-6, 15-60, 151-172.

2.1.2. Religious education in the Roman Catholic Church and "revelation"

Moreover, it seems that for G. Moran, every religion or religious institution or church is a legitimate way to discover universal truths or messages revealed by God. He does not pronounce however about the equal or non-equal value of religions especially in penetrating divine truths. Neither does he comment about the need for religions to be 'purified' by the revelation of Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, the fullness of God's revelation.

In our opinion, Moran carries on and applies the above mentioned religious sense of "revelation" in explaining the process of *religious education* based on revelation *within the Roman Catholic context* (the third ambit). He maintains that the object of religious education in the Catholic ambit is not the body of inspired teachings but the inspired relationship between God and man here and now. He seems to consider the Roman Catholic Church as one of the many legitimate particular expressions of nurturing the reality of divine-human conversation common to all men.

In his past writings, he explains this natural access of every man to God through the humanity of Christ. He held that since Christ's resurrection, communion with the revealing God was opened and humanity in general was capacitated to take part in that divine activity, that is, the divine-human interpersonal communication.[77] In the 2000-2010 decade, this thought is present in his affirmation that today God speaks not in the teachings and actions of Jesus of Nazareth but in the Spirit-filled Christ who rose from the dead. In another occasion, he affirms that educational

---

[77] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis ….*, cit., 85, 87-92.

reflection or reflection over the divine-human relation (God-man relationship) in the Church should not depart from so-called 'inspired writings' (referring to Sacred Scriptures) or from commentaries over those testimonies of Jesus' words and actions (referring to Tradition), but on the conversation between man and God which takes place at the present time. A question may surge in one's mind: was Jesus of Nazareth God? Why exclude then the Sacred Scriptures and Tradition in a reflection on revelation (religious education)? Was the Holy Spirit also at work in Jesus' time?

In concrete, in *Believing in a Revealing God* (2009), once explaining his proposed understanding of revelation, he maintains his stance that "the word 'revelation' should not be attached exclusively to a message from the past".[78] He had the impression that attaching "revelation" solely to the message from the past is an idea related to the Catholic teaching that "Christ is the fullness of revelation" and "there is no revelation after Christ" [sic].[79] In addition to that, this perspective, according to him, does not give central importance to the role of the Holy Spirit and the human experience of the risen Christ at present through the same Holy Spirit.[80] In Moran's mind, there is an evident *contraposition* between the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth and the Spirit-filled Christ. In our opinion, this contraposition does not have much sense, since *on one hand*, the Jesus that lived in Nazareth who preached about the Father and the sending of the Paraclete is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity; on the other hand, the same Holy Spirit makes present the teachings of Jesus *in the interior* of the human soul here and now, and even *from the exterior*, that is through the Magisterium.

---

[78] MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God*…., cit. 46.
[79] *Ibid.*, 49.
[80] *Ibid.*

Continuing with Moran's mental framework, he affirms a certain idea of "a sacramental universe" wherein God acts in everything and everyone.[81] This has two consequences to education in the Church: *first*, the assertion for a lifelong and life-wide education; *second*, the affirmation of the church-people's engagement to the educational task.

Concerning the first, Moran founds the idea that education should be lifelong or in his favorite term 'from womb to tomb', and also life-wide, that is, that all instances of life must be educational, because of the fact that God acts in everything and in every person.[82] We have commented already regarding this point. Even if this assertion may be true, distinction between the level of intensity of sacramentality of a thing or an instance must be done. Only one has the fullness of revelation (or rather, is the fullness of revelation): Jesus Christ. Moran surprisingly does not insert in this topic the 'obligation' or 'right' of each person to teach.

In that "sacramental universe", man likewise may be said to participate in the divine act. It is on this fact that G. Moran bases the educational activity of the church-people (his other term for the Church). The Church-people participates in the divine apprenticeship, in God's 'showing how'. Given that in this sacramental universe everyone teaches and everything is an instrument of teaching, he goes further to affirm that the education in the church must be life-long and life-wide. Lifelong education simply means permanent, that is, from womb to tomb. Life-wide education means that all instances in life, not just the school hours or formations years in universities, must be educational.

---

[81] Cfr. *ibid.*, 162-172.
[82] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Both Sides*…., cit., 224-225; MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God* …., cit., 162-172.

In relation to the second consequence, the church-people's engagement to the educational activity, he affirms that effectively each person may participate in the divine teaching act. His view that all teach is compatible with the idea of the obligation and right of all baptized Christians to assume seriously and faithfully the educational task (education understood in an ample sense). The Great Council taught that all the baptized (by reason of their baptism) form part of the mystical Body of Christ and thus share in essentially distinct ways in the *tria munera*, one of which is the teaching function.

There is a need however to explain further his notion of "church-people" and the individual 'desire for community' in order to capture well the church-people's engagement to education.

Moran affirms that every individual seeks to satisfy his natural desire for community in the church-people. This longing is met through education in the community. Education in the community simply refers to the interplay of education forms (job, family, leisure, and school). It seems that the education forms are the same with the so-called community ministries (liturgy, service, teachings, kerygma and witness).[83]

Moran gives importance to laypeople's exercise of magisterium[84] but, in another work, he places the lay people's role in the teaching and witnessing ministry in opposition to the magisterium attached to the pastoral functions of ordained ministers (and altogether to hierarchical authority in the Church).[85] The idea of the official Magisterium in the Church at the service of the people of God, as the Great Council taught, escaped Moran's imagination.

---

[83] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Fashioning a People Today*…., cit., especially, 13-32, 54-71.
[84] Cfr. *ibid.*, 93-121.
[85] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God* …., cit., 61-82, 166-167.

Moran's view of the church-people may be reductive of the Church's real nature, but somehow such a perspective (church-people) encourages the collaboration and complementarity between the so-called education forms of the church. In his view, the catholic's professional job is completely compatible with his practice of attending the Holy Mass every Sunday and in days of obligations. Moreover, his use of secular equivalents (job, art, teaching, witness, service, and community) of the classical *ministries* of the first Christian community (*leitourgia*, *didache*, *diakonia*, and *kerygma*) may serve as point of departure for further and deeper understanding of the community life-oriented 'educating' ministries in the Church.

As to the *liturgical* ministry, Moran identifies the liturgy as the *locus* of life-wide and lifelong education of the community.[86] He praises liturgy's use of nonverbal language in its educating act. He also affirmed that the Church's catechesis fittingly belongs in the liturgical ambit. He added that that it (catechesis) must not take on the burden of the whole Church's educational task. The proper praxis for catechesis therefore, in Moran's mind, is to participate in the *interplay of the Church's ministries* or other educational tools. Let us note that, for Moran, catechesis refers more to the smaller "socialization-symbolic aspect" of religious formation, but which is effective in that narrower context. Moran restricts 'catechesis' to the liturgical ambit and nonverbal form of teaching. We wonder however whether it crossed Moran's mind of applying his idea of "professional emancipation of the term *education*" (restriction to schooling) to his own understanding of "catcehesis". We mean a sort of freeing the restrictive understanding of catechesis as purely "socialization through Christian symbols". In that way, *catechesis may*

---

[86] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Fashioning a People Today*...., cit., 70-91; MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God* ...., cit., 167-169.

no longer refer solely to that nonverbal liturgical teaching action, but *the whole of testimony of Christian life* serving as catechesis.

Still inside the liturgical ministry, it is curios that Moran explicitly noted the bishop's teaching as enforcer of right practice (orthopraxis), but (explicitly) not of right doctrine (orthodoxy). He probably wanted to underline the exhortative aspect of the preaching of the bishop in liturgical activities, the exhortation to live the life of faith. Even then, understanding the right doctrine is a *sine qua non* for Christian life.

In any case, the catechetical reflection of Moran in the 2000-2010 decade has a noticeable displacement *from* an exclusive *individual* divine-human present encounter *to* a divine-human encounter *within a church-people, a community*. Moran purposely seems to present a picture of *a church-people* without reference to the hierarchy in order to emphasize the total equality and the democratic characteristic of the community.[87] Even then, Moran's concept of people-hood does not reach the level of the Old Testament *qahal* or the New Testament *ekklesia*, biblical categories often used in defining the mystical body of Christ, the Church.

2.2. Lee and the forging of Christian lifestyle through religious instruction

J. M. Lee is *a professionally competent educator* who takes teaching of religion seriously from his own expertise. In his last and only essay in the first decade of the 21st century, *Vision, prophecy and forging the Future* (2000), Lee vied for a religious instruction which is – (1) directed to forging a red-hot religion, (2) a "vocation" for religious educators, (3) one which requires professionalism and scholarship,

---

[87] Cfr. MORAN, G., *Fashioning a People Today*…., cit., 13-32; MORAN, G., *Believing in a Revealing God* …., cit., 83-104.

and therefore expertise as well in the use social sciences, and (4) a participation of the "religious education dimension" of the Church.

2.2.1. *Religious instruction and red-hot religion*

Lee is very clear that the teaching of religion by its very nature aims at putting faith into practice. This has always been the stance of Lee. He adds however the idea of "an ardent, zealous, devoted living" of that faith, in his last and only essay mentioned above. He uses the term "red-hot" religion.[88]

It is interesting to note that Lee did no longer allude to the idea he held before, that of religious instruction may cause faith. Faith, for Lee, is an intellectual construct, but which through the teaching *process* lead to a practical reality – a "lifestyle" or what he calls in other instances as "religion".[89] Lee may have mentioned in many instances before about religious instruction "causing faith" [sic].[90] That assertion was always made inside the context of social sciences. He certainly knew that any religious instruction, even how much it is organized by social sciences, can never cause faith. For sure, faith is a gift from God. From the perspective of social science theory, the practice of faith manifested in some concrete behaviors may be verifiable and measurable. It may or may not mean that such "causing", substitutes God. As mentioned above, Lee does not allude to it in his last and only essay in the 21st century.

---

[88] Cfr. LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 256-261.

[89] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 117-124.

[90] See for example his essay «Facilitating Growth in Faith through Religious Instruction», in LEE, JM IV (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, cit., 264-302. He explicitly mentions "facilitating and causing faith".

2.2.2. Human sciences, theology, and their collaboration in religious instruction

Lee vied for the professionalism in religious education. That idea, aside from being related to being a "vocation", is directly linked to the use of human sciences (sociology, pedagogy, and psychology).

Lee has followed the importance which G. Moran had endowed to human experience. He has opted for the employment of human sciences in dealing with "the human experience with deals with the practice of faith". Lee, although not the first in intuiting the great utility of human sciences in the study of religious and cultural matters, is the first to make a systematized social science theory in religious instruction.

The setback with Lee's option for social sciences is his leaving behind the part of theological sciences. He dismissed theology as purely cognitive and rationalist. According to him, such cognitive nature of theology has nothing to do with the practice-oriented religious instruction. In the first decade of the 21st century, Lee however slightly modified this stance. Expressing his preoccupation of the rising theological science, practical theology, and its attempt to subordinate "religious education", Lee firmly reiterated his position that a practical theology (as he intended theology as purely cognitive) is impossible because it is, he insisted, "cognitive".[91] He added that "if it has something to contribute to religious instruction", it must only be in the tiny cognitive aspect.

Lee's concept of theology as by nature cognitive or purely speculative may be true in some moments in the past centuries. Unfortunately, nobody holds that idea anymore now. As Pope Benedict XVI indicated once, theology must be sapiential or practice

---

[91] Cfr. LEE, J. M. IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 261-266.

oriented. Both perspectives/approaches offered by theology and social science in the study of Christian life or of what they call "the reality of divine-human relationship" are necessary. Both accedes religion but respecting its nature. Social sciences study religion from an empirical perspective, that is, from the aspect which is verifiable and measureable or predictable by human sciences. Theological reflection studies religion from the perspective of truths which are divinely revealed. Theological and social sciences are therefore needed in any authentic religious education aimed at maturity in Christian life.

