Globethics Repository



Recent trends in Roman Catholicism

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Wislerff, Carl F.
Publisher	Religious & Theological Students Fellowship
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-11-07 12:23:26
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/157349

Recent trends in Roman Catholicism

Carl F. Wisløff

The author is Professor of Church History at the Free Faculty of Theology in Oslo, Norway. We are grateful for this survey article.

At the beginning of the twentieth century Roman Catholicism was considered – by friends and foes alike – to be 'semper eadem' (forever the same): the Roman Catholic church had never changed and could never change. This, of course, was a simplification: the Roman Catholic church has been undergoing development throughout the centuries of its existence, and some of its greatest thinkers have endeavoured to explain how 'the development of Christian doctrine' (*cf.* the title of J. H. Newman's book, 1845) has taken place, and how the church in its changing historic appearances has always been 'the continuing incarnation of Christ' (J. A. Moehler, 1835), and so has been able to keep its identity intact.[1]

By the year 1900 the Roman Catholic church was strong and powerful. How different from the situation at the time of the French Revolution, when the pope had to undergo great humiliation and the very existence of the Roman see seemed jeopardized! The strength of the Roman church was a result of a concentration on its own intrinsic nature. The great Pope Pius IX called the attention of the faithful to the typically Roman dogmas: the immaculate conception of Mary (dogmatized 1854) and the infallibility of the pope *ex cathedra* (1870). The pope solemnly condemned modern ideas such as democracy, liberalism and modern civilization (1864). Pope Pius X crushed theological modernism in the Roman church (encyclicals *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi domini gregis*, 1907). All priests and teachers had to swear 'the anti-modernist oath' (1910). A monolithic orthodoxy seemed to reign in the church.

This, however, was not the case. The modernist tendency was still there. Theologians like Henri de Lubac and Henri Bouillard in their interpretation of scholastic theology actually criticized the traditional understanding of the dogmas. A new evaluation of Martin Luther and the Reformation and a new willingness to acknowledge the historic guilt of the Roman church paved the way for ecumenical openness. Pius XII seems to have been disturbed by these new tendencies. On 20 December 1949, he warned against continually drawing attention to the sins of the church while presenting analyses of the background to the Reformation.[2]

Pius XII felt that he had to stop the development that in his eyes constituted a threat to the church. In 1950 came his famous encyclical *Humani generis*. The pope warned against 'certain false opinions' which are 'disseminated not only among members of the clergy and in seminaries and religious institutions but also among the laity, and especially among those who are engaged in teaching youth'. Existentialism, a current philosophical way of thinking, threatened to lure people into a subversion of what is essentially Catholic, said the pope. Like his predecessor Pius IX, Pius XII wanted to mobilize the faithful to a wholehearted devotion to the Holy Virgin. On 1 November 1950, the dogma of Mary's assumption to heaven was promulgated, and in 1953-54 the Roman Catholic church celebrated a Marian year.[3]

A Catholic Bible movement has grown up in our century. While not absolutely a new phenomenon – contrary to a certain Protestant misconception there has never been a categorical prohibition against Bible reading in the Roman church – the modern Bible movement represents a new tendency. Bible societies have come into being and in some countries there is a constant and growing co-operation between Catholic and Protestant societies for Bible translation and Bible reading.

On an academic level Catholics seem to have accepted – without much reserve – the historical critical method of Protestant Bible research. Catholic exegesis has walked a long way since the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893) where Leo XIII clearly stated the church's belief in biblical inerrancy. In his *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943) Pius XII opened the door for the study of the Bible as a revelation in history. Today the methods and results of Catholic Bible research seldom differ from those found in books written by liberal Protestant scholars; it is only from the 'imprimatur' in the Catholic dissertation that one can tell that it is not Protestant.

