
EXCERPTA E DISSERTATIONIBUS IN SACRA THEOLOGIA

CUADERNOS
DOCTORALES
DE LA FACULTAD DE TEOLOGÍA

PUBLICACIÓN PERIÓDICA DE LA FACULTAD DE TEOLOGÍA
UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA / PAMPLONA / ESPAÑA



Universidad
de Navarra

JOHN PAUL ZENOLLITO PEDRERA GRANADA
Theological Aspects of
Catechesis in the United
States of America in the First
Decade of the 21st Century

VOLUMEN 62 / 2014

SEPARATA

Universidad de Navarra
Facultad de Teología

John Paul Zenollito PEDRERA GRANADA

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

Extracto de la Tesis Doctoral presentada en la
Facultad de Teología de la Universidad de Navarra

Pamplona
2014

Ad normam Statutorum Facultatis Theologiae Universitatis Navarrensis,
perlegimus et adprobavimus

Pampilonae, die 22 mensis ianuarii anni 2014

Dr. Ramirus PELLITERO

Dr. Ioannes Raimundus VILLAR

Coram tribunali, die 20 mensis iunii anni 2011, hanc
dissertationem ad Lauream Candidatus palam defendit

Secretarius Facultatis
D. nus Eduardus FLANDES

Cuadernos doctorales de la Facultad de Teología
Excerpta e Dissertationibus in Sacra Theologia

Vol. LXII, n. 4

Presentation

Abstract: The present study is all about the Catholic Church's catechesis, with focus, in particular, in its theological aspects. As the title shows, the study centers on the Church's catechetical enterprise in the United States of America. It opted to study the writings of North American authors (Gabriel Moran, James Michael Lee IV, Thomas H. Groome, Berard L. Marthaler and Michael Warren) whose writings have marked the modern catechetical movement in the USA in these last 4 decades, including obviously the first 10 years of the 21st century. The catechesis in the USA in the years 2000-2010 is characterized for its insights from the perspective of social sciences, for its increasing attention to human condition and actual culture, and for its growing awareness of the contribution of the lay faithful to the Church's educational task.

This study suggests that a theological reflection on the following themes may contribute to this great achievement in the catechesis in the USA in our times: the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church's task of educating its members; the nature of the ecclesial community (subject of catechesis); the role of the official Magisterium in the catechetical task; and the complementarity of the participations of the lay faithful and of the ordained ministers in the *munus docendi*.

Keywords: Catechesis, Pastoral Theology, 21st century Religious Education in USA.

Resumen: El presente estudio tiene que ver con la catequesis de la Iglesia Católica en los Estados Unidos, con especial atención a sus aspectos teológicos. Como el título quiere mostrar, el estudio se centra en la catequética en el ámbito de los Estados Unidos de América. Se optó por estudiar la producción de 5 autores estadounidenses (Gabriel Moran, James Michael Lee IV, Thomas H. Groome, Berard L. Marthaler y Michael Warren), cuyos escritos han marcado el Movimiento catequético en los EE.UU. en estas últimas 4 décadas, incluyendo obviamente los primeros 10 años del siglo 21. En la década 2000-2010, la catequesis de EE.UU. se ha caracterizado por su enfoque desde las ciencias sociales, por una mayor atención a la condición existencial del hombre y la cultura actual, y últimamente, por una mayor conciencia de la contribución de los fieles laicos en la tarea catequética de la Iglesia.

Este estudio sugiere que una reflexión teológica acerca del papel del Espíritu Santo en la tarea educativa que la Iglesia realiza sobre sus miembros, acerca de la naturaleza de la comunidad eclesial (sujeto de la catequesis), del papel del Magisterio oficial en la catequesis, y de la complementariedad entre las distintas maneras de participación de los fieles laicos y los ministros ordenados en la citada tarea educativa, pueden contribuir a perfeccionar los frutos de la catequesis en los EE.UU. en nuestro tiempo.

Palabras clave: Catequesis, Teología pastoral, Pedagogía religiosa del siglo XXI en EE.UU.

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

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

Throughout the progression of ecclesial consciousness, the Church came to develop in different forms the practice of catechesis. One thing is however clear: she has always been aware of the significance of the *education dimension* in the mission of Jesus which she now realizes with Christ. The Church does Christ's mission in *three* interconnected (circumcessio) grand activities – *missio ad extra* (mission «ad gentes»), *missio ecumenica* (ecumenism), and *missio ad intra* (pastoral). These activities, forming one singular whole of the Church's mission, as one and the same with Jesus' mission, are imbued with the so-called *tria munera*. In other words, every activity, say for instance, the *missio ad intra*, is made to happen in *three* concrete expressions – kingly, prophetic and priestly expressions. In the *missio ad intra*, those ecclesial action related to her member's civil life is referred to as the *kingly* expression of its pastoral mission. Her activities related to the sanctification of her members through the Liturgy and which culminates in the Holy Eucharist, express the *priestly* aspect of the pastoral mission. The Church's actions which have something to do with teaching the doctrines, with theological enterprises, and transmitting and guarding the truths entrusted to her by the Jesus, express the *prophetic aspect* of that same pastoral mission.

In addition to that, since participation in the mission of Jesus Christ in the Church has two essentially distinct forms (by incorporation through baptism and by Order), a distinction between the exercise of *those who received baptism* (baptized) and *those who received not only baptism but also given the task*

to do it as a ministry through Order (baptized and ordained), may likewise be distinguished within that one and single mission.

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

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

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

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

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

New catechetics is a significant factor in the US catechesis' opening to the contributions of *human sciences* and *of other theological sciences* like liturgy and scriptures, in its catechetical reflection and practice. New catechetics likewise has played a role in opening the focus of the US catechesis from instructing children to revitalizing the whole of Christian life of all baptized persons

(not only children). New catechetics have included ‘man and his existential reality’ (the anthropological dimension) in the ‘God-centered’ horizon of the US catechesis.

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

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

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

The catechetical reflections of Moran, Lee, and Groome present a catechesis directed to human experience, an interpreter of experience. It is the main idea that the term ‘hermeneutical catechesis’ in Part II’s title suggests.

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

Part IV, *Synthesis and Evaluation*, has only one chapter, Chapter VII *A Synthetic Analysis and Evaluation of the US Catechesis in 2000-2010*. The hermeneutical and evangelizing US catechesis in 2000-2010 is (1) clear of focusing its attention on Christian life, (2) on the integration of *an erudite religious-cul-*

tural education (cognitive dimension) and *a socializing catechesis* (affective and experiential dimensions), (3) committed towards maturity of faith through formation within the believing community and in view of serving the community, (4) values the symbols and traditional practices of the ecclesial community, (5) is steadfast for the transformation of society, and (6) directs its attention to the present culture.

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

Among the many things that we have learned in the course of doing this study, we value most the fundamental insight that catechesis (directed to the study of the reality of the divine human dialogue) depend on *three* indispensable elements: reason, tradition, and experience. Without reason, catechesis would be purely memorization of formulae. Without tradition, it will be foundationless adventure. Without experience, catechesis will purely be a speculative rendezvous.

This excerptum basically presents a substantial part of the abovementioned work. From the original seven chapters, we have condensed it into 3 chapters.

The Excerptum’s first chapter, The Historical and the Theological Context of US Catechesis, corresponds to the Chapter I of the original work, titled «New Catechetics» and The Attention to Human Experience. Like in the original work, this part presents the historical and theological orientation of the whole work.

The Excerptum’s second chapter, From Revelation to Evangelizing Catechesis, is a condensed gist of the chapters II to VI of the original work. As described above, those chapters were detailed analysis of the 2000-2010 relevant writings and the line of thought of the American authors concerned (Gabriel Moran, James Michael Lee, Thomas Groome, Berard Marthaler and Michael Warren). We have therefore re-printed in this second chapter the section «Summary and Conclusion» found at the end of each chapter in the original work.

The Excerptum's third chapter, A Synthetic Analysis and Evaluation of the US Catechesis in 2000-2010, brings the exact texts of the original work's Chapter VII (with the same title).

Finally, we have offered the same Conclusive Reflection and Bibliography of the original work.

Content of the Thesis

ABBREVIATION	5
INTRODUCTION	11
PART 1	
THE HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF US CATECHESIS	
Chapter I	
‘NEW CATECHETICS’ AND THE ATTENTION TO HUMAN EXPERIENCE	21
1. THE ORIGINS OF THE «NEW CATECHETICS»	22
2. PROPONENTS AND PROPOSALS	26
2.1. Moran and the new catechetics’ anthropological shift	26
2.1.1. Revelation and experience	28
2.1.2. Religious education and catechesis in revelation-human experience relation	31
2.2. Lee: human experience and religious instruction	34
2.2.1. The ‘why’ and ‘how’ of instructing religion	37
2.2.2. A fundamental problem: can faith or religion be taught?	40
2.2.3. Facilitating’ the growth of faith/religion through instruction	45
2.3. Groome: shared praxis and christian religious education	47
2.3.1. Christian religious education and shared praxis approach	50
2.3.2. The philosophical and theological foundations of shared praxis approach	52
2.3.3. A faith-based education geared towards life: an educational philosophy at the close of the 20th century	59
2.4. Marthaler: catechesis as a socialization process	68
2.4.1. Theology and anthropological catechesis	70
2.4.2. Socialization model of catechesis	72
2.5. Warren: counter-cultural catechesis	76
2.5.1. Sociology of religion, church evangelization and catechesis	78
2.5.2. Catechesis, local church, and culture	80
3. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION	85

PART 2

REVELATION, CULTURE AND HERMENEUTICAL CATECHESIS

Chapter II

MORAN: REVELATION AS GOD-MAN DIALOGUE IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	95
1. RELIGION AND EDUCATION: MORAN'S GENERAL CONCEPTS	95
1.1. A description of religious education (RE)	97
1.2. Religion, revelation and RE	105
2. RE WITHIN THE CHURCH: AN INTERPLAY OF MINISTRIES	112
2.1. The church, curriculum of religious education	112
2.2. The education 'forms' of the church	117
2.3. Christian life, faith and revelation, and religious education	125
2.3.1. Metaphors for a divine revealer	128
2.3.2. Participation in God's teaching act	129
2.3.3. Emancipation of 'teaching'	130
2.3.4. The sacramental universe: backdrop of the church's engagement to education	130
3. RE AND THE STATE	135
4. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION	140

Chapter III

LEE: «RED-HOT RELIGION» THROUGH RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION	147
1. PROPHETIC AND VISIONARY: RE IN THE FUTURE	150
1.1. Prophecy and its implication to religious instruction	150
1.2. Vision and its implication to religious instruction	153
2. LEE'S THREEFOLD VISION/PROPHECY FOR RE	154
2.1. Religious education, priority of the ecclesiastical institutions	155
2.2. The scholarly and scientific competence of religious educators	157
2.3. Religious instruction activity's focus: religion and instruction	158
3. FORGING A «RED-HOT RELIGION» THROUGH INSTRUCTION	159
3.1. Religion, substantive content of religious instruction	160
3.2. Instruction	163
4. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION	165
4.1. Church, munus docendi, and catechesis	165
4.2. Co-operation of sciences and lived religion/faith	169

Chapter IV

GROOME: CATECHETICAL EDUCATION IN FAITH, LIFE AND CULTURE	173
1. CATECHETICAL EDUCATION: A DESCRIPTION	174
2. CATHOLIC FAITH, CORE CONVICTIONS AND CATECHESIS	179
2.1. The Christian Story	185
2.2. The Sources of the Christian Story: Scriptures and Tradition	190

CONTENT OF THE THESIS

2.3. The core convictions (creed) of Christianity	199
2.3.1. Shared faith with non-Christian religions	201
2.3.2. Shared faith with all Christians	203
3. ON FAITH, CATECHESIS, AND US AMERICAN CULTURE	206
3.1. Catholic identity and the American social culture	207
3.2. Christian faith and the common good	211
4. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION	216

PART 3

CHURCH, MISSION AND EVANGELIZING CATECHESIS

Chapter V

MARTHALER: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CATECHESIS	223
1. GCD TO GDC: FROM «MINISTRY» TO «EVANGELIZATION»	223
1.1. Marthaler's introduction and summary of his commentary	224
1.2. Catechesis in the evangelizing mission of the Church	234
1.3. The message of the Gospel	244
1.4. On faith's pedagogy	248
1.5. On the recipients of catechesis	251
1.6. Catechesis in local churches	255
2. VATICAN II TO NDC/USCCA: FROM «INSTRUCTION» TO «CULTURAL EVANGELIZATION»	261
2.1. Introduction with three disclaimers	262
2.2. Catechesis in Vatican II and the immediate years (Chapter 1-3)	264
2.3. Catechesis for diverse settings and age levels in USA (Chapter 4)	292
2.4. Liturgical Reform and its reception in USA (Chapter 5)	299
2.5. The doctrine and mission of the Church (Chapters 6-8)	303
2.6. Catechesis in USA (Chapter 9-10)	312
2.7. Other catechetical matters: ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, lay catechists, and school issues (Chapter 11-13)	323
3. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION	333

Chapter VI

WARREN: CATECHESIS IN THE CHURCH'S PASTORAL PRACTICE	339
1. LOCAL CHURCH AND CONFRONTATION WITH CULTURE	340
2. THE CHURCH'S PASTORAL MINISTRY	346
3. CATECHESIS AND RE: ITS DISTINCTION	348
4. CATECHESIS AND THE «CORPORATE MEMORY» OF THE ECCLESIAL COMMUNITY	353
5. CONTEMPORARY CULTURE, CATECHESIS, AND RE	355
6. THE CHURCH'S MISSION AND YOUTH CATECHESIS	358
6.1. The Church's paradigm about the youth	358
6.2. Youth catechesis in the church's mission	362
7. PARISH PASTORAL ACTIVITIES AND HUMANIZING YOUTH CATECHESIS	366
8. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION	369

PART 4

SYNTHESIS AND EVALUATION

Chapter VII

A SYNTHETIC ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE US CATECHESIS IN 2000-2010	377
1. AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND EXPERIENTIAL INSINUATION OF THE 'NEW CATECHETICS': A HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CATECHESIS IN THE USA	377
1.1. Moran: «the present relationship between man and God» as the object of catechesis	380
1.2. Lee: the «empirical dimension» of the human-divine relation and the use of human sciences in religious instruction	384
1.3. Groome: the «sharing» within the community of the human-divine experience or «praxis»	391
1.4. Marthaler and Warren: catechesis as a socialization process	404
1.4.1. Marthaler: catechesis as the nurture of Christian life (human-divine experience) within the community	404
1.4.2. Warren: defending the nurture of «testimony of Christian life» from cultural aggressions	409
2. CATECHESIS OF CHRISTIAN LIFE WITHIN THE CHURCH: THE INSIGHT OF THE MAIN PROPONENTS OF 'NEW CATECHETICS' IN THE FIRST DECADE OF THE 21ST CENTURY	416
2.1. Moran and a comprehensive religious education	417
2.1.1. Comprehensive religious education based on «revelation»	418
2.1.2. Religious education in the Roman Catholic Church and «revelation»	420
2.2. Lee and the forging of Christian lifestyle through religious instruction	425
2.2.1. Religious instruction and red-hot religion	426
2.2.2. Human sciences, theology, and their collaboration in religious instruction	427
2.2.3. The Magisterium, munus docendi, and the vocation to teach	429
2.3. Groome and «faith-life and life-faith» catechesis	432
2.3.1. Being a Catholic is a spiritual matter	433
2.3.2. A catechetical education based on «faith»	436
2.3.3. The extra-ecclesial orientation of catechetical education	439
2.4. Marthaler and the «development of catechesis» (from instruction to way of life) as documented by Church documents	445
2.4.1. From instruction to living the Christian life	446
2.4.2. The liturgy and adult faith formation	447
2.4.3. Catechesis and evangelizing mission of the Church	448
2.4.4. Catechesis and the formation of catechists	450
2.4.5. Catechesis and doctrines	450
2.5. Warren and the «sapiential» catechesis within the ecclesial community	451
2.5.1. Catechesis and discipleship	452
2.5.2. The ecclesial community and catechesis	454
CONCLUSIVE REFLECTIONS	457
GENERAL INDEX	477

Abbreviations in the Thesis

APNE	Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism
APRRE	Association of Prof. and Researchers of Religious Education
CCC	Catechism of the Catholic Church
C-CCC	Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church
CCD	Confraternity of Christian Doctrine
COINAT	International Theological Commission
C-SD	Compendium of the Social Doctrine
CT	Catechesi Tradendae
CTSA	Catholic Theological Society of America
CUA	Catholic University of America
EDB	Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna
EN	Evangelium Nuntiandi
EV	Enchiridion Vaticanum
GCD	General Catechetical Directory (1971)
GDC	General Directory for Catechesis (1997)
LEV	Libreria Editrice Vaticana
LG	Dogmatic Constitution on Church
NCCB	National Catholic Conference of Bishops
NCCL	National Conference for Catechetical Leadership
NCEA	National Catechetical Educational Association
NDC	National Directory for Catechesis
NFCY	National Federation of the Catholic Youth
NFCYM	National Catholic Educational Association
OHWB	Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us
PAC	Partnership in Adolescent Catechesis
RCIA	Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults
RE	Religious Education
REA	Religious Education Association
SLF	Sharing the Light of Faith
TLL	The Living Light
US/USA	United States of America
USCC	United States Catholic Conference
USCCA	United States Catholic Catechism for Adults
USCCB	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Bibliography of the Thesis

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. *Magisterium*

- *Vatican II Documents*

VATICAN II, Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes* (1966), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1319-1644.

— Dogmatic Constitution *Dei verbum* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 872-911.

— Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 284-456.

— Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1-244.

— Decree *Ad Gentes divinitus* (1966), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1087-1242.

— Decree *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 912-1041.

— Decree *Christus Dominus* (1966), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 573-701.

— Decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 494-572.

— Declaration *Dignitatis humanae* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1042-1086.

— Declaration *Nostra aetate* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 853-871.

— Declaration *Gravissimum Educationis* (1965), in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 819-852.

- *Papal Documents*

JOHN XXIII, Allocutio *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, 11 October 1962, in EV 1, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 26-69.

PAUL VI, Adhortatio apostolica *Evangelii nuntiandi*, 08 December 1975, in EV 5, Bologna: EDB, 1979, 1588-1716.

JOHN PAUL II, Adhortatio apostolica *Catechesi Tradendae*, 16 October 1979, in EV 6, Bologna: EDB, 1980, 1764-1939.

— Carta encíclica «*Redemptoris missio*», 12 July 1990, Madrid: Promoción Popular Cristiana, 1992.

- Constitutio apostolica *Ex corde ecclesiae*, 15 August 1990, in EV 12, Bologna: EDB, 1992, 414-492.
- BENEDICT XVI, *Homily during a Mass celebrated in Lourdes*, Lourdes, France, 14 September 2008.
- Enc. *Caritas in Veritate*, 29 June 2009, in vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/.
- *Address to Members of the International Theological Commission*, Consistory Hall, 3 December 2010.
- *Address given to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications*, Vatican City, 28 February 2011.
- *Address given before the praying of the midday Regina Caeli*, Venice, Italy, 8 May 2011.

- *Documents of Pontifical Congregations*

- CONGREGATION FOR THE CLERGY, Directorium catechisticum generale *Ad normam decreti* (11 April 1971), in EV 4, Bologna: EDB, 1978, 453-654.
- Codex Iuris Canonici* (25 January 1983), in EV 8, Bologna: EDB, 1984.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH, *Instructio Donum veritatis*, 24 May 1990, in EV 12, Bologna: EDB, 1992, 244-305.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE CLERGY, Directorium generale pro catechesi *Concilium Vaticanum II* (15 August 1997), in EV 16, Bologna: EDB, 1999, 741-1127.
- CATECISMO DE LA IGLESIA CATÓLICA, Madrid: Asociación de Editores del Catecismo, 1999.
- CATECISMO DE LA IGLESIA CATÓLICA: COMPENDIO, Madrid: Asociación de Editores del Catecismo, 2005.
- COMISIÓN PONTIFICIA «IUSTITIA ET PAX», COMPENDIO DE LA DOCTRINA SOCIAL DE LA IGLESIA, Città del Vaticano: LEV, 2005.

- *Documents of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) and its Departments*

- NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS/UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999.
- *Journey to the fullness of life. A Report of the Implementation of the Rite of Catholic Christian Initiation for Adults in the United States*, Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2000.
- USCCB, *Statement In Support of catechetical ministry*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, June 16, 2000.
- *Stewardship and Young Adults: An invitation to help change the world*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2003.

- *National Directory for Catechesis*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005.
- *United States Catholic Catechism for Adults*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006.
- *Doctrinal Elements of a Curriculum Framework for the Development of Catechetical Materials for Young People of High School Age*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2008.

2. *The writings of the principal authors in 2000-2010*

- GROOME, Th., «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», in *TLL*, 37/4 (Summer 2001) 16-29.
- «Educación Catequética Global», in *Concilium*, 4 (Fall 2002) 583-592.
 - «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», in GROOME, TH.-HORELL, H. (eds.), *Horizons and Hopes: The Future of Religious Education*, NY: Paulist Press, 2003, 1-30.
 - «Remembering and Imagining», in *Religious Education*, 98/4 (2003) 511-520;
 - *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, NY: HarperSan Francisco Publishers, 2003.
 - «Let the Imagination Soar», in HUEBSCH, B. (ed.), *Imagining a New Church: Building a Community of Life*, Texas: Thomas More Publishing, 2003, 37-58.
 - «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», in *Faithful Past Faith-Filled Future. Papers Commissioned for the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Commission*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 25-36.
 - «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», in AUGENSTEIN, J., KAUFFMAN, C. F., WISTER, R. J. (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Catholic Education: Historical Essays in Honor of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003, 179-198.
 - «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», in POPE, S. (ed.), *Common Calling: The Laity and Governance of the Catholic Church*, Washington: Georgetown Press, 2004, 195-208.
 - «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», in ANDERSON, H., FOLEY, E., MILLER-MCLEMORE, B. AND SCHRIETER, R. (eds.), *Mutuality Matters*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004., 211-224.
 - «The Church is Catechetical», in MADGES, W. AND DALEY, M. (eds.), *The Many Marks of the Church*, CT: Twenty Third Publications, 2006, 79-84.
 - «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», in IMBELL, R. (ed.), *Handing On the Faith*, NY: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2006, 172-192.