Neither engaging the whole person to God through a systematic lecture of God's mysteries *alone* nor memorizing traditional formulae *alone*, do satisfy the inner longing of the human heart for God. This was very clear to Lee.

He intuited that the *divine* is *experienced* in or through *the finite created world*. We admire the 'obstinacy' of Lee in employing social sciences professionally to *the empirical manifestations of faith* (and his bold pretense to pinpoint the characteristics of a faith-filled lifestyle or 'red-hot religion'). At the heart of that insistence, we see Lee's conviction that God may indeed manifest in finite created realities. Experience however is not enough to detect and recognize the traces of God in finite realities; to "see" God in the ordinary events of life, the lens of faith are needed.

Finally, setting aside his open prejudice to theological sciences, he could have entertained the question: what if theology and social sciences have specific roles in the task of educating in faith? Besides, what is the function of the Magisterium in the teaching of faith?

2.2.3. The Magisterium, munus docendi, and the vocation to teach

Concerning the teaching "vocation" within "the religious education dimension" of the Church, Lee has always made reference to 'religious educator's divine vocation' to teach matters of the faith. For him, that teaching task is participation of the teaching mission of Jesus Christ (munus docendi) and which an educator has acquired through baptism.[92] Every baptized has a share in that task. In other words, following Lee's logic, the Church of baptized persons has that 'religious education' dimension and the teaching of religion or of the faith is a very important task. He did not however elaborate the idea that as a vocation, teaching the faith is a responsibility before God, before the Church, and before mankind.

He has intuited correctly that, *as a task or a function*, the transmission of the faith, religious education, or catechesis, is the responsibility of all the baptized. Any validly *baptized* person has the power to exercise the *teaching office* of the Church provided he or she has the sufficient and systematic knowledge of the faith's content. He is further right in connecting the *exercise of the teaching function* to the participation in Jesus Christ's *teaching function* by reason of one's incorporation to Him by the Sacrament of Baptism. It has somehow to be made precise that by baptism, a person shares in the Christ's *triple functions* – including the *munus docendi*, not in an abstract way, but *in* the Church, Christ's mystical body. Jesus Christ lives in the Church here and now through the Holy Spirit. Therefore, by virtue of baptism, a Christian is incorporated to *Christus totus*. A mother's showing her son how to make the sign of the cross is not a *sharing* of the *teaching function* of his parish priest, but a *real* exercise of the teaching function (received together with the other functions) in

---

[92] Cfr. *ibid.*, 253-256.

baptism. If we are to take the claim of Lee seriously, it can be stated that baptism, not the office of religious educator, founds the right and obligation of every Christian to teach the faith.

Vatican II has been very clear about common priesthood of all the baptized. This priesthood is called 'common' because it is precisely shared and exercised by all who received the sacrament of Baptism. In addition to that, the term 'common' distinguishes common priesthood from that participation in the priesthood of Christ through sacred Orders (the ministerial priesthood). Both *common priesthood* and *ministerial priesthood* have their own respective modes of exercising the *munus docendi* in the one Mystical Body of Christ.

In addition to that, we have to make it clear that inside that Mystical Body whose head is Christ himself, there are those assigned by our Lord to assume the office which has the task to *authoritatively* teach and to guarantee the faithfulness of the 'substantive content' of what is taught. This refers to the ministerial priesthood. The said authoritative teaching office used to be united with pastoral authority. As mentioned, its main purpose is to teach and at the same time to guarantee faithfulness. In other words, it is *at the service* of the common priesthood. This picture is therefore squarely contrary to Lee's thought (in his past writings) of the bishops as a privileged group in the hierarchy who manipulate the contents and the praxis in the whole Church's exercise of the teaching task.[93]

His personal opinion or understanding of faith seems to disagree with the catholic doctrine. He claims that 'faith' (*faith-construct* as he intended it) is the only authority to which the teaching task must confront itself. Faith and the teaching task belong,

---

[93] Cfr. LEE, J. M. IV, «Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always», cit., 32-66.

according to his thought, to the same teaching-learning dynamics. In contrast, ecclesiastical authorities in relation to 'faith' remain *outside* to the teaching-learning arrangement. With its assignment as something 'outside the dynamics', ecclesiastical authorities in the teaching task (catechesis, religious education, transmission of the faith, teaching mission) seem to assume the identity of an outsider, that is, with nothing to do with the teaching-of-the-faith affair.

In addition to that Lee attributes to the hierarchical order the following characteristics: *being a limitation to the possibilities of the teaching affair* and *doing political manipulation*.

We see behind Lee's particular considerations to the hierarchical order a certain fear of the "purity" of faith (or in his words, the *neutrality* or *value free*) being contaminated or manipulated. In square contradiction to Lee's idea, the *magisterium dimension united to pastoral authority* was purposely instituted by Christ himself to serve as assurance for the faith's purity.

In any case, the point we are up to is that the various forms of teaching done by the members of the mystical body of Christ form *one ecclesial act* which is aimed at one desired result: *salus animarum*.

Lee's consideration of religious instruction as something which responds to the demands of faith and is located at the same interior location with faith is a good observation. To evangelize is a demand of the faith itself and marks the nature of the Church. His insistence however that the Magisterium *stands outside* that teaching-faith structure seems to give less importance, or almost nil, to the *role of the Holy Spirit and the action of Christ*, in a religious education which is Christian and in the whole teaching mission of the Church.

2.3. Groome and "faith-life and life-faith" catechesis

Groome ended the 90s with a book proposing a philosophy of education as part of his reflection about the "non-clerical" teachers (parents and teachers) in the Church's teaching activity. It was a distinct type of philosophy of education because, as Groome claimed, it was based, not on pragmatic but spiritual principles. Those spiritual principles, he noted, were intimately related to the Catholic faith convictions.

Groome opens the first decade of the 21st century with a proposal of a spirituality based also on *faith* or *core convictions*. However, unlike in *Educating for Life* (1998), Groome describes those core convictions as *catholic* not in the sense that they are convictions that inspired totally by Roman Catholicism but because of their universality (shared by all believers). Groome did not explain directly whether these faith convictions are Roman Catholic or inter-confessional. He however used the term "shared" (not only among religious confessions but also between religions). We refer to his book, *What makes us catholic? Eight Gifts for Life* (2002). A certain caution is needed to read this book because Groome starts his presentation of each core conviction from the perspective of the faith held by Roman Catholics.

We observe that *those faith convictions* which Catholics share with other believers, are the same ones which underlie Groome's concept of education in faith or what he calls "catechetical education". For him, "faith" demands the integral/lifelong and communal direction of catechetical education. Therefore Groome's faith demands that catechetical education (1) be continuous and must involve the affective, cognitive and experiential dimensions of the Christian, (2) involve the whole community – programs and

ministries – in the whole task of education, and (3) take part in the secular education and involve the secular culture.

It is fitting first to synthesize here Groome's understanding of those core or faith convictions on which his proposed "spirituality", "catechetical education", and "Catholic's involvement in public life and engagement in culture", are based.

2.3.1. Being a Catholic is a spiritual matter

Groome is right in considering that being a Catholic is a spiritual matter.[94] In addition to that, we second him in affirming that Catholic spirituality involves *the bringing of faith into life and bringing life to faith*.[95] Being a Catholic is certainly a spiritual matter in the sense that the protagonist of Christian life is not the individual Christian himself but the Holy Spirit. Christian life is life in the Spirit. However, it is not a life which leaves the practical level of life. As Groome affirmed, it permeates the important *questions of life*, those principal dimensions which influence the whole being and acting of a person.[96]

---

[94] Cfr. GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, cit., xvii.

[95] *Ibid.*, xviii-xix.

[96] These eight gifts, according to Th. Groome, are actually Catholic perspectives on the so-called 'great questions of life' (man, time, society, etc.). Basing on Th. Groome's presentation, the understanding of each *question of life*, considered from the point of view of Catholic faith, constitutes theoretically an element of the Catholic Christian spirituality (*faith put into action*). The *eight* gifts for life constituting Catholic spirituality are [1] its anthropology (Chapter 2, 39-72), [2] its cosmology (Chapter 3, 73-104), [3] its sociology and idea of community living (Chapter 4, 105-132), [4] its understanding of time and history, Tradition and the Scripture (Chapter 5, 133-168), [5] its understanding of faith as investing despite of the risk (Chapter 6, 169- 206), [6] its politics or commitment to working for justice for all (Chapter 7, 207-234), [7] its distinctive commitment to loving without borders (Chapter 8, 235-264), and [8] its priority for growing spiritually (Chapter 9, 265-300). Chapter 8, about Catholic charity, is actually not a new topic. In

We further follow Groome in his allusion regarding the importance to some shared aspects in faith in God which may serve as point of dialogue with other believers. Groome held that catholic Christianity shares *with non-Christian religions,* among others, the belief in a Transcendent God, the belief in salvation, the practice of charity, the demand to work for justice and peace and the need to serve others. *With the other religions*, Catholic Christianity, according to Groome, shares the common human experience of the Transcending Mystery, a being which stands at the base of every thing and everything.[97]   Aside from the 'great religions', he mentions in particular 'religions who believe in personal divinity.' He makes special reference to Islam. With them, catholic Christianity shares explicit faith in God, and that God embraces all humanity with unconditional love, divine revelation, the vocation to partnership with God, caring for human well-being, the belief in an afterlife and the belief in God's respect to man's responsibility.[98] With the Jewish people, Groome indicates that Christianity shares with them the faith in a creator-provider God, in God's desire for *shalom*, in the integrity of creation, in the divine-human covenant of living the *shalom*, in the Ten Commandments (guidelines of the divine-human partnership and the governance of the world), in divine help or grace and in livening in a faith community.[99] With Christians, believers in Christ, Catholics share the discipleship of Jesus within the Body of Christ, the commandment of love, the task of helping realize God's reign of peace, justice, holiness, and fullness of life for all. Moreover, he

---

Educating for Life (1998), this topic was incorporated within Th. Groome's discussion of justice.

[97] GROOME, TH., *What Makes us Catholics….*, cit., 7.

[98] *Ibid.*

[99] *Ibid.*, cit., 8.

names the Bible as the inspired word of God and the basic profession of faith expressed in the Nicene and Apostles' creeds.[100]

But what are really the essential contents of Groome's faith? The contents of faith in Groome's catechetical paradigm focus on convictions 'shared' with other believers. In more occasions than one, he made distinctions between substantial and accidental aspects of faith, or other times, he considers faith as a spiritual wisdom. We recognize that Groome's approach to faith is a legitimate point of departure in dialogues with other believers. But his silence of fundamental aspects of the faith which Catholics do not share with other believers may provoke doubts as to their importance. Can faith really be a source of unity? In addition to that, are the contents of faith which may distinguish Catholics from the rest of believers essential to live an authentic Christian life?

At this point, we reiterate that we accompany Groome up to his assertion that *Christianity is a spiritual matter*. We respect his opinion that there are *core values shared by or agreed upon by believers from different religions* and those shared values make whoever holds them *distinctively universal* (in order not to use the term 'catholic'). However, we opine that what Groome does not comment about – the substantial matters of faith which differ Roman Catholics from other believers (faith in the fullness of divine revelation in Jesus Christ, the unicity and uniqueness of salvation in Jesus Christ, the infallibility of the Holy Father, the Sacraments, the Church's full possession of the means of salvation) – are substantially important if one wants to live an authentic spiritual life.

