

criticism, *Divino Afflante Spiritu* and *Dei Verbum* relied heavily upon the work of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. By contrast in the case of *Humanae Vitae* and the *Declaration*, the papal and curial authorities solicited reports from carefully selected advisory commissions but rejected the carefully produced and worded advice of those commissions.

Secondly, the treatment of the Bible in *Humanae Vitae* and the *Declaration*, and the subsequent papal reaffirmation, raises real questions about the degree to which the Vatican officials are willing to subscribe to the developed church teaching about appropriate treatment of the Bible.

Third, and most problematic of all, this undermining of the developments in teaching about the character of the Bible seems to proceed from the need to enforce developments in another area of doctrine. Increasingly in the last thirty years, the touchstone of Catholicism has become adherence to a set of prohibitions that center not on revelation in the Scriptures but on the status of the bodies of women. These prescriptions have been enforced by disciplinary actions against those who call for continued ethical and theological thought in the area of sexuality, those who suggest that the question of ordination should not be a closed one, those who rethink Marian theology in the interest of the liberation of women and of men. This pattern constitutes a kind of doctrinal shift in which gender orthodoxy has become, if not the center, then the boundary determinant of Roman Catholicism.

Even a reversal of the strictures on the lives of women in the foreseeable future may be too late to repair the losses of gifts and devotion of those who have been turned away, as well as of faithfulness to the tradition and attentiveness to the spirit of God in the church.

ELLEN M. LEONARD

*University of St. Michael's College
Toronto*

-
- Topic: The Faith/Morals Distinction
and the Development of Moral Doctrine
- Convener: Joseph E. Capizzi, The Catholic University of America
- Moderator: Michael J. Baxter, University of Notre Dame
- Presenters: John R. Berkman, The Catholic University of America
Joseph E. Capizzi, The Catholic University of America
- Respondents: James T. Bretzke, Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
Paul J. Wojda, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul

More than 45 people were present for a lively discussion about the past, present, and future of moral theology. Presenting first in a session devoted to an evaluation of much postconciliar moral theology, Dr. Capizzi explored the issue

of doctrinal development from the perspective of a critique of historicity. Historicity, it is claimed, makes doctrinal development possible. Expressing doubts about this use of historicity, Dr. Capizzi analyzed historicity's relationship to doctrinal development, tradition, and the church's teaching on moral matters.

Dr. Berkman, in "Why Modern Moral Theology Refuses Development," continued the appraisal of moral theology, but extended his remarks more broadly than did Dr. Capizzi. Dr. Berkman argued that a key stumbling block for efforts to analyze development in moral doctrine lies in the modern construal of moral rationality. Preoccupation with epistemological foundations leaves little room for tradition. Since development presupposes tradition, little sense has been made of development.

The recovery of the significance of development for moral theology requires a narration of the discipline's history. An understanding of the meaning of "morals" at Trent is helpful for this end, as it provides an alternative understanding of moral rationality. This understanding in turn opens possibilities for a tradition-constituted form of moral rationality better able to incorporate the development of moral doctrine.

After fine and probative responses by Drs. Wojda and Bretzke respectively, a lively and pointed discussion ensued. Concerns were raised by Professor Charles Curran and Professor William Spohn, among others, that Capizzi and Berkman spoke too broadly and thus their criticisms were off the mark. Professor Curran especially tried to explain that the difference between Capizzi and Berkman and him and similar-minded theologians, could be explained by an "either/or" approach on the part of the former and a "both/and" approach characteristic of the latter. Dr. Capizzi resisted this characterization as too vague: he expressed concern that Curran's own project evinced "either/or" tendencies in its inability to account for a constituency of Catholics of deep piety. Curran responded that perhaps then Capizzi aimed his reflections at the "top" while he was more interested in the "middle."

There seemed to be some concern about a lack of understanding of the differing views presented. The participants left with a stated hope that these issues be given close and more extensive exploration in future sessions, with exchanges among those whose views differ.

JOSEPH E. CAPIZZI

*The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.*