- LEE, J.M. IV (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 2000.
- MARTHALER, B., *Sowing Seeds: Notes and Comments on the General Directory for Catechesis*, Washington, D. C.: United States Catholic Conference, 2000.
- *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry: A Digest of Recent Church Documents*, Washington DC: National Catholic Education, 2008.
- MORAN, G., «Building on the Past», in LEE, JM IV (ed.), *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 2000, 134-154.
- *Both Sides: The Story of Revelation*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2002.
- *Fashioning a People Today: The Educational Insights of Maria Harris*, MN: Twenty Third Publications, 2007.
- *Speaking of Teaching: Lessons from History*, MD: Lexington Books Lanham, 2008.
- *Believing in a Revealing God: The Basis of the Christian Life*, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.
- WARREN, M. (ed.), *Changing Churches – the Local Church and the Structures of Change*, OR: Pastoral Press, 2000
- «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», in *TLL*, 37/1 (Fall 2000) 6-14.
- «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look», in ROEBBEN, B.-WARREN, M. (eds.), *Religious Education as Practical Theology*, Leuven: Peeters Publishers 2001, 125-144.
- «Towards an Anamnestic Catechesis», in *TLL*, 40/4 (2004) 18-26.
- «Finalités et contenus précisés pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», in *Revue Lumen Vitae* LIX/2 (2004) 199-212.
- «Imagining an Inconvenient Church», in MAHAN, B., WARREN, M. AND WHITE, D. (eds.), *Awakening Youth Discipleship*, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008, 41-60.
- «The Imagination of Youth», in MAHAN, B., WARREN, M. AND WHITE, D. (eds.), *Awakening Youth Discipleship*, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008, 61-74.
- «Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis», in PARTNERSHIP ON ADOLESCENT CATECHESIS (ed.), *Sourcebook for Adolescent Catechesis*, 1, Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2008, 37-42.

3. *Some of the writings of the same authors before 2000*

- GROOME, TH., *Christian Religious Education. Sharing our Story and Vision*, New York: Harper San Francisco, 1980.
- *Sharing faith. A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry*, Harper San Francisco, New York 1991.
- *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent*, Texas: Thomas More. An RCL Company, 1998.
- LEE, J. M. IV, *The Shape of Religious Instruction*, Pflaum, Dayton (Ohio) 1971.
- *The Flow of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1973.

- *The Content of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1985.
- (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1990.
- MARTHALER, B., *Catechetics in Context. Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory Issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy*, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, 1973.
- *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Traditional Themes and Contemporary Issues*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1994.
- *The Catechism Yesterday and Today. The Evolution of a Genre*, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
- MORAN, G., *Catechesis of Revelation*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- *Religious Education as a Second Language*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1989.
- MORAN, G.-HARRIS, M., *Reshaping Religious Education. Conversations on Contemporary Practice*, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- WARREN, M. (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics (1)*, Minnesota: St. Mary's Press, 1983.
- *Faith, Culture, and the Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1989.
- (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics (2)*, Minnesota: St. Mary's Press, 1997.

4. *About Catechesis in the United States of America*

- PELLITERO, R., «La reflexión catequética actual en los Estados Unidos», in *Scripta Theologica*, 29 (1997/2) 585-620.
- HAGARTY, M. T., *The Role of 'Experience' in Religious Education/Catechesis in the United States since the Second Vatican Council: An Analysis and Critique*, Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 2000.
- MARTORELL, M., *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis en los Estados Unidos: cinco autores católicos (1966-1992)*, Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 2000.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

- ALBERICH, E., *La Catechesi oggi. Manuale di catechetica fondamentale*, Torino: Elledici, 2001.
- ALEJOS GRAU, C.-J. (ed.), *Al Servicio de la Educación en la Fe. El Compendio del Catecismo de la Iglesia Católica*, Madrid: Palabra, 2007.
- ATKINSONS, H., «James Michael Lee», in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www.Talbot.edu/ce20/).
- AUGENSTEIN, J., KAUFFMANN, C. AND WISTER, R. (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Catholic Education: Historical Essays in Honor of the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003.

- BISSOLI, C., *Va' e Annuncia (Mc 5, 19). Manuale di Catechesi Biblica*, Torino: Elledici, 2006.
- BURGESS, H., «Memorial: James Michael Lee [B. 9-29-1931, D. 7-15-2004]», in *Religious Education*, 100/2 (2005) 109-112.
- CAPRILE, G., *Il Sinodo dei Vescovi. Quarta Assemblea Generale (30 settembre-29 ottobre 1977)*, Roma: Società Grafica Romana, 1978.
- CHICO GONZÁLEZ, P., *Diccionario de Catequesis y Pedagogía Religiosa*, Tomo I-II, Madrid: Bruño, 2006.
- DARCY-BERUBE, F., *Religious Education at a Crossroads. Moving On in the Freedom of the Spirit*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1995.
- DULLES, A., *Evangelization for the Third Millennium*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2009.
- ELIAS, J., *History of Christian Education: Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox Perspective*, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company, 2003.
- ELIAS, J. y NOLAN, L. (eds.), *Educators in the Intellectual Tradition*, Connecticut: Sacred Heart University Press, 2009.
- ENGLISH, L., «John Elias», in *Christian Educators in the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University [www.Talbot.edu/ce20].
- ETCHEGARAY CRUZ, A., *Storia della Catechesi* (2nd ed. Riveduta e ampliata), Roma: Edizione Paoline, 1983.
- FLANNERY, A. (ed.), *The Conciliar and Post-conciliar Documents/Vatican Council II (1981 edition)*, New York: Costello, 1975.
- FRANCHI, L. (ed.), *An Anthology of the Catholic Teaching on Education*, London-New York: Scepter, 2007.
- GALE, T., *Contemporary Authors* (2007) (acquired through at amazon).
- GEVAERT, J. (dir.), *Diccionario de Catequética*, Madrid: CCS, 1987.
- HERMICK, E., «James Michael Lee IV (1931-2004) – RIP», in *TLL* 40/4 (2004) 6-8.
- ILLANES, J. L. y SARANYANA, J. I., *Historia de la Teología*, Madrid: BAC, 1995.
- IZQUIERDO, C., BURGGRAF, J., AROCENA, F. M. (eds.), *Diccionario de Teología*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2006.
- KEANE, E., *A Generation Betrayed: Deconstructing Catholic Education in the English-Speaking World*, New York: Heatherleigh Press, 2002.
- KELLY, F. D., *The Mystery We Proclaim. Catechesis for the Third Millennium* (2nd revised ed.), Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999.
- MARY, M. (ed.), *Does the Church Really Want Religious Education. An Ecumenical Inquiry*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1988.
- MORALES, J., *La experiencia de Dios*, Madrid: Rialp 2007.
- NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, *Faithful Past, Faith-Filled Future. Papers Commissioned for the Centennial of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Washington D. C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 2003.
- NEWELL, E. J., «Education Has Nothing to Do with Theology»: *James Michael Lee's Social Science Instruction*, Princeton: Pickwick Publications, 2006.
- O'HARE, P. (ed.), *Foundations of Religious Education*, New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- PELLITERO, R. (ed.), *La Iglesia como familia de Dios*, Madrid: Rialp, 2010.

- *Ser Iglesia haciendo el mundo. Los laicos en la Nueva Evangelización*, Costa Rica: Promesa, 2008.
- (ed.), *Vivir el Amor. En torno a la encíclica Deus caritas est*, Madrid: Rialp, 2007.
- *Teología Pastoral. Panorámica y Perspectivas*, Bilbao: Grafite Ediciones, 2006.
- PUJOL, J., DOMINGO, F., GIL, A., BLANCO, M., *Introducción a la Pedagogía de la Fe*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2001.
- RATZINGER, J., *Trasmisión della fede e fonti della fede* (trad. Leandro Calvo), Casale Monferrato (AL): Edizioni Piemme di Pietro Marietti, 1985.
- RATZINGER, J., *Gospel, Catechesis, Catechism. Sidelights on the Catechism of the Catholic Church*, San Francisco: Ignatius, 1997.
- REICHERT, R. J., *Renewing Catechetical Ministry, a future agenda*, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2002.
- SCOTT, K., «Book Review of Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium» (2000) in *TLL*, 37/2 (Winter 2000) 77-78.
- SESE, J.-PELLITERO, R. (eds.), *La Transmisión de la Fe en la Sociedad Contemporánea*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2008.
- SMITH, J.-O'BRIEN, M., «Maria Harris», in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www.Talbot.edu/ce20/)
- TAYLOR, M. (ed.), *Changing Patterns of Religious Education*, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1984.
- WALCH, T., *Parish School. American Catholic Parochial Education from Colonial Times to the Present*, Washington DC: The National Catholic Educational Association, 2003.
- WILLEY, P., DE COINTET, P., MORGAN, B., *The Catechism of the Catholic Church and the Craft of Catechesis*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008.
- WILLHAUCK, S., «Berard Marthaler» in *Christian Educators of the 20th Century Project*, Talbot University (www.Talbot.edu/ce20/)
- WUERL, D., «La Aplicación del Catecismo de la Iglesia Católica en las Iglesias Particulares de Norteamérica», in *Actualidad Catequética*, 195-196 (2002) 451-458.

A Synthetic Analysis and Evaluation of the US Catechesis in 2000-2010

After a detailed discussion of the catechetical doctrines held by our principal American authors exposed in their writings in 2000-2010, it is but proper to present now a synthesis and a short evaluation. This synthesis and evaluation includes the historical and theological background provided by the new catechetical movement in the USA (Chapter I), as well as the main ideas of the principal American authors in their recent writings (Chapter II-VI).

1. AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND EXPERIENTIAL INSINUATION OF THE 'NEW CATECHETICS': A HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CATECHESIS IN THE USA

In Part I, *The Historical and Theological Context of the Catechesis in the USA*, with only one chapter (*Chapter I The New Catechetics and the attention to human experience*), we have attempted to provide a historical and theological background to the catechesis in the USA in the first decade of the 21st century. This historical and theological background is necessary to understand the main focus of our work in the succeeding chapters: some theological aspects in the writings of principal US American catechists representing the US catechesis.

We figured out an important moment in the catechetical movement in the USA in the immediate years after Vatican II, the so-called 'new catechetics'. We then started our historical re-composition of the US catechesis from the said phenomenon with a special focus on the catechetical doctrines of the said movement's principal proponents.

It has to be noted that in this present work, despite of the many other important US American catechists at present, we have opted to maintain our

focus on the main protagonists on the *new catechetics* and their writings in the first decade of the 21st century. In that way, we were able to trace and evaluate concretely the progress of the US catechesis, in particular the doctrines of principal American authors. The American authors we refer to are Gabriel Moran (University of New York, New York), James Michael Lee (University of Alabama, Birmingham), Thomas Groome (University of Boston, Boston), Berard Marthaler (Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.) and Michael Warren (St. John University, Jamaica, New York).

We figured out that *new catechetics* is associated with what authors consider as the ‘Americanization’ of the modern catechetical movement in the late 60s.

In our analysis, we indicate at least *four* general characteristics of the *new catechetics* in relation to the catechesis in the USA in general. *First*, the *new catechetics* has influenced the direction of catechesis in the USA towards giving ampler attention to the *anthropological-experiential dimension* of the reality of divine-human relationship. *Second*, it has anchored its study of the human reality to the human sciences such as sociology, pedagogy, psychology, and anthropology. *Third*, it explicitly presented a criticism on the traditional instructional method (cognitive centered) of catechesis and even the presentation of the *kerygma*. It proposed that catechesis extend its attention to making faith be palpable in and within the service of the community. Finally, *fourth*, the proponents of the *new catechetics* (at least those which we have taken up) proposed the modification of the understanding of the traditional catechesis (cognitive catechesis, memorization, etc.). Some, while recognizing traditional catechesis’ efficiency during the first centuries of the Church, proposed a new form of educating in faith, the so-called *religious education*. Religious education was designed to be ampler and more fitting to the culturally pluralistic social context of the present USA. Religious education was designed to incorporate the findings of human sciences and «speak» the language of the modern secular society. Some proponents also proposed the maintenance of the traditional name «catechesis» and offered a deeper understanding of the Church’s catechetical task. By *deeper understanding*, we mean a catechesis which is directed to the reflection of Christian life through the Church’s own catechetical traditional resources, that is, its practices, rites and symbols. All these, in any case, were attempts to overcome the then diffused perspective catechesis as a pure school instruction activity.

The *new catechetics* accompanied the eventual opening of the US catechetical reflection to all that which defines human situation – culture, so-

ciety, and symbols. Thereupon, catechesis in the USA assumed what experts call 'a hermeneutical function towards experience'. Catechesis moved from being what was called 'a carrier of theological formulae' to being a key element to understanding the human reality enveloped by the divine. In reality, catechesis properly understood and done always aims towards maturity in Christian life. However, there was a certain tendency in the previous centuries to identify catechesis with 'mere learning doctrinal formulae', as so perceived by the modern catechetical movement.

We can therefore say that the *new catechetics* program in the USA set the transformation of the USA catechesis' understanding of the catechetical task from «instruction» to something which has something to do directly with living the Christian life. We reiterate that in reality, catechetical erudition is compatible with serving God in practical life. Anyway, the absence of a common term that may refer to the catechetical ministry of the Church among *new catechetics* authors is more than a semantic problem.

1.1. Moran: «*the present relationship between man and God*» as the object of catechesis

G. Moran criticized the instruction and memorization method of in the traditional catechesis and even the then popular kerygmatic catechesis. He contended that kerygmatic catechesis, like the traditional catechesis, *solely emphasized* the words and actions of Jesus *in the past*. He vied instead for an educational task concerned with the *present* action of the Jesus who has already resurrected from the dead, that is, the action of the Spirit-filled Jesus here and now in individual persons. The proposal of G. Moran concretely consisted in a 'religious education' focused on every human being's dynamic *experience of the divine*. He used the term 'revelation' in reference to that experience. He explained that such a *human* experience (of the divine) derived from the experience of the humanity of Jesus Christ on the cross (together with the Lord's resurrection), wherein the communion of the human and the divine was inaugurated.

In concrete, he sustained that there is a continuous revelation/communication between God and man. In *Theology of Revelation* (1966), Moran writes that (1) the contents of revelation are inseparable with the act of revealing, that is, God is one with his revealing act, and (2) the Jesus Christ in his passion and death (with his human body dying on the cross and rising from the dead)

inaugurated this *continuous* divine-human communication or *revelation*. Moran therefore proposed a catechesis based on that concept of revelation, instead of «merely teaching doctrines and formulae». Hence, in *Catechesis of Revelation* (1966), Moran criticized the catechetical praxis of the then practiced kerygmatic catechesis and proposed a «catechesis» which was at the service of the ‘ongoing revelation’ phenomenon.

First, kerygmatic catechesis gave importance to catechesis in general in the knowledge of God. Moran, without denying that fact, sustained that even without catechesis, man may know God, because knowledge of God is first and foremost a divine initiative.¹

Second, the kerygmatic catechesis considered as its sources liturgy, scriptures, doctrine and testimony or the so-called *four signs of catechesis*. Moran, on his part, sustained that there are more. He further pointed out the inadequacies of each *sign* in the contemporary times.² Concerning *liturgy*, Moran comments that kerygmatic catechesis has limited itself to explaining religious symbolisms ignoring their significance to the children’s contemporary experience. Concerning the *Bible*, Moran presents it as a narration of the people of Israel and of the apostles which documents their *privileged* experience with God; but according to him, it is not the only source of revelation. Regarding *testimony*, Moran comments kerygmatic catechesis interprets the narrations of the bible according to the human experience, instead of explaining human experience in the light of what the Bible says. Regarding doctrine and teachings, he comments that kerygmatic catechesis holds dogmas more important than the inter-subjective relationship between man and God (revelation).

Third, he criticized kerygmatic catechesis’ concept of history of salvation. Moran writes that kerygmatic catechesis understands history as a series of past events. Moran proposed instead of an idea of history as «man’s self-awareness in time». Therefore, he proposed that history of salvation be understood or include the idea of «an encounter of God and man in man’s consciousness here and now». He added that any catechesis must depart that human experience.³

Fourth, he underlined the *freedom* of the students. In Moran’s view, catechesis should serve as an interpreter of the divine-human experience present in each individual. Authors refer to this function as «the hermeneutical function of catechesis», that is, the clarifying of ‘ongoing-revelation’ experiences of individuals.

He clearly viewed a catechesis more attentive to the anthropological dimension, or to the divine-human communion. He called his proposal «religious education».

As G. Moran moved to the ecumenical and even more to an interreligious plane,⁴ he seemed to extend such an intersubjective divine-human experience to all men and women. Thereafter, the Catholic's *catechesis*, in his perception, became a sort of a particular *intermediary activity* to the 'broader' religious education (as he understood it).⁵

Within that interreligious context, Moran, in his writings in the 90s, developed amplified towards the practical consequences of his proposed concept of revelation. This time, he focused on (1) the field of ethics/morality, (2) on the practical concept of revelation in inter-religious dialogue, and (3) on the field of education.⁶ It is interesting to note that in the first decade of the 21st century, Moran collates these *three principal themes* together with some variations in his re-proposal of his concept of *revelation*.⁷

To conclude, with Moran, the *new catechetics* restored to catechesis its real focus: *Christian life*, or in G. Moran's intuition, *the present relationship between the God and man*. It deepened and expanded the object of catechesis – not only the *kerygma* in itself but the *kerygma at work in the present lives of persons*.

We must however say that his concept of *revelation* is not the same with what the Catholic tradition holds. The Catholic tradition understands «revelation» in a *proper* and *wider* sense. That is, revelation, properly speaking, had its *fullness* in Jesus Christ and was closed in the apostolic times. The Church recognizes other «revelations of God» in nature, in the wise men of old, or in the lives of holy men and women, but uses another term for it – *manifestations* or *communications*– in order to avoid confusion. His use of «revelation» however reminds the concept of *semina Verbi*, a patristic term which was employed to designate, in fact, truths found in other cultures. The Church later employed the expression to refer to the truths the Holy Spirit left in other religions.

Moran seems to avoid saying that Jesus Christ works today in the Church through the Holy Spirit. He seems to prefer the affirmation that Jesus works today in individual persons (revelation) through the Holy Spirit. His concept of present revelation is more or less based on it. However, he seems to have difficulty in admitting that the words and actions of Jesus of Nazareth, preserved by the Church in the Scriptures and Tradition, is revelation. We therefore ask: was Jesus of Nazareth God or not? Was the Holy Spirit at work only after the resurrection of our Lord?

1.2. *Lee: the «empirical dimension» of the human-divine relation and the use of human sciences in religious instruction*

John Michael Lee IV, on his part, had pushed through in attending to the anthropological reality with the employment of social sciences. In particular, Lee devised a social science method capable of detecting the empirical progress of the practice of faith in Christian life (as he claimed).⁸ Furthermore, it is no surprise that at the moment of determining the identity of the teaching of the catholic faith in the contemporary times, he stands in favor of 'religious education' than in the traditional 'catechesis'.

In *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (1971), Lee lays down the *rationale* for his opted approach. M. Martorell writes that in this book, Lee presents a religious instruction based, not on theology, but on social sciences,⁹ on the nature and methods of improving the *teaching act* (and the other factors that condition learning).¹⁰

If in the first book, Lee highlighted the teaching-learning activity as the central point in the social science approach to religious instruction, in *The Flow of Religious Instruction. A Social Science Approach* (1973), he sought to explain the process of «learning» religion through instruction. Giving valuable importance to the centrality of experience in the process of learning, he considered teaching a task of configuring human experiences. This is realized through the selection of experiences adequate to the *four variables* which composes the single teaching-learning activity (teacher, student, subject, and conditions of learning). In the case of religious education, the experience being dealt with is the *faith-experience* of students. Since the beginning of the process, *the act of religious instruction* modifies 'faith' in the process and the other variables that intervenes in its (faith's) development. A new reality is created at the end: *faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting*. Here the new reality (faith-as-taught/learned-in-a-setting) is qualified as an experience. Inasmuch as it is composed of set of experiences or acts (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), it is further qualified as a *lifestyle*. That *lifestyle* is conditioned by psychological, sociological, and physical factors. In this case faith seems to be a *psychological product*, or in Lee's terms, a '*construct*'. Citing Lee, Martorell explains that a *construct* is a concept which has the added meaning of having been deliberately invented or consciously adopted for particular purpose. It is functional by nature. In addition, Martorell notes that the *construct of faith* is necessarily inexact, probable and mutable.

Parallel with Lee's systematization of social sciences at the service of religious instruction is his total detestation of theology. He considers theology as purely cognitive and the religious education based on theological sciences incapable of reaching the same results obtained through social sciences. According to Martorell's view, Lee holds modern catechesis to be still dependent on a rationalist theology. Unfortunately, nobody in our times hold such a concept of theology anymore. Theology is not a purely cognitive science. It is *sapience* or wisdom, a science which affects the cognitive, affective, experiential, and social dimensions of reality.