---

[100] *Ibid.*, 9-10.

2.3.2. A catechetical education based on "faith"

Groome is deeply convinced that "faith" is the principle of the Church's educational task.[101] His 2000-2010 writings do not present an exhaustive explanation of the *nature* of that faith on which the catechetical education is based. He simply pointed out the two *perspectives* in understanding faith – *holistic* and *communal* - and described their implications to catechesis.

The *holistic dimension* refers to faith's demand that in the faith education, the whole person be attended (not only his or her cognitive aspect). Thus, true nurturing one in the Christian faith engages his or her integral person (cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects) and involves all educational agents around in that nurturing. It further implies that faith must be nurtured not only on the moment of its reception, that is, in baptism, but throughout man's life. In addition to that, faith demands that its nurture be done not only in a formal academic instruction classes, but within a communal atmosphere.

The *communal dimension* refers to faith's demand that the whole community be involved in its nurture. From the perspective of the communal dimension of faith, its nurture must be done not only by one agent or program but by various agents or programs, by the whole community. Th. Groome, in short, as his recent writings

---

[101] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 103-112; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 172-192.

show, came to formulate the idea of *the whole Church as the catechist educator.* His understanding of whole community catechesis is the following: that all educational communities – the school, parish, family and all other programs with educational end – should adapt a *catechetical consciousness* at the moment of exercising the Church's classical ministries.[102] As he puts it, 'everything in the Church and in the world should be intentionally crafted *to nurture* people *in faith.*'[103]

In his 2000-2010 writings, Th. Groome has employed the term *catechetical education* to refer to education in faith.[104] It is a kind of catechesis responding to the demands of faith (as previously discussed). He conceives education in faith (or catechesis) as an integration of *catechesis* (understood as socialization) and of *religious education* (informative teaching around the religious culture).[105] For

---

[102] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 23; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 587-592; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 218; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 180-186.

[103] GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 177.

[104] *Vid.* GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 583-592; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 172-192.

[105] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 17, 26-27; GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequetica Global», cit., 583-584; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-3; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over»,

Groome, in this case, religious education and catechesis are necessary in the Church's educational task aimed at maturity in Christian life. He often links to this idea of catechetical education the need for a permanent and integral formation. By permanent formation, Groome means that catechetical education is lifelong, that is, it deals with the education in faith from the beginning until maturity, from toddlers to mature ones.[106] By integral, he means that catechetical education involves the affective, cognitive and experiential aspects of the person. In addition to that, it likewise forms the person within the community and orients him to the service of the community.[107] For Groome, therefore, catechetical education is "total".

---

cit., 211, 221-222; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 177-173.

[106] In Th. Groome's dialogue with the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997), he alleged that GDC has left itself open for misinterpretation. Its recommendation of having all catechesis be inspired by the catechumenate is being taken as if all catechesis must be modeled after the catechumenal paradigm. He holds that catechesis built on the catechumenal paradigm will not work in our present time because it was ever designed for a particular time and context very much different from that of the present. In particular, it focuses, instead on daily nurture of the faith, on sudden conversions (*vid.* GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224).

[107] Th. Groome, to stress his point of the need for a co-operation of educating communities – parish, family, and school – he demonstrates the need to overcome the school didactic paradigm of teaching the faith, the need for the family to take back its role as first educator, and eventually for the need of all educating communities exercising the ministries to work together (*vid.* GROOME, TH., «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 583-585; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; GROOME, TH., «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 175-178; GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 80-84). More than criticizing any conversion-leaning program in education in faith, Th. Groome deepens and continues his reflection on the

Th. Groome is convinced, as ever, that lifelong and communal catechetical education will be effective only if it is paired by *an appropriate pedagogical approach*, alluding to his shared praxis approach.[108] It is curious that he founds his approach to a theological outlook: *a divine pedagogy concretized in Christ's pedagogy* and therefore is the model of the pedagogy appropriate to a total catechetical education.[109]

In his last essay, *Handing on the Faith* (2006), after referring to the divine pedagogy reflected in Christ's pedagogy, the source and model of the pedagogy of faith, Th. Groome is able to proceed without difficulty of 'the relationship between *faith* and *culture* which total catechetical education presumes and promotes'.[110]

2.3.3. The extra-ecclesial orientation of catechetical education

In several occasions, Groome writes that Catholic Christianity, for the faith it holds, has something to contribute to

---

communal dimension of education in faith. In the more recent total catechetical education essays, Th. Groome reaches the conclusion that 'the whole Church' is the 'catechist educator' (cfr. GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 175) and 'the whole church' must have 'a catechetical consciousness' (cfr. GROOME, TH., «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 80-81), and thus vies for 'a whole community catechesis'.

[108] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 27-28; GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 187-189.

[109] GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 28. This is exactly the same throughout the total catechetical education writings.

[110] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 189-192.

whatever society or culture and in whatever era of history it may find itself.[111]

In *Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: the Challenge for Religious Educators* (2003), Groome deals about Religious educators' role concerning the identity of Catholics in the midst of American culture. American culture seems to be squarely in opposition to the core convictions on which the catholic identity is founded. The principal thesis of Th. Groome is that the faith on which Catholic identity is based has an impressive track record of being able to blend with any culture; while it enriches the particular culture to which it 'mixes', it is also enriched by the said culture on the process. In this essay, Th. Groome analyzes how Religious educators may help forge a mutually enriching dialogue between the two.

Even if Th. Groome does not dwell at any moment in explaining that the identity of Catholics as *Catholics* is shaped or formed by their core convictions (also identified with *faith*), he presupposes the idea throughout the essay. Th. Groome uses catholic identity and catholic faith interchangeably. As it was shown in *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002), he demonstrated that that which constitutes Catholic *identity* is its faith, or if it can be permitted to say, *that aspect of faith which 'may be' shared by other believers.*[112]

---

[111] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», cit., 25-36, but especially 33-34; GROOME, TH., *What Makes Us Catholic....*, cit., 157-158; GROOME, TH., «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», cit., 179-198; GROOME, TH., «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for now and Always», cit., 8.

[112] As we have already indicated, Groome does not explicitly make distinction between being a Roman Catholic and being Catholic. It seems that in the first place he intends catholic for 'universal'. When associating the idea of 'being a Roman catholic' with 'being catholic or universal', he refers to Roman Catholics embracing the concept of universality, that is, of sharing or participating

Th. Groome presents a model of inculturation founded on 'the logic of the Incarnation', an encounter of culture and faith in which one becomes truly Catholic while simultaneously truly American. Groome explained that Christian faith has always appropriated itself according to the cultural contexts it encountered. He explained that "incarnating" the Gospel message must be done not in a way that the same Gospel Message would appear alien to the particular context, but 'as indigenous to the culture and yet faithful to the Gospel'. Th. Groome further explained that inculturation of the Christian faith in a particular context may be considered authentic only when 'each people expresses Christ's message in its own way' and when there is a 'living exchange' or mutual enrichment between the Christianity and particular culture.[113]

Th. Groome however is very clear that no cultural appropriation can change the core beliefs, morals and sacraments that are constitutive of Catholic Christian faith.[114] He adds that a culture's reception of Christian faith is a matter of 'highlighting an aspect of the Christian faith'.[115] From the idea of 'living exchange', he identifies 'blessings' from American culture which would be enriching to catholic identity and vice versa. For the first he identifies, the rights and equality of persons, the spirit and practice of democracy, and public discourse and debate.[116] For the second, the together with his rights, person has also responsibilities, life is gracious and sacramental, sense of community and responsibility for

---

in a 'conviction' or a 'core value' which others also hold as such. Aware of this, one may read Groome 'with caution' (an expression he uses for reading the *GDC*).

[113] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», cit., 29.

[114] Cfr. *ibid.*

[115] Cfr. *ibid.*

[116] Cfr. *ibid.*, 30-32.

the common good, treasuring of tradition, practice of distributive and social justice, charity to all, a spirituality characterized by its being communal, filled with consideration with others, and joyful.[117]   In this first decade, Groome has not however discussed how Christian faith may inculturate with the present technological culture.

In *For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education* (2003), Groome comments about Catholic faith's possible influence on the public's common good, particularly the American public. Groome's main idea here is that the Catholic faith, the 'motivating foundation' of catholic education is capable not only of educating Catholics to be good Catholics *(education for faith)* but also of persons (including Catholics) to be good citizens *(education from faith)*. Th. Groome holds that this is precisely the charism of Catholic educational system.

Th. Groome traces this catholic style of teaching – for faith and which extends to serve the common good - in the first Christian community's reflection of Jesus' earthly ministry itself.[118] He writes the first community had seen that in Jesus' salvific mission, education played an important role. He notes that the first community noted 'that Jesus intended to educate for faith'.[119]

For Th. Groome, education *for* faith-*from* faith perspective is traced back to the first Christian community's reflection of teaching and earthly life of Jesus himself. They have understood the following: (1) education *in faith* is closely related to the salvific mission of Jesus[120], (2) Jesus *lived* the faith which 'motivated' his

---

[117] Cfr. *ibid.*, 33-34.
[118] Cfr. GROOME, TH., «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», cit., 180.
[119] *Ibid.*, 181.
[120] Cfr. *ibid.*

teaching with an intimate connection with God's reign here on earth, and (3) Jesus left it clear that he wanted that his disciples continue his mission.[121] He pointed out the tensions whether the Church should only educate for faith or include education from faith perspective. He likewise pointed out how the Church has adapted this perspective throughout various historical contexts and situations. He concludes then that the educational model the Church has that ally *education for faith* and *from a faith perspective* together is well tested by time. He rightly intuits the Church's effort in evangelization and human promotion in her educational apostolate.

According to his analysis, Th. Groome writes that such faith alluded by Jesus in his 'educating *for* faith' required living as a person of God according to Jesus' own way of life. He means that the faith to which the persons Jesus was teaching necessarily includes discipleship or living Jesus' own way of life. What was the guiding vision of Jesus' way of life? Th. Groome writes, the reign of God. Therefore, for Th. Groome, *educating for faith* is closely related to discipleship or living the *life for God's reign* which was the life led by Jesus himself. Moreover, from the pair *faith-God's reign*, Th. Groome's idea of *educating from faith* (for the common good) follows.

He therefore proposes 'a two-way conversation' between American Catholic education and the American public education. Th. Groome is convinced that with its defining charism of 'educating for and from faith', Catholic education has something to offer to American public education. He too recognizes that Catholic education has something to learn too from American public education.

---

[121] Cfr. *ibid.*, 182-190.

Therefore Th. Groome indicates that Catholic education may fill the American public education's 'dire need for a spiritual foundation', and American public education may show American catholic education how 'to avoid sectarianism and every semblance of proselytizing'.[122]

For Th. Groome, the spiritual foundation which Catholic education offer to public education is constituted of core spiritual values which 'renew a humanizing and holistic vision for American education'[123], which 'fosters the human capacity and desire for the Transcendent'[124] and 'around which many of the great world religions and spiritualities can reach consensus'[125]. For Groome, this is equivalent to *the education from faith perspective* practiced by catholic education.

Concerning that which Catholic education may learn from public education, he writes that before the main objective of avoiding sectarianism and proselytizing, catholic education must recognize 'that education for faith and education from faith perspective need not be collapsed into each other'[126]. He means that while catholic schools will offer education for Catholic faith to catholic students, it

---

[122] Cfr. *ibid.*, 191-192.

[123] Cfr. *ibid.*, 193-194.

