

□ CHAPTER FOUR □

Scripture in the Life of the Church

BRIGID CURTIN FREIN

THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL'S teaching on Scripture in general and on the place of Scripture in the life of Church in specific ranks among its most far-reaching accomplishments. *Dei Verbum* (DV), the Dogmatic Constitution on Revelation, addresses the Church's understanding of how the life of faith is to be shaped by God's revelation in Scripture.¹ Some of its teaching had immediate effects, but in other ways its influence still remains to be seen and in many ways much of what is taught in this groundbreaking document still awaits implementation thirty years after the closing of the Council. My tasks here are to: 1) outline the main themes of the Council's teaching on Scripture in the life of the Church; 2) briefly indicate how this teaching has been implemented, received, and developed; and 3) sketch an agenda for the future.

Vatican II and Scripture in the Life of the Church

The process by which *Dei Verbum* came to be written mirrored the polarities between more traditionalist Council Fathers, who advocated a static view of faith as a "deposit" of propositions which must be defended, and more progressive segments of the Council, whose views of faith and God's revelation were more dynamic and who sought to reinvigorate the life of faith by emphasizing how God's word acts in history.

These polarities manifested themselves in most of the Council's proceedings and provided the creative tension which allowed the Church to renew itself without losing its roots.²

The document places Scripture within the context of divine revelation as a whole. Revelation is the way in which "God wished to manifest and communicate both himself and the eternal decrees of his will concerning the salvation of mankind" (*DV* 6). The Bible, then, must be understood as an aspect of the more comprehensive reality of divine revelation.³ As an aspect of revelation, Scripture is also tied to the Sacred Tradition of the Church, which comes to the Church from Christ through the preaching of the apostles and through which the Church came to recognize the canon of Scripture. The connection consists in the fact that both Tradition and Scripture convey the word of God, both originate from the same source — God — and both have the same aim — salvation of souls (9-10). Yet, as article 24 makes clear, the Scriptures are preeminent because they *are* the Word of God in human words, while Tradition *conveys* the word of God.⁴

Dei Verbum also discusses Scripture and Tradition in relation to the teaching office of the Church, the Magisterium. The role of the Magisterium in relation to the Word of God is variously characterized as servant, listener, protector, and transmitter. While the authority in interpreting Scripture rests with the teaching office of the Church, this authority is not above the Word of God in Scripture; it is its servant.⁵

One of the most disputed articles of the whole document, article 11, is also one of the most far-reaching in its implications for the way Scripture is received and interpreted in the modern Church.⁶ It states that "Scripture, firmly, faithfully and without error, teaches that truth which God, for the sake of our salvation, wished to see confided to the Sacred Scripture." More than any other statement in the document, this one allows the Church to avoid the trap of fundamentalist literalism while at the same time unequivocally asserting the authority and inspiration of Scripture.

That the document describes Scripture as *teaching* truth and not as *being* truth indicates that the Church accepts that some statements found in Scripture may not be factual statements, yet they do nonetheless teach truth. Article 12 reiterates this

sentiment: "for the fact is that truth is differently presented and expressed in various types of historical writing, in prophetic and poetical texts." Thus *Dei Verbum* teaches that while Christians must see Scripture as a source of truth, they are not bound to assert that all details of Scripture are factual. The implications of this statement for interpretation are developed later in the discussion of the Old and New Testaments (14-20). The Old Testament conveys a "lively sense of God" and "authentic divine teaching" even while it contains "matters imperfect and provisional" (15). The four Gospels tell the "honest truth about Jesus," even though the writers selected, synthesized, and explained elements of Jesus' teaching which had been handed on orally or in writing. This editorial activity took into consideration the needs and concerns of communities which the evangelists originally addressed (19). Thus *Dei Verbum* makes it possible for the Church to affirm the reliability of the Old Testament's revelation of God even while allowing believers to see that it is imperfect in some matters. It also insists that the Gospels present us with a faithful portrait of the person, words and acts of Jesus while acknowledging the editorial activity of the evangelists and accepting that the Gospel tradition developed in three stages from the actual words of Jesus to the oral tradition of the apostles and earliest believers and finally to the written Gospels.⁷

The phrase "which God, for the sake of our salvation, wished to see confided to sacred Scripture" specifies what sort of truth Scripture is intended to convey. It does not teach truth about everything; rather, it conveys that truth which is necessary for salvation. The careful phrasing of this article enabled the Church to recognize the historical and human conditionedness of Scripture and avoid literal interpretations of those parts of the Bible which could be taken as legitimating oppression, while still asserting its divine inspiration and inerrancy.⁸ The truth of Scripture, then, is inextricably linked to the salvation of humankind (see also articles 1, 10). Article 11 carefully situates the discussion of inspiration, inerrancy, and the meaning of Scripture in the context of soteriology.⁹

The consequences of this view of inspiration and inerrancy for the Church's interpretation of Scripture are set forth in article 12.