In any case, for Lee, the theological approach seems to remain in the cognitive dimension and less (or nil) in the practical or experiential dimension. The educational approach – then imbued by the advances of other social sciences as psychology, pedagogy, sociology, together with the Marxist leaning educational ideologies common in those times – foment the experiential dimension in teaching religion. It deals with elements which are verifiable, measurable and modifiable (behaviours, intellectual constructs, thinking patterns, and the like). From the educational point of view, Lee's approach deals scientifically well the experiential dimension of teaching-learning in the teaching of the faith.

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

Again in 1977 at the Boston Symposium, Lee summarized his principles regarding the nature of catechesis or religious education in a speech titled *Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction* (1977).

Like Moran, he vied for the relinquishment of the traditional term 'catechesis' in favor of the anglo-american term 'religious education'. He singled out that «catechesis» originally formed part of an educational system (*kerygma-catechesis-didascalia*) in the primitive Church. In that educational system, catechesis only referred to a tiny part: the 'oral' and 'cognitive' instruction imparted to beginners 'about the rudiments of the Christian religion'.

Lee therefore intuited that «catechesis» is distinct from the total educational task of the Church. With that intuition, Lee wanted a broader name for the Church's task of educating in faith and which may include within it the cognitive and instruction focused «catechesis». He thus proposed the *religious instruction*. In addition to that, he judged to be outdated that the intramural term «catechesis» in the pluralistic and ecumenical academic ambiance.¹¹

Second, Lee reiterates the fundamental elements of religious instruction mentioned in his anterior works. Referring specifically to teaching religion, he applies the four basic elements in an 'instruction event', namely, the teacher, the learner, the substantive content, and the environment.¹² Moreover, he endows a role of mediation to *the teaching act* in the processing of the student's *experience of faith*.¹³

Third, M. Martorell notes that Lee seems to simply reduce faith into mere human experience processed or elaborated into an *intellectual construct*.¹⁴ Inasmuch as it is a human behavior, it is understood to be composed of cognitive, affective and psychomotor operations. As an *experience*, Lee defends the fittingness therefore of social sciences –neither the theological sciences nor the Magisterium– as that which should study and systematize those individual faith-experiences.¹⁵

Lee's approach to religious education seems to fall short in a theological evaluation of the *experience of faith*. He dedicated the third book of his trilogy, *The Content of Religious Instruction. A Social Science Approach* (1985), to the discussion of the «substantive content» of religious instruction, that is, religion, or faith transformed into practice, into day to day life.

In *Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always* (1988)¹⁶, he discussed the relationship of the Church and its educational task to faith. Here, Lee closely identified catechesis with the Catholic Church's pastoral activity.¹⁷ Lee attributed education to the pastoral solicitude of the Church; however, instead of seeing the hierarchy's tie with the teaching action of the Church as a service, as Christ intended it, Lee viewed the hierarchy as a sort of an entity extrinsic to faith and therefore, its relation to the teaching ministry, a sort of a manipulation.¹⁸ For him, religious instruction was a science governed by principles deriving from *faith-elaborated-by-experience*. From this perspective, catechesis, being governed by an external authority, that is, the Church Magisterium, stood outside the category of religious instruction.¹⁹

Despite of his apparent biases regarding the ecclesiastical authority over catechesis and its disqualification for being an authentic religious instruc-

tion, Lee recognizes a certain dosage of catechesis necessary for the Catholic Church and for its members' initial stages.²⁰ He is however convinced that the maturity of Church members lies not in catechesis but in religious instruction.²¹ We opine the contrary: religious education and catechesis do not exclude each other, but need each other to attain the maturity in faith of the Church's members.

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

Lee went further asserting that faith is facilitated and caused by religious instruction.²² Before giving a judgment, it must be mentioned that Lee made the assertion from the perspective of his social science theory (which considers faith as an intellectual construct). From the theological point of view, Lee's assertion was not Roman Catholic. Faith is a gift from God.

We opine that Lee could have been consistent to his social science theory stance. The empirical manifestations of living faith may be detected by human sciences. He ascertained it. However, claiming that social sciences may cause faith is squarely in opposition to the truth: God grants faith, not the catechist nor a religious education founded on the best scientific methods. In addition to that, any authentic science deals and at the same time respects the nature of religion.

Religion, even if it has empirical aspect (the beliefs, the practices, the number of followers, etc.), is an affair with deals with non-empirical realities (divine truths). Religious instruction may therefore deal directly with religion's empirical dimension, and indirectly and respectfully, its non-empirical aspects. Theology, on the other hand, deals with divinely revealed truths held by a religion. Theological and human sciences study religion from different planes, but they need each other in the educational task, like catechesis or religious education, aimed at maturity in Christian life.

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

1.3. *Groome: the «sharing» within the community of the human-divine experience or «praxis»*

With *christian religious education*, Thomas Groome offered another alternative model of education in faith. It was an education characterized by (1) a «sharing» or mutual exchange of (2) «praxis» or faith-filled experiences.²³ There are two ideas which are principally involved in Groome's proposal: a community as place of mutual exchange (*sharing*), and a faith which lived and a life imbued with faith (*praxis*).

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

Groome shared the «popular» prejudice of those times which considered the Church's traditional catechesis as purely an instruction-cognitive activity. For him, catechesis is basically *oral* teaching (informative in nature) suited and effective in the context of the ancient Church. He thinks that filling it with formative and experiential dimension in order to adjust it to the contemporary times would be equal to destroying its efficacy.²⁴ He was well aware of the «knowing-being dichotomy» prevalent in pedagogical sciences during that time which dominated also even in catechesis. In line with the rising interest of religious education on human experience, Groome made *praxis*, a concept which reconciled knowledge and action, as the main element in the education-sharing activity of the community.

In addition to that, he simply did not agree to the idea of updating the «traditional» catechesis for the simple reason that, in his view, it is effective in the historical context in which it was invented, that is, in the first centuries of the primitive Church. He vied instead for a «new» way of teaching the

faith apt for our times which incorporates the contributions of sacred sciences (Scripture, Theology, etc.), and of human sciences (pedagogy, psychology, sociology, etc.).²⁵

Groome's *praxis* is a principal idea for understanding his understanding of *faith, revelation* and even of the understanding of «vision», «horizon» of education-sharing task. He refers to «God's reign» as the «political» program of the education-sharing task. For him, the *faith* involved in the education-sharing task had a necessary consequence, that is, *the furthering of God's reign* here and now.²⁶ It consists of the establishment of *God's desire of peace and justice, love, order, etc.* for man, starting now here on earth until the afterlife.

The theological setbacks of this proposal lie, *first*, in its concept of a community without an official teaching authority; the value of the teaching act of each member is radically equal. This idea is squarely distinct from a hierarchically structured Church. *Second*, there is therefore no Magisterium, which may «officially» hold what the community holds as «its» truth or may «authoritatively» interpret Scriptures and Tradition. *Third*, the contents of the faith «shared» or the *praxis* are simply not clear.

According to M. Martorell, Th. Groome distinguishes *faith* from the *Christian faith*.²⁷ On one hand, faith, for Groome is the *a priori* 'gift from God' which disposes a person towards relationship with the divine. Christian faith, on the other hand, refers to the *specific faith tradition* to which the Christian community nurtures its members. With the philosophical foundation exposed above in mind, Th. Groome seems to consider these two 'faiths', not as different and separate kinds but two *dimensions* in the exercise of *one single reality* called 'faith'.²⁸

In M. Martorell's observation, Th. Groome identifies the *Christian faith* – the specification of that general understanding of *religious faith* – with the *Christian story and vision*.²⁹ The term 'Christian Story' refers to one particular version of the universal story of religious phenomenon. Its descriptive word 'christian' associates that Story with a distinctive inseparable Vision, that is, the furthering of God's reign from this moment up to hereafter.

Faith in general, distinct from Christian faith (discussed above), seems to be more related to his concept of *divine revelation*. Such a faith refers to the general attitude or disposition for «divine revelation». For him, revelation refers to God's entrance into time to encounter man; it is therefore a divine-human encounter in time/world. But unlike Moran who only emphasizes God's revelation at present and puts aside revelations in the past, Groome holds that

in revelation's *historical* realization, God's 'entrance in time' in the past has *an intimate relation* with his revelations at present.

For Groome, the divine revelations which happened in the past are those which are recorded in sacred beliefs, symbols and customs. He considers them as «useful reference tools» in interpreting revelations that occur at present. He considers Scripture and Tradition as 'normative in guiding the collective discernment of the divine designs' here and now.

Conversely, past divine revelations are re-interpreted with the 'new' revelations taking place at present. There is therefore an intimate relation between the revelations in the past and those which happens at present. In addition to that, he believes that every divine revelation (may it be that in the past or that which has taken place at present) is *open* to re-interpretations.

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

Finally, for Th. Groome, the task of interpreting revelation or what he calls «a hermeneutical mediation» is crucial. Revelation has to be mediated. Groome endows the role of hermeneutical mediation to the Church. The Church is the official interpreter of God's communiqués to mankind. But what does he intend for Church? He intends for «church» as a community of disciples of Christ, a community which exercises a transforming influence in the world.³⁰ In addition to that, Groome sustains that a church is an *inclusive community of partnership, inclusive discipleship of equals*.³¹ Despite of Th. Groome's evident difficulty of emphasizing the importance of the lay faithful and participation in the teaching mission of the Church (without undermining the part of the hierarchy), *his model of the church* encourages dialogue, community life and dynamic relationship among members. Moreover, in that ecclesial model, the *services* of ordained ministers appear to be an appointment from God enacted through the lay people's consensus.

M. Martorell rightly notes Th. Groome's ecclesial model repercussions in his understanding of *the teaching dimension* of the Church. As a Church among equals, Th. Groome distributes the teaching authority *equally* among three entities: (1) *the official teaching office associated with pastoral authority* (to pronounce officially the faith consensus of the community), (2) *the theologians* (their researches and investigations), and (3) *the sensus fidelium* (the discernment of the people).³² Again, here, an effort to explain the shared responsibility of all baptized in the teaching mission of the Church where everybody

belongs is evident. While his emphasis on the part of the researches of theologians and the teaching role of the lay faithful may indeed help discover their fundamental right to exercise the prophetic function, he elaborates less of its relationship to the ordained ministers' exercise of the same teaching function.

Groome continued to advance his concept of educating in faith in a Church without a hierarchical role. At the end of the 20th century, he focused his attention on task of educating in faith, especially of 'non-clerical' educators (parents and teachers). He centered on the philosophy of education of parents and teachers which is based on spiritual values. Those spiritual values according to him are constituted of convictions emanating from *faith*. We must say that despite of the geniality of Groome's philosophy of education based on faith-inspired spirituality, his concept of *faith* continued to be in need of theological clarification.

In *Educating for Life. A Spiritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent* (1998), he therefore proposed a spiritual vision which permeates the education agent's soul and his teaching. It was an educational philosophy founded on Catholic religion's *substantial* spiritual outlook. He further claimed that like other philosophies, it is *humanizing* (helping the students to be more human) and *universal or catholic* (may be adapted by teacher of whatever religious or denominational background).

Having in mind his shared praxis approach, Th. Groome pairs this proposed philosophy of education with a *humanizing* pedagogy which permits the *spiritual character* of his vision to influence into concrete reality. This intent is embedded in his famous phrase – *to bring faith to life and to bring life to faith* or *an overall dynamic of from Life to Tradition to Life, to Tradition to Life to Tradition*.³³

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

For the interest of our study –the theological aspects– we may focus more on those characteristics which Th. Groome considers substantial of Catholicism (and relevant to education not only in within the religious realm, but also in the realm of *life*) and less on his discussion on how to make them operative in the teaching activity. He therefore believed that Catholicism has (1) a positive perspective of man (*positive anthropology*), (2) a perspective of the

world (*a sacramental consciousness*), (3) a perspective of *community life* which fosters commitment to relationship and community, (4) a perspective of *time and history* which fosters appreciation for tradition, cultivating for reason and wisdom of life, and (5) the *three* principal (or he terms it *cardinal*) *commitments* of fostering holistic spirituality, formation in social justice, and inculcating a catholic world view. All these *four perspectives* (*speculative* in nature) and the *three practical* commitments of Catholic Christianity, Th. Groome holds, forms a spiritual vision on which his proposed educational philosophy may be grounded.³⁴

The *first* claim, that is, that Catholicism offered a *positive anthropology*,³⁵ Th. Groome, through the term *person*, presented man as ‘an agent who initiates one’s own actions and yet finds human identity in relationships’.

For the *second* claim –that Catholicism offers a cosmological perspective, or what he calls, *a sacramental consciousness*³⁶– Th. Groome departed from, what he claims to be catholic conviction, that ‘God mediates Godself to humankind’ through the world He created ‘directly or in partnership with humankind’. Therefore, he continued that man, on his part, receives God’s grace and discovers God’s desire for him through, *in his words*, ‘nature and the created order, through human culture and society, through our minds and bodies, hearts and souls, through our labors and efforts, our creativity and generativity, in the depth of our own beings and through our relationships with others, through the events and experiences that come our way, through what we are doing and what is ‘going on’ around us, through everything and anything of our world’.

This therefore, he continued, encourages and forms *the sacramental imagination or consciousness*. Somewhere, he simplified his explanation of sacramental consciousness as ‘to see God in everything’ or ‘to encounter and to respond to God through the medium of the world’.

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

(a *word-of-God* community), *leitourgia* (a *worshipping* community), *diakonia* (a community of *welfare*), and *marturia* (a *witnessing* community).

For the *fourth* claim –a Catholic perspective of time and history– Th. Groome wrote, basing on the previous claims that Catholicism fosters, what he calls, a *critical appreciation* of tradition and an occasion of exercising *human agency* in handing on the tradition (by discerning what is God’s reign here in now). Here, Th. Groome, went back to his idea that Catholicism regards history as a privileged locus for the human-divine encounter. As he wrote in the previous chapters, God mediates his divinity through the world; man in his turn discovers, and eventually responsibly responds, the divine plans in that same world. Therefore, he claimed that this perspective fosters a certain attitude towards things of the past –tradition– that is not purely passive but of *critical appreciation*. With his human agency, man has the task *to evaluate and discern* in tradition the elements of God’s reign and *to appropriate* them to the present with view of the future.

This attitude towards tradition permeated by the Catholic core convictions, Th. Groome believed, clarifies three important realities: *the natures and relationship of Scripture and Tradition, the blending of faith and culture, Catholicism’s long time commitment to humanizing education*.³⁷

According to Th. Groome’s observation, the Church has the tendency to overemphasize Tradition and thereby falls to authoritarianism. He therefore vied for a *real partnership* of the two *primordial media of God’s revelation*. He believed Scriptures provide Tradition ‘the guidance of an original identity to which it (Tradition) must be faithful’, while Tradition on its part ‘lends vitality’ to the Scriptures.³⁸ Tradition animates Scripture provided that Tradition itself must be continually revitalized by being reinterpreted according to contemporary understanding and living of biblical faith, and he adds too, ‘in the light of changing circumstances and contemporary consciousness’³⁹.

Th. Groome commented on the absolute authority given to Tradition (to the depreciation of Scripture) in the Church’s teaching activity and to the teaching authority of the Church itself. He underlined that the teaching authority of magisterium cannot be limited to the ‘institutional magisterium’ but ‘to the whole community of the body of Christ, including all the baptized Christians’.⁴⁰ In addition to that, while he appreciated the importance of Tradition’s authority in the Church’s teaching task, he vied, on the other hand, for the constant re-interpretation or a sort of a constant updating of Tradition so as to avoid the pitfall of authoritarianism.⁴¹

The other two themes to which Th. Groome traced his concept of tradition are *in Catholicism's inculturation* and *its consistent commitment to humanizing education*. For the humanizing education, he simply presented the Church's tradition (small *t*) of favoring in its education curricula the study of humanities, arts, and sciences.

For inculturation, Th. Groome pointed out the Catholic faith's 'strong disposition' to blend with culture, or faith's capacity to be a way of life. He claimed that the usual tendency of inculturation is *encouraged* by Christians' (including therefore *Catholics*) 'strong position on the reality of Incarnation'.⁴² He added in that 'sentiment to inculturate Christian faith' the support of 'a positive anthropology, the principle of sacramentality, and emphasis on community'.⁴³

Discussing *the cardinal commitments* of fostering holistic *spirituality*, formation in *social justice*, inculcating a *catholic world view*, Th. Groome explained that these three define the identity of Catholicism by 'helping compose the esprit de corps that makes Catholic Christianity distinctive' and that 'each is significant to a philosophy and spirituality for teachers and parents'.⁴⁴

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

Th. Groome in commenting the Church's distinctive commitment to justice underlines, among others, the following characteristics: it is done after the example of Jesus' promotion of God's reign, done with a special favor for the poor, done as partners in God's intentions of shalom by living a faith that does justice for peace, for the common good.⁴⁵ For the Church's commitment to have a universal point of view, Th. Groome underlines the radical treatment without distinction that the Church should have, the idea which he has in an inclusive community of disciples.⁴⁶ The context of this idea is what he claims as sectarian and parochial mindsets still present in the Church. His insistence on the radical equality among members of the Church has allowed himself to discover the 'right and responsibility' of *lay people* (he does not use the term) to catechize or to educate in faith by reason of their baptism. A downside of his ecclesial paradigm is the putting aside of the 'share' of those who received Sacrament of Holy Orders in the Mystical Body's teaching function.

1.4. *Marthaler and Warren: catechesis as a socialization process*

Another social science-filled proposal for understanding an anthropological-experiential catechesis was the so-called socialization process. Its first Catholic proponents were Marthaler and Warren. There are many socialization models. In any case, catechesis as socialization theory deals with the managing of the group's own liturgical symbols and belief system with the specific aim of forming a particular religious identity. Catechesis as socialization process would include the so-called world-maintenance or the maintenance of the ambiance conducive for fomentation of religious identity.

1.4.1. Marthaler: catechesis as the nurture of Christian life (human-divine experience) within the community

Catechesis, for Marthaler, was a matter of managing «beliefs» or «symbolic». The focus on belief system than on doctrines or practices may have been advantageous. The realm of beliefs, *on one hand*, intensifies the holding on to unchanging doctrines; *on the other hand*, it in a way animates the doing of religious practices. The realm of beliefs does not deal directly with doctrines, a general catechetical prejudice associated with the traditional catechesis. Neither it did deal directly and purely with practices and social religious activities. Marthaler at times use the term 'catechesis of symbolics'.

Among the books and essays he wrote in the 70s, there are two essays which Marthaler presented in the CTSA which presented the main his main thoughts on catechesis as a socialization process. In *Catechesis and Theology* (1973), the paper he presented to the CTSA in 1973, Marthaler presented GCD's definition of catechesis as one of the forms of the Ministry of the Word. He wrote that catechesis 'ministers' the Word, not systematizing and analyzing it (as theology does). It (catechesis) simply presents the Word (not excluding, of course, theological rigor). Marthaler however accurately indicated that the 'catechetical presentation' of the Word aims not only to man's *cognitive dimension* but to the whole person. It is noteworthy that as early as this point, *Marthaler already indicates catechesis 'going beyond' the kerygmatic catechetical approach*. He claims that GCD – while adopting the framework of the kerygmatic approach – gives catechesis an identity of its own: *a move in the direction of the so-called 'anthropological catechesis'*.⁴⁷

As such, he therefore underlined the importance both of *theological and human sciences* in catechesis. In addition to that, he also pointed out *the importance of the role of the community* that *GCD* gives in the introduction or familiarization of catholic individuals to its symbols and rituals which ‘communicate the meaning and values of the gospel message’. For him, community is the keeper of tradition and meaning of the common faith, and it is in that believing community that catechesis best functions.⁴⁸

Again, in a paper presented to the CTSA in 1976, *To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith* (1976), Marthaler made clear that catechesis is concerned also with «learning» the contents of faith (but not like the way theology does) through the «familiarization» of the community’s rites, formulae, symbols which «provokes» and «confirms» adhesion to the contents of faith. He likewise added that in this bi-polar schema (learning and socializing) the importance of human sciences in catechesis, especially in relating ‘learning doctrines-socialization into rituals and practices’ to ‘the concrete conditions of human existence’.⁴⁹

In his essay delivered in Boston College in 1977, Marthaler aimed among others at determining the nature of the Catholic Church’s catechetical ministry (in the USA) in the contemporary times. He defended the theory that maintains catechesis as socialization of its members to the Catholic Christian religion.

Basing on M. Martorell’s careful study of Marthaler’s socialization model, we lay down three general points here of Marthaler’s doctrine.

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

Second, catechesis is, in concrete, how the Church socializes its members into the Catholic faith. For Marthaler, catechesis is a process of social formation in which personal faith is awakened, nourished and developed through dialectical relationship with the community's institutionalized faith.⁵⁰ It is a sort of a community education in which the neophyte slowly assimilates the Christian *beliefs*. Quoting Marthaler, Martorell writes that inasmuch as catechesis in the primitive Church was an intentional process, socialization was traditionally called «catechesis».⁵¹ Martorell continues that Marthaler admits that in our days, the usage of the catechetics, which Marthaler synonymously uses with religious education and education in faith, has extended its meaning thus including kerygma, the preparation for the sacraments and the ongoing formation which nurtures the life of faith of Christians.⁵²

In this socialization theory, Marthaler holds that any beginner in the faith finds an already «objectified» or organized set of Christian practices, creeds and symbols (*beliefs*) – a complex system which was «exteriorized» by previous generations who shared a common Christian faith. For Marthaler, beliefs are specific expressions of personal faith, and therefore, assume an intermediary function between personal faith and its meaning. Catechesis, as a socialization process, in his mind therefore, moves more in the plane of *beliefs* than directly in faith. It is clear that maturation in faith comes about in the dialectic interaction between personal faith and the community's faith.