[124] Cfr. *ibid.*, 192

[125] Cfr. *ibid.*, 195. He lists them as: (1) Human beings have equal dignity, rights and responsibilities. (2) Life in the world is a gift charged with purpose and meaning. (3) Our human identity is essentially communal; we need and must care for each other. (4) Living life well requires wisdom that encourages responsibility. (5) All the great spiritualities teach justice for all and compassion for the needy. (5) At their best, most spiritualities are universal in outlook, emphasizing the bondedness of all people. (6)   all spiritualities are convinced that the human vocation is to live in 'right relationship' with God – however named – with oneself, others, and creation.

[126] Cfr. *ibid.*, 196.

could at the same time offer a holistic education from a faith perspective without the slightest hint of proselytizing.

2.4. Marthaler and the "development of catechesis" (from instruction to way of life) as documented by Church documents

In the decade 2000-2010, B. Marthaler simply traces the development of catechesis in the important documents of the Magisterium and other influential catechetical organizations. After reflecting over the three decades that have passed since the closing of the Vatican II, great promoter of catechesis, Marthaler's thesis is: there is a development in the understanding of the nature of catechesis in the Church, together with the multiplication of catechesis goals and tasks throughout these years.

Marthaler observes that in the time between Vatican II up to the first decade of the 21st century, many events had taken place which greatly reshaped the Church catechetical ministry, namely: the publication of the national directories, the *CCC*, the synod of Bishops which defined the Church's nature and evangelizing mission, the publications of compendiums of the *CCC* and the Church's social doctrine, the publication of national catechetical directories and other efforts of inculturating catechesis, and the publication of national catechesis (*USCCA*).

In *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008), he testifies to 'the development and progression of thought regarding the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry' recorded by Church documents published in the wake of the Vatican II, or of 'a new

understanding of the nature, tasks, and scope of this ministry of the word [catechesis]'[127].

Marthaler indicates Vatican II as animator of the catechetical renewal. He says that the Council inspired catechesis (1) *to be liturgical*, (2) *to be world/society-directed*, (3) *to be animated by the Scriptures*, and (4) *to be ecclesial*. In addition to that, he also indicated the seed-impulses *of global evangelization*, *of ecumenism* and *of inculturation* which later also influenced the direction of catechetical progress. He adds that with the Council's *pastoral* inclination, it influenced catechesis' *shift* from being a *cognitive* matter into an *integral*, *wholistic* and *real human-existence* affair.[128]

In *Sowing Seeds* (2000), Marthaler mentions of 'three major developments that have further clarified the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry'. They are (1) the promulgation of the *RCIA* in 1972 which hailed back the ties between liturgy and catechesis, (2) Paul VI's *EN* which made catechesis an important element in the new evangelization, and (3) the publication of the *CCC* in 1992.[129]

2.4.1. From instruction to living the Christian life

For Marthaler, the documents of the Church records development of catechesis. While *GCD* (1971) systematized the inspiring claims of Vatican II for catechesis, the *Code of Canon Law* (1983), especially in its Books III-IV, made them binding for the whole Latin Church. *GCD* defined catechesis as a ministry of the Word. The definition included the instruction and the formation aspects of catechesis. However, he recognizes that it is the Code of

---

[127] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 11.

[128] Cfr. *ibid.*, 11-17.

[129] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., v-vi.

Canon which made the distinction clear: faith instruction is meant for living the faith.

In the USA, in particular, Marthaler traces the same cognitive-practical tension with the Bishops' first documents since Vatican II. *TTJD* (1972) systematized catechesis through the four pillars: *service, community, message, (and liturgy)*, while *Basic teachings* (1973) presented the cognitive and doctrinal foundations which later would be adapted by succeeding documents in the USA, by the USCCB or by other groups like the NCEA or the PAC. In any case, *TTJD* (1972) and *Basic teachings* (1973) were both incorporated to the first US national directory, *SLF* (1979).[130]

The US catechesis on young people is an amazing example. Since *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), the catechesis directed to youth people had been directed towards maturity of faith, or adulthood in faith, concretely manifested in *a lived faith in the community*.[131] In the Bishops' pastoral plan for the third millennium, *Our hearts were burning within Us* (1999), adult faith formation became the expressed priority of all catechetical endeavors; and in 2005, *United States Catechism for Catholic Adults* (USCCA), the US Catechism, is meant to be its doctrinal guide and reference.

2.4.2. The liturgy and adult faith formation

Marthaler likewise underline the *liturgical aspect* of this development of catechesis with the reforms of the *RCIA* (1972 and its eventual revisions). He affirms that the *RCIA* showed the

---

[130] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry…*, cit., 41-80.

[131] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry…*, cit., 81-90; MARTHALER, B., «Foreword» of *TLL* 38:3 (Spring 2002) 4-5.

necessary relationship between liturgy and catechesis.[132] In 1997, a scientific survey was conducted by the *NCCB* about the efficiency of *RCIA* in the US parishes.[133] From the very positive result, the US Bishops' made *adult faith formation* as priority of the pastoral direction of the US Church in the third millennium.[134]

Marthaler saw that liturgical catechesis functions efficiently in *deciphering of the rituals and symbols of faith*. With the present liturgical progress, that is, catechesis linked with liturgy in the formation of adult faith, liturgical catechesis may forge Catholics to *see through faith* God's actions-made-efficient through sacred symbols and rites. This idea was then present in his essay in 1972.[135]

2.4.3. Catechesis and evangelizing mission of the Church

In what he claims to be Pope John Paul II's 'popularization' of the (new) evangelization, Marthaler asserts that the Church has understood better that her mission, evangelization, is an integral part of her very nature. In that ecclesial consciousness, Marthaler marks the 'job promotion' of catechesis, from being *one of the forms of Ministry of the Word* to being *an indispensable part of the Church essential expression*, that is, in *mission* and *evangelization*.[136]

---

[132] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 91-98.

[133] Cfr. NCCB/USCC, *Journey to the Fullness of Life. A Report on the Implementation of the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults in the United States*, Washington, D.C. (October 2000).

[134] Cfr. USCCB, *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999; MARTHALER, B., «Foreword» of *TLL* 37:1 (Fall 2000) 4-5.

[135] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., «To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith», cit., 232-233.

[136] Cfr. Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds….*, cit., v-vi.

In other words, the recognition of *evangelization* as integral part of the Church's very being placed *catechesis* into the heart of the Church's very core. There is even an emerging idea of 'evangelizing catechesis' (a title of one of his chapters in *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008)). In relation to the Church's evangelizing task in the USA, especially in confrontation with the so-called "USA culture", Marthaler holds that (1) inculturation is no other than the evangelization of cultures, (2) inculturation is the process by which the Gospel helps reshape a culture and by which the people's understanding of the Gospel is reshaped, (3) evangelizing the particular USA culture is giving it a Catholic identity, and (4) such a task is more on an *interior transformation*.[137]

This is very logical. The 1971 *GCD*'s named catechesis (together *missionary preaching or evangelization*, the liturgical form and the theological form) as one of the many forms of the Ministry of the Word.[138] As Paul VI pronounced in 1975 that evangelization is *gratia ac vocatio Ecclesiae propria*,[139] catechesis likewise openly formed an important part in the Church's action. Pope John Paul II in 1979 mentioned that catechesis is intimately linked to the whole life of the Church (exterior and interior) and is a priority in the Church internal and external activities.[140]

In the 1997 *GDC*, we find many fundamental functions of catechesis in view of attaining its definitive end - *communio cum Iesu Christo*[141] - professed in the faith of the one God, Father, on and the Holy Spirit[142]. According to *GDC*, for a deeper and intimate

---

[137] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., «Foreword» of *TLL* 37:2 (Winter 2000) 4-5.
[138] Cfr. *GCD* 17-18.
[139] Cfr. *EN* 14.
[140] Cfr. *CT* 13-15.
[141] Cfr. *GDC* 80-81.
[142] Cfr. *GDC* 82-83.

relationship with Christ, catechesis has the following function: *fidem conoscendam fovere* (knowledge and life of faith), *institutio liturgica* (liturgical formation), *formatio moralis* (Christian life formation), and *praecepta orandi tradere* (obtaining a life of prayer).[143] It further elaborates on catechesis' function concerning the formation of Church members towards community life and mission.[144]

2.4.4. Catechesis and the formation of catechists

In Marthaler's analysis, the important 'position' acquired by catechesis in the Church's mission of evangelization likewise animated the further attention in the field of catechesis in the USA in ecumenical and inter-religious dialogues, as well as in the concern for the spiritual and humane needs of catechists. Worthy to mention are, among others, the recognition of being a catechist as a "vocation" in the Church, the concern for the catechists' intellectual and spiritual formation, the remuneration/professionalization of their office.[145]

The consideration of important of human sciences in catechesis is another important aspect of the so-called *evangelization* progress, especially distinctive in the US context. Here, the human sciences have always supported the 'experiential plane' of catechesis.

2.4.5. Catechesis and doctrines

Regarding the publications of the *CCC*, its compendium, and the compendium of social doctrines, Marthaler clarifies that they are catechetical materials which must be contextualized in the whole catechetical ministry. He is consistent to his affirmation that they

---

[143] Cfr. *GDC* 85.

[144] Cfr. *GDC* 86.

[145] Cfr. MARTHALER, B., *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry….*, cit., 249-250.

are, especially the *CCC*, 'a sure doctrinal reference' and guide in the creation of local catechisms and directories.

Most Reverend Donald Cardinal Wuerl mentions of a 're-direction' of catechesis in the USA since the publication of the *CCC*. Since then, a growing awareness on the authentic and integral presentation of the doctrines of the Catholic faith has been observed (*manifest in the creation of orthodoxy oversight committees, the requiring of Declaration of conformity to the CCC, the making of the NDC and the USCCA, etc.*).

2.5. Warren and the "sapiential" catechesis within the ecclesial community

For Warren, more than a *ministry of symbolic* or *life structures* (as held by Marthaler), catechesis is the task of 'liberation', the freeing from the 'orchestrated' conditions or factors which may impede the living of the Jesus' way of life. In addition to that, living the Jesus' Way is aimed at transforming the society. This is the idea which Warren maintained in general in his past writings.

In his 2000-2010 writings, Warren is maintains that catechesis works in a wider context which is the Church's *pastoral* function or 'discipleship'.[146] In other writings, he often made it clear that catechesis fundamentally deals with *Christian discipleship* which takes place in the *ecclesial community* – Church and the living of the Jesus Way.

---

[146] It is enough to read the first lines of his essays in order to capture his general context, especially the following: *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church* (2000), *A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry* (2000), *Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis* (2004), *Imagining an Inconvenient Church* (2008), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis* (2008).

2.5.1. Catechesis and discipleship

Within this general context of discipleship within the community, Warren makes a distinction between catechesis and another noble undertaking, the religious education. He points out the importance of the basic element - freedom. One comes for catechesis or religious education not because a State regulation ordains so, but one wants it.[147] In the case of toddlers, of course, the freedom element is given by the parents.

Warren seems to have in view Marthaler's perspective of the shift of catechesis from being mere instruction to an activity which has for horizon life itself. He has been unswerving in stating that catechesis deals with "transforming sensibilities and practice", the changing for good of "behavior", of "a way of life", and of "sapience" (the practice-oriented learning). He adds to this concept of catechesis a *humanization* aspect which consists in the formation in culture, virtues, a good critical sense in relation to the contemporary culture of television publicities, strategies of resistance, utilitarianistic view of realities, the value of the dignity of persons, and even prayer life.[148]

This includes doctrinal deepening through practice (and evidently also through reason and study). He is quick to affirm that catechesis aims at *behavior, life-practice*, something similar to JM Lee's red-hot religion or lifestyle. Warren widens the scope of catechesis

---

[147] Warren's writings that underline this point are the following: *Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look* (2001) and *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008).