If Scripture reveals the Word of God spoken through humans in a human fashion, then understanding that revelation requires inquiry into the intent of the human authors and into the literary forms used by that author. Such an inquiry requires a consideration of the situation of the author at the time of writing and the circumstances of his time and culture, as well as the ways of perceiving, speaking, and narrating that were prevalent in the time and situation of its writing. While the intent of the human author is the starting point for determining Scripture's divine message of salvation, the truth revealed in Scripture often goes beyond that original intent. Yet the purpose of the author must serve as the framework for understanding the deeper and richer meanings of Scripture.¹⁰

Article 12 then not only allows for and encourages critical study of the Bible, it stipulates it as necessary for a complete understanding of divine revelation. If Scripture is the saving Word of God expressed in the words of humans, then an understanding of the divine meaning requires an understanding of the human; and because human expressions always take place in history and are inseparable from their literary form, investigation of the historical and literary background of the biblical text is necessary if we are to understand the intent of the human author.¹¹

Yet critical literary and historical investigations are not enough. While *Dei Verbum's* encouragement of such scholarship is perhaps the most innovative aspect of the document, and while it had greatest impact on the development of Catholic biblical scholarship, the Constitution on Divine Revelation also insisted that since interpretation of Scripture is an activity of the Church, and since both Tradition and Scripture are the revelation of the one God, interpreters must consider the Tradition of the Church as they search for the meaning of texts.¹² *Dei Verbum*, then, provides a way for the Church's interpretation of Scripture to remain rooted in the best insights of the patristic theologians while also being enriched by the fruits of modern critical exegesis.¹³

The final chapter of the document specifically addresses the topic of Scripture in the life of the Church. The primary image for Scripture's role in the Church is that of nourishment. Scripture is analogous to the Body of Christ in that both are

venerated by the Church and both nourish the faithful. The nourishment of Scripture “enlightens the mind, strengthens the will, and fires the hearts of men with the love of God” (21). By seeing the Word of Scripture as spiritual food, the Council reiterates what had been stated in the Constitution on the Liturgy (56), the Liturgy of the Word is to be seen as of equal value with the Liturgy of the Eucharist, and not simply as a preliminary to it.¹⁴ This image of Scripture has implications for the place of the Bible in the lives of the faithful, its role in the ministries of the Church, and its relationship with the study of sacred theology.

The document stipulates that the Bible play a new and central role in the lives of all of the faithful. In order that the faithful may be nourished by Scripture, the Council urged that they be given greater access through new more accurate translations (22) and through Bible study and reading (25). Before the Council, the only translation officially approved for use by Catholic laity in the United States was the CCD Bible, a translation of a translation of the Latin Vulgate, which had in turn been translated from the original languages of Hebrew and Greek. *Dei Verbum* urged that new “suitable and correct” translations be made from the original language manuscripts (22), and these should be accompanied by adequate explanations (25). In the preconciliar Church, private Bible reading and group Bible study were seen as exclusively Protestant practices.¹⁵ This document urges all Christians to be nourished by Scripture, not only in sacred liturgy but also in devout reading (25). By placing Bible reading in the center of Christian life, the council gave new direction to Catholic piety.¹⁶

The ministries of the Church are to be renewed by an expanded understanding of the Scriptures. It urges continued biblical studies so that “those who are ministers of the divine Word may be able to distribute fruitfully the nourishment of the Scriptures” (23). All aspects of the ministry of the Word, including preaching and catechetics, are formed by and derive their strength from the Scripture; and therefore, those involved in such ministries must be especially devoted to its study (24-25). These instructions expanded the call for regular homilies during the Eucharist found in the Constitution on the Liturgy (52) by emphasizing that such preaching should be oriented toward Scripture.

