

Augustine, Aquinas or the Gospel *sine glossa*?
Divisions over *Gaudium et spes*¹

Joseph A. Komonchak

One of the most striking developments in the first decade after the close of Vatican II was the splintering of the coalition of theologians who helped at the first session to break the power of those who had controlled the Council's preparation. Those theologians played a major role in the deliberations which resulted in conciliar documents marked by a quite different spirit and offering a quite different message to the Church and to the world. But then they bifurcated along paths symbolised by two new theological journals. The first issue of *Concilium* appeared in 1964, while the Council was still meeting; *Communio* was founded in 1972 by several theologians who had since resigned from the editorial board of *Concilium* (and was inevitably therefore labelled an 'anti-*Concilium*'). The seeds of this schism were planted long before the Council opened, slept in the soil for the first two sessions, then broke into the light as the Council moved to its close. Anyone interested in healing the division would be well advised to trace them to their roots.

The differences began to appear, especially, in the last stages of the preparation of *Gaudium et spes* and were consistently reflected, also, in the initial commentaries on the pastoral constitution. I will consider those differences through the

commentaries on the redaction of *Gaudium et spes* of three theologians: Marie-Dominique Chenu, Joseph Ratzinger and Giuseppe Dossetti.

‘What Now?’: The Question of Schema 13

The split among the progressive majority suggests that the theological dynamic of Vatican II was more complex – as Giuseppe Alberigo, echoing Joseph Ratzinger, has observed – than the simple opposition between a ‘curial tendency’ and a ‘progressive tendency’.² It is significant that both men made this comment in the course of observations on *Gaudium et spes*. For although differences among the progressives with regard both to practical tactics and to theological orientations were not lacking in earlier moments of the conciliar deliberations, they had then been largely subordinated to the common interest of opposing the ecclesiastical and theological system which was reflected in the official texts prepared for the Council’s discussion and expected approval. In the midst of that struggle it appeared sufficient to analyse the conciliar tension as one between ‘two tendencies in modern theology’, to use the title of Mgr Gérard Philips’s famous essay.³ But once that struggle had ended a question arose, nicely stated by Joseph Ratzinger: ‘The preparatory work was unsatisfactory, and the Council rejected the extant texts. But the question at this point was: What now?’⁴ The question was particularly acute with regard to Schema 13.

After its initial discussion during the third session of the Council, Schema 13 was extensively rewritten, particularly during and after the long and fruitful meeting at Ariccia in January–February 1965. A useful description of the new plan and method was provided by Mgr P. Hauptmann shortly before the Council resumed its work.⁵ In response to criticisms

of the previous version, the redactors had constructed a Christian anthropology set out in the four chapters of the first part of the schema, which was followed by a consideration of material on some more pressing problems that previously had been treated in appendices. Addressed first to Catholics and through them to all people, the schema would take the form, not of an authoritative claim to jurisdiction over the issues discussed, but rather of a testimony, one that simply stated what the Church is, what it believes, and what it thinks about contemporary questions. This required a style and form both simple and direct; it also called for a method that would begin ‘from facts and truths the most commonly acknowledged, would then illumine and judge them in the light of Revelation, and finally would centre them upon Christ himself’. The method was theologically motivated: ‘for facts and human development (*‘devenir’*) in their own way constitute a *locus theologicus* in which the believer must seek . . . the appeals and the solicitations of the Spirit’. The result was ‘a *sui generis* type of schema’.

Rahner’s Criticisms of Schema 13

The Ariccia text encountered serious criticism at the meeting of German bishops in Fulda at the end of August 1965. A set of observations prepared by Karl Rahner were discussed and in large part adopted by the German and Scandinavian bishops. Despite the great effort that had been expended on its revision, the schema, according to Rahner, still had many defects.

First, it lacked a sufficient ‘theological gnoseology’ that would explain how it had arrived at its analysis of the contemporary world – how much of it had been borrowed from contemporary analysts, how much derived from the faith – and how the authors had come to the concrete and practical

conclusions it stated. Secondly, Rahner argued that the schema did not adequately address the relationship between the order of creation and the order of redemption, particularly the meaning of the human activity that was profoundly transforming the world. The inner-worldly significance of this activity was neglected in favour of its immediate religious and moral significance. The concept of the 'world' in the text also needed further clarification. Thirdly, the German Jesuit said, the schema lacked 'a real and profound theology of sin': it was content with lamenting immorality in a way that scarcely surpassed what mere experience might yield. The ineradicable depths of sin were overlooked; the ideology of a 'better world' obtainable if people only willed it had replaced the 'legitimate and necessary "pessimism" that Christians must profess before the world'. Fourthly, said Rahner, it neglected what a Christian theology of history must acknowledge: 'that the antagonism between a world under the power of the Evil One and the disciples of Christ will never be mitigated but will grow ever more bitter in the course of time'.

