

rereading your articles on *gratia operans*,' to which Bernie replied without batting an eye, 'It's a thrill a minute, isn't it?' On another occasion we were talking about the human sciences. At one point Bernie said, 'Their problem is that they don't know how to isolate their primitive terms.' To which I nodded. Then he turned to me and said, 'Do *you* know how to isolate primitive terms?'

"His strength deteriorated considerably over the course of the summer, and in August the personnel at the infirmary were not sure he would live through the summer. Part of the problem had been loss of appetite, but he seemed to pick up after the heat had died down. Even then, though, he made it very clear that he was now much more comfortable in bed than sitting up, which he found quite painful. Neither his wit nor his intelligence left him during this time. One day he indicated to me that he had been sitting up quite long enough, and I went to get a nurse to help him back into bed. When I returned I said to Bernie, 'The nurse said she would be here in a few minutes.' He thanked me, and then, after a moment's pause, asked, 'Does she know where *here* is?'

"On the day before Bernie died, his brother Greg told me that Bernie was near the end, and he said, 'You have to tell him about the Collected Works.' We had been in negotiations for several months with University of Toronto Press, and while we were confident that the Press would publish the collection, nothing had yet been made official. But Greg, correctly, insisted that Bernie had to be told, and had to be told now. So I made a special effort to let him know: 'Bernie,' I said, 'Fred and I are in negotiation with University of Toronto Press, and they are going to publish the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan.' The slightest bit of a smile came on his face, and he said, very weakly and quietly, 'Good for them!'

"One of the best things anyone said after his death (and I forget who it was who said it) was this, which you will be familiar with if you've read the story of Archimedes at the very beginning of *Insight*: 'I have visions now of Bernie Lonergan running naked down the streets of heaven, shouting, "Eureka!"' "

* * * * *

John Courtney Murray, S.J. (1904-1967)

The following brief biography by J. Leon Hooper, S.J., appears in the commemoration booklet.

John Courtney Murray was born on September 12, 1904, to Michael John Murray and Margaret Courtney. He entered the New York Jesuits in 1920, received his BA and MA from Boston College (1926, 1927) and an STL at Woodstock College, Maryland (1933). In 1937, he completed a Gregorian STD with specialization in the doctrines of grace and Trinity. Returning to Woodstock, he taught systematic, Trinitarian theology and, in 1941, assumed editorship of *Theological Studies*. He held both positions until his death in 1967.

Of the many dogmatic and moral issues that Murray argued (with secularists, Protestants and Catholic University faculty), his scandalous claims for God's ongoing revelation are most publicly visible throughout his argument for religious freedom. He began that argument in 1944, attempting solely from Catholic sources to assuage Protestant fears of Catholic establishment doctrine—one "minor neuralgic" hindrance to Catholic and Protestant postwar collaboration. However, after eking out as much grudging tolerance and minimal cooperation as he could from the then current Roman concessions to public heretical voices, he moved to reconstitute the sources of the church's social moral—and theological—argumentation. Turning to the historical record (a move he earlier had spurned), he discovered that a new understanding of the human social nature had emerged outside the church—often opposed by the church to which the church must pay attention, under its obligation to a God who reveals (here through "nature," elsewhere through revealed discourse).

Murray's claims that values emerge outside the church led in 1954, to the suppression of his own voice, and barred him from the first session of the Second Vatican Council. However, as Cardinal Ottaviani's tight controls over the Council weakened, Cardinal Spellman forced Ottaviani to (re)invite Murray to the remaining sessions. At the Council, Murray quickly became the principal author of the third and fourth drafts of *Dignitatis Humanae* [*Declaration on Religious Freedom*], advancing an argument that religious freedom is a requirement for the contemporary common good (not simply for the sake of individual human dignity, certainly not as a lesser evil to be endured). However, the fifth draft sidestepped Murray's claims for the primarily non-Catholic sources of civic religious freedom, trying to found that freedom on an asocial Search for the Truth. Only in the last few edits did Murray's own historical and common good assertions reenter the document as a second line of argument (also joined by the lesser-of-two-evils argument). After the council Murray continued writing on the issues of religious freedom and doctrinal development, stating that the arguments offered by the final declaration were inadequate, though the affirmation of religious freedom was unqualified.