In order for the Church to be fully nourished by Scripture, the Council encouraged those engaged in scholarly biblical studies to continue and renew their work because biblical studies should be seen as the soul of sacred theology (23-24). That the study of theology is to be informed by renewed Scripture studies represents a change from previous approaches to dogmatic theology which started from Church teaching and then supported it with proofs from Scripture. Scripture as the soul of theology must be considered first on its own terms, and dogmatic theology must be built on its basis.¹⁷

In many ways *Dei Verbum* is as notable for what it does not say as for what it does say. It does not clearly describe how Scripture and Tradition interact. It does not attempt to describe systematically the nature or function of inspiration.¹⁸ There is no elaboration on the nature of the cooperation between divine authorship and human literary authorship.¹⁹ It neither condemns nor endorses any particular methodological approach to exegesis. Indeed, unlike the earlier drafts of the document, the final draft contains no condemnations.²⁰ No attempt to address the question of how the Bible can be used to critique Church practices or to mediate between various traditions is made.²¹ Yet its silence on these matters allowed the Church to restore the Bible to the center of its faith life without too narrowly defining its position on many of the more difficult questions of interpretation.

The Reception, Development, and Implementation of *Dei Verbum's* Teaching

The impact of the Second Vatican Council as a whole still remains to be completely assessed, and this is true of the Constitution on Divine Revelation as well. I will focus on three broad areas of Catholic life that have been most profoundly affected by this document: biblical studies, the Church's ministry of teaching and preaching, and Catholic piety. Because of the limits of space in this volume, most of my discussion will focus on life in the Church of the United States.

Dei Verbum's effect on Catholic Biblical scholarship was immediate. Twenty-two years before the Council issued *Dei*

Verbum, Pius XII's encyclical, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, had begun to reverse the Church's stand against critical historical studies of the Bible and had gone a long way in alleviating the hostility toward Catholic biblical scholarship by members of the hierarchy who believed that the rationalist roots of historical criticism made it inimical to the Catholic faith. As a result of this encyclical, American Catholic Biblical scholarship began to flourish during the 1950s.²² Yet even a papal encyclical was not enough to put to rest traditionalist objections to historical critical scholarship. Up until the eve of the Council, biblical scholars both in the United States and Europe were still being forced out of teaching positions in Catholic institutions.²³

Dei Verbum gave critical biblical scholarship a place in the Catholic Church by insisting that the writers of the biblical books were "true authors." Though chosen by God, they wrote using their own powers and faculties (11). Hence, Scripture is the Word of God in human language; and in order to understand God's message in Scripture, interpreters must determine what the writer meant to say (12). By so sanctioning historical criticism, the Council sparked the renewal and development of Catholic biblical scholarship.²⁴

One of the most immediate results was that Catholic biblical scholars gained recognition within the wider academy of scholars. This is attested to by the fact that five presidents of the historically Protestant Society of Biblical Literature since 1967 have been Catholics.²⁵ Catholic scholars have collaborated on major non-denominational translations (e.g., the Revised Standard Version, the New English Bible, the New Revised Standard Version) and editions (most notably the Oxford Annotated editions of both the Revised Standard and the New Revised Standard). Also, the Catholic Biblical Association, which began as a subcommittee of the American Bishop's Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, became a scholarly organization which, while it retained its Catholic character, is open to and respected by scholars of many faiths. Paul J. Achtemeier, a Presbyterian biblical scholar, served as the president of the Catholic Biblical Association in 1984-85.

The publication of the New American Bible in 1970 demonstrates the reception of the teaching of *Dei Verbum* in

Catholic biblical scholarship. What became the New American Bible began as a revision of the CCD edition of the Challoner-Rheims Bible (a translation of the Vulgate) commissioned in 1936 by the bishops of the United States to be carried out by the newly formed Catholic Biblical Association. However, before this revision could be completed, the encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, which encouraged recourse to ancient manuscripts and the application of the principles of textual criticism, was issued. From that point on, the project became not a revision of CCD Bible, but rather a new translation from the original languages.²⁶ When the New American Bible was first published in 1970, it reflected the changed attitude toward biblical studies brought about by the Council. Several Protestant scholars were commissioned to work on the project. The brief discussion of inspiration in the introduction reflects *Dei Verbum's* teaching that the divinely inspired authors wrote as members of a particular human society using their own powers and talents.²⁷ The introduction to the Pentateuch carefully discusses the four sources of the Pentateuch and presents Moses as the lawgiver *par excellence* but not the author in the modern sense of the word.²⁸