Vatican II

During the 1950s, it was felt by observers, great tensions existed inside the Roman church. The old monolithic orthodoxy seemed to prevail, but new tendencies, such as those which Pius XII had warned against, were still there. These tendencies came to the fore during the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). This Council – the most spectacular event in Christendom during the 1960s – has been discussed in countless books, and evaluations differ greatly. The only way to some understanding of the Roman church today is through an analysis of what happened during the Second Vatican Council.[5]

In his opening speech John XXIII emphasized two things especially. First: the salient point of the council was not to be a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the church; this was presumed to be well known and familiar to all. Second: the deposit of faith was one thing, the way in which it is presented was another. The pope explained that it was the latter which was now to be taken into consideration by the Council. And this is exactly what happened. The dogma of the church was not discussed, only confirmed, very often by direct quotation from the First Vatican Council (1869-70), for example concerning the Holy Virgin (*The Church,* 59) and the infallibility of the pope (*ibid.,* 25). The authority and position of the bishops was accentuated: just as Peter and the rest of the apostles were one 'college', so the pope (the successor of Peter) and the bishops (the successors of the apostles) form a college, the head of which is the pope. The college of bishops has no authority unless in unity with the pope. A selected group of bishops form the Synod of Bishops, which meets at specified times (see canons 330 and 342 in *The Code of Canon Law* (1983)).

The first work of Vatican II to be completed was the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.* The liturgy of the Roman church was thoroughly reformed. This great work is a result of a development which had been on its way since the beginning of our century. The so-called 'Liturgical Movement' in France and Germany had called the church to a new understanding of its liturgical life. Men like Odo Casel and Johan L. Mayer criticized the traditional celebration of mass for concentrating too much on the performance of the priest. The service of the church, they felt, was too pompous, too individualistic – lay people saying their prayers instead of really participating in the common action of the eucharist. The congregation should engage in a joint action together with the priest, who – of course – is the one to perform the sacramental act of transubstantiation. The ideas of the Liturgical Movement were to a great extent accepted by the Council. Catholic congregations will now endeavour to follow the advice of Pius X: You shall not pray *in* the mass – you shall pray *the mass!* The faithful are taught not only to 'hear mass', saying their own prayers while the priest ministers at the altar, but to follow the words of the liturgy, which are said in the vernacular. The huge Gothic or Baroque altars, before which the priest used to stand with his back to the congregation while saying the prayers, are still there, but the priest has taken his position *versus populum* (facing the congregation) behind a small table placed in the chancel. There is a new emphasis on preaching.[6]

This liturgical attempt to mobilize the laity is only one aspect of the new vision of the responsibility of the lay people. The new approach can be studied in the *Constitution on the Church* (1964). According to the traditional understanding the church is first of all the hierarchy. Now, however, the church is the people of God: following Vatican II lay people are called upon to share responsibility in the church. It is the decree on the *Apostolate of the laity* (1965) that laid the basis for a reconsideration of the position and importance of lay people.

All these efforts represent a trend towards a certain 'secularization' of the church. That expression could perhaps be misleading, but will easily be understood by anyone who has witnessed the spectacular change in the outward appearance of the Roman Catholic church. During the years of the Council the church was repeatedly criticized by its own members, for its alleged 'triumphalism' and for its pompousness, this being – it was claimed – a survival from the age of the Baroque. Let the church, it was said, be a home for men and women of today! So off went the clerical garb and the garb of nuns and sisters of mercy, with the result that anyone who saw ecclesiastical Rome thirty years ago might wonder today what has happened to all those people he used to see in the streets. The same thing seems to have happened in most countries. There is a story about an American nun who was asked, sometime in the uproarious 1960s, if she never used her old garb any more. Answer: well, only for picketing!