Marthaler therefore delineates three objectives in the education of faith, namely, (1) growth in personal faith, (2) religious affiliation, and (3) the maintenance and transmission of a religious tradition.⁵³

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

Even though the socialization theory dwells more on the 'external or social factors' –or the so-called 'symbolics of faith'–, nevertheless, Marthaler's choice of it excellently brings home the point: catechesis as formation in the larger group's faith and which is fundamental to any member.

Third, catechesis is closely associated with the proclamation of the Word, service in the community, with the celebration in liturgy. Aside from the GCD's emphasis

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

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

1.4.2. Warren: defending the nurture of «testimony of Christian life» from cultural aggressions

Warren on his part, another sustainer of the view of catechesis as a socialization theory focused on the maintenance of the religious environment necessary for the nurture of faith. In the socialization theory parlance, this idea is called «world maintenance».

Warren endowed catechesis the task of emancipating the Christian message from actual cultural frameworks which are by nature simply destructive of the pleasant religious environment, or are adverse to the growth of Christian religious identity. The socialization process, instead of focusing on the education act, teaching act or the catechetical act, placed its weight on the *agent* of that action, the ecclesial community as a whole.

In *Evangelization: a catechetical concern* (1973), Warren argued about the importance of *testimony of life* in the task of evangelization and catechesis, citing the Church's *historical commitment* as pronounced in the International Catechetical Week in Medellin in 1968.⁵⁴

In *Catechesis: An enriching category for Religious Education* (1981), he underlined how the modern catechetical movement amplified religious education from its limited educational language. Warren claimed that the modern catechesis, through socialization, linked religious education to a richer way of learning, that is, *through ecclesial experience*.

Since 1984, Warren advanced his stance of «catechesis as a socialization process» to «catechesis as a social liberation activity».⁵⁵ M. Martorell

observed that the term 'catechesis of liberation', became a frequent phrase in his writings and which signify more than a *socialization process*.

Martorell added that this advancement is due to Warren's encounter with the social insights of Raymond Williams. Williams theorized a cultural materialism which moulds human perception or philosophy. As a culture, it appears as a truth and dominates people's way of thinking.

Warren, with Williams' outlook, evaluates the dominant culture of our times (US setting), that is, the consumerist culture, and considers it as incompatible and a even stumbling block for people to understand the values of the Gospel.⁵⁶ *On one hand*, he observes a dominant culture which is a hindrance for the appreciation of the Gospel values, and *on the other hand*, the Christian message which pits the community against the dominant consumerist culture. Warren then calls role of catechesis in this given situation as *ministry of life structures*, that is, the cementing of profound structures on which the disciple of Christ's action proceeds.⁵⁷ He describes liturgy, for instance, as a moment of ministry of life structure (more than an effort of making understand what is it).⁵⁸ In short, he marks catechesis with a *counter-cultural character*.⁵⁹

If Marthaler is interested in the study of *symbolic systems* (those which help maintain and transmit the faith or *symbols* in the future generations) because of the strong cultural context of a given period of time in which the Church exists, Warren is rather more concerned on *how* to maintain and transmit such faith or *symbols* or what he calls 'symbolic of practice' or 'life practice symbols', through a process he calls 'hermeneutical dislocation'.⁶⁰ Warren, maintaining a socialization theory inspired by William's neomarxist sociological ideas, conceives catechesis as a pastoral ministry specifically concerned with the formation *life structures* shaped by the Gospel and confronting cultural hegemonies squarely opposed or which hinder the formation of Gospel-inspired life-structures. More than rational discussion of divinely revealed truths, for Warren, catechesis is more concerned with *the testimony or the faithful practice* (of the Gospel) *of the believing community*, or more particularly, to the *life structures*.⁶¹ Warren, says Martorell, curiously observed that liturgy for instance coincides with catechesis in this matter: creating life structures through confrontation or familiarization with Christian symbols or embodiments of the Christian faith, or simply, through Christian practice or testimony of the community.⁶² The end of catechesis is transformation of one's life according to the demands of the Gospel. It further extends its end in the criticism of the dominant hegemony or the

consumerist culture which, in his opinion, is in radical opposition with the Gospel values and therefore, either hinders its assimilation in the life of individuals or totally eradicates a Christian environment.⁶³ Therefore, as Martorell affirms, for Warren, catechesis or Christian formation in general must be counter-formation, that is, leveled against the hegemony of consumerist culture.⁶⁴ More than just the maintenance of one's religious world and the transmission of community practices or of *symbolics*, Warren goes beyond the socialization theory with his idea of 'the transmission of life practice symbolic through a hermeneutics of dislocation'.⁶⁵

Warren is however clear that such 'a ministry of life practice symbolic through a hermeneutic dislocation' is an ecclesial task. In the same work, *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church* (1989), Warren clearly outlines catechesis as one of aspects of the Church's Ministry of the Word.⁶⁶ Martorell says that for Warren, ministry of the word is ecclesial action.⁶⁷

In the 90s, Warren gave more attention to *culture at hand* and its influence on the current Christians especially at the hour of *doing* their Christian faith (inside the Church or in their day to day lives).⁶⁸ This led to the publication of *Communications and Cultural Analysis* (1992) and which was revised and published later as *Seeing through the Media: A Religious view of Communications and Culture Analysis* (1997). Other writings which manifest the Warren's more mature catechetical thought are *The Local Church and Its Practice of the Gospel: The Materiality of Discipleship in a Catechesis of Liberation* (1993), and *At This Time, In This Place. The Spirit embodied in the local assembly* (1999).

* * *

To end this synthesis of the contextualization of the 2000-2010 writings of the principal American authors in the US catechesis, we affirm that the attention of catechesis in the USA towards *human experience* had opened a whole field of catechetical opportunities.

As seen above, with Moran, *new catechetics* had contributed to US catechesis' to take an «anthropological» direction, or as Pope John Paul II would put it, «man is the way of the Church in this world». This way opened by Moran has pioneered the succeeding pedagogical-catechetical improvements in the US catechesis. With JM Lee, human sciences re-discovered its place in the educational activity aimed at the maturity in Christian life. The eventual

professionalization and competence of catechists from the point of view of the employment of human sciences may be traced from Lee's initiative.

Three things may be pointed out with Groome: *first*, he contributed to attributing human experience with a theoretical-practical value; *second*, he underlined the «shared» character of Christian life in the community, and; *third*, he named «God's reign» as the horizon of a lived faith. Groome's ideas certainly had contributed to the determination of the role of the lay people in the «education-sharing» task in the Church. In addition to that, he has also contributed to the development of the idea of the interplay of the classical ministries and church programs in the Church's «education-sharing task» (though this may be rightly attributed to Maria Harris).

With Marthaler and Warren's understanding of catechesis as a socialization process, *new catechetics* contributed to a deeper reflection of the importance of the ecclesial community (with its rich liturgical symbols, practices and belief system) in the nurture of Christian life, and the awareness of the external cultural factors aggressive to the growth of Christian living. In addition to that, we must mention Marthaler's frequent citation (among many) of the incorporation the «social horizon» to the distinctive mark of a mature faith (the goal of catechesis). Indeed, in our opinion, conceiving catechesis as a socialization process, the Roman Catholic Church in the USA advanced in its educational task taking advantage the rich resources it had within (its rich liturgical symbols and the catechumenate, the Sacraments, the Creed, its very organized institutional structure, its rich tradition, its catechisms and directories, etc.) and the advances of human sciences, the multi-cultural context of the USA, the values priced by US democracy, etc.

The analysis on the works of concrete American authors were important because behind their concrete proposals which indeed contributed to the opening of the US catechesis to its present development,⁶⁹ there were many elements that were interesting theologically as well as elements that needed theological evaluation and clarification.

The tremendous pedagogical advances pioneered by *new catechetics* must have been accompanied by a theological reflection. It is true that catechesis in our times cannot do without the help of human sciences; they (human sciences) anchor catechesis better to human reality. However, it is likewise important to recognize that a necessary parallel theological reflection is necessary, because first and foremost catechesis deals with Christian life imbued by faith in God. This is therefore what we have tried to do in this present work's Part

II *Revelation, Culture and Hermeneutical Catechesis*, and Part III *Church, Mission and Evangelizing Catechesis*. In reality, the discussion in the first chapter, we have already pointed out many theological aspects that, in our observation, continued to be in need of reflection in the writings first decade of the 21st century of the same authors.

2. CATECHESIS OF CHRISTIAN LIFE WITHIN THE CHURCH: THE INSIGHT OF THE MAIN PROPONENTS OF 'NEW CATECHETICS' IN THE FIRST DECADE OF THE 21ST CENTURY

The historical description traced above was more or less the catechetical picture which *new catechetics* was attempting to draw three decades ago. The influence of *the new catechetics movement* in the renewal of the US catechesis is undeniable. But we may ask: how far have the insinuations of new catechetics had come?

In general, we observe an ecclesial focus in catechesis in the writings of the principal authors of the US catechesis in 2000-2010. The nurture of Christian life within the Church continued and developed until this first decade. To cite an example, the participation in and service to the community as a mark of the mature faith (as explicitly indicated by B. Marthaler and the *GCD*) appeared throughout until this first decade of the new century. In addition to that, we note that there is likewise a growing interest around the necessary «extra-ecclesial orientation» (dialogue with other believers and the secular culture) of the faith that is mature.

Moreover, another striking characteristic of the writings of those authors is the general vision of catechesis in the USA. This presented an advantage and at the same a disadvantage. A general view of the US catechesis saved us from the arduous task of composing the historical pieces of the complicated web of the US catechesis. This simultaneously presented a disadvantage. As in any field, «a general historical outlook» limits itself in merely indicating clues of theological aspects which principal authors had themselves treated. Catechesis has a genetic affiliation with theology: strictly speaking, they deal with the same object of study: God. Therefore, it has necessarily rich theological aspects worthy of study. In the case of the US catechesis (here represented by the principal authors), the object of study of catechesis is articulated in *the human-divine dialogue* (with an ample consideration of the anthropological side).

Therefore, we presented almost the same authors with their writings in the first decade of the 21st century. In Part II entitled *Revelation, culture and hermeneutical catechesis*, we highlighted the theological ideas in the catechetical doctrines of G. Moran, JM Lee and Th. Groome. We dedicated chapter II to the writings of G. Moran, chapter III to JM Lee, and chapter IV to Th. Groome. In Part III, *The Church, its mission and evangelizing catechesis*, we analyze the writings, published in the decade 2000-2010, of Marthaler in chapter V and Warren in chapter VI.

2.1. *Moran and a comprehensive religious education*

In Moran's 2000-2010 writings, Moran has commented about religious education in *three* contexts: (1) the religious education in the interreligious field, (2) the religious education needed by the general public, and (3) the religious education in the Catholic Church.

The theological aspects interesting to take note in Moran's doctrine are his concept of the divine-human communion which he calls «revelation», his concept of the a church as «church-people», his view of the action of the Holy Spirit in the Risen Christ (but not in the words and actions of Jesus now conserved in the Scriptures and Traditions of the Church), and his concept of the official teaching authority of the Church or the Magisterium as a hindrance (instead of a service or an instrument though which the Holy Spirit works) to the «common magisterium».

2.1.1. Comprehensive religious education based on «revelation»

Now, for Moran, religious education is the meeting point in which the two great elements of life meet – religion and education.⁷⁰ From this perspective, he distinguished between *the religious educations done by particular religions* (Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, etc.) and *the religious education needed by the general public*.⁷¹ The *religious educations done by particular religions*, refers to the religious education aimed usually at religious socialization and fortification of one's religious identity. The religious education in the Catholic Church context may be included here, but we prefer to discuss it further, since Moran himself has dedicated another separate instance to explain his views.⁷²

The *religious education needed by the general public*, for Moran, may be promoted by the State for the cultural formation of its citizens, and will focus

mainly on the belief system and traditional customs and practices of particular religions. He holds that this *second type* is likewise complementary and necessary in particular religions.⁷³

G. Moran envisions that religions education in the 21st century, referring to religious education in general, will be *international, interreligious, inter-institutional* and *inter-generational*.⁷⁴ He notes that in today's world, the use of the term 'religion' is ambiguous. 'Outsiders' refer it (the term religion) to the *institutional aspect* of any particular religion. For 'insiders', it is more than being a member of a religion or a church. The current use therefore does not totally describe the 'religious' reality.⁷⁵

What exactly happens in that 'religious' reality? Here enters the idea of revelation he is proposing and in which education reflection, for him, must depart from. In Moran's perception, a man who is into a religion experiences a sort of a conversation or communion with the revealing God.⁷⁶ Like in a school of thought, one enrolls in it, participates in it, involves oneself in it and takes an indispensable role in that divine activity. He uses the metaphor of apprenticeship, or the 'showing how' aspect of teaching-learning activity.

In his discussions within the interreligious and secular context of religious education based on «revelation», Moran does not clearly explain how other religions come to have a «revelation». He simply cites it as a fact that the idea of a «revelation» (from which the comprehensive religious education must be based) is not unique to Christianity. We observe that in this ambit, Moran's use of the term 'revelation' is different the Catholic tradition's *proper* use of it. Moran's use of «revelation» instead seems to equate with what Catholic tradition refer to as the «religious sense». This religious sense is proximate to the patristic idea of the *semina Verbi* which the Holy Spirit sows on human wisdom. Later, the Church has applied moderately the idea of *semina Verbi* to religions with the thought that every religion may contain aspects or elements of truth or goods of salvation.

2.1.2. Religious education in the Roman Catholic Church and «revelation»

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

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

In our opinion, Moran carries on and applies the above mentioned religious sense of «revelation» in explaining the process of *religious education* based on revelation *within the Roman Catholic context* (the third ambit). He maintains that the object of religious education in the Catholic ambit is not the body of inspired teachings but the inspired relationship between God and man here and now. He seems to consider the Roman Catholic Church as one of the many legitimate particular expressions of nurturing the reality of divine-human conversation common to all men.

In his past writings, he explains this natural access of every man to God through the humanity of Christ. He held that since Christ’s resurrection, communion with the revealing God was opened and humanity in general was capacitated to take part in that divine activity, that is, the divine-human interpersonal communication.⁷⁷ In the 2000-2010 decade, this thought is present in his affirmation that today God speaks not in the teachings and actions of Jesus of Nazareth but in the Spirit-filled Christ who rose from the dead. In another occasion, he affirms that educational reflection or reflection over the divine-human relation (God-man relationship) in the Church should not depart from so-called ‘inspired writings’ (referring to Sacred Scriptures) or from commentaries over those testimonies of Jesus’ words and actions (referring to Tradition), but on the conversation between man and God which takes place at the present time. A question may surge in one’s mind: was Jesus of Nazareth God? Why exclude then the Sacred Scriptures and Tradition in a reflection on revelation (religious education)? Was the Holy Spirit also at work in Jesus’ time?

In concrete, in *Believing in a Revealing God* (2009), once explaining his proposed understanding of revelation, he maintains his stance that «the word ‘revelation’ should not be attached exclusively to a message from the past».⁷⁸ He had the impression that attaching «revelation» solely to the message from the past is an idea related to the Catholic teaching that «Christ is the fullness of revelation» and «there is no revelation after Christ» [sic].⁷⁹ In addition to that, this perspective, according to him, does not give central importance to the role of the Holy Spirit and the human experience of the risen Christ at present through the same Holy Spirit.⁸⁰ In Moran’s mind, there is an evident *contraposition* between the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth and the Spirit-filled

Christ. In our opinion, this contraposition does not have much sense, since *on one hand*, the Jesus that lived in Nazareth who preached about the Father and the sending of the Paraclete is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity; on the other hand, the same Holy Spirit makes present the teachings of Jesus *in the interior* of the human soul here and now, and even *from the exterior*, that is through the Magisterium.

Continuing with Moran's mental framework, he affirms a certain idea of «a sacramental universe» wherein God acts in everything and everyone.⁸¹ This has two consequences to education in the Church: *first*, the assertion for a lifelong and life-wide education; *second*, the affirmation of the church-people's engagement to the educational task.

Concerning the first, Moran founds the idea that education should be life-long or in his favorite term 'from womb to tomb', and also life-wide, that is, that all instances of life must be educational, because of the fact that God acts in everything and in every person.⁸² We have commented already regarding this point. Even if this assertion may be true, distinction between the level of intensity of sacramentality of a thing or an instance must be done. Only one has the fullness of revelation (or rather, is the fullness of revelation): Jesus Christ. Moran surprisingly does not insert in this topic the 'obligation' or 'right' of each person to teach.

In that «sacramental universe», man likewise may be said to participate in the divine act. It is on this fact that G. Moran bases the educational activity of the church-people (his other term for the Church). The Church-people participates in the divine apprenticeship, in God's 'showing how'. Given that in this sacramental universe everyone teaches and everything is an instrument of teaching, he goes further to affirm that the education in the church must be life-long and life-wide. Lifelong education simply means permanent, that is, from womb to tomb. Life-wide education means that all instances in life, not just the school hours or formations years in universities, must be educational.

In relation to the second consequence, the church-people's engagement to the educational activity, he affirms that effectively each person may participate in the divine teaching act. His view that all teach is compatible with the idea of the obligation and right of all baptized Christians to assume seriously and faithfully the educational task (education understood in an ample sense). The Great Council taught that all the baptized (by reason of their baptism) form part of the mystical Body of Christ and thus share in essentially distinct ways in the *tria munera*, one of which is the teaching function.

There is a need however to explain further his notion of «church-people» and the individual ‘desire for community’ in order to capture well the church-people’s engagement to education.

Moran affirms that every individual seeks to satisfy his natural desire for community in the church-people. This longing is met through education in the community. Education in the community simply refers to the interplay of education forms (job, family, leisure, and school). It seems that the education forms are the same with the so-called community ministries (liturgy, service, teachings, kerygma and witness).⁸³

Moran gives importance to laypeople’s exercise of magisterium⁸⁴ but, in another work, he places the lay people’s role in the teaching and witnessing ministry in opposition to the magisterium attached to the pastoral functions of ordained ministers (and altogether to hierarchical authority in the Church).⁸⁵ The idea of the official Magisterium in the Church at the service of the people of God, as the Great Council taught, escaped Moran’s imagination.

Moran’s view of the church-people may be reductive of the Church’s real nature, but somehow such a perspective (church-people) encourages the collaboration and complementarity between the so-called education forms of the church. In his view, the catholic’s professional job is completely compatible with his practice of attending the Holy Mass every Sunday and in days of obligations. Moreover, his use of secular equivalents (job, art, teaching, witness, service, and community) of the classical *ministries* of the first Christian community (*leitourgia*, *didache*, *diakonia*, and *kerygma*) may serve as point of departure for further and deeper understanding of the community life-oriented ‘educating’ ministries in the Church.

As to the *liturgical* ministry, Moran identifies the liturgy as the *locus* of life-wide and lifelong education of the community.⁸⁶ He praises liturgy’s use of nonverbal language in its educating act. He also affirmed that the Church’s catechesis fittingly belongs in the liturgical ambit. He added that that it (catechesis) must not take on the burden of the whole Church’s educational task. The proper praxis for catechesis therefore, in Moran’s mind, is to participate in the *interplay of the Church’s ministries* or other educational tools. Let us note that, for Moran, catechesis refers more to the smaller «socialization-symbolic aspect» of religious formation, but which is effective in that narrower context. Moran restricts ‘catechesis’ to the liturgical ambit and nonverbal form of teaching. We wonder however whether it crossed Moran’s mind of applying his idea of «professional emancipation of the term *education*» (restriction to

schooling) to his own understanding of «catechesis». We mean a sort of freeing the restrictive understanding of catechesis as purely «socialization through Christian symbols». In that way, *catechesis* may no longer refer solely to that nonverbal liturgical teaching action, but *the whole of testimony of Christian life* serving as catechesis.

Still inside the liturgical ministry, it is curious that Moran explicitly noted the bishop's teaching as enforcer of right practice (orthopraxis), but (explicitly) not of right doctrine (orthodoxy). He probably wanted to underline the exhortative aspect of the preaching of the bishop in liturgical activities, the exhortation to live the life of faith. Even then, understanding the right doctrine is a *sine qua non* for Christian life.

In any case, the catechetical reflection of Moran in the 2000-2010 decade has a noticeable displacement *from* an exclusive *individual* divine-human present encounter *to* a divine-human encounter *within a church-people, a community*. Moran purposely seems to present a picture of *a church-people* without reference to the hierarchy in order to emphasize the total equality and the democratic characteristic of the community.⁸⁷ Even then, Moran's concept of people-hood does not reach the level of the Old Testament *qahal* or the New Testament *ekklesia*, biblical categories often used in defining the mystical body of Christ, the Church.

2.2. *Lee and the forging of Christian lifestyle through religious instruction*

J. M. Lee is a *professionally competent educator* who takes teaching of religion seriously from his own expertise. In his last and only essay in the first decade of the 21st century, *Vision, prophecy and forging the Future* (2000), Lee vied for a religious instruction which is – (1) directed to forging a red-hot religion, (2) a «vocation» for religious educators, (3) one which requires professionalism and scholarship, and therefore expertise as well in the use social sciences, and (4) a participation of the «religious education dimension» of the Church.