Finally, said Rahner, the schema lacked the needed Christian anthropology. The idea of the 'image of God' was presented too rapidly and too briefly and ignored the complexities of the notion. The reflections on human dignity were too abstract, too formal, and too oriented toward contemplation. The text lacked a 'theology of the cross' and of its implications for the history of the world and of the human race. Rahner's proposal was that the text either be remanded to a post-conciliar commission or that it be reduced in authority from a 'pastoral constitution'.

Joseph Ratzinger echoed many of Rahner's criticisms and added others of his own. The text came close to a Teilhardian identification of Christian hope with modern confidence in progress, according to Ratzinger; it seemed 'unaware of the

ambivalence of all external human progress'. Its descriptions of contemporary movements were so polite and reasonable that the eventual references to Christ seemed half-embarrassed afterthoughts. Unclarified notions of the relationship between the Church and the world reflected habits formed while the Church had been retreating from the general course of modern developments into its little ecclesiastical sphere from which it was now trying to speak to the whole of humanity. After the council Ratzinger would repeat many of these criticisms in his commentaries on *Gaudium et spes*.

In order to prevent these disagreements among habitual conciliar allies from endangering the text, several French- and German-speaking bishops and theologians met on 17 September. After the former defended the schema from the critiques of the latter, the common decision was made to accept the schema as a basis but to try to improve it. Joseph Ratzinger, who attended the meeting, described the 'new fronts [that] had emerged in the face of new tasks and new problems' as reflecting 'a certain opposition between German and French theology' within the ranks of the progressives.⁶

But there was a third voice in the debate, that of Giuseppe Dossetti (1913–96). Not very well known outside Italy, Dossetti played important roles at two of the most important events in twentieth-century Italian history, as a layman at the Constituent Assembly of 1948 that produced the Constitution for the new Italian Republic, and at the Second Vatican Council, where he was the chief adviser to Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro (1891–1976), Archbishop of Bologna. In Italian politics he had belonged to the left wing of the Christian Democrat party. Frustrated at his lack of influence, he began to work for a renewal of the Church that might be able to promote a badly needed different form of politics. After a quixotic run for mayor of Bologna, he was ordained a priest in 1959. He established the

well-known Institute of Religious Studies in Bologna. After Vatican II, he withdrew into the quasi-monastic community he had founded.

A very evangelical vision inspired the speeches Dossetti prepared for Lercaro and a few other bishops and the memoranda he composed during and after Vatican II. He insisted that if the Council did not embody and call for a very radical conversion to the gospel (*sine glossa*, he liked to call it – without extenuating commentary), it would fall short of the epochal intentions of Pope John. The Council, of course, did not go down that road, and Dossetti regarded its final texts as greatly compromised by Paul VI's caution and his desire for near-unanimity.

As the debate on Schema 13 was about to resume Dossetti wrote to Cardinal Lercaro of 'our position between two fires (the conservatives and the progressives)'.⁷ This comment, along with the intervention Dossetti prepared for the cardinal, reveals the presence of another, more radical and evangelical, approach to the questions.

Three Theologians, Three Approaches

The three men – Chenu, Ratzinger and Dossetti – were in broad agreement in a number of areas. They agreed on the inadequacy of modern 'Catholic social doctrine' which argued on the basis of a natural law, accessible, it was thought, to right reason, and practised a method of deduction from rather abstract first principles. They were all opposed, too, to an approach – from within an ecclesiology of the *societas perfecta* – that would be content with service of a separate little Catholic world. They agreed on the need for a biblically inspired engagement of the Church and the Christian with the world of history. They all wished to overcome an anthropology

which so stressed the distinction that it became a separation between nature and grace, reason and faith, world and Church. And yet, for all these agreements, their assessments of *Gaudium et spes* often differed sharply. Why is this?

Leaving aside an inevitably superficial explanation in terms of 'optimism' vs. 'pessimism', one might be tempted to be content with the differences between an incarnational and an eschatological approach. But who would wish to suggest that any one of the three theologians would consider compromising either of the great mysteries, the Incarnation or the Cross? The relative weight given to one or the other, in contrast, may be traceable to differences in basic theological or methodological stances.