During the years of Vatican II an optimistic mood seemed to prevail. The church, it was felt, was on the offensive. Pope John XXIII's great word was 'aggiornamento', *i.e.* 'bringing up to date', which everyone seemed to think could only be a good thing. Pope John, so the anecdote goes, was asked by journalists why he had convoked the Council. In answer Pope John simply went and opened a window. One is tempted to say more things entered through that window than the pope could have anticipated. New winds have caused a great deal of antagonism within the church. The great, seemingly monolithic structure of the Roman Catholic church now seems to be split into various factions.[7]

Factions

Many Catholic priests and laymen are involved in *radical political parties,* sometimes even in revolutionary activity. These men and women – nuns are often active – protest against the social injustice, economic exploitation and political oppression they find in their societies. At the same time their protest is also directed against the traditional position of the church, which they accuse of being too lenient towards the established society. As one of the leaders, Leonardo Boff, puts it: 'the theology of liberation attempts to elaborate the total content of Christianity starting from the demands of social liberation, which anticipates and mediates final liberation in the kingdom'. Behind this thinking lies a

new eschatology: the kingdom of God will be brought about by a revolution, which is God's way of making all things new, radical Christians being the instrument in his hands.[8]

John Paul II has felt it necessary to deal with the radical priests and theologians in Latin America. In September 1984 a document was published in which the Vatican issued a challenge to that movement. The document takes a balanced position in so far as it strongly condemns dictatorship, corruption, economic exploitation, *etc.;* here the pope follows in the steps of the great social encyclicals of Leo XIII (*Rerum novarum,* 1891), Pius IX (*Quadragesimo anno,* 1931), John XXIII (*Mater et magistra,* 1961) and Paul VI (*Populorum progressio,* 1967). In all these documents economic liberalism is condemned as well as all kinds of exploitation of the poor. But most of all the document warns against a theology of liberation which uncritically borrows Marxist ideas. A revolutionary society will only create new forms of oppression and so the liberation theologians betray the poor they mean to help.[9]

Radical theologians, like Hans Küng and Edvard Schillebeeckx, have attracted much attention. Küng's book *Infallible? an Inquiry* (English ed. 1971) questions the cornerstone of Roman Catholicism, namely the infallibility of the pope when speaking *ex cathedra* on matters of faith and morals. Only God is infallible, says Küng, arguing from his philosophical supposition that no human statements, not even those of the Bible, are free of error. In a new book (*On being a Christian,* 1974) Küng questions the historicity of the virgin birth, the miracles of Christ, Christ's ascension to heaven, *etc.* His position is very similar to that of contemporary Protestant theologians of liberal persuasion such as Bultmann and Käsemann. He teaches a kind of modernistic theology which makes itself felt in almost every Christian church today. Küng has been repeatedly warned by Vatican authorities and was finally stripped of his post: the Congregation of the Faith issued a declaration to the effect that Küng could no longer teach as a Catholic theologian (December 1979). Schillebeeckx also has been summoned to Rome for questioning. His book *Jesus, An Experiment in Christology* (1974) is quite modernistic in its discussion of the deity of Christ. The French theologian and scientist P. Teilhard de Chardin (d. 1955) may be mentioned here; his posthumously published books present his controversial ideas about the universe as being in a process that will finally gather all things up in God.

These cases are not exceptional. On the contrary, one could say, with the words of a close observer of contemporary theology: 'The Catholic church is now becoming like the Protestant church: a mixture of everything. You have traditional Catholics who accept all dogmas in typical nineteenth-century form including a distinctive Roman Catholic ethic. At the opposite end, you have liberals who are uneasy about believing in God, let alone in a divine Christ.'[10]

The Dutch branch of Roman Catholicism used to be fervently traditionalistic. Not any longer. Since Vatican II Dutch Catholicism has moved in a markedly radical direction. A *Cathecism for adults* (1967) caused a great deal of controversy because of its liberal tendency. A rather tolerant line has been taken on abortion and homosexuality. Lay men and women have been allowed to carry out tasks formerly reserved for priests. To keep the priests of Holland in line, John Paul II chose a conservative archbishop of Rotterdam (1970), and ten years later called a number of Dutch bishops to the Vatican for an extraordinary synod. The bishops seem to have bowed to the Pope's insistence on questions of celibacy, liturgical liberties and on individual confession, which is said to be nearly extinct in Holland and in Germany. There should, it was said, be an end to common communion for Catholics and Protestants. In fact, the most progressive branch of the Roman Catholic church was disciplined by the pope and his advisers, primarily Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger.[11]