2.2.1. Religious instruction and red-hot religion

Lee is very clear that the teaching of religion by its very nature aims at putting faith into practice. This has always been the stance of Lee. He adds however the idea of «an ardent, zealous, devoted living» of that faith, in his last and only essay mentioned above. He uses the term «red-hot» religion.⁸⁸

It is interesting to note that Lee did no longer allude to the idea he held before, that of religious instruction may cause faith. Faith, for Lee, is an intellectual construct, but which through the teaching *process* lead to a practical reality – a «lifestyle» or what he calls in other instances as «religion».⁸⁹ Lee may have mentioned in many instances before about religious instruction «causing faith» [sic].⁹⁰ That assertion was always made inside the context of social sciences. He certainly knew that any religious instruction, even how much it is organized by social sciences, can never cause faith. For sure, faith is a gift from God. From the perspective of social science theory, the practice of faith manifested in some concrete behaviors may be verifiable and measurable. It may or may not mean that such «causing», substitutes God. As mentioned above, Lee does not allude to it in his last and only essay in the 21st century.

2.2.2. Human sciences, theology, and their collaboration in religious instruction

Lee vied for the professionalism in religious education. That idea, aside from being related to being a «vocation», is directly linked to the use of human sciences (sociology, pedagogy, and psychology).

Lee has followed the importance which G. Moran had endowed to human experience. He has opted for the employment of human sciences in dealing with «the human experience with deals with the practice of faith». Lee, although not the first in intuiting the great utility of human sciences in the study of religious and cultural matters, is the first to make a systematized social science theory in religious instruction.

The setback with Lee's option for social sciences is his leaving behind the part of theological sciences. He dismissed theology as purely cognitive and rationalist. According to him, such cognitive nature of theology has nothing to do with the practice-oriented religious instruction. In the first decade of the 21st century, Lee however slightly modified this stance. Expressing his preoccupation of the rising theological science, practical theology, and its attempt to subordinate «religious education», Lee firmly reiterated his position that a practical theology (as he intended theology as purely cognitive) is impossible because it is, he insisted, «cognitive».⁹¹ He added that «if it has something to contribute to religious instruction», it must only be in the tiny cognitive aspect.

Lee's concept of theology as by nature cognitive or purely speculative may be true in some moments in the past centuries. Unfortunately, nobody holds

that idea anymore now. As Pope Benedict XVI indicated once, theology must be sapiential or practice oriented. Both perspectives/approaches offered by theology and social science in the study of Christian life or of what they call «the reality of divine-human relationship» are necessary. Both accedes religion but respecting its nature. Social sciences study religion from an empirical perspective, that is, from the aspect which is verifiable and measurable or predictable by human sciences. Theological reflection studies religion from the perspective of truths which are divinely revealed. Theological and social sciences are therefore needed in any authentic religious education aimed at maturity in Christian life.

Neither engaging the whole person to God through a systematic lecture of God's mysteries *alone* nor memorizing traditional formulae *alone*, do satisfy the inner longing of the human heart for God. This was very clear to Lee.

He intuited that the *divine* is *experienced* in or through *the finite created world*. We admire the 'obstinacy' of Lee in employing social sciences professionally to *the empirical manifestations of faith* (and his bold pretense to pinpoint the characteristics of a faith-filled lifestyle or 'red-hot religion'). At the heart of that insistence, we see Lee's conviction that God may indeed manifest in finite created realities. Experience however is not enough to detect and recognize the traces of God in finite realities; to «see» God in the ordinary events of life, the lens of faith are needed.

Finally, setting aside his open prejudice to theological sciences, he could have entertained the question: what if theology and social sciences have specific roles in the task of educating in faith? Besides, what is the function of the Magisterium in the teaching of faith?

2.2.3. The Magisterium, munus docendi, and the vocation to teach

Concerning the teaching «vocation» within «the religious education dimension» of the Church, Lee has always made reference to 'religious educator's divine vocation' to teach matters of the faith. For him, that teaching task is participation of the teaching mission of Jesus Christ (munus docendi) and which an educator has acquired through baptism.⁹² Every baptized has a share in that task. In other words, following Lee's logic, the Church of baptized persons has that 'religious education' dimension and the teaching of religion or of the faith is a very important task. He did not however elaborate the idea that as a vocation, teaching the faith is a responsibility before God, before the Church, and before mankind.

He has intuited correctly that, *as a task or a function*, the transmission of the faith, religious education, or catechesis, is the responsibility of all the baptized. Any validly *baptized* person has the power to exercise the *teaching office* of the Church provided he or she has the sufficient and systematic knowledge of the faith's content. He is further right in connecting the *exercise of the teaching function* to the participation in Jesus Christ's *teaching function* by reason of one's incorporation to Him by the Sacrament of Baptism. It has somehow to be made precise that by baptism, a person shares in the Christ's *triple functions* – including the *munus docendi*, not in an abstract way, but *in* the Church, Christ's mystical body. Jesus Christ lives in the Church here and now through the Holy Spirit. Therefore, by virtue of baptism, a Christian is incorporated to *Christus totus*. A mother's showing her son how to make the sign of the cross is not a *sharing* of the *teaching function* of his parish priest, but a *real* exercise of the teaching function (received together with the other functions) in baptism. If we are to take the claim of Lee seriously, it can be stated that baptism, not the office of religious educator, founds the right and obligation of every Christian to teach the faith.

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

In addition to that, we have to make it clear that inside that Mystical Body whose head is Christ himself, there are those assigned by our Lord to assume the office which has the task to *authoritatively* teach and to guarantee the faithfulness of the 'substantive content' of what is taught. This refers to the ministerial priesthood. The said authoritative teaching office used to be united with pastoral authority. As mentioned, its main purpose is to teach and at the same time to guarantee faithfulness. In other words, it is *at the service* of the common priesthood. This picture is therefore squarely contrary to Lee's thought (in his past writings) of the bishops as a privileged group in the hierarchy who manipulate the contents and the praxis in the whole Church's exercise of the teaching task.⁹³

His personal opinion or understanding of faith seems to disagree with the catholic doctrine. He claims that 'faith' (*faith-construct* as he intended it) is the

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

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

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

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

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

2.3. Groome and «faith-life and life-faith» catechesis

Groome ended the 90s with a book proposing a philosophy of education as part of his reflection about the «non-clerical» teachers (parents and teachers) in the Church's teaching activity. It was a distinct type of philosophy of education because, as Groome claimed, it was based, not on pragmatic but spiritual principles. Those spiritual principles, he noted, were intimately related to the Catholic faith convictions.

Groome opens the first decade of the 21st century with a proposal of a spirituality based also on *faith* or *core convictions*. However, unlike in *Educating*

for *Life* (1998), Groome describes those core convictions as *catholic* not in the sense that they are convictions that inspired totally by Roman Catholicism but because of their universality (shared by all believers). Groome did not explain directly whether these faith convictions are Roman Catholic or inter-confessional. He however used the term «shared» (not only among religious confessions but also between religions). We refer to his book, *What makes us catholic? Eight Gifts for Life* (2002). A certain caution is needed to read this book because Groome starts his presentation of each core conviction from the perspective of the faith held by Roman Catholics.

We observe that *those faith convictions* which Catholics share with other believers, are the same ones which underlie Groome's concept of education in faith or what he calls «catechetical education». For him, «faith» demands the integral/lifelong and communal direction of catechetical education. Therefore Groome's faith demands that catechetical education (1) be continuous and must involve the affective, cognitive and experiential dimensions of the Christian, (2) involve the whole community – programs and ministries – in the whole task of education, and (3) take part in the secular education and involve the secular culture.

It is fitting first to synthesize here Groome's understanding of those core or faith convictions on which his proposed «spirituality», «catechetical education», and «Catholic's involvement in public life and engagement in culture», are based.

2.3.1. Being a Catholic is a spiritual matter

Groome is right in considering that being a Catholic is a spiritual matter.⁹⁴ In addition to that, we second him in affirming that Catholic spirituality involves *the bringing of faith into life and bringing life to faith*.⁹⁵ Being a Catholic is certainly a spiritual matter in the sense that the protagonist of Christian life is not the individual Christian himself but the Holy Spirit. Christian life is life in the Spirit. However, it is not a life which leaves the practical level of life. As Groome affirmed, it permeates the important *questions of life*, those principal dimensions which influence the whole being and acting of a person.⁹⁶

We further follow Groome in his allusion regarding the importance to some shared aspects in faith in God which may serve as point of dialogue with other believers. Groome held that catholic Christianity shares *with non-Christian religions*, among others, the belief in a Transcendent God, the belief in

salvation, the practice of charity, the demand to work for justice and peace and the need to serve others. *With the other religions*, Catholic Christianity, according to Groome, shares the common human experience of the Transcending Mystery, a being which stands at the base of every thing and everything.⁹⁷ Aside from the ‘great religions’, he mentions in particular ‘religions who believe in personal divinity.’ He makes special reference to Islam. With them, catholic Christianity shares explicit faith in God, and that God embraces all humanity with unconditional love, divine revelation, the vocation to partnership with God, caring for human well-being, the belief in an afterlife and the belief in God’s respect to man’s responsibility.⁹⁸ With the Jewish people, Groome indicates that Christianity shares with them the faith in a creator-provider God, in God’s desire for *shalom*, in the integrity of creation, in the divine-human covenant of living the *shalom*, in the Ten Commandments (guidelines of the divine-human partnership and the governance of the world), in divine help or grace and in livening in a faith community.⁹⁹ With Christians, believers in Christ, Catholics share the discipleship of Jesus within the Body of Christ, the commandment of love, the task of helping realize God’s reign of peace, justice, holiness, and fullness of life for all. Moreover, he names the Bible as the inspired word of God and the basic profession of faith expressed in the Nicene and Apostles’ creeds.¹⁰⁰

But what are really the essential contents of Groome’s faith? The contents of faith in Groome’s catechetical paradigm focus on convictions ‘shared’ with other believers. In more occasions than one, he made distinctions between substantial and accidental aspects of faith, or other times, he considers faith as a spiritual wisdom. We recognize that Groome’s approach to faith is a legitimate point of departure in dialogues with other believers. But his silence of fundamental aspects of the faith which Catholics do not share with other believers may provoke doubts as to their importance. Can faith really be a source of unity? In addition to that, are the contents of faith which may distinguish Catholics from the rest of believers essential to live an authentic Christian life?

At this point, we reiterate that we accompany Groome up to his assertion that *Christianity is a spiritual matter*. We respect his opinion that there are *core values shared by or agreed upon by believers from different religions* and those shared values make whoever holds them *distinctively universal* (in order not to use the term ‘catholic’). However, we opine that what Groome does not comment about – the substantial matters of faith which differ Roman Catholics

from other believers (faith in the fullness of divine revelation in Jesus Christ, the unicity and uniqueness of salvation in Jesus Christ, the infallibility of the Holy Father, the Sacraments, the Church's full possession of the means of salvation) – are substantially important if one wants to live an authentic spiritual life.

2.3.2. A catechetical education based on «faith»

Groome is deeply convinced that «faith» is the principle of the Church's educational task.¹⁰¹ His 2000-2010 writings do not present an exhaustive explanation of the *nature* of that faith on which the catechetical education is based. He simply pointed out the two *perspectives* in understanding faith – *holistic* and *communal* – and described their implications to catechesis.

The *holistic dimension* refers to faith's demand that in the faith education, the whole person be attended (not only his or her cognitive aspect). Thus, true nurturing one in the Christian faith engages his or her integral person (cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects) and involves all educational agents around in that nurturing. It further implies that faith must be nurtured not only on the moment of its reception, that is, in baptism, but throughout man's life. In addition to that, faith demands that its nurture be done not only in a formal academic instruction classes, but within a communal atmosphere.

The *communal dimension* refers to faith's demand that the whole community be involved in its nurture. From the perspective of the communal dimension of faith, its nurture must be done not only by one agent or program but by various agents or programs, by the whole community. Th. Groome, in short, as his recent writings show, came to formulate the idea of *the whole Church as the catechist educator*. His understanding of whole community catechesis is the following: that all educational communities – the school, parish, family and all other programs with educational end – should adapt a *catechetical consciousness* at the moment of exercising the Church's classical ministries.¹⁰² As he puts it, 'everything in the Church and in the world should be intentionally crafted to nurture people in faith.'¹⁰³

In his 2000-2010 writings, Th. Groome has employed the term *catechetical education* to refer to education in faith.¹⁰⁴ It is a kind of catechesis responding to the demands of faith (as previously discussed). He conceives education in faith (or catechesis) as an integration of *catechesis* (understood as socialization) and of *religious education* (informative teaching around the religious

culture).¹⁰⁵ For Groome, in this case, religious education and catechesis are necessary in the Church's educational task aimed at maturity in Christian life. He often links to this idea of catechetical education the need for a permanent and integral formation. By permanent formation, Groome means that catechetical education is lifelong, that is, it deals with the education in faith from the beginning until maturity, from toddlers to mature ones.¹⁰⁶ By integral, he means that catechetical education involves the affective, cognitive and experiential aspects of the person. In addition to that, it likewise forms the person within the community and orients him to the service of the community.¹⁰⁷ For Groome, therefore, catechetical education is «total».

Th. Groome is convinced, as ever, that lifelong and communal catechetical education will be effective only if it is paired by *an appropriate pedagogical approach*, alluding to his shared praxis approach.¹⁰⁸ It is curious that he founds his approach to a theological outlook: *a divine pedagogy concretized in Christ's pedagogy* and therefore is the model of the pedagogy appropriate to a total catechetical education.¹⁰⁹

In his last essay, *Handing on the Faith* (2006), after referring to the divine pedagogy reflected in Christ's pedagogy, the source and model of the pedagogy of faith, Th. Groome is able to proceed without difficulty of 'the relationship between *faith* and *culture* which total catechetical education presumes and promotes'.¹¹⁰

2.3.3. The extra-ecclesial orientation of catechetical education

In several occasions, Groome writes that Catholic Christianity, for the faith it holds, has something to contribute to whatever society or culture and in whatever era of history it may find itself.¹¹¹

In *Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: the Challenge for Religious Educators* (2003), Groome deals about Religious educators' role concerning the identity of Catholics in the midst of American culture. American culture seems to be squarely in opposition to the core convictions on which the catholic identity is founded. The principal thesis of Th. Groome is that the faith on which Catholic identity is based has an impressive track record of being able to blend with any culture; while it enriches the particular culture to which it 'mixes', it is also enriched by the said culture on the process. In this essay, Th. Groome analyzes how Religious educators may help forge a mutually enriching dialogue between the two.

Even if Th. Groome does not dwell at any moment in explaining that the identity of Catholics as *Catholics* is shaped or formed by their core convictions (also identified with *faith*), he presupposes the idea throughout the essay. Th. Groome uses catholic identity and catholic faith interchangeably. As it was shown in *What Makes Us Catholic* (2002), he demonstrated that that which constitutes Catholic *identity* is its faith, or if it can be permitted to say, *that aspect of faith which 'may be' shared by other believers*.¹¹²

Th. Groome presents a model of inculturation founded on 'the logic of the Incarnation', an encounter of culture and faith in which one becomes truly Catholic while simultaneously truly American. Groome explained that Christian faith has always appropriated itself according to the cultural contexts it encountered. He explained that «incarnating» the Gospel message must be done not in a way that the same Gospel Message would appear alien to the particular context, but 'as indigenous to the culture and yet faithful to the Gospel'. Th. Groome further explained that inculturation of the Christian faith in a particular context may be considered authentic only when 'each people expresses Christ's message in its own way' and when there is a 'living exchange' or mutual enrichment between the Christianity and particular culture.¹¹³

Th. Groome however is very clear that no cultural appropriation can change the core beliefs, morals and sacraments that are constitutive of Catholic Christian faith.¹¹⁴ He adds that a culture's reception of Christian faith is a matter of 'highlighting an aspect of the Christian faith'.¹¹⁵ From the idea of 'living exchange', he identifies 'blessings' from American culture which would be enriching to catholic identity and vice versa. For the first he identifies, the rights and equality of persons, the spirit and practice of democracy, and public discourse and debate.¹¹⁶ For the second, the together with his rights, person has also responsibilities, life is gracious and sacramental, sense of community and responsibility for the common good, treasuring of tradition, practice of distributive and social justice, charity to all, a spirituality characterized by its being communal, filled with consideration with others, and joyful.¹¹⁷ In this first decade, Groome has not however discussed how Christian faith may inculturate with the present technological culture.

In *For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education* (2003), Groome comments about Catholic faith's possible influence on the public's common good, particularly the American public. Groome's main idea here is that the Catholic faith, the 'motivating foundation' of catholic

education is capable not only of educating Catholics to be good Catholics (*education for faith*) but also of persons (including Catholics) to be good citizens (*education from faith*). Th. Groome holds that this is precisely the charism of Catholic educational system.

Th. Groome traces this catholic style of teaching – for faith and which extends to serve the common good – in the first Christian community’s reflection of Jesus’ earthly ministry itself.¹¹⁸ He writes the first community had seen that in Jesus’ salvific mission, education played an important role. He notes that the first community noted ‘that Jesus intended to educate for faith’.¹¹⁹

For Th. Groome, education *for faith-from* faith perspective is traced back to the first Christian community’s reflection of teaching and earthly life of Jesus himself. They have understood the following: (1) education *in faith* is closely related to the salvific mission of Jesus¹²⁰, (2) Jesus *lived* the faith which ‘motivated’ his *teaching* with an intimate connection with God’s reign here on earth, and (3) Jesus left it clear that he wanted that his disciples continue his mission.¹²¹ He pointed out the tensions whether the Church should only educate for faith or include education from faith perspective. He likewise pointed out how the Church has adapted this perspective throughout various historical contexts and situations. He concludes then that the educational model the Church has that ally *education for faith* and *from a faith perspective* together is well tested by time. He rightly intuits the Church’s effort in evangelization and human promotion in her educational apostolate.

According to his analysis, Th. Groome writes that such faith alluded by Jesus in his ‘educating *for* faith’ required living as a person of God according to Jesus’ own way of life. He means that the faith to which the persons Jesus was teaching necessarily includes discipleship or living Jesus’ own way of life. What was the guiding vision of Jesus’ way of life? Th. Groome writes, the reign of God. Therefore, for Th. Groome, *educating for faith* is closely related to discipleship or living the *life for God’s reign* which was the life led by Jesus himself. Moreover, from the pair *faith-God’s reign*, Th. Groome’s idea of *educating from faith* (for the common good) follows.

He therefore proposes ‘a two-way conversation’ between American Catholic education and the American public education. Th. Groome is convinced that with its defining charism of ‘educating for and from faith’, Catholic education has something to offer to American public education. He too recognizes that Catholic education has something to learn too from American public education.

Therefore Th. Groome indicates that Catholic education may fill the American public education's 'dire need for a spiritual foundation', and American public education may show American catholic education how 'to avoid sectarianism and every semblance of proselytizing'.¹²²

For Th. Groome, the spiritual foundation which Catholic education offer to public education is constituted of core spiritual values which 'renew a humanizing and holistic vision for American education'¹²³, which 'fosters the human capacity and desire for the Transcendent'¹²⁴ and 'around which many of the great world religions and spiritualities can reach consensus'¹²⁵. For Groome, this is equivalent to *the education from faith perspective* practiced by catholic education.

Concerning that which Catholic education may learn from public education, he writes that before the main objective of avoiding sectarianism and proselytizing, catholic education must recognize 'that education for faith and education from faith perspective need not be collapsed into each other'¹²⁶. He means that while catholic schools will offer education for Catholic faith to catholic students, it could at the same time offer a holistic education from a faith perspective without the slightest hint of proselytizing.

2.4. *Marthaler and the «development of catechesis» (from instruction to way of life) as documented by Church documents*

In the decade 2000-2010, B. Marthaler simply traces the development of catechesis in the important documents of the Magisterium and other influential catechetical organizations. After reflecting over the three decades that have passed since the closing of the Vatican II, great promoter of catechesis, Marthaler's thesis is: there is a development in the understanding of the nature of catechesis in the Church, together with the multiplication of catechesis goals and tasks throughout these years.

Marthaler observes that in the time between Vatican II up to the first decade of the 21st century, many events had taken place which greatly reshaped the Church catechetical ministry, namely: the publication of the national directories, the CCC, the synod of Bishops which defined the Church's nature and evangelizing mission, the publications of compendiums of the CCC and the Church's social doctrine, the publication of national catechetical directories and other efforts of inculturating catechesis, and the publication of national catechesis (*USCCA*).

In *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008), he testifies to ‘the development and progression of thought regarding the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry’ recorded by Church documents published in the wake of the Vatican II, or of ‘a new understanding of the nature, tasks, and scope of this ministry of the word [catechesis]’¹²⁷.

Marthaler indicates Vatican II as animator of the catechetical renewal. He says that the Council inspired catechesis (1) *to be liturgical*, (2) *to be world/society-directed*, (3) *to be animated by the Scriptures*, and (4) *to be ecclesial*. In addition to that, he also indicated the seed-impulses of *global evangelization*, of *ecumenism* and of *inculturation* which later also influenced the direction of catechetical progress. He adds that with the Council’s *pastoral* inclination, it influenced catechesis’ *shift* from being a *cognitive* matter into an *integral, wholistic* and *real human-existence* affair.¹²⁸

In *Sowing Seeds* (2000), Marthaler mentions of ‘three major developments that have further clarified the nature and tasks of catechetical ministry’. They are (1) the promulgation of the *RCLIA* in 1972 which hailed back the ties between liturgy and catechesis, (2) Paul VI’s *EN* which made catechesis an important element in the new evangelization, and (3) the publication of the *CCC* in 1992.¹²⁹

2.4.1. From instruction to living the Christian life

For Marthaler, the documents of the Church records development of catechesis. While *GCD* (1971) systematized the inspiring claims of Vatican II for catechesis, the *Code of Canon Law* (1983), especially in its Books III-IV, made them binding for the whole Latin Church. *GCD* defined catechesis as a ministry of the Word. The definition included the instruction and the formation aspects of catechesis. However, he recognizes that it is the Code of Canon which made the distinction clear: faith instruction is meant for living the faith.