M.-D. Chenu was, by religious commitment, by training, and by expertise, a Thomist. Within his comments on the pastoral constitution one can hear echoes of the theological epistemology and anthropology which he defended 25 years before the Council not only in scholarly works on Aquinas but also in works that urged a typically Thomist approach to theology for a Church that is present in and for the modern world. Then and later he saw the Thomist method as corresponding to the logic of the Incarnation and of Redemption as the recapitulation of all things in Christ, including the physical universe and the embodied spirit of man. Then and later he urged that theological anthropology had to go beyond the realm of the psychological to include the social, cultural and the historical dimensions and to see these latter, neglected, dimensions not only to be constitutive of man but also the locus of those same orientations toward and created capacities for the supernatural that Thomism had defended, for example, in categories such as that of 'obediential potency'. A sharp disjunction, such as the one that is content with the two categories of sin and grace, was inadequate on Thomist grounds because

it neglected the created autonomy and intelligibility of the world of nature, man and history; and because it tended to compromise the methodological autonomy of the sciences that study it. Chenu's defence of the basic method and orientation of *Gaudium et spes* did not derive, or did not simply derive, from his congenital optimism; it had theological grounds.

In Joseph Ratzinger's assessment of the pastoral constitution one can see a theological method and vision that stands far closer to the streams of Augustinianism that during the Middle Ages and in the post-Reformation era had been very reserved towards the Thomist effort. Ratzinger seems far more at home in the world of the Scriptures, the Fathers and St Bonaventure. In his remarks on *Gaudium et spes*, as also in many other writings, he makes clear his preference for Augustinian (and even Lutheran) notions of freedom and his belief that Thomists (if not Thomas himself) had so stressed the autonomy of the world and of human reason that the first constituted a separate world capable of being understood by the second, with the result that the world disclosed by revelation and accepted by faith appeared to be a more-or-less arbitrarily imposed alternative. To a Thomist epistemology he regards as inadequate he prefers a typically Augustinian distinction between *scientia* and *sapientia*, the former, imitated today by the necessarily reductionistic modern empirical sciences, content with mere phenomena and indifferent to the ontological truth of things, which is only apparent to the latter, itself the fruit of faith. The pastoral constitution continues to reflect the myth of pure reason which leads it to a necessarily ineffective method of dialogue that neglects that faith is not demonstrable; what is needed is kerygmatic witness, the simple presentation of the gospel and an invitation to enter its world of intelligibility and rationality. The basic issue remains that of the relationship between faith and understanding.

Giuseppe Dossetti is more difficult to place. At least in his participation at the Council and in his remarks on *Gaudium et spes*, he appears more as a prophet than as a scholar, less as a professor than as the engaged Christian he had been in both society and Church. He seems closer to Ratzinger, first, in his distrust of the modern self-professedly Thomist theological tradition elaborated in the service of a *societas perfecta* that he thought had compromised the evangelical engagement that should mark the Church; second, in his preference for the engagement typical of early Christianity; and, third, in his insistence on the radical rupture in intelligibility, the redefinition of rationality, required by the Cross. For him, too, the primary presence of the Church must be one of testimony (a word used by all three men), but this is witness to an utterly supernatural vision and reality, which in the end cannot be rendered reasonable to non-believers. For that reason he quite disagreed with Chenu's assessment of the analysis that underlay *Gaudium et spes*, which he thinks scarcely surpasses the level of a common-sense sociology that is content with a banal general understanding and promotes a timid Christian engagement. At the same time, he clearly disagreed with Ratzinger on what the question of war and peace required of the Council, and so, far from being content with Ratzinger's apparently inconsistent resignation to the conciliar position on the question, he regards the latter as indicative of the radical incompleteness of the whole conciliar experience and achievement. For Dossetti the Council missed a unique opportunity. Underlying the failure, for him, is the Council's inability to escape, with the radicality required, from the institutional constraints and from the theology that served them, for the sake of a gospel *sine glossa*. It must also be said that of the three men it is Dossetti who actually attempted something like a reading of the 'signs of

the times', while Ratzinger remained unconvinced of the very idea and Chenu was content with remarks of great generality.

Of the three men, clearly Dossetti was the most radical in the demands he placed on the conciliar fathers and in the criteria by which he subjected their achievements to judgement. Dossetti found the draft's analysis of the contemporary world nothing but 'common sense propositions', at the level of 'journalistic popularisation'. The text should be revised, he said, in order to give the response of the gospel to concrete problems and to do this 'in the immediacy and relevance of its most vigorous statements'. He, too, wished the Council to offer an optimistic and positive message; but, he went on, there is a great difference between 'an utterly supernatural Christian optimism' that anticipates 'a transfiguration and regeneration that is like a resurrection from the dead, solely in virtue of the blessed passion of Christ', and a naturalistic optimism that 'indulges in a phenomenology of human progress and ignores or flees the principle that everyone and everything must be "salted with fire" (Mark 9:49), by the fire of the Cross and of the Spirit of Christ'. The draft's optimism was not salted in this way, he argued; it conformed to common opinions, was uncritical and timid.