[148] See for instance, Warren's essays: *Catechesis and/or Religious education: Another Look* (2001), *Imagining an Inconvenient Church* (2008), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008) and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis* (2008).

to preserving the *'right environment'* in which 'discipleship' may be put into life.[149]

Warren made his doctoral thesis about the sociology of religion in CUA in 1973. He has been adept with the importance of testimony of Christian a life and the various cultural influences that may influence exteriorly and interiorly the religious space or world of believers.

He considered culture an *external factor* which may condition the mindset of a practitioner of the Jesus Way. He likewise hypothesizes the power of culture to create its own signifying system so as to influence the whole Church itself.[150] The question therefore that is at hand is: will the Church allow the adverse cultural system to contaminate its sacred space (or the minds of its members) or will the Church analyze, learn how, and adapt the 'manipulating realities strategy ('media bombardment', for instance)?

Preserving the right environment as part of the task of catechesis does not only operate with external factors like culture (as discussed previously). He likewise names a sort of *an internal form of living* (the internal human powers at work) despite of an adverse external factor. Warren shows how the *social imagination* influences the *religious culture* or *the norms of behavior* through *patterning perception electronically* (construction, shift, re-focus of images).

---

[149] Warren's writings that underline this point are the following: *Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look* (2001) and *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008).

[150] Warren employs various scientific theories, *vid.*, WARREN, M., «Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church», cit.; WARREN, M., «Imagining an Inconvenient Church», cit., 41-60; WARREN, M., «The Imagination of Youth», cit., 61-74; WARREN, M., «Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis», cit., 18-26; WARREN, M., «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», cit., 199-212; WARREN, M., «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look», cit., 125-144.

With the possible factors simply contrary to the Gospel practice, Warren therefore maintains his stance before of a catechesis with a counter-cultural task[151] or what he calls now "strategies of resistance".

Certainly Warren, as an expert on cultures, is aware of the many cultural opportunities for the practice of the Jesus Way of life and for the transformation of society. It cannot however be denied that his analyses present a rather negative outlook of culture. Moreover, he wrote less about how external factors (like society's culture) may help in the better understanding and the living of the Gospel.[152]

However, it is remarkable how Warren flawlessly communicates his catechetical positions employing the 'US catechetical parlance', that is, a way of communicating through *technical terms* used by social sciences. It must be stated that in his employment of *conceptual categories* from social sciences in catechesis, he chooses and uses them with a good critical sense.

2.5.2. The ecclesial community and catechesis

As mentioned above, Warren is very clear with his view: the community is always *the first and fundamental subject* of catechesis and permanent formation. In his observation for instance about the novelty of the 1997 *GDC* and the then USCC/NCCB's *Our Hearts were Burning within Us* (1999), he points out: the church life as primary communicator of gospel living *and* the bishops' ownership of the of the needed adult faith formation of the community.

---

[151] Cfr. MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis….*, cit., 218-238.

[152] Cfr. BENEDICT XVI, *Address given to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications*, Vatican City, 28.

Concerning the importance of the church or the community, Warren says that *GDC*, more than in *GCD*, gives emphasis the on the local church's gospel practice as the 'primary communicator of the gospel message'.[153] He further underlines *GDC*'s views of the church's struggle to be effective, like the sower in the parable, in 'discerning the most diverse social situations as potentially marked by the creative activity of God' or what he calls, the church's 'way of being in the world'. He says that this existential condition demands the church to interpret day to day happenings from a gospel perspective.[154]

He further attributes to the church or ecclesial community a *corporate memory* embodied in its symbols, customs and practices that help any neophyte see in flesh that which the community hold in its heart (faith).[155]

Warren however seems to place at an opposing position the *non-cognitive* and the *cognitive* aspects of communal catechesis. At times, he appears as negligent of the importance of the cognitive or intellectual formation in the determination of Catholic identity. This is evident in his principle of the priority of "embodied memory" over those "memorized Catholic doctrines", or in his often-used priority of secondary doctrines (Christian life) over primary doctrines (the dogmas).[156] Certainly, Christian life precedes dogmas and precepts. But in order to life an authentic Christian life, clarity of understanding – which are provided by dogmas and the precepts of

---

[153] Cfr. WARREN, M., «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», cit., 6

[154] *Ibid.*

[155] Cfr. WARREN, M., «Towards an Anamnetic catechesis», cit., 18-26.

[156] Cfr. WARREN, M., «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», cit., 6-15; WARREN, M., «Towards an Anamnetic catechesis», cit., 18-26; WARREN, M., «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», cit., 209-211.

the Church – the cognitive aspect of communal catechesis is a *sine qua non*.

Warren's remark the Holy Eucharist may be improved.[157] He emphasized the "sign aspect" of the Holy Eucharist, but less of its being *an effective sign* of the grace the sacrament gives.

In 2004, Warren thought of refining the content and tasks of catechesis and religious education in the light of many contemporary practical matters.[158] He has always vied for a transformation-oriented catechesis.   His intuitions seem to go with what is occurring nowadays with the publications of catechisms – *CCC, GDC, C-CCC, CSC, NDC, USCCA* and *the Youcat*: a catechesis with clearly-defined contents.

---

[157] See the following essays: *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church* (2000), *Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis* (2004) *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse (2004), The Imagination of Youth (2008),* and *Youth Ministry in an inconvenient Church (2008).*

[158] We refer to his essay *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse (2004).*

Conclusive Reflections

After an attempt to draw a historical and theological context for the catechesis of the USA in 2000-2010, with a special focus on some theological aspects, part of our conclusion at the end of this study is to affirm that *new catechetics* had a hand throughout the development up to the present picture of the USA catechesis. From its insinuation of giving attention to the anthropological dimension, various *new catechetics'* principles have led to a dynamic intra-ecclesial catechesis with extra-ecclesial orientations (ethnical identities, secular life, politics, technological culture, society, etc.).

1. Education in faith, with Moran, directed its attention, from instructing doctrines and formulae of faith to the dynamic relationship between God and man, or what we call, the life of faith, life in communion with God.[1] Moran was right in intuiting that *catechesis must be "actual"*, that it must be relevant to the contemporary times, that it must be able to engage into sincere conversation with man in the contemporary times. Catechesis ministers man's relationship with God in a way that it always seeks to contribute to the forging and fortification of the man's anchorage in God in whatever time in history and in whatever human circumstance.

Moran was also right in asserting that the *"divine-human communion" reached its apex in Christ's paschal mystery*, and therefore, such

---

[1] Please refer to Chapter II of this work, dedicated entirely to the discussion of Moran and his 2000-2010 writings, 95-145; or to the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century, found in this same work, 380-383, 417-424.

a communion continues in the actual moment through the Spirit-filled Christ.

Moran's view may not necessarily contradict a religious education based on "the communion between God and man that had taken in the past and now conserved in the Church's Tradition and Scriptures". It is the same Holy Spirit who worked throughout the history of salvation – from the times of Abraham, the prophets, up to the contemporary times dominated by the internet. Such a divine-human communion had its fullness in the mystery of Jesus Christ.

Moran however preferred the idea of *God revealing to man "in" and "through" everything.* He preferred the idea of a "world sacramentality" which seems not to give utmost importance to *the distinction between "the fullness of revelation in Jesus Christ" and the other forms of divine communications or manifestations.* Moran is not able to take advantage of the "fullness of revelation of Jesus Christ" in his catechetical framework which is totally dependent on the "actual" divine-human communion. Moreover, Moran is not able to appreciate the action of the Holy Spirit in his concept of religious education. *It is the same Holy Spirit who is behind the Spirit-filled Christ working in every individual and in the Church today*, and who was at work through the prophets of old and during the earthly life of our Lord.

Moran, who is known for his attention on Christian life, in particular, on the divine-human relation of every *individual*, dedicated *Fashioning a People Today* (2007), for church education. His main ideas may be summarized with the following lines: (1) there is a certain *desire for a community* dwelling in every individual's heart; (2) that innate desire can be fulfilled by exterior community structures like the family, church, and society; (3) the church in itself fulfills this *community* desire of every individual through an educational process, and; (4) that 'educational' process refers to the interplay of different

'ministries' within the church (*leitourgia*, *didache*, *kerygma*, and *diakonia*). The ecclesial model presented by Moran is attractive. It recognizes the primacy and importance to the individual in the community. In this ecclesial framework, every body and every thing may educate according to Moran. In addition to that, in Moran's mental design, the interplay of the various ecclesial ministries serves the innate, or we can even say, sacred, demand coming from the very core of every individual's hearts. We can therefore say that Moran's *ecclesial community* takes into account the concrete individuals composing it.

As Moran conceived a church composed of people filled with the best ideals and democratic values, he failed however to take into consideration the reality of *the mystical body of Christ, structured in time*. In his idea of church education as interplay of the classical ministries and community structures, he failed to give due consideration to the church as a people owned, animated and led in time by the Spirit of God, as documented by the hagiographers (biblical concepts of *qahal* and *ekklesia*).

In addition to that, we cannot however demerit Moran's concern for the relevance of the Church and her teaching tasks in the contemporary times. The concern for "speaking a language intelligible to the contemporary world" and the participation of all the baptized in community education are among the valuable contributions of Moran's reflections.

2. The above mentioned "valuable contributions" were likewise present in the educational perspective of James Michael Lee

IV.[2] He viewed a religious instruction anchored on *social sciences* that influences the *way of living* a Christian life.

Parting from the social science perspective, he viewed "faith" simply as an "intellectual construct", but which has "empirical" manifestations. From his perspective, faith may be detectable or measurable in one's way of living. Without affirming that God does not cause faith, Lee asserted – of course, always from the social science perspective - that religious instruction does not only foment but also cause faith. The affirmation certainly caused criticisms. Faith is a gift from God. He tried to avoid the said expression in his only essay in 2000 and focused more on the role of a religious instruction in forging a mature faith (red-hot religion).

Lee vied for the use of social sciences because indeed they better affix the study of religion to human reality. That "anchorage to reality" seemed the reason for Lee to protest against a purely cognitive approach to the study of religion. He unfortunately accused "theology" as the embodiment of that non-practical oriented science.

In reality, neither social science alone nor theology alone can be an effective foundation of religious education. Each approaches religion from different levels. Social sciences study the empirical dimension of religion while simultaneously respecting its non-empirical aspect. Faith as a gift from God is outside the object of study of social sciences. Theology focuses on the revealed truths held by a religion. But its concern does not stop merely in speculations. We must however accept the fact that neither a

---

[2] Chapter III of this work is entirely dedicated to Lee and his 2000-2010 writings, 147-171. See also the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century, found in this same work, 384-390, 425-431.

bombardment of Christian dogmas can be a fully effective approach to educating in faith. Our point is that both theology and social sciences are necessary for any religious education aimed at forging maturity of faith in Christian life.

In any case, Lee intuited the importance of scientific study (cognitive-oriented study) in a religious education, as mentioned above, aimed at the maturity in Christian life.

He intuited the utmost importance of taking religious instruction professionally (which included the competence in the use of social sciences). He even perceived, though did not deepen it, the idea that "teaching religion" is a "vocation", a participation through Baptism in the teaching mission of Jesus Christ. His intuition reminds us of Vatican II's teaching on the baptized person's participation in the *tria munera* (kingly, prophetic and priestly functions) of Jesus Christ. It is baptism, not even the office of the religious educator, which demands that baptized lay persons teach the faith.