Another indication of the implementation of the Council's teaching on Scripture can be seen in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, first published in 1968. This one-volume commentary on both Old and New Testaments was consciously conceived of as a project of Catholic biblical scholars. The fact that Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah (Is 40-55) are treated in separate commentaries and the placement of the commentary on the Gospel of Mark before Matthew and the Gospel of John after the epistles demonstrate how widely accepted the methods and results of biblical scholarship had become.²⁹ The explosion of commentary series and monographs on Scripture by Catholic scholars also witnesses to the flowering of critical Scripture scholarship in the Church.

Since the Council, however, there have been unanticipated developments within biblical studies. Many of these are related to changes in the intellectual climate not only in the Church but in society in general. Although Catholic exegetes originally adopted historical-critical methodologies with great confidence, recently, scholars both within and outside of the Church have questioned

both its presuppositions and its results.³⁰ An example of this kind of challenge from within the Church can be found in Cardinal Ratzinger's "Biblical Interpretation in Crisis." While not advocating a return to pre-critical, over literalist approaches, he did accuse modern exegesis of

completely relegat[ing] God to the incomprehensible, the otherworldly and the inexpressible in order to be able to treat the biblical text itself as an entirely worldly reality according to natural-scientific methods.³¹

Literary studies, the emergence of postmodern approaches, the use of social science methodologies, feminist, and liberationist approaches have all challenged the hegemony of historical-critical exegesis and have brought unanticipated richness as well as unexpected controversy to Catholic biblical scholarship. There is much less unanimity among Catholic biblical scholars now than in the years just after the Council.

The repercussions of *Dei Verbum* in the field of biblical studies' soon had effects in the teaching and preaching of the Church. As result of the call for regular homilies at Sunday Mass and for those homilies to reflect on the biblical reading, the years after the Council saw an explosion of study sessions and programs to give priests more extensive training in biblical interpretation.³² Numerous publications provide priests with exegetical notes to help them prepare homilies that help worshipers to be more completely formed by the Word of God in Scripture. The Second Vatican Council's Decree on the Training of Priests (16) as well as the Basic Plan for Priestly Formation (78) stipulate that seminarians should be carefully trained in exegetical method and that all other areas of theological training should draw on Scripture.³³ The Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults recommends that new Catechumens be given a Bible during the Rite of Acceptance into the Order of Catechumens (64),³⁴ and many RCIA programs use the lectionary as a basis for catechesis.³⁵ Religious education has also become more biblically oriented. It is now not uncommon for Catholic parishes to sponsor "Vacation

Bible Schools” for children, a practice borrowed from Protestant churches.

Catholic piety and parish life have also changed as a result of *Dei Verbum's* encouragement of biblical reading by all of the faithful. Whereas Bible study groups were almost unheard of in Catholic parishes before Vatican II, they have become part of the fabric of almost every parish in the United States. In thirty years, the Church has moved the Bible from the edges of the faith life of ordinary Catholics to its center. Raymond Brown points out that “the Bible became a fundamental referent in Catholic theology, spirituality and religious discussion.”³⁶ In assessing the effects of *Renew*, a program aimed at revitalizing parish life whose central element is the rediscovery of the power of God’s Word in Scripture, Richard Sklba, auxiliary bishop of the diocese of Milwaukee, found that communal reading and praying the Scripture could be a force of reintegration for divided and disintegrating parishes.³⁷

The Latin American “base community” movement has been one of the most widely recognized responses to *Dei Verbum's* encouragement of increased biblical reading among the laity.³⁸ The effects of this movement have been far reaching and controversial. Members of these groups often learned to read by reading the Bible. Their reading of the Bible inspired these often impoverished Catholics inspired to work against the forces of society that oppress them. The roots of liberation theology, then, can be found in the lay Bible study movement.