The Jesuit order, traditionally considered to be the watchdog of Catholic tradition, formed by its founder Ignatius Loyola (1534) to be absolutely obedient to the pope, has been under severe criticism from the pope. In the USA and in Holland Jesuits have been in the forefront of the battle for social activism, birth control and ordination of women, and also on the matter of celibacy (which by many liberals is considered unsuitable outside of monasteries). In their concern for social justice many Jesuits have adopted Marxist ideas. Gustavo Gutierrez, one of the leading Latin American theologians of liberation, is a Jesuit. In April 1982 Pope John Paul appointed his own delegate as interim head of the Jesuit order. The pope has criticized their 'secularistic tendencies', and in 1982 he summoned Jesuit leaders from all parts of the world to a meeting in Rome, where he made it clear to them that they had to remember their oath of obedience to the supreme head of the church.[12]

An ultra-conservative group stands as the opposite extreme. At the close of Vatican II the French archbishop Marcel Lefebvre was convinced that the Council had acted under influence of neo-modernism. In 1969 he protested against Paul VI's new Mass Ordinal, which is a result of decisions made by Vatican II. In 1974 the archbishop launched severe attacks on the established church, declaring Vatican II false and the pope's mass illegal. From his base in Encone in Switzerland the archbishop criticized the pope for allowing the most severe aberrations in doctrine and deviation from traditional forms of devotion. Being a rightly ordained archbishop he insists that the ordinations given by him are valid; but because the archbishop has been suspended by the pope, his ordinations are considered invalid by the established church. The Priestly Fraternity of Pius X (Priesterbruderschaft St. Pius X), which is the name the followers of Lefebvre have given their organization, have two theological institutions and several centres for celebration of mass in the old form (the so-called Mass of Pius V (1570) which was used before Vatican II).[13]

The charismatic movement has invaded all of Christendom, and the Roman Catholic church is no exception. Charismatics are found in most Catholic churches in America and Europe. Some high officials, like Cardinal Suenens, are sympathetic towards them. One could, of course, wonder how this movement, with its emphasis on a certain experience of 'baptism in the Spirit', could be compatible with the Catholic doctrine on baptismal regeneration. Obviously this is a difficult point. Catholic charismatics endeavour 'to integrate the saving efficacy of the sacrament with the experienced *effects* of the baptism'. A person who was born again in infant baptism will understand the experience of 'baptism in the Spirit' as 'the coming to fruition

of what is already there'. Evangelical Christians sometimes feel concern because Catholic charismatics give witness to a new devotion to the holy virgin. On the other hand orthodox Catholics feel that the authority and power of the hierarchy is bypassed by the special experience of the charismatics.[14]

The tendencies mentioned so far no doubt represent real difficulties for the pope. And yet he may be able to turn the tide. The man who presently occupies the see of Rome is a person of extraordinary ability. He has come to Rome from the Polish Catholic church, which is conservative in its liturgy as well as in its forms of popular devotion. The Catholic church in Poland has been equal to the most trying political situations.[15] The mighty force of Roman Catholic tradition is on the pope's side.