Moreover, this participation in Christ's *munus docendi* takes place concretely *in* the Church, the mystical body of Jesus Christ. Lee's choice of not deepening the idea is understandable. In his writings before, he often asserted that the Church (referring to the hierarchy and the Magisterium) is "external" to man's interior faith. The teaching act, for him, is a natural demand of faith and therefore also "interior". The Magisterium however is *outside* and therefore has no authority over the teaching of faith. For Lee, all the Church does with the magisterial authority, which is not service, but "manipulation". Lee forgot however that the teaching act, either by the Magisterium or by lay religious educators belong to one single ecclesial act. Both teaching actions are participation in Christ's *munus docendi* in the Church. Again, the Spirit-filled Christ who works in the

Holy Father and the bishops teaching on the inviolability of human life, is the same Spirit-filled Christ at work in parents who teaches children to make the sign of the cross. It is that same Holy Spirit who works "inside" and "outside" man's soul that transforms faith to become "red-hot religion", that is, a life of faith, a faith-filled lifestyle translated into charity.

3. That "faith-transformed-into-charity" in society is what characterizes, among others, Groome's concept of catechetical education.[3] He often expressed his idea about the Church's task of educating in faith as both *religious-cultural erudition and interior familiarization of the Church's practices and symbols*. In Groome's view, the "fulfillment of God's reign" forms part in that society-oriented church education.

It is remarkable how Groome conceived a "catechetical education" founded on "faith-convictions". With those faith-convictions, catechetical education leads man to work for the furthering of God's reign in secular culture and within society's public structures.

He was further convinced that an existence based on faith, like that of being a Catholic, is a spiritual matter. He was deeply convinced that faith shaped man's perspective of his own self, of the community, and of the world, and therefore, of man's own actions. He was therefore convinced that living with faith is compatible and even advantageous in improving the "non-religious" realm of society.

---

[3] For an analysis of Groome's writings in 2000-2010, refer to Chapter IV of this work, 173-219; or to the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century found in this same work, 391-403, 432-444.

Groome identified that "faith" on which Christian spirituality and catechetical education are founded with those "shared faith-convictions" with other believers. He *did not clarify however whether those creeds which distinguish a Catholic, for example, from other believers, are necessary for an authentic spirituality.* In like manner, he did not make it clear whether believing in the infallibility of the Petrine ministry, in the unicity and universality of the salvation in Jesus Christ, and in the Roman Catholic Church's possession of the full means of salvation, may make a difference in authentic Christian existence and in the apostolate.

Groome seems to assign the hermeneutical task of "identifying the contents of faith" to the whole ecclesial community itself. Unlike Moran, Groome gave Tradition and Scriptures a special place in the whole of the Church's hermeneutical task. His theory of *shared praxis* approach includes the community's discernment of the *present* circumstances under the guidance of the community's experience in the *past* gathered together in the Tradition and Scriptures.

However, *the absence of the Magisterium* in relation to the Church's teaching task in general is noticeable in his 2000-2010 writings. In fact, Groome in this decade advanced his reflection on the ecclesial community's educational ministry and the spiritual identity of parents and teachers in the ecclesial community, without any reference or mention of the official teaching office of the Church (Magisterium). This does not mean however the negation of the Magisterium's part.

In his past writings, he identified a sort of "a hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed" in interpreting the truths of faith. While Groome elaborated on the shared teaching opportunity between the Magisterium, the theologians' researches, and the sensus fidelium, he

however favored a "hermeneutical privilege', attributed *not* to the Magisterium, but to the 'oppressed' referring to the poor, the marginalized, the persecuted, and the missionaries in mission lands. *In his 2000-2010 writings*, however, in his discussion of the Church's Tradition and Scriptures, he no longer mentions the Magisterium. In view of this context, we reiterate that the Magisterium, the official teaching authority of the Church, is an important instrument of the Holy Spirit in guarding the deposit of faith.

Groome's insistence of the equal opportunity in the exercise of the *munus docendi* in the Church may be explained by the kind of church he had in mind. He seemed to be convinced that *a community of equals* is a structure more faithful to the community of disciples that Jesus created to further His mission, than *a hierarchically-structured church*. His view is not what the Catholic Church holds.

However, we cannot take away from Groome the merit of his intuitions concerning the radically equal importance of the participation of all baptized – priests and lay people alike - in the Church's task of catechetical education. The two "participations" in the *munus docendi* are equal, but are *essentially* different and distinguishable forms.

In addition to that, his consideration concerning "education from and for faith" *and* "being a catholic" and the "furthering of God's reign" as spiritual matters, are among Groome's precious insights and contributions to the catechetical development of the US catechesis.

4. In line, again, with the development of the US catechesis, the proponents of understanding *catechesis as a socialization theory*, Marthaler and Warren, reached the same observations mentioned above (in the discussion of Moran, Lee and Groome), especially

concerning the anthropological attention and development of the US catechesis in the last three centuries. Marthaler and Warren, however, encountered no problems with the role of a church structured with a hierarchy and with an official teaching office (Magisterium).

Marthaler, in his 2000-2010 writings, employed interchangeably the terms 'catechesis', 'catechesis of symbolics', and 'catholic religious education'.[4] The catechetical theorists mentioned previously – Moran, Lee and Groome – continued with their proposal before, that is, the relinquishment of the traditional term "catechesis"; in their 2000-2010 writings, each coined a new term referring to the educational task of the Church, such as "comprehensive and particular religious education" (Moran), "religious instruction" (Lee), and "catholic education" (Groome). We simply note that while the disagreement of the name to refer to 'educating in faith' may indicate the differing personal catechetical frameworks of its proponents, this apparent semantic confusion may also be interpreted as an indication of the development or enrichment in the understanding of the reality of catechesis itself. If one has to really reflect on the ideas behind every semantic proposal, there is one core idea: catechesis is no more a mere *instruction* affair, but about the nurture of Christian life.

This is in fact the principal idea of Marthaler observable in his 2000-2010 writings. He observed that since the close of Vatican II, the interest of catechesis has shifted from being *a cognitive instruction* into what is now an *integral*, *holistic* and *real human-existence*

---

[4] Chapter V of this work is entirely dedicated to Marthaler and his 2000-2010 writings, 223-337. See also the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century found in this same work, 404-408, 445-450.

affair. With his idea of catechesis as a socialization process, it can be observed that for Marthaler, the Church is the principal setting of that "human experience" shift in catechetical ministry.

Marthaler expressed best the idea of the *shift* through ecclesiastical terminologies: catechesis through and in the community, *a biblical, liturgical and communal catechesis*, catechesis aimed at the service of community and forged by the liturgy, ministry of the Word, evangelizing catechesis, and the like. All these signify not only the amplification and development of the understanding of catechesis throughout these years.

Marthaler identified in concrete the *catechetical shift* in the USA from *TTJD* (1972) up to the publication of the *USCCA* (2005). *TTJD* (1972) systematized catechesis through the four pillars: *service, community, message, (and liturgy)*, while *Basic teachings* (1973) presented the cognitive and doctrinal foundations which later would be adapted by succeeding documents in the USA, by the USCCB or by other groups like the NCEA or the PAC. As known, the cognitive (doctrine) and practical (liturgy, social and moral aspects) concerns in *TTJD* (1972) and *Basic teachings* (1973) were both incorporated to the first US national catechetical directory, *SLF* (1979). In its early stage, the US catechesis' interest on maturity of faith, rather than doctrines, were traceable in a very special way in the documents regarding the formation of young people. Since *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), the catechesis directed to youth people had been directed towards maturity of faith, or adulthood in faith. That maturity of faith was characterized by active participation and aimed at serving the community. This line of thinking was maintained consistently in subsequent youth documents in the 80s and 90s. In the Bishops' pastoral plan for the third millennium, *OHBW* (1999), adult faith formation became the expressed priority of all catechetical

endeavors; and in 2005, *USCCA* is meant to be its doctrinal guide and reference.

These developments in the USA happened side by side with the catechetical progress in the whole Church throughout the world. Marthaler seemed to point out that the intra-ecclesial progress with the Church's increasing awareness of the importance of the Sacred Liturgy, of the Word of God, and its own mission in the world and of its own existence and identity.

From the point of view of its educational task, the Church had to take advantage of the richness of its own resources. In the documents after Vatican II, especially *GCD* (1971) and *CIC* (1983), it was clear that catechesis was a sort of an ecclesial instruction, a ministry of the Word – side by side with liturgical preaching, theology, first evangelization - aimed at living Christian life.

In what he claims to be Pope John Paul II's 'popularization' of the (new) evangelization, Marthaler asserts that the Church has understood better that her mission, evangelization, is an integral part of her very nature. In that ecclesial consciousness, Marthaler marks the 'job promotion' of catechesis, from being *one of the forms of Ministry of the Word* to being *an indispensable part of the Church essential expression*, that is, in *mission* and *evangelization*.

The 1971 *GCD*'s named catechesis (together with *missionary preaching or evangelization*, the liturgical form and the theological form) as one of the many forms of the Ministry of the Word. In *EN* (1975), Paul VI stated that evangelization is *gratia ac vocatio Ecclesiae propria*; thereby, catechesis formed an integral part in the Church's action. In *CT* (1979), Blessed Pope John Paul II, announced that catechesis is intimately linked to the whole life of the Church (exterior and interior) and is a priority in the Church internal and external activities. Together with drafting which started 1984 until

the publication of the *editio typica latina* of the *CCC*, new directives in the catechetical ministry were needed. The 1997 *GDC* accumulated the various developments that helped shape the direction, functions and even the maturing understanding of the Church's catechetical task. According to the *GDC*, in view of accomplishing the definitive end of catechesis, communion with Jesus Christ professed in the faith of the one God, Father, on and the Holy Spirit, it has the following function: *fidem conoscendam fovere* (knowledge and life of faith), *institutio liturgica* (liturgical formation), *formatio moralis* (Christian life formation), and *praecepta orandi tradere* (obtaining a life of prayer). It also explained that catechesis has to take charge of the formation of Church members towards community life and mission.

Marthaler reiterated the mind of the catechetical directory that *the community is the locus – setting, agent, and end – of catechesis*. With his idea of catechesis as a socialization model, it is not difficult to understand the many instances in which Marthaler underlined the importance of the testimony of the whole community in the *knowledge* and in the *life* of faith.

Marthaler sustained that in order to attain *communion with God* (ultimate end of catechesis) and the maturity of faith (manifest in the individual or communal responsible commitment to lead a Christian life), the ecclesial community is an indispensable factor. Aside from the fact that individuals profess the faith of the ecclesial community, the same community nurtures that faith held by the individual through the community's whole life. He further concretized that *a mature faith* is one which flows to *the active participation in the community and in the society*.

Remarkable however in the socialization catechists, "experts in *intra-ecclesial* nurture of faith", is their insights concerning the *extra-ecclesial orientation* of Church catechesis. Marthaler's thought goes

with his idea of evangelization and inculturation. First and foremost, for Marthaler, the recognition of *evangelization* as integral part of the Church's very being placed *catechesis* into the heart of the Church's very core. Marthaler alluded to the emerging idea of 'evangelizing catechesis' in one of titles of the chapters of his 2008 book.

In relation to the Church's evangelizing task in the USA, especially in confrontation with the so-called "USA culture", Marthaler holds that (1) inculturation is no other than the evangelization of cultures, (2) inculturation is the process by which the Gospel helps reshape a culture and by which the people's understanding of the Gospel is reshaped, (3) evangelizing the particular USA culture is giving it a Catholic identity, and (4) more than creating programs and strategies, evangelizing a particular culture is an *interior transformation*.

In Marthaler's analysis, the important 'position' acquired by catechesis in the Church's mission of evangelization likewise animated the further attention in the field of catechesis in the USA in ecumenical and inter-religious dialogues, as well as in the concern for *the spiritual and humane needs of catechists*. Worthy to mention are, among others, the recognition of being a catechist as a "vocation" in the Church, the concern for the catechists' intellectual and spiritual formation, the remuneration/professionalization of their office.