In the USA, in particular, Marthaler traces the same cognitive-practical tension with the Bishops’ first documents since Vatican II. *TTJD* (1972) systematized catechesis through the four pillars: *service, community, message (and liturgy)*, while *Basic teachings* (1973) presented the cognitive and doctrinal foundations which later would be adapted by succeeding documents in the USA, by the USCCB or by other groups like the NCEA or the PAC. In any case, *TTJD* (1972) and *Basic teachings* (1973) were both incorporated to the first US national directory, *SLF* (1979).¹³⁰

The US catechesis on young people is an amazing example. Since *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), the catechesis directed to youth people had been directed towards maturity of faith, or adulthood in faith, concretely manifested in *a lived faith in the community*.¹³¹ In the Bishops' pastoral plan for the third millennium, *Our hearts were burning within Us* (1999), adult faith formation became the expressed priority of all catechetical endeavors; and in 2005, *United States Catechism for Catholic Adults* (USCCA), the US Catechism, is meant to be its doctrinal guide and reference.

2.4.2. The liturgy and adult faith formation

Marthaler likewise underline the *liturgical aspect* of this development of catechesis with the reforms of the *RCLIA* (1972 and its eventual revisions). He affirms that the *RCLIA* showed the necessary relationship between liturgy and catechesis.¹³² In 1997, a scientific survey was conducted by the *NCCB* about the efficiency of *RCLIA* in the US parishes.¹³³ From the very positive result, the US Bishops' made *adult faith formation* as priority of the pastoral direction of the US Church in the third millennium.¹³⁴

Marthaler saw that liturgical catechesis functions efficiently in *deciphering of the rituals and symbols of faith*. With the present liturgical progress, that is, catechesis linked with liturgy in the formation of adult faith, liturgical catechesis may forge Catholics to *see through faith* God's actions-made-efficient through sacred symbols and rites. This idea was then present in his essay in 1972.¹³⁵

2.4.3. Catechesis and evangelizing mission of the Church

In what he claims to be Pope John Paul II's 'popularization' of the (new) evangelization, Marthaler asserts that the Church has understood better that her mission, evangelization, is an integral part of her very nature. In that ecclesial consciousness, Marthaler marks the 'job promotion' of catechesis, from being *one of the forms of Ministry of the Word* to being *an indispensable part of the Church essential expression*, that is, in *mission and evangelization*.¹³⁶

In other words, the recognition of *evangelization* as integral part of the Church's very being placed *catechesis* into the heart of the Church's very core. There is even an emerging idea of 'evangelizing catechesis' (a title of one of his chapters in *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry* (2008)). In re-

lation to the Church's evangelizing task in the USA, especially in confrontation with the so-called «USA culture», Marthaler holds that (1) inculturation is no other than the evangelization of cultures, (2) inculturation is the process by which the Gospel helps reshape a culture and by which the people's understanding of the Gospel is reshaped, (3) evangelizing the particular USA culture is giving it a Catholic identity, and (4) such a task is more on an *interior transformation*.¹³⁷

This is very logical. The 1971 *GCD*'s named catechesis (together *missionary preaching or evangelization*, the liturgical form and the theological form) as one of the many forms of the Ministry of the Word.¹³⁸ As Paul VI pronounced in 1975 that evangelization is *gratia ac vocatio Ecclesiae propria*,¹³⁹ catechesis likewise openly formed an important part in the Church's action. Pope John Paul II in 1979 mentioned that catechesis is intimately linked to the whole life of the Church (exterior and interior) and is a priority in the Church internal and external activities.¹⁴⁰

In the 1997 *GDC*, we find many fundamental functions of catechesis in view of attaining its definitive end – *communio cum Iesu Christo*¹⁴¹ – professed in the faith of the one God, Father, on and the Holy Spirit¹⁴². According to *GDC*, for a deeper and intimate relationship with Christ, catechesis has the following function: *fidem conoscendam fovere* (knowledge and life of faith), *institutio liturgica* (liturgical formation), *formatio moralis* (Christian life formation), and *praecepta orandi tradere* (obtaining a life of prayer).¹⁴³ It further elaborates on catechesis' function concerning the formation of Church members towards community life and mission.¹⁴⁴

2.4.4. Catechesis and the formation of catechists

In Marthaler's analysis, the important 'position' acquired by catechesis in the Church's mission of evangelization likewise animated the further attention in the field of catechesis in the USA in ecumenical and inter-religious dialogues, as well as in the concern for the spiritual and humane needs of catechists. Worthy to mention are, among others, the recognition of being a catechist as a «vocation» in the Church, the concern for the catechists' intellectual and spiritual formation, the remuneration/professionalization of their office.¹⁴⁵

The consideration of important of human sciences in catechesis is another important aspect of the so-called *evangelization* progress, especially distinctive in the US context. Here, the human sciences have always supported the 'experiential plane' of catechesis.

2.4.5. Catechesis and doctrines

Regarding the publications of the *CCC*, its compendium, and the compendium of social doctrines, Marthaler clarifies that they are catechetical materials which must be contextualized in the whole catechetical ministry. He is consistent to his affirmation that they are, especially the *CCC*, 'a sure doctrinal reference' and guide in the creation of local catechisms and directories.

Most Reverend Donald Cardinal Wuerl mentions of a 're-direction' of catechesis in the USA since the publication of the *CCC*. Since then, a growing awareness on the authentic and integral presentation of the doctrines of the Catholic faith has been observed (*manifest in the creation of orthodoxy oversight committees, the requiring of Declaration of conformity to the CCC, the making of the NDC and the USCCA, etc.*).

2.5. Warren and the «sapiential» catechesis within the ecclesial community

For Warren, more than a *ministry of symbolic or life structures* (as held by Marthaler), catechesis is the task of 'liberation', the freeing from the 'orchestrated' conditions or factors which may impede the living of the Jesus' way of life. In addition to that, living the Jesus' Way is aimed at transforming the society. This is the idea which Warren maintained in general in his past writings.

In his 2000-2010 writings, Warren maintains that catechesis works in a wider context which is the Church's *pastoral* function or 'discipleship'.¹⁴⁶ In other writings, he often made it clear that catechesis fundamentally deals with *Christian discipleship* which takes place in the *ecclesial community* – Church and the living of the Jesus Way.

2.5.1. Catechesis and discipleship

Within this general context of discipleship within the community, Warren makes a distinction between catechesis and another noble undertaking, the religious education. He points out the importance of the basic element – freedom. One comes for catechesis or religious education not because a State regulation ordains so, but one wants it.¹⁴⁷ In the case of toddlers, of course, the freedom element is given by the parents.

Warren seems to have in view Marthaler's perspective of the shift of catechesis from being mere instruction to an activity which has for hori-

zon life itself. He has been unswerving in stating that catechesis deals with «transforming sensibilities and practice», the changing for good of «behavior», of «a way of life», and of «sapience» (the practice-oriented learning). He adds to this concept of catechesis a *humanization* aspect which consists in the formation in culture, virtues, a good critical sense in relation to the contemporary culture of television publicities, strategies of resistance, utilitarianistic view of realities, the value of the dignity of persons, and even prayer life.¹⁴⁸

This includes doctrinal deepening through practice (and evidently also through reason and study). He is quick to affirm that catechesis aims at *behavior, life-practice*, something similar to JM Lee's red-hot religion or lifestyle. Warren widens the scope of catechesis to preserving the '*right environment*' in which 'discipleship' may be put into life.¹⁴⁹

Warren made his doctoral thesis about the sociology of religion in CUA in 1973. He has been adept with the importance of testimony of Christian a life and the various cultural influences that may influence exteriorly and interiorly the religious space or world of believers.

He considered culture an *external factor* which may condition the mindset of a practitioner of the Jesus Way. He likewise hypothesizes the power of culture to create its own signifying system so as to influence the whole Church itself.¹⁵⁰ The question therefore that is at hand is: will the Church allow the adverse cultural system to contaminate its sacred space (or the minds of its members) or will the Church analyze, learn how, and adapt the 'manipulating realities strategy' ('media bombardment', for instance)?

Preserving the right environment as part of the task of catechesis does not only operate with external factors like culture (as discussed previously). He likewise names a sort of *an internal form of living* (the internal human powers at work) despite of an adverse external factor. Warren shows how the *social imagination* influences the *religious culture* or *the norms of behavior* through *patterning perception electronically* (construction, shift, re-focus of images).

With the possible factors simply contrary to the Gospel practice, Warren therefore maintains his stance before of a catechesis with a counter-cultural task¹⁵¹ or what he calls now «strategies of resistance».

Certainly Warren, as an expert on cultures, is aware of the many cultural opportunities for the practice of the Jesus Way of life and for the transformation of society. It cannot however be denied that his analyses present a rather negative outlook of culture. Moreover, he wrote less about how external fac-

tors (like society's culture) may help in the better understanding and the living of the Gospel.¹⁵²

However, it is remarkable how Warren flawlessly communicates his catechetical positions employing the 'US catechetical parlance', that is, a way of communicating through *technical terms* used by social sciences. It must be stated that in his employment of *conceptual categories* from social sciences in catechesis, he chooses and uses them with a good critical sense.

2.5.2. The ecclesial community and catechesis

As mentioned above, Warren is very clear with his view: the community is always *the first and fundamental subject* of catechesis and permanent formation. In his observation for instance about the novelty of the 1997 *GDC* and the then USCC/NCCB's *Our Hearts were Burning within Us* (1999), he points out: the church life as primary communicator of gospel living *and* the bishops' ownership of the of the needed adult faith formation of the community.

Concerning the importance of the church or the community, Warren says that *GDC*, more than in *GCD*, gives emphasis the on the local church's gospel practice as the 'primary communicator of the gospel message'.¹⁵³ He further underlines *GDC*'s views of the church's struggle to be effective, like the sower in the parable, in 'discerning the most diverse social situations as potentially marked by the creative activity of God' or what he calls, the church's 'way of being in the world'. He says that this existential condition demands the church to interpret day to day happenings from a gospel perspective.¹⁵⁴

He further attributes to the church or ecclesial community a *corporate memory* embodied in its symbols, customs and practices that help any neophyte see in flesh that which the community hold in its heart (faith).¹⁵⁵

Warren however seems to place at an opposing position the *non-cognitive* and the *cognitive* aspects of communal catechesis. At times, he appears as negligent of the importance of the cognitive or intellectual formation in the determination of Catholic identity. This is evident in his principle of the priority of «embodied memory» over those «memorized Catholic doctrines», or in his often-used priority of secondary doctrines (Christian life) over primary doctrines (the dogmas).¹⁵⁶ Certainly, Christian life precedes dogmas and precepts. But in order to life an authentic Christian life, clarity of understanding – which are provided by dogmas and the precepts of the Church – the cognitive aspect of communal catechesis is a *sine qua non*.

Warren's remark the Holy Eucharist may be improved.¹⁵⁷ He emphasized the «sign aspect» of the Holy Eucharist, but less of its being *an effective sign* of the grace the sacrament gives.

In 2004, Warren thought of refining the content and tasks of catechesis and religious education in the light of many contemporary practical matters.¹⁵⁸ He has always vied for a transformation-oriented catechesis. His intuitions seem to go with what is occurring nowadays with the publications of catechisms – *CCC*, *GDC*, *C-CCC*, *CSC*, *NDC*, *USCCA* and *the Youcat*: a catechesis with clearly-defined contents.

CONCLUSIVE REFLECTIONS

After an attempt to draw a historical and theological context for the catechesis of the USA in 2000-2010, with a special focus on some theological aspects, part of our conclusion at the end of this study is to affirm that *new catechetics* had a hand throughout the development up to the present picture of the USA catechesis. From its insinuation of giving attention to the anthropological dimension, various *new catechetics'* principles have led to a dynamic intra-ecclesial catechesis with extra-ecclesial orientations (ethnic identities, secular life, politics, technological culture, society, etc.).

1. Education in faith, with Moran, directed its attention, from instructing doctrines and formulae of faith to the dynamic relationship between God and man, or what we call, the life of faith, life in communion with God.¹⁵⁹ Moran was right in intuiting that *catechesis must be «actual»*, that it must be relevant to the contemporary times, that it must be able to engage into sincere conversation with man in the contemporary times. Catechesis ministers man's relationship with God in a way that it always seeks to contribute to the forging and fortification of the man's anchorage in God in whatever time in history and in whatever human circumstance.

Moran was also right in asserting that the «*divine-human communion*» reached its apex in Christ's paschal mystery, and therefore, such a communion continues in the actual moment through the Spirit-filled Christ.

Moran's view may not necessarily contradict a religious education based on «the communion between God and man that had taken in the past and now conserved in the Church's Tradition and Scriptures». It is the same Holy Spirit who worked throughout the history of salvation – from the times of

Abraham, the prophets, up to the contemporary times dominated by the internet. Such a divine-human communion had its fullness in the mystery of Jesus Christ.

Moran however preferred the idea of *God revealing to man «in» and «through» everything*. He preferred the idea of a «world sacramentality» which seems not to give utmost importance to *the distinction between «the fullness of revelation in Jesus Christ» and the other forms of divine communications or manifestations*. Moran is not able to take advantage of the «fullness of revelation of Jesus Christ» in his catechetical framework which is totally dependent on the «actual» divine-human communion. Moreover, Moran is not able to appreciate the action of the Holy Spirit in his concept of religious education. *It is the same Holy Spirit who is behind the Spirit-filled Christ working in every individual and in the Church today*, and who was at work through the prophets of old and during the earthly life of our Lord.

Moran, who is known for his attention on Christian life, in particular, on the divine-human relation of every *individual*, dedicated *Fashioning a People Today* (2007), for church education. His main ideas may be summarized with the following lines: (1) there is a certain *desire for a community* dwelling in every individual's heart; (2) that innate desire can be fulfilled by exterior community structures like the family, church, and society; (3) the church in itself fulfills this *community* desire of every individual through an educational process, and; (4) that 'educational' process refers to the interplay of different 'ministries' within the church (*leitourgia, didache, kerygma, and diakonia*). The ecclesial model presented by Moran is attractive. It recognizes the primacy and importance to the individual in the community. In this ecclesial framework, every body and every thing may educate according to Moran. In addition to that, in Moran's mental design, the interplay of the various ecclesial ministries serves the innate, or we can even say, sacred, demand coming from the very core of every individual's hearts. We can therefore say that Moran's *ecclesial community* takes into account the concrete individuals composing it.

As Moran conceived a church composed of people filled with the best ideals and democratic values, he failed however to take into consideration the reality of *the mystical body of Christ, structured in time*. In his idea of church education as interplay of the classical ministries and community structures, he failed to give due consideration to the church as a people owned, animated and led in time by the Spirit of God, as documented by the hagiographers (biblical concepts of *qahal* and *ekklesia*).

In addition to that, we cannot however demerit Moran's concern for the relevance of the Church and her teaching tasks in the contemporary times. The concern for «speaking a language intelligible to the contemporary world» and the participation of all the baptized in community education are among the valuable contributions of Moran's reflections.

2. The above mentioned «valuable contributions» were likewise present in the educational perspective of James Michael Lee IV.¹⁶⁰ He viewed a religious instruction anchored on *social sciences* that influences the *way of living* a Christian life.

Parting from the social science perspective, he viewed «faith» simply as an «intellectual construct», but which has «empirical» manifestations. From his perspective, faith may be detectable or measurable in one's way of living. Without affirming that God does not cause faith, Lee asserted – of course, always from the social science perspective – that religious instruction does not only foment but also cause faith. The affirmation certainly caused criticisms. Faith is a gift from God. He tried to avoid the said expression in his only essay in 2000 and focused more on the role of a religious instruction in forging a mature faith (red-hot religion).

Lee vied for the use of social sciences because indeed they better affix the study of religion to human reality. That «anchorage to reality» seemed the reason for Lee to protest against a purely cognitive approach to the study of religion. He unfortunately accused «theology» as the embodiment of that non-practical oriented science.

In reality, neither social science alone nor theology alone can be an effective foundation of religious education. Each approaches religion from different levels. Social sciences study the empirical dimension of religion while simultaneously respecting its non-empirical aspect. Faith as a gift from God is outside the object of study of social sciences. Theology focuses on the revealed truths held by a religion. But its concern does not stop merely in speculations. We must however accept the fact that neither a bombardment of Christian dogmas can be a fully effective approach to educating in faith. Our point is that both theology and social sciences are necessary for any religious education aimed at forging maturity of faith in Christian life.

In any case, Lee intuited the importance of scientific study (cognitive-oriented study) in a religious education, as mentioned above, aimed at the maturity in Christian life.

He intuited the utmost importance of taking religious instruction professionally (which included the competence in the use of social sciences). He even perceived, though did not deepen it, the idea that «teaching religion» is a «vocation», a participation through Baptism in the teaching mission of Jesus Christ. His intuition reminds us of Vatican II's teaching on the baptized person's participation in the *tria munera* (kingly, prophetic and priestly functions) of Jesus Christ. It is baptism, not even the office of the religious educator, which demands that baptized lay persons teach the faith.

Moreover, this participation in Christ's *munus docendi* takes place concretely in the Church, the mystical body of Jesus Christ. Lee's choice of not deepening the idea is understandable. In his writings before, he often asserted that the Church (referring to the hierarchy and the Magisterium) is «external» to man's interior faith. The teaching act, for him, is a natural demand of faith and therefore also «interior». The Magisterium however is *outside* and therefore has no authority over the teaching of faith. For Lee, all the Church does with the magisterial authority, which is not service, but «manipulation». Lee forgot however that the teaching act, either by the Magisterium or by lay religious educators belong to one single ecclesial act. Both teaching actions are participation in Christ's *munus docendi* in the Church. Again, the Spirit-filled Christ who works in the Holy Father and the bishops teaching on the inviolability of human life, is the same Spirit-filled Christ at work in parents who teaches children to make the sign of the cross. It is that same Holy Spirit who works «inside» and «outside» man's soul that transforms faith to become «red-hot religion», that is, a life of faith, a faith-filled lifestyle translated into charity.

3. That «faith-transformed-into-charity» in society is what characterizes, among others, Groome's concept of catechetical education.¹⁶¹ He often expressed his idea about the Church's task of educating in faith as both *religious-cultural erudition and interior familiarization of the Church's practices and symbols*. In Groome's view, the «fulfillment of God's reign» forms part in that society-oriented church education.

It is remarkable how Groome conceived a «catechetical education» founded on «faith-convictions». With those faith-convictions, catechetical education leads man to work for the furthering of God's reign in secular culture and within society's public structures.

He was further convinced that an existence based on faith, like that of being a Catholic, is a spiritual matter. He was deeply convinced that faith shaped

man's perspective of his own self, of the community, and of the world, and therefore, of man's own actions. He was therefore convinced that living with faith is compatible and even advantageous in improving the «non-religious» realm of society.

Groome identified that «faith» on which Christian spirituality and catechetical education are founded with those «shared faith-convictions» with other believers. He *did not clarify however whether those creeds which distinguish a Catholic, for example, from other believers, are necessary for an authentic spirituality*. In like manner, he did not make it clear whether believing in the infallibility of the Petrine ministry, in the unicity and universality of the salvation in Jesus Christ, and in the Roman Catholic Church's possession of the full means of salvation, may make a difference in authentic Christian existence and in the apostolate.

Groome seems to assign the hermeneutical task of «identifying the contents of faith» to the whole ecclesial community itself. Unlike Moran, Groome gave Tradition and Scriptures a special place in the whole of the Church's hermeneutical task. His theory of *shared praxis* approach includes the community's discernment of the *present* circumstances under the guidance of the community's experience in the *past* gathered together in the Tradition and Scriptures.

However, *the absence of the Magisterium* in relation to the Church's teaching task in general is noticeable in his 2000-2010 writings. In fact, Groome in this decade advanced his reflection on the ecclesial community's educational ministry and the spiritual identity of parents and teachers in the ecclesial community, without any reference or mention of the official teaching office of the Church (Magisterium). This does not mean however the negation of the Magisterium's part.

In his past writings, he identified a sort of «a hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed» in interpreting the truths of faith. While Groome elaborated on the shared teaching opportunity between the Magisterium, the theologians' researches, and the *sensus fidelium*, he however favored a «hermeneutical privilege», attributed *not* to the Magisterium, but to the 'oppressed' referring to the poor, the marginalized, the persecuted, and the missionaries in mission lands. *In his 2000-2010 writings*, however, in his discussion of the Church's Tradition and Scriptures, he no longer mentions the Magisterium. In view of this context, we reiterate that the Magisterium, the official teaching authority of the Church, is an important instrument of the Holy Spirit in guarding the deposit of faith.

Groome's insistence of the equal opportunity in the exercise of the *munus docendi* in the Church may be explained by the kind of church he had in mind. He seemed to be convinced that *a community of equals* is a structure more faithful to the community of disciples that Jesus created to further His mission, than *a hierarchically-structured church*. His view is not what the Catholic Church holds.

However, we cannot take away from Groome the merit of his intuitions concerning the radically equal importance of the participation of all baptized –priests and lay people alike– in the Church's task of catechetical education. The two «participations» in the *munus docendi* are equal, but are *essentially* different and distinguishable forms.

In addition to that, his consideration concerning «education from and for faith» *and* «being a catholic» and the «furthering of God's reign» as spiritual matters, are among Groome's precious insights and contributions to the catechetical development of the US catechesis.

4. In line, again, with the development of the US catechesis, the proponents of understanding *catechesis as a socialization theory*, Marthaler and Warren, reached the same observations mentioned above (in the discussion of Moran, Lee and Groome), especially concerning the anthropological attention and development of the US catechesis in the last three centuries. Marthaler and Warren, however, encountered no problems with the role of a church structured with a hierarchy and with an official teaching office (Magisterium).