Murray's mature theological and moral arguments similarly rested on notions of the pluralistic sourcing of moral and theological truth claims, and on a sense that genuinely new truths can emerge. His God was a God who could—and demonstrably did—positively speak from even the mouths of heretics and atheists.

Ginter: [In introducing Murray to the banquet attendees, Ginter continued:] "Third, we commemorate the life of Murray. As we all just witnessed, this theological Society presents an award in honor of this man. Some here, though, may not remember that this Society began this award making nearly 60 years ago not in honor of Murray, but in honor of Murray's primary advocate at Vatican II, Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York."

Hooper: "In June of 1959, John Courtney Murray led a CTSA workshop on the implications of Lonergan's *Insight* for Catholic systematic theology. From a show of hands we can see that only one of us here tonight attended that 1959 Convention. And from a second show of hands, that less than a dozen of us ever

encountered Murray at any CTSA Convention. Murray recedes into the mythic past, sooner perhaps than the others we honor tonight, perhaps because he died so young. I myself never met the man. In 1959, I was a high school sophomore. And in 1967, when Murray died, I had barely escaped my own California Novitiate—to the backwoods of Spokane, Washington.

“For the past fifteen years, though, I have known my fellow Woodstocker and Jesuit, Walter Burghardt, and he knew Murray well. For fifteen years we have swapped Murray stories and arguments. Two months ago, over lunch, when I asked Walter what we should emphasize this evening, he said he wanted two things mentioned: first, that Murray continued to pester Rome with religious liberty manuscripts even after his informal silencing in 1954, and second, that Murray was witty. But, then, Walter told me that, for this presentation this evening, we are on our own. ‘Leon,’ he said, ‘my sight is so bad I can’t tell who you are except by your voice. I don’t want to go among my friends and not be able to respond to them.’ “So, Walter sends his love, and is praying this very moment that the following will convey some sense of who Murray was.

“Anyway, Walter and I judge that this evening we can let Murray do the heavy lifting, at least for a demonstration of his wittiness. I have a couple clips from a talk he gave for a summer 1964 conference at Georgetown University. There, Murray traced the up-to-then Conciliar twists and turns over religious freedom. The Council was then poised between its third and the fourth sessions. During the first session, as Murray here describes it, the main battle had been to get the religious liberty discussion away from Ottaviani’s theology Secretariat over to Bea’s ecumenical Secretariat. Murray was not at that first session, about which we will hear more in a moment. Then Cardinal Spellman forced Ottaviani to invite Murray to subsequent sessions. During the second and third sessions, three drafts on religious freedom emerged. Again, according to a portion of his talk that we won’t hear, the first draft judged civil religious freedom to be a lesser of two evils—the grudging ‘tolerance’ argument that had magisterial endorsement. The second draft was a French argument, which again we will allow Murray to describe. Then, came the third, Murray’s own draft. This draft was not voted on during the third session because of events Murray and others called a *dies irae*, a Day of Wrath. Coming now toward the fourth session, Murray’s text had center stage.

Audio

Hooper: “In the following audio clip, [Murray] outlines his own ‘historically embedded argument for religious freedom, an argument that honestly recognizes that the intrinsic good of juridical religious freedom arose outside the church, to which the church now, if it is to follow the leads of its Lord, must be attentive. We pick up his talk where he takes on French reactions to his text.

“The eight-minute clip begins with a claim that the third draft abandons the French line of argument (from the asocial imperative to Search for the Truth). In an aside, he talks of being invited to a meeting with French speaking *periti*,

at which 'I had my ears, my theological ears, pinned back in grand style.' He then presents his own, 'the English speaking and Italian speaking approach.' First, '[t]he methodology is commanded entirely by the historical consciousness,' by which he means the contemporary emergence of the consciousness of human dignity, and of constitutional protection of civic freedom, including religious. Secondly, the draft insists that the notion of religious freedom is formally, in the first instance, a juridical notion. Then it points out that

[Murray:] [R]eligious freedom today is not based on—or certainly not necessarily based on—any irreligious ideology, as was the case in the nineteenth century. And that introduces an historical question. Oh, this historical question! I wrote it five different times and it's still no good. It was criticized and quite rightly criticized because it's too narrow. It undertakes to make just one point, namely, you have the fact that Pius IX, exactly a hundred years before *Pacem in terris*, said exactly the opposite to what John XXIII said. Pius IX, quoting Gregory XVI, said that religious freedom is a nightmare, a *deliramentum* [insanity], such a fantasy as might overcome a man in the middle of the night. An illusion. John XXIII exactly a hundred years later says that religious freedom is a natural right of man. A man has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Well this presents a nice little problem in the development of doctrine. How do you get two popes who say exactly the opposite things to be really saying the same thing. Well this is what we have theologians for. . . .