In catechesis as a socialization process (as sustained by Marthaler), the liturgical treasure of the ecclesial community is a principal element in the nurture of faith. In fact for Marthaler, the intra-ecclesial catholic religious education, now oriented towards the maturity in Christian life, had likewise developed *liturgically*. Though without elaborating, Marthaler emphasized his observation of the catechetical development in the *liturgical aspect* with the reforms of the *RCIA* (1972 and its eventual revisions) and the inclusion of the

prenotandas of the liturgical books. *He affirmed that the RCIA showed the necessary relationship between liturgy and catechesis*, again without elaborating. Marthaler's simple affirmation is confirmed by a scientific survey which was conducted in 1997 by the *NCCB* about the efficiency of *RCIA* in the US parishes. From its very positive result, the US Bishops' made *adult faith formation* as priority of the pastoral direction of the US Church in the third millennium (see USCCB's *OHWB*). Marthaler saw that liturgical catechesis functions efficiently in *deciphering of the rituals and symbols of faith*. With the present liturgical progress, that is, catechesis linked with liturgy in the formation of adult faith, liturgical catechesis may forge Catholics to *see through faith* God's actions-made-efficient through sacred symbols and rites, as he affirmed already in 1972.

Finally, in line with *the idea of a "practical-oriented catechesis"* observed and sustained by Marthaler, we highlight the fact that little has been written concerning *the "cognitive" or "doctrinal" aspect of catechesis.*

Marthaler, perhaps due for the *descriptive nature* of his 2000-2010 writings, limited himself in *simply indicating*, among others, the 1983 *CIC*'s mention of "an ecclesial instruction in view of Christian living", or the 2004 *NDC*'s mention of "theological catechesis" (*NDC* Chapter 2, 17-D). Regarding the publications of the *CCC*, C-CCC, C-SC, Marthaler underlined that they are catechetical *materials* which must *be contextualized in the whole catechetical ministry*. He was consistent to his affirmation that they are, especially the *CCC*, 'a sure doctrinal reference' and guide in the creation of local catechisms and directories.

It was Cardinal Wuerl instead that explicitly mentioned that there is *a change of direction of US catechesis* since the publication of the *CCC*. This "re-direction" consists of a growing awareness on the

authentic and integral presentation of the doctrines of the Catholic faith.

5. Warren, on his part, vied for *a catechesis of behavior* or aimed at practice, of transforming sensibilities.[5] He seems to have in view Marthaler's perspective of *the shift of catechesis from being mere instruction to Christian-life oriented activity*. We observe that in his 2000-2010 writings, Warren had been insistent in affirming that *catechesis is all about "transforming sensibilities and practice", the changing for good of "behavior", of "a way of life", and of "sapience"* (the practice-oriented learning). As we have commented on Marthaler, all these, which Warren had also observed, signify not only the amplification but also the development of the understanding of catechesis throughout these years.

We found two unique concepts in Warren's writings (in the decade 2000-2010) related to his understanding of the nature of catechesis: the incorporation of the idea of a *humanizing catechesis* and the importance of *freedom* in catechesis as well as in religious education.

The *humanization* aspect of catechesis consists in the formation in culture, virtues, a good critical sense in relation to the contemporary culture of television publicities, strategies of resistance, utilitarianistic view of realities, the value of the dignity of persons, and even prayer life. This aspect reflects what Blessed John Paul II always taught in many occasions, echoing the mind of Vatican II's *Gaudium et spes*: man is the way of the Church. In the same line, the

---

[5] Please refer to Chapter VI of this work, dedicated entirely to the discussion of Warren and his 2000-2010 writings, 339-373; or to the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century, found in this same work, 409-415, 451-456.

thought of Warren would lead us to say that the more a person is catechized, the more human he or she is, the more sensitive he or she is in the most humane concerns of society.

Moreover, in comparing catechesis and religious education, Warren pointed out the importance of the basic element - *freedom*. One comes for catechesis or religious education not because a State regulation ordains so, but one wants it. In the case of toddlers, of course, the freedom element is given by the parents. His idea here of *freedom in catechesis or religious education* is directed to *the students' disposition* that teachers or superiors *must respect and take seriously* in any type of education in faith. The particular issue of *freedom in catechesis or religious instruction* in Europe nowadays refers instead to the parents' freedom and right to choose to educate religiously their children. Just the same, freedom is a fundamental element in any faith education.

We further observe in Warren's catechetical doctrine *an insufficient deepening* of the *"cognitive aspect"* of community catechesis. In his discussions, he rather left the "cognitive aspect" in "a bad light". To highlight the point of our comment, we bring forward some concrete examples. In underlining the *corporate memory* embodied in the ecclesial community's symbols, customs and practices that help any neophyte see in flesh that which the community hold in its heart (faith), Warren seemed to place in an opposing position the *non-cognitive* and the *cognitive* aspects of communal catechesis. At times, he appears as negligent of the importance of the cognitive or intellectual formation in the determination of Catholic identity. This is evident in his principle of the priority of "embodied memory" over those "memorized Catholic doctrines", or in his often-used priority of "secondary doctrines" (dogmas) over "primary doctrines" (Christian life).

Certainly, Christian life precedes dogmas and precepts. We hold however that in order to live an authentic Christian life, clarity of understanding and eventually the nurture of "the cognitive aspect of communal catechesis" – in which dogmas and the precepts of the Church are a big help – is a *sine qua non. A doctrinal deepening is necessary for maturity in a genuine Christian life.*

The *liturgical dimension* in the community catechesis is another aspect in Warren's catechetical doctrine which can still be developed. As a proponent of catechesis as a socialization process, he must have intuited, like Marthaler, the importance in the nurture of faith of "deciphering the divine through the communities' sacred symbols and practices". Warren on his part, in two of his essays where he made reference to the Holy Eucharist (the essay concerning the "anamnetic catechesis" and the essay on the formation of the Youth), he only underlined the "sign aspect" of the Holy Eucharist, but less of its "effective" aspect. In the Holy Eucharist, above all, the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ is received. The definite end of catechesis is *communio cum Iesu Christo* (*GDC* 80-81).

Warren is outstanding in his expertise in the use of sociological language and concepts. This is evident in his elaboration of the *"extra-ecclesial orientation"* of his church-centered catechesis. We observe that since the beginning of his writing career, for Warren, *the concrete historical manifestation of the Good News* and the Church's *catechetical task* is closely related. In one moment of his catechetical career, he sustained that more than a *ministry of symbolic* or *life structures*, catechesis is a task of 'liberation', the freeing from the 'orchestrated' conditions which are simply anti-Gospel.

In other words, in this context, *catechesis*, for Warren, *has the task of clearing a space in which the Jesus-way of life promoted by the Church*

may thrive and eventually perform its transformative function in the world. That perhaps explains Warren's *huge interest* on culture, signifying systems, theories of the mind's assimilation of external factors, etc.. It must be said also that, in all these, Warren has no problem in exploring and using scientific theories (with a very good critical sense) in presenting his positions in catechesis.

In his 2000-2010 writings, it is clear to Warren that catechesis works in a wider context, which is the Church's *pastoral* function. He had been consistent in maintaining that catechesis deals with *transforming sensibilities and practice.* He extends catechesis preoccupation with maintaining the *'right environment'* in which 'discipleship' may be put into life.

Warren, an expert on the sociology of religion, seemed to be cautious however with *culture.* For Warren, the testimony of Christian life is central in the nurture of faith in the ecclesial community. He has been attentive to the various cultural influences that may influence exteriorly and interiorly the religious space or world of believers.

He considered *culture* an *external factor* which may influence the individual and corporate memory of the community. He likewise hypothesized the power of culture to create its own signifying system so as to influence the whole Church itself.

Preserving the right environment as part of the task of catechesis does not only operate with external factors like culture. He likewise nominated *an internal form of living* (the internal human powers at work) despite of an adverse external factor. Warren showed how the *social imagination* influences the *religious culture* or *the norms of behavior* through *patterning perception electronically* (construction, shift, re-focus of images). As known, Warren maintains *a counter-cultural stance* for catechesis, a position he had made in his earlier

writings until now. That counter-cultural stance consists of what he calls now "strategies of resistance". The affirmations of Blessed John Paul II and Benedict XVI may complete the "cautioning intuitions" of Warren. These Holy Fathers, in their teachings, consider that contemporary "digital culture" can be not only a new anthropological perspective and an instruments for transmitting the Gospel but also a setting for reflecting more deeply the relations of the Christian faith to man's contemporary preoccupations.

We opine that Warren, as an expert on cultures, is certainly aware of the many cultural opportunities for the practice of the Jesus Way of life and for the transformation of society. It cannot however be denied that his analyses present a rather negative outlook of culture. Moreover, he wrote less about how external factors (like society's culture) may help in the better understanding of human life and the living of the Gospel. As already mentioned above, we bow to how Warren flawlessly communicates his catechetical positions employing the 'US catechetical parlance', that is, a way of communicating through *technical terms* used by social sciences. It must be stated that in his employment of *conceptual categories* from social sciences in catechesis, he chooses and uses them with a good critical sense.

General Index

Bibliography

I - PRIMARY SOURCES

1 - Magisterium

Vatican II Documents

VATICAN II, Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes* (1966), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1319-1644.

_____, Dogmatic Constitution *Dei verbum* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 872-911.

_____, Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 284-456.

_____, Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1-244.

_____, Decree *Ad Gentes divinitus* (1966), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1087-1242.

_____, Decree *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 912-1041.

_____, Decree *Christus Dominus* (1966), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 573-701.

_____, Decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 494-572.

_____, Declaration *Dignitatis humanae* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1042-1086.

_____, Declaration *Nostra aetate* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 853-871.

_____, Declaration *Gravissimum Educationis* (1965) in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 819-852.

Papal Documents

JOHN XXIII, Allocutio *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, 11 October 1962, in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 26-69.

PAUL VI, Adhortatio apostolica *Evangelii nuntiandi*, 08 December 1975, in EV 5, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1588-1716.

JOHN PAUL II, Adhortatio apostolica *Catechesi Tradendae*, 16 October 1979, in EV 6, Bologna: EDB, 1980, 1764-1939.

_____, Carta encíclica *"Redemptoris missio"*, 12 July 1990, Madrid: Promoción Popular Cristiana, 1992.

_____, Constitutio apostolica *Ex corde ecclesiae*, 15 August 1990, in EV 12, Bologna: EDB, 1992, 414-492.

BENEDICT XVI, *Homily during a Mass celebrated in Lourdes,* Lourdes, France, 14 September 2008.

_____, Enc. *Caritas in Veritate*, 29 June 2009, in vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/.

_____, *Address to Members of the International Theological Commission*, Consistory Hall, 3 December 2010.

_____, *Address given to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications*, Vatican City, 28 February 2011.

_____, *Address given before the praying of the midday Regina Caeli*, Venice, Italy, 8 May 2011.

Documents of Pontifical Congregations

CONGREGATION FOR THE CLERGY, Directorium catechisticum generale *Ad normam decreti* (11 April 1971), in EV 4, Bologna: EDB, 1978, 453-654.

Codex Iuris Canonici (25 January 1983), in EV 8, Bologna: EDB, 1984.

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH, Instructio *Donum veritatis*, 24 May 1990, in EV 12, Bologna: EDB, 1992, 244-305.

CONGREGATION FOR THE CLERGY, Directorium generale pro catechesi *Concilium Vaticanum II* (15 August 1997), in EV 16, Bologna: EDB, 1999, 741-1127.

CATECISMO DE LA IGLESIA CATÓLICA, Madrid: Asociación de Editores del Catecismo, 1999.