An organization called *Opus Dei (God's work)* was founded in 1928 by the Spanish monsignore Josemaria Escriva. Today this movement has about 75,000 lay members and 1,200 priests in forty countries. This rich and mighty organization is decidedly conservative and very loyal to the pope. They have members working in numerous universities and schools all over the world. The *Opus Dei* run almost 700 newspapers and periodicals together with fifty-two TV or radio stations. Because of its orthodox position the *Opus Dei* attracts many Catholic believers, but on the other hand it is attacked by progressive priests. There seem to be differences of opinion concerning this movement in the Vatican, but John Paul II apparently thinks very highly of it. Some observers think the *Opus Dei* may fill the traditional role of the Jesuits, who in many cases have taken unorthodox and unusual positions.[16]

Ministerial recruitment and celibacy

Expectations were running high during Vatican II. The future of the Roman Catholic church seemed to be a brilliant one; a new spirit penetrated the old structure of the church, and a new vigour was to be expected. The developments in the years after Vatican II must have been a disappointment. The church is facing difficulties at the point where it used to have its greatest asset, namely in recruiting of candidates for ordination and for convents. There is an acute shortage of priests. Since 1962, when Vatican II opened, more than 30,000 priests have left their pastoral work, 12,000 of these in the USA alone. Twenty years ago the American Catholic church had 48,000 seminarians; in April 1983 there were 12,000, and only about 60 % of them were expected to take the final vow.[17]

Why this 'flight from the yoke of Christ'? the German periodical *Der Spiegel* asked (October 1971). The answer was apparently not difficult to find: most of these priests wanted to marry. Celibacy has been under dispute for some time. The Bishops' Synod in 1967 discussed the problem. Two things are to be considered: (1) ordination of mature married men (which is practised in the Greek Orthodox Church), and (2) permission for ordained men to marry (which the Greek Orthodox Church does not allow). There seems to be a distant possibility that married men might be permitted to take the priest's vow under very special conditions. Celibacy is too deeply rooted in the Roman Catholic church to be lightly given up. Illegal tendencies in that direction (in the Dutch church) have been curbed, as we have seen.

There are other conflicting loyalties to be mentioned. The pope's ban on 'the pill' (1968), in which he condemned all methods of contraception except the rhythm method, has been interpreted as leniently as possible by some bishops. No-one, they say, can be forced to act contrary to their conscience; the pope's word of course carries authority, and yet the conscience of the individual must not be violated.[19] There is a moral crisis in all of Christendom, and the Roman Catholic church has its share.

Progressive theologians maintain that the development following Vatican II has not gone far enough. Traditionalists, however, contend that it has gone too far. The 'aggiornamento' has falsely opened a door for all kinds of error. In many seminaries Christianity is being interpreted in terms of secular philosophy which contradicts the Word of God. The result of all this can only be confusion.[20] There may be some reason to think that the traditionalists are right. The Roman Catholic church is in danger of ending up in the same kind of relativism which has deprived most Protestant churches of their spiritual conviction and vigour.

Dialogue and ecumenism

The most conspicuous result of Vatican II is the new attitude towards non-catholics. Some readers will recall the bewilderment caused in 1953 by an American priest who defended the traditional belief that there is no salvation outside of the Roman Catholic church. That was too much – even Pius IX dared to hope for the salvation of those who lived outside of the Roman church because of ignorance – and the priest was disciplined. Today, however, not only individual non-catholics but even 'separated churches and communities' are considered to be used as 'means of salvation' by the Spirit of God (*Decree on ecumenism,* 1964). As a result of this new attitude a long series of dialogues has been arranged between Roman Catholic theologians and their Protestant colleagues.

The statements issued as a result of these dialogues usually follow a certain pattern. First of all they express willingness to acknowledge each other as Christians, and then strong words are used to condemn separations in Christendom and to recommend attempts at unity. Usually the Protestants have a tendency to go further than the Catholics. In matters of dogma the statements often say more than the Protestant creeds and markedly less than what Vatican II demands.

The final report from the Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission (1981) is one example. The report says that 'a substantial agreement' has been reached. For instance, Anglicans are willing to accept the institution of a single head of the church as a practical necessity. 'In any future union a universal primacy should be held' by the bishop of Rome. This, of course, is a major concession by the Anglicans, but it is very much less than Vatican II and John Paul can accept.