Hooper: "Murray continues through the third draft argument, including the draft's 'resounding assertion that the juridical religious freedom as a good in itself. And, then, why? Because it enshrines a true and proper human right.' He then spells out the factors upon which the draft bases its endorsement of religious freedom. The third such principle he calls the 'principle of the free society,' and I include his discussion here perhaps as an aid to our own theological method. He continues":

Murray: And the principle of the free society is established here, namely, as much freedom as possible, as much restraint as necessary. You see: this is just the inverse of the maxim of our friends who plead for tolerance. They say as much tolerance as necessary, as much restraint as possible. I had a little trouble getting this in here and keeping this in here. And the only way it could be kept in there was to show that this was simply a transposition of, a translation, a paraphrase of the fifteenth among the *Regulae iuris canonici*, the fifteenth of Rules of Canon law, *odia restringi et favores convenit ampliari*, which is itself in substance a piece of Roman civil law. And when they heard that, they said: 'Oh, well, yes, of course. If that's what you mean, we're all for it.' Nothing like hiding behind canon law, in favor of something else.

Hooper: "Over the next three years Murray's argument for religious freedom became even more firmly grounded in 'historical consciousness,' a notion he took over from Lonergan, and in my judgment, developed in his own right. Each person we honor this evening staked out remarkable claims concerning where we might find God's redeeming presence in their and our worlds. . . .

"Murray was not a very good prophet in the sense of a fortune cookie. In 1964, at the death of John XXIII, he proclaimed that the church could no longer turn a deaf ear to anyone to whom John had listened. In 1966, after the release of the Majority Report of Paul VI's commission on artificial birth control, Murray endorsed as a true conclusion (based in historical consciousness) the majority's endorsement of artificial birth control, and suggested that Paul VI had himself released the report to prepare the faithful for an upcoming change in magisterial dogmatic teaching. No fortuneteller here. At various times he predicted that we could reasonably apply limited nuclear strikes in Korea, but also that we could reasonably defend selective conscientious objection during Vietnam—positions that will appall one or the other of us. But behind them all was his hope for the ongoing correction that emerges only within conversation.

"Civility as Murray practiced it, as he endured it, led him where he at various other points in his life would not and could not go. Thank God he went there. Thank God he was a faithful servant.

"But we should allow Murray the last word. This is a clip from the earlier part of that 1964 address, where Murray is describing what happened during the first session of the Council, the session that he sat out at Woodstock College.

[Murray:] At the beginning of the second session, a text on religious freedom was submitted. Its major author was Bishop Emile Joseph de Smedt, the bishop of Bruges. And his inspiration came very largely, I understand—I was not around at the time. I was not at the first session. Not that I was uninvited. On the contrary, I was de-invited—which is much, much nicer.

Hooper: "And, he might have added, it is much, much nicer yet to be reinvited. And even nicer yet to find there our living, working God."

* * * * *

Karl Rahner, S.J. (1904–1984)

The following brief biography, by Leo J. O'Donovan, S.J., appears in the commemoration booklet.

One of seven children of Karl Rahner, Gymnasium Professor, and Luise Trescher, Karl Rahner entered the Society of Jesus in 1922, three years after his brother Hugo. During his philosophical studies (1924–1927), he was influenced especially by Joseph Maréchal's Thomistic response to the thought of Immanuel Kant. After teaching Latin at the Feldkirch Novitiate in Austria, he studied theology at Valkenburg in the Netherlands (1929–1933), where he was ordained a priest in 1932. Preparing to be a professor in the history of philosophy, Rahner went to the University of Freiburg im Breisgau and attended Martin Heidegger's seminars. When his thesis interpreting Saint Thomas's epistemology was rejected, he returned to Innsbruck and was able to satisfy the doctoral and postdoctoral requirements for teaching in the University's faculty of theology. After World