Yet in spite of thirty years of progress, many priests and laity remain biblically uninformed. While the new lectionary has received more attention, the quality of preaching has not improved as quickly as many had originally expected.³⁹ Indeed the new, expanded lectionary may have contributed to the low quality of preaching. There are now more readings that are difficult to preach on and even more difficult for congregations to comprehend.⁴⁰ Even though the “Decree on the Training of Priests” emphasizes the need for adequate Scripture study, the discussion of homiletics instruction in the “Program of Priestly Formation” says very little about incorporating seminary study of Scripture into training in homiletics.⁴¹ Many Masters of Divinity programs offered at Catholic seminaries and theological schools require only

two courses in Scripture.⁴² It seems, then, that not only do recently educated priests learn a minimum about Scripture, but they are also not prepared to incorporate that learning into their preaching.

Dei Verbum has also not had the hoped for implementation in catechesis. While major religious education curricula used in Catholic schools and parish catechetical programs include a scriptural component,⁴³ it is not uncommon to find college freshmen who, after twelve years of Catholic school, are unfamiliar with the central events and characters of the Bible, not to mention Church teaching about biblical interpretation and the truth of Scripture.⁴⁴ Many of them are convinced that Catholic faith requires them to read Genesis 1-2 as one (not two) factual account of how God created the world and humankind, and that Catholic teaching does not allow 'believers to accept the theory of evolution.

A further and even more disturbing indication that the teaching of Vatican II on Scripture has not been well-received and implemented in the area of catechesis can be found in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*.⁴⁵ While the section in the *Catechism* on Revelation presents the main points of *Dei Verbum* (*Catechism* #80-141), the rest of the *Catechism* shows little evidence that the Council's teaching on Scripture has influenced the way Scripture is used in the presentation of the Catholic faith. For example, in the discussion of the Fall (#390), the reader is reminded that Genesis 3 uses figurative language but it nonetheless refers to a real event. The text does not discuss what "figurative language" means in this context or how this figurative language can refer to a real event. Similarly, the discussion of the fundamental goodness of creation in #339 leaves the impression that the six-day creation story is a literal fact.⁴⁶ The discussion of the life of Christ (*Catechism* #484-658) simply harmonizes the Gospels and shows no awareness of the development of the Gospel tradition as outlined in *Dei Verbum* 19.⁴⁷ Even though *Dei Verbum* emphasizes that frequent reading of the Bible is necessary if Christians are to come to know Christ and to conform their lives to His (*DV* 25), and even though the Scriptures are presented as essential nourishment for faith (*DV* 21), the importance of regular and prayerful reading

of Scripture is not mentioned until the last major division of the *Catechism* (#2653).⁴⁸ The *Catechism* contains little guidance for Christians in how they should read the Bible so as to be nourished by it.

The Second Vatican Council's teaching on Scripture in the life of the Church has opened the way for a greater appreciation of Scripture among Catholics not only by encouraging the development of Scripture scholarship in the Church, but also by ensuring that the faithful have access to the Bible through accurate translations and commentaries. Catholics, more than at any time in the modern era, can be nourished by Scripture in catechesis and preaching, and through communal and individual reading and study. Yet while the Bible has moved from the periphery of Catholic life, much of the vision of *Dei Verbum* remains to be accepted and implemented. Scripture scholarship has not made significant contributions to questions in systematic and moral theology. The problem of moving from what the text *meant* to what it *means* remains unanswered. While many more Catholics read Scripture now than before the Council, even serious Catholics tend to be less biblically literate than their Protestant neighbors. While the homily has become a fixture at Sunday Mass, the vision of that homily as opening the Word of God in Scripture to the people has not been realized. In spite of attempts such as *Renew*, effective ways of bringing the Bible to bear on the daily lives of Catholics at the end of the twentieth century have not been found.⁴⁹

Agenda for the Future

The future of the biblical renewal in the Catholic Church begun by Vatican II depends on the Church's willingness to do as it did in the 1960s; that is, to assess how the Church's teaching can address the world at the end of the twentieth century. With regard to the role of Scripture in the life of the Church, the Council had to address the following problems: 1) there was little understanding of how Scripture was related to Tradition and of how both Tradition and Scripture functioned as revelation; 2) Scripture had been relegated to the margins of theological investigation,

catechesis, and Catholic piety; 3) most of the faithful had little familiarity and even less understanding of the Bible as God's revelation; and 4) Catholic scholars who endeavored to contribute to the Church's understanding of Scripture were often thwarted by official suspicion and misunderstanding of their goals and methods. Some of these problems have diminished since the Council, but others have arisen. The teachings of *Dei Verbum* must be addressed to the questions that have arisen in the thirty years since the end of the Council.