This is exactly what was said by the Holy Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in an important statement printed in the pope's official organ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (1 October 1982).[21] This statement should be studied by all who are under the impression that all of Christendom is on its way to unity. The Holy Congregation of the Faith (voicing the opinion of the pope) is thankful for the report as an important ecumenical event. There are, however, many objections. There is a certain ambiguity, the Congregation says, in the

phrase 'substantial agreement'. The Holy Congregation says that expression leads one to read into it a fundamental agreement on essential points. But such an agreement has not been reached. When the members of ARCIC speak about 'the consensus we have reached', 'one does not always see clearly whether this means the faith already professed by the two Communions in dialogue, or a conviction which the members of the Commission have reached'. In other words: when members of a mixed commission agree, it does not necessarily follow that their communions have reached a consensus. And so the Holy Congregation goes on to demonstrate that transubstantiation, adoration of the sacrament, ministerial priesthood and supreme jurisdiction of the pope belong to the sphere of dogma which cannot be altered.

The Holy Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith also comments on the Anglican-Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist (1971). In this 'agreement' a solution was sought on the difficult question of the mass as a sacrifice for the living and the dead. A solution was found 'in the notion of *memorial* as understood in the passover celebration at the time of Christ – *i.e.* making effective in the present an event in the past'. This, the Anglican-Catholic commission felt, has opened the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. But the Vatican is not at all content with that kind of solution. Most of all 'the propitiatory value' of the eucharist should not be forgotten, says the Congregation of the Faith. This is a very important point for the Roman church, because masses are still read for the living and the dead. The mass is a real sacrifice offered up to God; this is Roman dogma.

Let us take a look at one more 'agreement'. The Reformation preached justification by faith alone for Christ's sake alone. The Reformation fathers said that the Scripture alone shall constitute articles of faith. Here we have the three great 'alones' of evangelical Christians. But Vatican II says that 'both sacred Tradition and sacred Scripture are to be accepted and venerated with the same sense of devotion and reverence' (*Revelation 10,* quoting Vatican I!). Efforts have been made to prove that Vatican II has moved away from the old theory of Scripture and tradition as two 'sources'. That may be true, but the fact remains that Vatican II says: 'it is not from sacred Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed' (*ibid.*). The infallibility of the pope and the veneration of Mary cannot be proven from the Bible. Rome takes her proof and certainty from tradition.

'By faith alone' is a fundamental concept in Protestant creeds. The Council of Trent condemned the belief that we are justified through faith alone solely by the favour of God. This has been discussed in dialogues between Protestants and Catholics, for instance in the USA, where six volumes have been published as a result of the consultations. The sixth volume deals with justification.[22] The members of the Lutheran-Catholic commission agree that our entire hope of justification and salvation rests in Christ Jesus and the gospel whereby the good news of God's merciful action in Christ is made known: 'We do not place our ultimate trust in anything other than God's promise and saving work in Christ'. At first sight this seems conclusive. On closer observation, however, it is evident that they do not agree on the main question: what *is* justification? Is it a declaration in which God says that the sinner is righteous by faith alone (Luther, Calvin), or is justification a healing process by which the sinner is made 'more and more justified' (Council of Trent)? This is the salient point. Here is no agreement. Indeed, can there ever be an agreement on these matters as long as the Roman Catholic church sticks to its concept of tradition as a source of revelation?

On 1 January 1983 a new edition of *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (the law of the Roman Catholic church) was published.[23] It clearly shows that nothing has changed in the field of dogma. Papal infallibility, the Catholic understanding of the relation between Scripture and tradition, indulgences and sacrificial mass, it is all there. This is only what could be expected, and it should not come as a surprise to anyone who has read the papal encyclicals *Mysterium fidei* (1965) and *Mysterium Ecclesiae* (1973). In its dogma the Roman Catholic church certainly is 'semper eadem'.