Marthaler, in his 2000-2010 writings, employed interchangeably the terms 'catechesis', 'catechesis of symbolics', and 'catholic religious education'.¹⁶² The catechetical theorists mentioned previously –Moran, Lee and Groome– continued with their proposal before, that is, the relinquishment of the traditional term «catechesis»; in their 2000-2010 writings, each coined a new term referring to the educational task of the Church, such as «comprehensive and particular religious education» (Moran), «religious instruction» (Lee), and «catholic education» (Groome). We simply note that while the disagreement of the name to refer to 'educating in faith' may indicate the differing personal catechetical frameworks of its proponents, this apparent semantic confusion may also be interpreted as an indication of the development or enrichment in the understanding of the reality of catechesis itself. If one has to really reflect on the ideas behind every semantic proposal, there is one

core idea: catechesis is no more a mere *instruction* affair, but about the nurture of Christian life.

This is in fact the principal idea of Marthaler observable in his 2000-2010 writings. He observed that since the close of Vatican II, the interest of catechesis has shifted from being a *cognitive instruction* into what is now an *integral, holistic and real human-existence* affair. With his idea of catechesis as a socialization process, it can be observed that for Marthaler, the Church is the principal setting of that «human experience» shift in catechetical ministry.

Marthaler expressed best the idea of the *shift* through ecclesiastical terminologies: catechesis through and in the community, a *biblical, liturgical and communal catechesis*, catechesis aimed at the service of community and forged by the liturgy, ministry of the Word, evangelizing catechesis, and the like. All these signify not only the amplification and development of the understanding of catechesis throughout these years.

Marthaler identified in concrete the *catechetical shift* in the USA from *TTJD* (1972) up to the publication of the *USCCA* (2005). *TTJD* (1972) systematized catechesis through the four pillars: *service, community, message (and liturgy)*, while *Basic teachings* (1973) presented the cognitive and doctrinal foundations which later would be adapted by succeeding documents in the USA, by the USCCB or by other groups like the NCEA or the PAC. As known, the cognitive (doctrine) and practical (liturgy, social and moral aspects) concerns in *TTJD* (1972) and *Basic teachings* (1973) were both incorporated to the first US national catechetical directory, *SLF* (1979). In its early stage, the US catechesis' interest on maturity of faith, rather than doctrines, were traceable in a very special way in the documents regarding the formation of young people. Since *A Vision of Youth Ministry* (1976), the catechesis directed to youth people had been directed towards maturity of faith, or adulthood in faith. That maturity of faith was characterized by active participation and aimed at serving the community. This line of thinking was maintained consistently in subsequent youth documents in the 80s and 90s. In the Bishops' pastoral plan for the third millennium, *OHBW* (1999), adult faith formation became the expressed priority of all catechetical endeavors; and in 2005, *USCCA* is meant to be its doctrinal guide and reference.

These developments in the USA happened side by side with the catechetical progress in the whole Church throughout the world. Marthaler seemed to point out that the intra-ecclesial progress with the Church's increasing aware-

ness of the importance of the Sacred Liturgy, of the Word of God, and its own mission in the world and of its own existence and identity.

From the point of view of its educational task, the Church had to take advantage of the richness of its own resources. In the documents after Vatican II, especially *GCD* (1971) and *CIC* (1983), it was clear that catechesis was a sort of an ecclesial instruction, a ministry of the Word –side by side with liturgical preaching, theology, first evangelization– aimed at living Christian life.

In what he claims to be Pope John Paul II's 'popularization' of the (new) evangelization, Marthaler asserts that the Church has understood better that her mission, evangelization, is an integral part of her very nature. In that ecclesial consciousness, Marthaler marks the 'job promotion' of catechesis, from being *one of the forms of Ministry of the Word* to being *an indispensable part of the Church essential expression*, that is, in *mission* and *evangelization*.

The 1971 *GCD* named catechesis (together with *missionary preaching or evangelization*, the liturgical form and the theological form) as one of the many forms of the Ministry of the Word. In *EN* (1975), Paul VI stated that evangelization is *gratia ac vocatio Ecclesiae propria*; thereby, catechesis formed an integral part in the Church's action. In *CT* (1979), Blessed Pope John Paul II, announced that catechesis is intimately linked to the whole life of the Church (exterior and interior) and is a priority in the Church internal and external activities. Together with drafting which started 1984 until the publication of the *editio typica latina* of the *CCC*, new directives in the catechetical ministry were needed. The 1997 *GDC* accumulated the various developments that helped shape the direction, functions and even the maturing understanding of the Church's catechetical task. According to the *GDC*, in view of accomplishing the definitive end of catechesis, communion with Jesus Christ professed in the faith of the one God, Father, on and the Holy Spirit, it has the following function: *fidem conoscendam fovere* (knowledge and life of faith), *institutio liturgica* (liturgical formation), *formatio moralis* (Christian life formation), and *praecepta orandi tradere* (obtaining a life of prayer). It also explained that catechesis has to take charge of the formation of Church members towards community life and mission.

Marthaler reiterated the mind of the catechetical directory that *the community is the locus –setting, agent, and end– of catechesis*. With his idea of catechesis as a socialization model, it is not difficult to understand the many instances in which Marthaler underlined the importance of the testimony of the whole community in the *knowledge* and in the *life* of faith.

Marthaler sustained that in order to attain *communion with God* (ultimate end of catechesis) and the maturity of faith (manifest in the individual or communal responsible commitment to lead a Christian life), the ecclesial community is an indispensable factor. Aside from the fact that individuals profess the faith of the ecclesial community, the same community nurtures that faith held by the individual through the community's whole life. He further concretized that *a mature faith* is one which flows to *the active participation in the community and in the society*.

It is further remarkable to note that in the «catechetical socialization theory», the intra-ecclesial nurture of the faith naturally leads to extra-ecclesial activities. Marthaler's thought goes with his idea of evangelization and inculturation. First and foremost, for Marthaler, the recognition of *evangelization* as integral part of the Church's very being placed *catechesis* into the heart of the Church's very core. Marthaler alluded to the emerging idea of 'evangelizing catechesis' in one of titles of the chapters of his 2008 book.

In relation to the Church's evangelizing task in the USA, especially in confrontation with the so-called «USA culture», Marthaler holds that (1) inculturation is no other than the evangelization of cultures, (2) inculturation is the process by which the Gospel helps reshape a culture and by which the people's understanding of the Gospel is reshaped, (3) evangelizing the particular USA culture is giving it a Catholic identity, and (4) more than creating programs and strategies, evangelizing a particular culture is an *interior transformation*.

In Marthaler's analysis, the important 'position' acquired by catechesis in the Church's mission of evangelization likewise animated the further attention in the field of catechesis in the USA in ecumenical and inter-religious dialogues, as well as in the concern for *the spiritual and humane needs of catechists*. Worthy to mention are, among others, the recognition of being a catechist as a «vocation» in the Church, the concern for the catechists' intellectual and spiritual formation, the remuneration/professionalization of their office.

In catechesis as a socialization process (as sustained by Marthaler), the liturgical treasure of the ecclesial community is a principal element in the nurture of faith. In fact for Marthaler, the intra-ecclesial catholic religious education, now oriented towards the maturity in Christian life, had likewise developed *liturgically*. Even without elaborations, Marthaler emphasized his observation of the catechetical development in the *liturgical aspect* with the reforms of the *RCLIA* (1972 and its eventual revisions) and the inclusion of

the *prenotandas* of the liturgical books. He affirmed that the RCLA showed the necessary relationship between liturgy and catechesis, again without elaborating. Marthaler's simple affirmation is confirmed by a scientific survey which was conducted in 1997 by the NCCB about the efficiency of RCLA in the US parishes. From its very positive result, the US Bishops' made *adult faith formation* as priority of the pastoral direction of the US Church in the third millennium (see USCCB's *OHWB*). Marthaler saw that liturgical catechesis functions efficiently in *deciphering of the rituals and symbols of faith*. With the present liturgical progress, that is, catechesis linked with liturgy in the formation of adult faith, liturgical catechesis may forge Catholics to *see through faith* God's actions-made-efficient through sacred symbols and rites, as he affirmed already in 1972.

Finally, in line with *the idea of a «practical-oriented catechesis»* observed and sustained by Marthaler, we highlight the fact that little has been written concerning *the «cognitive» or «doctrinal» aspect of catechesis*.

Marthaler, perhaps due for the *descriptive nature* of his 2000-2010 writings, limited himself in *simply indicating*, among others, the 1983 *CIC*'s mention of «an ecclesial instruction in view of Christian living», or the 2004 *NDC*'s mention of «theological catechesis» (*NDC* Chapter 2, 17-D). Regarding the publications of the *CCC*, *C-CCC*, *C-SC*, Marthaler underlined that they are catechetical *materials* which must be *contextualized in the whole catechetical ministry*. He was consistent to his affirmation that they are, especially the *CCC*, 'a sure doctrinal reference' and guide in the creation of local catechisms and directories.

It was Cardinal Wuerl instead that explicitly mentioned that there is *a change of direction of US catechesis* since the publication of the *CCC*. This «re-direction» consists of a growing awareness on the authentic and integral presentation of the doctrines of the Catholic faith.

5. Warren, on his part, vied for *a catechesis of behavior* or aimed at practice, of transforming sensibilities.¹⁶³ He seems to have in view Marthaler's perspective of *the shift of catechesis from being mere instruction to Christian-life oriented activity*. We observe that in his 2000-2010 writings, Warren had been insistent in affirming that *catechesis is all about «transforming sensibilities and practice», the changing for good of «behavior», of «a way of life», and of «sapience»* (the practice-oriented learning). As we have commented on Marthaler, all these, which Warren had also observed, signify not only the amplification but also the development of the understanding of catechesis throughout these years.

We found two unique concepts in Warren's writings (in the decade 2000-2010) related to his understanding of the nature of catechesis: the incorporation of the idea of a *humanizing catechesis* and the importance of *freedom* in catechesis as well as in religious education.

The *humanization* aspect of catechesis consists in the formation in culture, virtues, a good critical sense in relation to the contemporary culture of television publicities, strategies of resistance, utilitarianistic view of realities, the value of the dignity of persons, and even prayer life. This aspect reflects what Blessed John Paul II always taught in many occasions, echoing the mind of Vatican II's *Gaudium et spes*: man is the way of the Church. In the same line, the thought of Warren would lead us to say that the more a person is catechized, the more human he or she is, the more sensitive he or she is in the most humane concerns of society.

Moreover, in comparing catechesis and religious education, Warren pointed out the importance of the basic element – *freedom*. One comes for catechesis or religious education not because a State regulation ordains so, but one wants it. In the case of toddlers, of course, the freedom element is given by the parents. His idea here of *freedom in catechesis or religious education* is directed to *the students' disposition* that teachers or superiors *must respect and take seriously* in any type of education in faith. The particular issue of *freedom in catechesis or religious instruction* in Europe nowadays refers instead to the parents' freedom and right to choose to educate religiously their children. Just the same, freedom is a fundamental element in any faith education.

We further observe in Warren's catechetical doctrine *an insufficient deepening* of the «cognitive aspect» of community catechesis. In his discussions, he rather left the «cognitive aspect» in «a bad light». To highlight the point of our comment, we bring forward some concrete examples. In underlining the *corporate memory* embodied in the ecclesial community's symbols, customs and practices that help any neophyte see in flesh that which the community hold in its heart (faith), Warren seemed to place in an opposing position the *non-cognitive* and the *cognitive* aspects of communal catechesis. At times, he appears as negligent of the importance of the cognitive or intellectual formation in the determination of Catholic identity. This is evident in his principle of the priority of «embodied memory» over those «memorized Catholic doctrines», or in his often-used priority of «secondary doctrines» (dogmas) over «primary doctrines» (Christian life).

Certainly, Christian life precedes dogmas and precepts. We hold however that in order to live an authentic Christian life, clarity of understanding and eventually the nurture of «the cognitive aspect of communal catechesis» –in which dogmas and the precepts of the Church are a big help– is a *sine qua non*. *A doctrinal deepening is necessary for maturity in a genuine Christian life.*

The *liturgical dimension* in the community catechesis is another aspect in Warren's catechetical doctrine which can still be developed. As a proponent of catechesis as a socialization process, he must have intuited, like Marthaler, the importance in the nurture of faith of «deciphering the divine through the communities' sacred symbols and practices». Warren on his part, in two of his essays where he made reference to the Holy Eucharist (the essay concerning the «anamnetic catechesis» and the essay on the formation of the Youth), he only underlined the «sign aspect» of the Holy Eucharist, but less of its «effective» aspect. In the Holy Eucharist, above all, the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ is received. The definite end of catechesis is *communio cum Iesu Christo* (GDC 80-81).

Warren is outstanding in his expertise in the use of sociological language and concepts. This is evident in his elaboration of the «*extra-ecclesial orientation*» of his church-centered catechesis. We observe that since the beginning of his writing career, for Warren, *the concrete historical manifestation of the Good News* and the Church's *catechetical task* is closely related. In one moment of his catechetical career, he sustained that more than a *ministry of symbolic or life structures*, catechesis is a task of 'liberation', the freeing from the 'orchestrated' conditions which are simply anti-Gospel.

In other words, in this context, *catechesis*, for Warren, *has the task of clearing a space in which the Jesus-way of life promoted by the Church may thrive and eventually perform its transformative function in the world.* That perhaps explains Warren's *huge interest* on culture, signifying systems, theories of the mind's assimilation of external factors, etc. It must be said also that, in all these, Warren has no problem in exploring and using scientific theories (with a very good critical sense) in presenting his positions in catechesis.

In his 2000-2010 writings, it is clear to Warren that catechesis works in a wider context, which is the Church's *pastoral function*. He had been consistent in maintaining that catechesis deals with *transforming sensibilities and practice*. He extends catechesis pre-occupation with maintaining the '*right environment*' in which 'discipleship' may be put into life.

Warren, an expert on the sociology of religion, seemed to be cautious however with *culture*. For Warren, the testimony of Christian life is central in the nurture of faith in the ecclesial community. He has been attentive to the various cultural influences that may influence exteriorly and interiorly the religious space or world of believers.

He considered *culture* an *external factor* which may influence the individual and corporate memory of the community. He likewise hypothesized the power of culture to create its own signifying system so as to influence the whole Church itself.

Preserving the right environment as part of the task of catechesis does not only operate with external factors like culture. He likewise nominated *an internal form of living* (the internal human powers at work) despite of an adverse external factor. Warren showed how the *social imagination* influences the *religious culture* or *the norms of behavior* through *patterning perception electronically* (construction, shift, re-focus of images). As known, Warren maintains *a counter-cultural stance* for catechesis, a position he had made in his earlier writings until now. That counter-cultural stance consists of what he calls now «strategies of resistance». The affirmations of Blessed John Paul II and Benedict XVI may complete the «cautioning intuitions» of Warren. In their teachings, they consider that contemporary «digital culture» can be, not only a new anthropological perspective and an instruments for transmitting the Gospel, but also a setting for reflecting more deeply the relations of the Christian faith to man's contemporary preoccupations.

We opine that Warren, as an expert on cultures, is certainly aware of the many cultural opportunities for the practice of the Jesus Way of life and for the transformation of society. It cannot however be denied that his analyses present a rather negative outlook of culture. Moreover, he wrote less about how external factors (like society's culture) may help in the better understanding of human life and the living of the Gospel. As already mentioned above, we bow to how Warren flawlessly communicates his catechetical positions employing the 'US catechetical parlance', that is, a way of communicating through *technical terms* used by social sciences. It must be stated that in his employment of *conceptual categories* from social sciences in catechesis, he chooses and uses them with a good critical sense.

* * *

In general, it can be said that in the US catechesis in these last 10 years, there is a noticeable emphasis on *the whole ecclesial community* as *the principal subject* of the catechetical activity. However, the ecclesiological concept involved here sets aside the part of the ordained and consecrated faithful in the Church's catechetical task. A deeper problem is involved in this ecclesiological system: the work of the Holy Spirit may only be effective within a non-hierarchical ecclesial community.

In addition, the nurture of the faith *within* the community naturally leads towards apostolic endeavors *outside* the community, that is, the society, other belief systems other than the Christian faith, particular cultures, etc. The authors present an ecclesial community with a strong missionary consciousness: a church that, by the *Christian faith* it holds, has something to offer to the society at large.

Notes

1. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 93-94.
2. *Ibid.*, 94-95.
3. *Ibid.*, 95-96.
4. Moran's interreligious interest may be traced even before the 1980s. See for instance, *Design for Religion: Towards Ecumenical Education* (1968) and *Catechesis, RIP* (1970), *The Intersection of Religion and Education* (1974), and his intervention in the 1977 Symposium in Boston College (about the new catechetics). They already carried the symptoms of Moran's *amplification of interest* in the 1980s.
5. In *Religious Education Development. Images for the Future* (1983) and *Religious Education as Second Language* (1989), he considers catechesis as an intermediary state of the «broader» religious education. It seems that in his perspective, Moran saw the religious phenomenon as a broader field. In this religious field, each religion or «particular groups» (who holds a religion) does a sort of religious education. Religious education, in his view, consists of a «concretization» of this general religious experience common to all men. In this «process of concretization», particular customs (or the material expressions of subjective faith) called «beliefs» are necessary. Moran's perspective of catechesis as an intermediary of religious education may be understood in this context. Moreover, Moran considers religious education more adequate (than catechesis) to the pluralistic reality of contemporary society (cfr. *ibid.*, 109-113).
6. In the field of *ethics or morality*, he offered a concept of *responsibility* that is a moral consequence of revelation. For Moran, responsibility is basically the *ability of the person to respond* (response-ability). In this case, Moran focuses on the man's attitudes or reactions in front of the revealing God. he inserts his concept of freedom in this context. His book, *A Grammar of Responsibility* (1996), offers an exhaustive discussion. His main idea is: the *responsibility of every person over his or her actions* is determined by *the present relation he or she has with God* (revelation), and not by the demands of *human codes or prescriptions*.
In the field of the *dialogue with other religions*, Moran presents the idea of inclusive uniqueness. The main idea is that Christians may be different but not indifferent to other religions. Any religious may claim uniqueness but without excluding others. He claims that the concept of inclusive uniqueness is a consequence of looking at Christian life as a present relationship with God (revelation). His book *Uniqueness. Problem or Paradox in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (1992) exposes enough this idea.
In the field of *education*, particularly in *Showing How: The Act of Teaching* (1997), Moran, develops the idea of education as a metaphor of the God's dealing with man. His concept of revelation refers to the present divine-human interaction. As a metaphor of that divine-human interaction, the educating reality becomes a participation of God's act of educating.
7. See for example *Both Sides* (2002), especially, Chapter 6 Responsibility and Revelation (133-161), Chapter 7 The Logic of Revelation (162-187), and Chapter 8 Revelation as Teaching

and Learning (188-214). This is repeated in *Believing in a Revealing God* (2008), especially in Chapter 4 A responsible Church, Chapter 5 Christian Interpretation of Divine Revelation, and Chapter 7 Revealing-Believing as Teaching and Learning.

8. JM Lee's macrotheory, the social science approach to religious education, is systematically exposed in three books published within the decades of 70s-80s. The following writings of JM Lee present his fundamental ideas on religious education: *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (1971), *The Flow of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1973), and *The Content of Religious Education. A Social Science Approach* (1985). It is not difficult to imagine how much influence his approach had to many educators and catechetical leaders in USA within this period and after.
9. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Catequesis en Estados Unidos...*, cit., 117.
10. Cfr. *ibid.*, 120-126.
11. *Ibid.*, 43ff. (cited from M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 132-133.
12. J. M. LEE IV, «Key Issues in the Development of a Workable Foundation for Religious Instruction», cit., 291.
13. *Ibid.*, 291ff (cited from M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 120-121).
14. Cfr. *ibid.*, 136-137.
15. Cfr. *ibid.*, 122-123, 136-137. Vid. also E. J. NEWELL, «Education Has Nothing to Do with Theology»: *James Michael Lee's Social Science Instruction* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series), Princeton: Pickwick Publications, 2006. This is the most recent study concerning JM Lee's doctrine. In this book, Newell focuses, in particular, JM Lee's view on the relationship between theology and social science in religious education.
16. J. M. LEE IV, «Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always», in MARY, M. (ed.), *Does the Church Really Want Religious Education. An Ecumenical Inquiry*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1988, 32-66.
17. *Ibid.*, 37.
18. Cfr. *ibid.*, 59-60.
19. *Ibid.*, 43.
20. Cfr. *ibid.*, 64.
21. *Ibid.*
22. J. M. LEE IV, «Facilitating Growth in faith Through Religious Education», in J. M. LEE IV (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1990, 264-302.
23. M. Martorell presents Th. Groome's shared praxis approach to catechesis as an *alternative*, something that may possibly substitute catechesis. Synthesizing Th. Groome's three principal writings of the late 70s up to the 90s – *Christian Education for Freedom. A «Shared-Praxis» Approach* (1977), *Christian Religious Education. Sharing Our Story and Vision* (1980), and *Sharing Faith. A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry* (1991), M. Martorell comes up with the following description of how *the teaching of the faith through shared praxis* should take place.
As a pedagogical approach, it has the following characteristics or moments: (1) there is one common theme or an activity which is suppose to capture the interest and involve those present (generative theme), (2) each one gives his or her critical assessment on the generative theme, (3) a *christian story or vision* is made accessible to all, (4) a dialectical comparison of the *christian story or vision* with the actual praxis will be made, and (5) the community decides to compromise to plan of action geared towards the fulfillment of God's reign. Th. Groome employs the so-called 'Christian Story/Vision' to refer to the Christian version of living or practicing the universal religious phenomenon. Moreover, that Christian way of realizing the religious phenomenon present in all cultures is characterized by its concrete objective (vision) – the furthering of God's reign here on earth and in the next.
24. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 163.