While aspects of historical-critical biblical scholarship have been incorporated into the Church's understanding of Scripture, and while there are few serious attacks on the work of Catholic biblical scholars, there is still need for a biblical scholarship that is distinctively Catholic. Since all of our knowledge rests on often unexamined presuppositions, it is important that the Church not accept the presupposition of disbelief that undergirds some (but certainly not all) historical-critical scholarship. Biblical scholars in the Church need to develop approaches and methods that rest on the presuppositions of faith. In a critique of recent historical Jesus scholarship, Luke T. Johnson points out that the historical-critical approach used by members of the Jesus Seminar and other more secular New Testament scholars presupposes that the texts of the New Testament are nothing more than sources for the reconstruction of Christian origins. Such presuppositions distort the character of the text and fail to consider the intent of the author. To counter such one-dimensional approaches, Johnson proposes a new approach for Scripture scholarship that he calls an "experience/interpretation model." It considers the human character of the writings, the experiences and convictions that generated them, and the cultural and historical symbols they appropriate. Such an approach takes seriously the Bible's character as witness to human religious experience.⁵⁰ While it is a good thing for biblical scholars in the Church to be respected by and to interact with the larger academy of scholars, it is important that the task of biblical scholars in service to the Church not be defined by the interests of the academy. Catholic biblical scholars need to bridge the gap between scholarship in service to the Church and that which responds to the demands of the academic community.⁵¹

Another chasm needs to be spanned when it comes to the role of the Bible in preaching and teaching. It is not enough to give priests, deacons, and catechists a broad familiarity with the content of Scripture and its historical and literary character. They must be enabled to show how Scripture teaches "truth for the sake of our salvation"; in other words, how Scripture addresses both the perennial problems of human existence and the challenges to the life of faith that are particular to our age. Those who carry out the Church's ministry of the Word must be able to use what they learn about Scripture in their training to nurture faith in those to whom they minister.

The future of the biblical renewal is threatened by two opposing cultural trends. One is the fundamentalism of televangelists who promote a literalist, ahistorical view of the Bible; the other is the skeptical historicism of the Jesus Seminar, which has recently captured almost as much media attention as the televangelists. As the Bible continues to play a more central role in Catholic piety, Catholics need more guidance in how to understand the Bible in relation to Tradition, and in how to appropriate it as not only the Word of God but the Word of God in human language. While *Dei Verbum's* encouragement of prayerful Bible study and reading has been enthusiastically received, many Catholics remain uncertain about how the teaching of the Bible fits to the teaching of the Church.

The teaching of Vatican II changed the way Scripture was perceived in the life of the Church, and restored the Bible to its rightful place as the Word of God which, together with the Tradition of the Church, reveals salvation and nourishes faith. As a result of *Dei Verbum*, the Church has gained a new appreciation of the human character of the writings of the Bible and of their importance in preaching, teaching and the life of faith. Yet, much of the promise of Vatican II remains unrealized. While Scripture scholarship developed and flourished since the Council, overall it has not greatly aided in the religious appropriation of the Bible. The Bible is still seen by many Catholics as inspirational in some ways, but as having little to do with their fundamental beliefs and practices. The agenda for the future is to revitalize the biblical renewal begun by the Second Vatican Council by developing

approaches to biblical studies that take the religious character of the Bible seriously, and by continuing to emphasize the centrality of Scripture in the life of faith.

Notes

1. Walter M. Abbott, ed., *Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild, 1966).

2. Robert Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," in *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After*, ed. Adrian Hastings (London: SPCK, 1991), 74; see also Beda Rigaux, "Chapter V: The New Testament," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. 3, ed. H. Vorgrimler (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 252-53.

3. Thomas F. Dailey, "In Praise of God's Word: Biblical Studies Since Vatican II," in *The Church in the Nineties*, ed. Pierre M. Hegy (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1993), 52.

4. John R. Donahue, "A Journey Remembered: Catholic Biblical Scholarship 50 Years After *Divino Afflante Spiritu*," *America* 169, no. 7: 8; Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, "Sacred Scripture in the Life of the Church," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 3, 270.

5. Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 76.

6. See Alois Grillmeier's account of the growth the text of article 11 of *Dei Verbum* in "The Divine Inspiration and the Interpretation of Sacred Scripture," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 3, 199-215.

7. Rigaux, "Chapter V: The New Testament," 259.

8. Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 8.

9. Grillmeier, "The Divine Inspiration," 230-231, 233.

10. Grillmeier, "The Divine Inspiration," 238-39, 242.

11. Grillmeier, "The Divine Inspiration," 242; Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 75.

12. See Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), 334-50; also Dailey, "In Praise of God's Word," 54, and Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 8.

13. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Preface to "The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church," Pontifical Biblical Commission *Origins* 23, no. 29, 499.

14. Ratzinger, "Sacred Scripture," 262-63.

15. Raymond E. Brown, "The Contribution of Historical Biblical Criticism to Ecumenical Church Discussion," in *Biblical Interpretation in*

- Crisis: The Ratzinger Conference on Bible and Church*. Encounter Series, ed. Richard John Neuhaus (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 36.
16. Ratzinger, "Sacred Scripture," 270.
 17. Ratzinger, "Sacred Scripture," 269.
 18. Dailey, "In Praise of God's Word," 53.
 19. Grillmeier, "The Divine Inspiration," 230.
 20. Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 76.
 21. Dailey, "In Praise of God's Word," 53.
 22. Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 7; Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 348.
 23. Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 8; Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 334-35.
 24. Dailey, "In Praise of God's Word," 50, 54; Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 8; Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 343; Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 80.
 25. Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 348-49.
 26. Francis S. Rossiter, "Forty Years Less One: An Historical Sketch of the Catholic Biblical Association," CBQ 49, suppl. (1987): 8.
 27. See "How to Read Your Bible," in *St. Joseph Edition of The New American Bible* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing, 1970; 1986) 17-18; see also Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 347.
 28. Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 347.
 29. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1968), x-xiv; Fogarty, *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship*, 348.
 30. Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 80; for a recent example, see Luke T. Johnson, *The Real Jesus: the Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1996).
 31. Ratzinger, *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis*, 17.
 32. Brown, "Contribution," 36.
 33. Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 1970, in *Norms for Priestly Formation*, (Washington: USCC, 1982).
 34. *Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing, 1988).
 35. Joan Wingert. "It's in the Book," *Bible Today* (March 1992): 90.
 36. Brown, "Contribution," 36.
 37. R. Sklba, "The Importance of Scripture in the *Renew Process*," *New Catholic World* 227 (1984): 257.
 38. Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 80.
 39. Brown, "Contribution," 36.

40. Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 79.
41. "In addition to having an accurate knowledge of Sacred Scripture . . . the seminarian should learn . . . to communicate the Gospel message in a clear, precise and well-organized way" NCCB, *The Program of Priestly Formation* (Washington: United States Catholic Conference, 1981), #168-169.
42. Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 10.
43. The Sadlier "Coming to Faith" series (New York: Sadlier, 1994) for Catholic schools devotes its sixth grade textbook to the study of Scripture. In other grade levels, biblical material is incorporated into nearly every lesson. The Silver, Burdett, and Ginn "This is our Faith" series (Morristown, NJ, 1991) shows a similar emphasis on Scripture.
44. Brown, "Contribution," 36.
45. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994).
46. G.S. Sloyan, "The Role of the Bible in Catechesis," in *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Traditional Themes and Contemporary Issues*, ed. Berard Marthaler (New York: Paulist, 1994), 36.
47. L. Cunningham, "The New Catechism: A First Reading," *Commonweal* 120 (March 12, 1993): 10; cf. Luke T. Johnson, "Response to the Catechism," *Commonweal* 120 (May 7, 1993): 17, who rejoices that the Catechism ignores the results of critical biblical scholarship, because in his estimation, the contributions of biblical scholarship have not been particularly impressive. However, it is one thing to ignore results of scholarship, it is another for the Catechism to fail to incorporate the teaching of Vatican II on the importance of biblical scholarship.
48. Sloyan, "The Role of the Bible in Catechesis," 34.
49. Murray, "Revelation (*Dei Verbum*)," 77.
50. Luke T. Johnson, *The Real Jesus*, 169-74.
51. Donahue, "A Journey Remembered," 11.