One wonders why so many leading churchmen from almost every church denomination speak so easily about approaching unity and the prospect of full communion. Answering this, we are struck by the fact that almost all churches of today are penetrated and filled with the same kinds of modern theological trends. The 'existential' way of thinking, the tendency to speak about the secular rather than the celestial city, the willingness to take a comprehensive position, all this is found everywhere. And so why shouldn't they come to an understanding with the same kind of people who happen to represent another church denomination? In the days of rationalism – *c.* 1800 – Lutheran pastors and Catholic priests sometimes changed pulpits on Sundays. The congregations heard the same kind of sermon anyway. Their ministers were neither Lutherans nor Catholics, they were neologians.

The theology of the Enlightenment blew over, and was followed by the Catholic restoration of Pius IX. The future is known by God alone. And yet there might be some reason to think that almost the same development could occur again.

[1]K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*, vol. 1 (N.Y., 1958), *passim;* Walther von Loewenich, *Der moderne Katholizismus* (2. Aufl., 1956), *passim.*

[2]G. C. Berkouwer, *Recent Developments in Roman Catholic Thought* (N.Y., 1958); Vittorio Subilia, *The Problem of Catholicism* (London, 1964).

[3]Encyclicals are quoted from *Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context,* ed. Anne Freemantle (N.Y., 1956).

[4]Pius Parsch, 'The Rediscovery of the Bible in the Roman Catholic Church' (*Bulletin of the United Bible Societies,* First Quarter 1951; *cf.* Second Quarter 1958).

[5]All quotations from Council documents are taken from Walter M. Abbott (ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II* (N.Y., 1966).

[6]E. B. Kvenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (Chicago, 1954); Odo Casel, *Das Christliche Kultmysterium* (Regensburg, 1948); Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945).

[7]G. C. Berkouwer, *The Second Vatican Council and the New Catholicism* (Eerdmans, 1965); David F. Wells, *Revolution in Rome* (London, 1973).

[8]J. Andrew Kirk, *Theology encounters Revolution* (IVP, 1980); Don Ford, 'Changes in Catholicism in Latin America' (*Themelios,* March 1974).

[9]*Time,* September 10, 1984: 'Berating Marxism's "False Hopes"' by Richard N. Ostling.

[10]Kenneth Kantzer in *Christianity Today,* November 26, 1982; Donald Dean Smeeton, 'Hans Küng: architect of radical Catholicism' (*Themelios,* January 1982); David F. Wells, *Revolution in Rome* (London, 1973).

[11]*Time,* January 28, 1980; *Time,* February 11, 1984.

[12]*Christianity Today,* April 9, 1982: 'Reining in the Jesuits' by Harry Genet with Royal Peck.

[13]Malachi Martin, *The Final Conclave* (N.Y., 1978), pp. 36 ff.; *Mitteilungsblatt der Priesterbruderschaft St. Pius für den deutschen Sprachraum,* Nr. 70, October 1984.

[14]Quoting from Anne Mather, 'The Charismatic Movement' (*Themelios,* April 1984).

[15]Mary Craig, *Man from A Far Country* (London, 1979).

[16]Richard N. Ostling, 'Building God's Global Castle' (*Time,* June 11, 1982).

[17]Kenneth Woodward, 'An Acute Shortage of Priests' (*Newsweek,* April 11, 1981); Paul Hendrickson, *Seminary* (N.Y., 1983); *Der Spiegel,* 'Massenflucht aus dem Joch Christi' (October 18, 1971).

[18]*The Ministerial Priesthood. Statement from The Synod of Bishops,* November 30, 1967; *Vatican II. More Postconciliar Documents, Vol II* (Eerdmans, 1982).

[19]Pastoral Letter from the Nordic bishops (St. Olav 19/68).

[20]Ralph Martin, *A Crisis of Truth* (Michigan, 1982).

[21]*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* October 1, 1982, pp. 1060 ff.

[22]*Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue. Statement on Justification* (Minneapolis, 1983). See the assessment by Peter Toon in the *Church of England Newspaper,* December 2, 1982.

[23]English translation, *The Code of Canon Law* (London, 1983).