25. Cfr. *ibid.*, 165-168.
26. Cfr. *ibid.*
27. Cfr. *ibid.*, 147.
28. Th. GROOME, *Sharing Faith...*, cit., 18 [quoted by M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 148].
29. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 148-149.
30. Th. Groome basis this axiom on E. Troeltsch's classification of predominant social forms of Christianity: church, sect and mysticism. According to that classification, mystical type of church refers to an agglomeration of individual persons driven by 'inner spiritual experiences and dispositions' but without a formal religious structure whatsoever. A sect, on its part, is a group of persons characterized by their common desire to strictly observe Christian values apart from a hopeless world. The church type is a community of persons characterized by its openness to all, its dependence on God's grace, and its social influence in whatever context it is formed. It is on this third sense that Th. Groome affirms the community of disciples to be a church (cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 156).
31. M. Martorell writes that Th. Groome's concept is inspired by E. S. Fiorenza's *inclusive discipleship of equals* (cfr. *ibid.*, 157). This perspective sees in another light the nature of the Church, its mission, its structures and functions. Th. Groome in fact, in order the sustain that radical equality employs the *designated Christian ministry* (a function entrusted by the community and corresponding to a gift of the Spirit) and the *Christian universal ministry* (a prerogative of all members of the church by virtue of being members of the body of Christ and therefore co-responsible for Christ's mission) to explain the various offices in the Church. As M. Martorell rightly observes, such a distinction has a negative consequence to his understanding of the hierarchical constitution of the Church as well as of the Holy Orders (especially in matters like the gift of celibacy and the traditional masculine priesthood) (cfr. *ibid.*, 159).
32. M. Martorell comments that Th. Groome tends to limit the function of the Magisterium to the mere confirmation of the *sensus fidelium*. She also observes that Th. Groome positively recognizes the work of theological experts in the shaping of what the Church holds as her faith. Th. Groome holds a so-called *hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed*, that is, of those who are directly involved in the works of promoting justice and peace, those who are combating the plague of hunger and sickness, etc. He attributes them a sort of *knowing better* in the practical dimension of reality which the Church confronts. Th. Groome underlines the contribution of each of *his* three sources the Church's magisterium. In our opinion, his thought needs to be completed with a specific discussion of the exercise of that teaching authority by the bishops of the whole world in communion with the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and customs (LG 23, 25) and of the Roman Pontiff's exercise of it as Vicar of Christ and Pastor of the whole Church (LG 23).
33. This *touch of reality* characteristic of his pedagogical process is a cycle. It involves 'an endless and creative exchange of between learners' own lives in the world and the legacy those before and around them' (cfr. *ibid.*, 429-440).
34. The distinction *perspectives-commitments* are important to note. Th. Groome hints that they function in a different mode. Perspective refers to Catholicism's mental framework while commitment, to its operational framework. See Th. Groome's explanation in Chapter 7 where he starts with the first commitment, that is fostering holistic spirituality (Th. GROOME, *Educating for Life...*, cit., 322).
35. Cfr. *ibid.*, 67-116. This covers chapter 2 of the book, titled *A Good People: «God's own Image and Likeness»*. Th. Groome's perspective of man is completed with chapter 4 (chapter 2-3 included). While chapter 2 focuses on man as a person in a community, chapter 4 underlines the community as composed of persons.
36. Cfr. *ibid.*, 117-170.

37. Taking up *the natures and relationship between Scriptures and Tradition*, we begin recalling that for Th. Groome, tradition is a legacy of history; history is a medium of divine revelation; therefore, tradition carries with it *sparks* of divine revelation. Man therefore (in this framework) may *respond and appreciate* God's revelation which he discovers in tradition and, by his human agency, may *creatively* appropriate it to the 'needs of the present times', thus continuing the weaving of tradition. In this framework, Th. Groome considers Scriptures and Tradition as the 'original' and 'cumulative' symbols of God's self-disclosure over time (cfr. *ibid.*, 242-245).
38. *Ibid.*, 238.
39. *Ibid.*, 242.
40. Once again, he revoked his three cooperative sources of teaching and learning in the Church – the research of the scholars, the discernment of ordinary people of faith, and the official magisterium of the papacy/episcopacy (cfr. *ibid.*, 241-242). Here he underlines the *cooperation* of the three and the official magisterium's role as *consensus builder*, and that authority in the church must 'always leave room for freedom of conscience', without specifying in which *state* the conscience is found.
41. Cfr. *ibid.*, 242-245.
42. Cfr. *ibid.*, 224
43. For the explanations of these terms, please refer to the four *claims* discussed previously.
44. Cfr. *ibid.*, 322.
45. Cfr. *ibid.*, 360-378.
46. Cfr. *ibid.*, 395-413.
47. B. MARTHALER, «Catechesis and Theology», cit., 262. He vied for Lonergan's idea of 'functional specialties' in understanding catechesis' role towards the Word. Basing on it, catechesis and theology are considered as specialized functions in the one service or ministry to the Word. *Vid.* B. LONERGAN, *Method in Theology* (1972), for the 8 functional specialties in theology (research, interpretation, history, dialectics, foundations, doctrines, systematic, and communications). According to Marthaler, catechesis is found in 'communications', which means, it moves in the theology's *external* relations (with history culture, art, media communications, etc.). With the Lonergan framework, catechesis pretends to go beyond the task of theology (characterized with 'managing' the foundational symbols necessary to communicate the Gospel message).
48. As can be alluded, Marthaler associates catechesis with the idea of socialization. If in Boston Symposium in 1977, he talks already of catechesis as socialization, well in this point of time, Marthaler writes of 'catechesis as an *aspect* of socialization' (*ibid.*, 265).
49. Cfr. MARTHALER, B., «To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith», cit., 232-233.
50. *Vid.* also Marthaler's other writings about the catechism: *Catechetics in Context. Notes and Commentary on the General Catechetical Directory Issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy* (1973), *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Traditional Themes and Contemporary Issues* (1994), and *The Catechism Yesterday and Today. The Evolution of a Genre* (1994).
51. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 181, 184, 191.
52. Cfr. *ibid.*, footnote 316; B. MARTHALER, *Catechetics in Context...*, cit., 1973, 75.
53. *Ibid.*, 197-205.
54. Cfr. M. WARREN, «Evangelization: a catechetical concern», in M. WARREN (ed.), *Sourcebook for Modern Catechetics*, I, cit., 333. This is the re-published edition of the article written 10 years ago.
55. See, for example, Warren's writings: *Faith Culture and Worshipping Community. Shaping the Practice of the Local Church* (1989), *The Worshipping Assembly: Possible Zone of Cultural Contestation* (1989)
56. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 233.
57. *Ibid.*, 225.

NOTES

58. *Ibid.*, 227.
59. Martorell traces this idea as an influence of the French neo-marxist sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 234).
60. *Ibid.*
61. Life structures condition our perception of reality. Martorell, summarizing Warren's explanation in *Faith, Culture, and the Worshipping Community. Shaping Practice of the Local Church* (1989), says that life structure is a habit, emphasis or a stable model through which behaviors, actions or personal conduct are governed. It is acquired unconsciously and configured through influence of culture (cfr. *ibid.*, 225).
62. Cfr. *ibid.*, 226-230. In this, Martorell notes Warren's priority of practice over contents in catechesis.
63. Warren, says Martorell, establishes two dialectical tensions: (1) the consumerist society opposes the sense and practice of the Gospel, and (2) the Gospel confronts the liturgical assembly or the local church against the dominant culture at hand (cfr. *ibid.*, 223-224).
64. Cfr. *ibid.*, 234.
65. Hermeneutics of dislocation, explains Martorell, consists in a critical process or discernment (judgment, reflection, discourse) which is facilitated through forging bonds with the poor and the marginalized of society (cfr. *ibid.*, 237-238).
66. Cfr. WARREN, M., *Faith, Culture and the Worshipping Community...*, cit., 12.
67. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 213.
68. Cfr. WARREN, M. (ed.), *Changing Churches – the Local Church and the Structures of Change*, OR: Pastoral Press, 2000, 1.
69. Cfr. J. ELIAS, *A History of Christian Education...*, cit., 214-216.
70. Cfr. G. MORAN, «Building on the Past», cit. 34.
71. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Speaking of Teaching*, cit., 121-138.
72. See for instance, two of Moran's 2000-2010 books: *Fashioning a People Today* (2007) and *Believing in a Revealing God* (2009).
73. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Speaking of Teaching...*, cit., 132.
74. Cfr. G. MORAN, «Building on the Past», cit. 148-153.
75. Cfr. *ibid.*, cit. 149; G. MORAN, *Speaking of Teaching...*, 132.
76. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Both Sides...*, cit. 10-18; 188-216, 219-225; G. MORAN, *Believing in a Revealing God...*, cit. 3-6, 15-60, 151-172.
77. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 85, 87-92.
78. G. MORAN, *Believing in a Revealing God...*, cit. 46.
79. *Ibid.*, 49.
80. *Ibidem.*
81. Cfr. *ibid.*, 162-172.
82. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Both Sides...*, cit., 224-225; G. MORAN, *Believing in a Revealing God...*, cit., 162-172.
83. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Fashioning a People Today...*, cit., especially, 13-32, 54-71.
84. Cfr. *ibid.*, 93-121.
85. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Believing in a Revealing God...*, cit., 61-82, 166-167.
86. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Fashioning a People Today...*, cit., 70-91; G. MORAN, *Believing in a Revealing God...*, cit., 167-169.
87. Cfr. G. MORAN, *Fashioning a People Today...*, cit., 13-32; G. MORAN, *Believing in a Revealing God...*, cit., 83-104.
88. Cfr. J. M. LEE IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 256-261.
89. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 117-124.
90. See for example his essay «Facilitating Growth in Faith through Religious Instruction», in J. M. LEE IV (ed.), *Handbook of Faith*, cit., 264-302. He explicitly mentions «facilitating and causing faith».

91. Cfr. J. M. LEE IV, «Vision, prophecy and forging the Future», cit., 261-266.
92. Cfr. *ibid.*, 253-256.
93. Cfr. J. M. LEE IV, «Catechesis Sometimes, Religious Education Always», cit., 32-66.
94. Cfr. Th. GROOME, *What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life*, cit., xvii.
95. *Ibid.*, xviii-xix.
96. These eight gifts, according to Th. Groome, are actually Catholic perspectives on the so-called 'great questions of life' (man, time, society, etc.). Basing on Th. Groome's presentation, the understanding of each *question of life*, considered from the point of view of Catholic faith, constitutes theoretically an element of the Catholic Christian spirituality (*faith put into action*). The *eight* gifts for life constituting Catholic spirituality are [1] its anthropology (Chapter 2, 39-72), [2] its cosmology (Chapter 3, 73-104), [3] its sociology and idea of community living (Chapter 4, 105-132), [4] its understanding of time and history, Tradition and the Scripture (Chapter 5, 133-168), [5] its understanding of faith as investing despite of the risk (Chapter 6, 169-206), [6] its politics or commitment to working for justice for all (Chapter 7, 207-234), [7] its distinctive commitment to loving without borders (Chapter 8, 235-264), and [8] its priority for growing spiritually (Chapter 9, 265-300). Chapter 8, about Catholic charity, is actually not a new topic. In *Educating for Life* (1998), this topic was incorporated within Th. Groome's discussion of justice.
97. Th. GROOME, *What Makes us Catholics...*, cit., 7.
98. *Ibidem*.
99. *Ibid.*, cit., 8.
100. *Ibid.*, 9-10.
101. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; Th. GROOME, «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 103-112; Th. GROOME, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; Th. GROOME, «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; Th. GROOME, «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224; Th. GROOME, «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 172-192.
102. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 23; Th. GROOME, «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 587-592; Th. GROOME, «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 218; Th. GROOME, «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 180-186.
103. Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 177.
104. *Vid.* Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; Th. GROOME, «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 583-592; Th. GROOME, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; Th. GROOME, «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; Th. GROOME, «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224; Th. GROOME, «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 79-84; Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 172-192.
105. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 17, 26-27; Th. GROOME, «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 583-584; Th. GROOME, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-3; Th. GROOME, «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211, 221-222; Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 177-173.

106. In Th. Groome's dialogue with the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997), he alleged that GDC has left itself open for misinterpretation. Its recommendation of having all catechesis be inspired by the catechumenate is being taken as if all catechesis must be modeled after the catechumenal paradigm. He holds that catechesis built on the catechumenal paradigm will not work in our present time because it was ever designed for a particular time and context very much different from that of the present. In particular, it focuses, instead on daily nurture of the faith, on sudden conversions (*vid.* Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 16-29; Th. GROOME, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; Th. GROOME, «Conversion or Nurture: When we thought the debate was over», cit., 211-224).
107. Th. Groome, to stress his point of the need for a co-operation of educating communities – parish, family, and school – he demonstrates the need to overcome the school didactic paradigm of teaching the faith, the need for the family to take back its role as first educator, and eventually for the need of all educating communities exercising the ministries to work together (*vid.* Th. GROOME, «Educación Catequética Global», cit., 583-585; Th. GROOME, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for Now and Always», cit., 1-30; Th. GROOME, «Good Governance, the Domestic Church and Religious Education», cit., 195-208; Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 175-178; Th. GROOME, «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 80-84). More than criticizing any conversion-leaning program in education in faith, Th. Groome deepens and continues his reflection on the communal dimension of education in faith. In the more recent total catechetical education essays, Th. Groome reaches the conclusion that 'the whole Church' is the 'catechist educator' (cfr. Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 175) and 'the whole church' must have 'a catechetical consciousness' (cfr. Th. GROOME, «The Church is Catechetical», cit., 80-81), and thus vies for 'a whole community catechesis'.
108. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 27-28; Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 187-189.
109. Th. GROOME, «Conversion, Nurture, or Both. Towards a lifelong catechetical education – a cautious reading of the GDC», cit., 28. This is exactly the same throughout the total catechetical education writings.
110. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Handing on the Faith: The Need for Total Catechetical Education», cit., 189-192.
111. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», cit., 25-36, but especially 33-34; Th. GROOME, *What Makes Us Catholic...*, cit., 157-158; Th. GROOME, «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», cit., 179-198; Th. GROOME, «Total Catechesis/Religious Education: A Vision for now and Always», cit., 8.
112. As we have already indicated, Groome does not explicitly make distinction between being a Roman Catholic and being Catholic. It seems that in the first place he intends catholic for 'universal'. When associating the idea of 'being a Roman catholic' with 'being catholic or universal', he refers to Roman Catholics embracing the concept of universality, that is, of sharing or participating in a 'conviction' or a 'core value' which others also hold as such. Aware of this, one may read Groome 'with caution' (an expression he uses for reading the *GDC*).
113. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «Catholic Identity in the Public Forum: The Challenge for Religious Educators», cit., 29.
114. Cfr. *ibid.*
115. Cfr. *ibid.*

116. Cfr. *ibid.*, 30-32.
117. Cfr. *ibid.*, 33-34.
118. Cfr. Th. GROOME, «For and From Faith for the Common Good: The Charism of Catholic Education», cit., 180.
119. *Ibid.*, 181.
120. Cfr. *ibid.*
121. Cfr. *ibid.*, 182-190.
122. Cfr. *ibid.*, 191-192.
123. Cfr. *ibid.*, 193-194.
124. Cfr. *ibid.*, 192
125. Cfr. *ibid.*, 195. He lists them as: (1) Human beings have equal dignity, rights and responsibilities. (2) Life in the world is a gift charged with purpose and meaning. (3) Our human identity is essentially communal; we need and must care for each other. (4) Living life well requires wisdom that encourages responsibility. (5) All the great spiritualities teach justice for all and compassion for the needy. (5) At their best, most spiritualities are universal in outlook, emphasizing the bondedness of all people. (6) all spiritualities are convinced that the human vocation is to live in 'right relationship' with God –however named– with oneself, others, and creation.
126. Cfr. *ibid.*, 196.
127. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry...*, cit., 11.
128. Cfr. *ibid.*, 11-17.
129. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *Sowing Seeds...*, cit., v-vi.
130. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry...*, cit., 41-80.
131. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry...*, cit., 81-90; B. MARTHALER, «Foreword» of *TLL* 38:3 (Spring 2002) 4-5.
132. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry...*, cit., 91-98.
133. Cfr. NCCB/USCC, *Journey to the Fullness of Life. A Report on the Implementation of the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults in the United States*, Washington, D.C. (October 2000).
134. Cfr. USCCB, *Our Hearts Were Burning Within Us: A Pastoral Plan for Adult Formation in the United States*, Washington, D. C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999; B. MARTHALER, «Foreword» of *TLL* 37:1 (Fall 2000) 4-5.
135. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, «To Teach Theology or to Teach Faith», cit., 232-233.
136. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *Sowing Seeds...*, cit., v-vi.
137. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, «Foreword» of *TLL* 37:2 (Winter 2000) 4-5.
138. Cfr. *GCD* 17-18.
139. Cfr. *EN* 14.
140. Cfr. *CT* 13-15.
141. Cfr. *GDC* 80-81.
142. Cfr. *GDC* 82-83.
143. Cfr. *GDC* 85.
144. Cfr. *GDC* 86.
145. Cfr. B. MARTHALER, *The Nature, Tasks and Scope of the Catechetical Ministry...*, cit., 249-250.
146. It is enough to read the first lines of his essays in order to capture his general context, especially the following: *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church* (2000), *A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry* (2000), *Towards an Anamnetic Catechesis* (2004), *Imagining an Inconvenient Church* (2008), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis* (2008).
147. Warren's writings that underline this point are the following: *Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look* (2001) and *Finalités et contenus reprécisés pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008).
148. See for instance, Warren's essays: *Catechesis and/or Religious education: Another Look* (2001), *Imagining an Inconvenient Church* (2008), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), *Finalités et contenus*

NOTES

- reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008) and *Reflections on Parish and Adult Catechesis* (2008).
149. Warren's writings that underline this point are the following: *Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look* (2001) and *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2008).
 150. Warren employs various scientific theories, *vid.*, WARREN, M., «Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church», cit.; WARREN, M., «Imagining an Inconvenient Church», cit., 41-60; WARREN, M., «The Imagination of Youth», cit., 61-74; WARREN, M., «Towards an Anamnestic Catechesis», cit., 18-26; WARREN, M., «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», cit., 199-212; WARREN, M., «Catechesis and (or) Religious Education, another look», cit., 125-144.
 151. Cfr. M. MARTORELL, *Introducción al Estudio de la Catequesis...*, cit., 218-238.
 152. Cfr. BENEDICT XVI, *Address given to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications*, Vatican City, 28.
 153. Cfr. M. WARREN, «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», cit., 6
 154. *Ibid.*
 155. Cfr. M. WARREN, «Towards an Anamnestic catechesis», cit., 18-26.
 156. Cfr. M. WARREN, «A New Priority in Pastoral Ministry», cit., 6-15; M. WARREN, «Towards an Anamnestic catechesis», cit., 18-26; M. WARREN, «Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse», cit., 209-211.
 157. See the following essays: *Writing the Gospel into the Structures of the Local Church* (2000), *Towards an Anamnestic Catechesis* (2004) *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2004), *The Imagination of Youth* (2008), and *Youth Ministry in an inconvenient Church* (2008).
 158. We refer to his essay *Finalités et contenus reprécises pour les cours de religion et la catéchèse* (2004).
 159. Please refer to Chapter II of the original work, dedicated entirely to the discussion of Moran and his 2000-2010 writings, 95-145; or to the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century, found in this same work, 380-383, 417-424.
 160. Chapter III of the original work is entirely dedicated to Lee and his 2000-2010 writings, 147-171. See also the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century, found in the same work, 384-390, 425-431.
 161. For an analysis of Groome's writings in 2000-2010, refer to Chapter IV of the original work, 173-219; or to the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century found in the same work, 391-403, 432-444.
 162. Chapter V in the original work is entirely dedicated to Marthaler and his 2000-2010 writings, 223-337. See also the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century found in the same work, 404-408, 445-450.
 163. In the original work, Chapter VI is entirely dedicated to the discussion of Warren and his 2000-2010 writings, 339-373; or to the *synthesis and evaluation* of his catechetical doctrine based on his writings before and during the first decade of the 21st century, may as well be consulted, 409-415, 451-456.

Index of Excerptum

PRESENTATION	223
CONTENT OF THE THESIS	229
ABBREVIATION OF THE THESIS	233
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE THESIS	235
A SYNTHETIC ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE US CATECHESIS IN 2000-2010	243
1. AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND EXPERIENTIAL INSINUATION OF THE 'NEW CATECHETICS': A HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CATECHESIS IN THE USA	243
1.1. Moran: «the present relationship between man and God» as the object of catechesis	245
1.2. Lee: the «empirical dimension» of the human-divine relation and the use of human sciences in religious instruction	248
1.3. Groome: the «sharing» within the community of the human-divine experience or «praxis»	252
1.4. Marthaler and Warren: catechesis as a socialization process	259
2. CATECHESIS OF CHRISTIAN LIFE WITHIN THE CHURCH: THE INSIGHT OF THE MAIN PROPONENTS OF 'NEW CATECHETICS' IN THE FIRST DECADE OF THE 21ST CENTURY	266
2.1. Moran and a comprehensive religious education	267
2.2. Lee and the forging of Christian lifestyle through religious instruction	272
2.3. Groome and «faith-life and life-faith» catechesis	276
2.4. Marthaler and the «development of catechesis» (from instruction to way of life) as documented by Church documents	283
2.5. Warren and the «sapiential» catechesis within the ecclesial community	287
CONCLUSIVE REFLECTIONS	290
NOTES	305
INDEX OF EXCERPTUM	315