CATECISMO DE LA IGLESIA CATÓLICA: COMPENDIO, Madrid: Asociación de Editores del Catecismo, 2005.

COMISIÓN PONTIFICIA "IUSTITIA ET PAX", COMPENDIO DE LA DOCTRINA SOCIAL DE LA IGLESIA, Città del Vaticano: LEV, 2005.

Documents of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) and its Departments

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS/UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999.

———, *Journey to the fullness of life. A Report of the Implementation of the Rite of Catholic Christian Initiation for Adults in the United States*,

Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2000.

USCCB, Statement *In Support of catechetical ministry*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, June 16, 2000.

_____, *Stewardship and Young Adults: An invitation to help change the world*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2003.

_____, *National Directory for Catechesis*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005.

_____, *United States Catholic Catechism for Adults*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006.

_____, *Doctrinal Elements of a Curriculum Framework for the Development of Catechetical Materials for Young People of High School Age*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2008.

2 - The writings of the principal authors in 2000-2010

GROOME, TH., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», in *TLL* 37/4 (Summer 2001) 16-29.

_____, «Educación Catequética Global», in *Concilium* 4 (Fall 2002) 583-592.

_____, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», in GROOME, TH.-HORELL, H. (eds.), *Horizons and Hopes: The Future of Religious Education*, NY: Paulist Press, 2003, 1-30.

_____, «Remembering and Imagining», in *Religious Education* 98/4 (2003) 511-520;

_____, *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, NY: HarperSan Francisco Publishers, 2003.

_____, «Let the Imagination Soar», in HUEBSCH, B. (ed.), *Imagining a New Church: Building a Community of Life*, Texas: Thomas More Publishing, 2003, 37-58.

_____, «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», in *Faithful Past Faith-Filled Future. Papers Commissioned for the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Commission*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 25-36.

_____, «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», in AUGENSTEIN, J., KAUFFMAN, C. F., WISTER, R. J. (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Catholic Education: Historical Essays in Honor of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 179-198.

_____, «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», in POPE, S. (ed.), *Common Calling: The Laity and Governance of the Catholic Church*, Washington: Georgetown Press, 2004, 195-208.

_____, «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», in ANDERSON, H., FOLEY, E., MILLER-MCLEMORE, B. AND SCHRIETER, R. (eds.), *Mutuatlity Matters*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004., 211-224.

_____, «The Church is Catechetical», in MADGES, W. AND DALEY, M. (eds.), *The Many Marks of the Church*, CT: Twenty Third Publications, 2006, 79-84.

_____, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education» in IMBELLI, R. (ed.), *Handing On the Faith*, NY: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2006, 172-192.

LEE, J.M. IV (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 2000.

MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds: Notes and Comments on the General Directory for Catechesis*, Washington, D. C.: United States Catholic Conference, 2000.

_____, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry: A Digest of Recent Church Documents*, Washington DC: National Catholic Education, 2008.

MORAN, G., «Building on the Past», in LEE, JM IV (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 2000, 134-154.

_____, *Both Sides: The Story of Revelation*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2002.

_____, *Fashioning a People Today: The Educational Insights of Maria Harris*, MN: Twenty Third Publications, 2007.

_____, *Speaking of Teaching: Lessons from History*, MD: Lexington Books Lanham, 2008.

_____, *Believing in a Revealing God: The Basis of the Christian Life*, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.

WARREN, M. (ed.), *Changing Churches – the Local Church and the Structures of Change*, OR: Pastoral Press, 2000

_____, «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», in *TLL* 37/1 (Fall 2000) 6-14.

_____, «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look», in ROEBBEN, B.-WARREN, M. (eds.), *Religious Education as Practical Theology*, Leuven: Peeters Publishers 2001, 125-144.

_____, «Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis», in *TLL* 40/4 (2004) 18-26.

_____, «Finalités et contenus représcises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», in *Revue Lumen Vitae* LIX/2 (2004) 199-212.

_____, «Imagining an Inconvenient Church», in MAHAN, B., WARREN, M. AND WHITE, D. (eds.), *Awakening Youth Discipleship*, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008, 41-60.

_____, «The Imagination of Youth», in MAHAN, B., WARREN, M. AND WHITE, D. (eds.), *Awakening Youth Discipleship*, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008, 61-74.

_____, «Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis», in PARTNERSHIP ON ADOLESCENT CATECHESIS (ed.), *Sourcebook for Adolescent Catechesis*, 1, Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2008, 37-42.

3 – Some of the writings of the same authors before 2000

GROOME, TH., *Christian Religious Education. Sharing our Story and Vision*, New York: Harper San Francisco, 1980.

_____, *Sharing faith. A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry*, Harper San Francisco, New York 1991.

_____, *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent*, Texas: Thomas More. An RCL Company, 1998.

LEE, J. M. IV, *The Shape of Religious Instruction*, Pflaum, Dayton (Ohio) 1971.

_____, *The Flow of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1973.

_____, *The Content of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1985.

_____ (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1990.

MARTHALER, B., *Catechetics in Context. Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory Issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy*, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, 1973.

_____, *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Traditional Themes and Contemporary Issues*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1994.

_____, *The Catechism Yesterday and Today. The Evolution of a Genre*, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1995.

MORAN, G., *Catechesis of Revelation*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

_____, *Religious Education as a Second Language*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1989.

MORAN, G.-HARRIS, M., *Reshaping Religious Education. Conversations on Contemporary Practice*, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.

WARREN, M. (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics (1)*, Minnesota: St. Mary's Press, 1983.

_____, *Faith, Culture, and the Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1989.

_____ (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics (2)*, Minnesota: St. Mary's Press, 1997.

4 - About Catechesis in the United States of America

PELLITERO, R., «La reflexión catequética actual en los Estados Unidos», in *Scripta Theologica* 29 (1997/2) 585-620.

HAGARTY, M. T., *The Role of 'Experience' in Religious Education/Catechesis in the United States since the Second Vatican Council: An Analysis and Critique*, Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 2000.

MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis en los Estados Unidos: cinco autores católicos* (1966-1992), Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 2000.

II – SECONDARY SOURCES

ALBERICH, E., *La Catechesi oggi. Manuale di catechetica fondamentale*, Torino: Elledici, 2001.

ALEJOS GRAU, C-J. (ed.), *Al Servicio de la Educacion en la Fe. El Compendio del Catecismo de la Iglesia Catolica*, Madrid: Palabra, 2007.

ATKINSONS, H., «James Michael Lee», in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/.

AUGENSTEIN, J., KAUFFMANN, C. AND WISTER, R. (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Catholic Education: Historical Essays in Honor of the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003.

BISSOLI, C., *Va' e Annuncia (Mc 5, 19). Manuale di Catechesi Biblica*, Torino: Elledici, 2006.

BURGESS, H., «Memorial: James Michael Lee [B. 9-29-1931, D. 7-15-2004]», in *Religious Education*, 100/2 (2005) 109-112.

CAPRILE, G., *Il Sinodo dei Vescovi. Quarta Assemblea Generale (30 settembre-29 ottobre 1977)*, Roma: Società Grafica Romana, 1978.

CHICO GONZÁLEZ, P., *Diccionario de Catequesis y Pedagogía Religiosa*, Tomo I-II, Madrid: Bruño, 2006.

DARCY-BERUBE, F., *Religious Education at a Crossroads. Moving On in the Freedom of the Spirit*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1995.

DULLES, A., *Evangelization for the Third Millennium*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2009.

ELIAS, J., *History of Christian Education: Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox Perspective*, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company, 2003.

ELIAS, J.- NOLAN, L. (eds.), *Educators in the Intellectual Tradition*, Connecticut: Sacred Heart University Press, 2009.

ENGLISH, L., «John Elias», in *Christian Educators in the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University [www.Talbot.edu/ce20]).

ETCHEGARAY CRUZ, A., *Storia della Catechesi* (2nd ed. Riveduta e ampliata), Roma: Edizione Paoline, 1983.

FLANNERY, A. (ed.), *The Conciliar and Post-conciliar Documents/Vatican Council II (1981 edition)*, New York: Costello, 1975.

FRANCHI, L. (ed.), *An Anthology of the Catholic Teaching on Education*, London-New York: Scepter, 2007.

GALE, T., *Contemporary Authors* (2007) (acquired through at amazon).

GEVAERT, J. (dir.), *Diccionario de Catequética*, Madrid: CCS, 1987.

HERMICK, E., «James Michael Lee IV (1931-2004) – RIP», in *TLL* 40/4 (2004) 6-8.

ILLANES, JL - SARANYANA, JI, *Historia de la Teologia*, Madrid: BAC, 1995.

IZQUIERDO, C., BURGGRAF, J., AROCENA, F. M., (eds.), *Diccionario de Teología*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2006.

KEANE, E., *A Generation Betrayed: Deconstructing Catholic Education in the English-Speaking World*, New York: Heatherleigh Press, 2002.

KELLY, F. D., *The Mystery We Proclaim. Catechesis for the Third Millennium* (2nd revised ed.), Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999.

MARY, M. (ed.), *Does the Church Really Want Religious Education. An Ecumenical Inquiry*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1988.

MORALES, J., *La experiencia de Dios*, Madrid: Rialp 2007.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, *Faithful Past, Faith-Filled Future. Papers Commissioned for the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington D. C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003.

NEWELL, E. J., *"Education Has Nothing to Do with Theology": James Michael Lee's Social Science Instruction*, Princeton: Pickwick Publications, 2006.

O'HARE, P. (ed.), *Foundations of Religious Education*, New York: Paulist Press, 1978.

PELLITERO, R., (ed.), *La Iglesia como familia de Dios*, Madrid: Rialp, 2010.

———, R., *Ser Iglesia haciendo el mundo. Los laicos en la Nueva Evangelización*, Costa Rica: Promesa, 2008.

_____, (ed.), *Vivir el Amor. En torno a la encíclica Deus caritas est*, Madrid: Rialp, 2007.

_____, *Teología Pastoral. Panorámica y Perspectivas*, Bilbao: Grafite Ediciones, 2006.

PUJOL, J., DOMINGO, F., GIL, A., BLANCO, M., *Introduccion a la Pedagogia de la Fe,* Pamplona: EUNSA, 2001.

RATZINGER, J., *Trasmissione della fede e fonti della fede* (trad. Leandro Calvo), Casale Monferrato (AL): Edizioni Piemme di Pietro Marietti, 1985.

RATZINGER, J., *Gospel, Catechesis, Catechism. Sidelights on the Catechism of the Catholic Church*, San Francisco: Ignatius, 1997.

REICHERT, R. J., *Renewing Catechetical Ministry, a future agenda*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2002.

SCOTT, K., «Book Review of Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium» (2000) in *TLL* 37/2 (Winter 2000) 77-78.

SESE, J.-PELLITERO, R. (eds.), *La Transmisión de la Fe en la Sociedad Contemporánea*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2008.

SMITH, J.-O'BRIEN, M., «Maria Harris», in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/)

TAYLOR, M. (ed.), *Changing Patterns of Religious Education*, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1984.

WALCH, T., *Parish School. American Catholic Parochial Education from Colonial Times to the Present*, Washington DC: The National Catholic Educational Association, 2003.

WILLEY, P., DE COINTET, P., MORGAN, B., *The Catechism of the Catholic Church and the Craft of Catechesis*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008.

WILLHAUCK, S., «Berard Marthaler» in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www. Talbot.edu/ce20/)

WUERL, D., «La Aplicación del Catecismo de la Iglesia Católica en las Iglesias Particulares de Norteamérica», in *Actualidad Catequética* 195-196 (2002) 451-458.