This affected most particularly, in his view, the text's treatment of war and peace. The text tried so hard to be non-judgemental, he thought, that it ignored the judgements on contemporary evils the Church is called to make in the name of Christ. On so crucial a point as war, he wanted the Council's discourse to be 'absolute, synthetic, evangelical'. Only this approach could respond to the anxiety of peoples; only this could 'banish war and make peace, not by human calculation but by the creative force of the Word of God'. This is the witness to faith in Jesus Christ that the whole Church is called

to give; in this moment of supreme danger, it could give no truer response than to say to the world: 'Entrust yourself not to defence by arms and by political prudence, but only to the protection of the Lord Jesus.' When the bishops failed to follow this evangelical call, articulated at the Council by Lercaro and a few others, Dossetti thought that the value of the Council as a whole was called into question. The failure demonstrated how tight were certain institutional and theological knots that could not be loosened 'except by a sword, by the sword of the Word of God, clear and simple, beyond all other theological reflection'.

There is visible in his final assessments of Vatican II a good deal of the distinct position he urged upon Cardinal Lercaro from the first session onwards and which was reflected in the speech in which the Archbishop of Bologna pleaded that the whole conciliar agenda be reconceived in terms of the problem of poverty. Dossetti was fiercely critical both of the method, compromising from the beginning, reflected in the decision to retain as much as possible of the preparatory schemas, and of the at best only half-successful results this fatal choice permitted. Neither in the Council's doctrinal texts nor in the texts on the Church's relationship with the modern world did Vatican II achieve the breakthrough Dossetti thought could alone correspond to Pope John's vision. It was a theological, indeed a religious, commitment that underlay Dossetti's disagreement over the Council's programme and tactics – a disagreement that, as quickly became apparent, set him apart not only from the intransigent minority but within the progressive majority as well.

Aquinas vs. Augustine

The final stages of the redaction of *Gaudium et spes* also revealed the sorts of disagreements within that majority that

are illustrated in the figures of Chenu and Ratzinger and that, perhaps inevitably, appeared when, with the preparatory drafts rejected, the Council faced the question: what now? It was one thing to delegitimise the theological system that had guided the preparation of the Council; it was quite another to write texts that would reflect the positive and pastoral aims Pope John had set out in his opening speech. In the course of the elaboration of the texts, it is clear that there were differences within the majority now in charge of redacting the conciliar documents, even the ones on the Church *ad intra* but especially in those on the Church *ad extra*, to use the unfortunate division commonly invoked at the time. These differences inevitably reflected the theological background, training and interests of the theologians employed in the tasks, as is clear from the comparison of Chenu and Ratzinger.

Their differences may be traceable to the differences between a typically Thomist and a typically Augustinian epistemology and anthropology. Perhaps the analysis may be extended beyond these two men. Commenting on the much-reduced presence of St Thomas Aquinas in the final conciliar texts, Yves Congar remarked that, nevertheless, 'St Thomas, the *Doctor communis*, furnished the redactors of the dogmatic texts of Vatican II with the foundations and the structure of their thought.'⁸ In Congar's mind, if with *Gaudium et spes* and *Dignitatis humanae* the Council had finally broken with 'political Augustinianism', it was because it achieved something similar to what the 'Albertine-Thomist revolution' had effected in the thirteenth century.⁹

Ratzinger, however, provided a different account of the Council's inspiration. In a generally negative paper written ten years after the Council began, he asked what theological and spiritual resources the Church had with which to face the Council's disappointing aftermath. The only hope lay, he

thought, 'in those forces that really had made Vatican II possible and shaped it but that shortly thereafter had been overrun by a wave of modernity'. This was:

a theology and a piety which essentially were based on the Holy Scriptures, on the Church Fathers, and on the great liturgical heritage of the universal Church. At the Council this theology succeeded in nourishing the faith not only on the thought of the last hundred years but on the great stream of the whole tradition in order thus to make it richer and more vital and at the same time simpler and more open.

He dismissed two other options: the post-conciliar progressivism that had arisen out of J. B. Metz's transformation of Karl Rahner's transcendental Thomism into, first, a theology of hope and, second, a political theology. This stream Ratzinger thought had lost its usefulness because of its uncritical surrender to vaguely Marxist analysis. As for the scholastic philosophy and theology defended by conservatives at the Council, Ratzinger said that it no longer played any role; in fact, he observed how rapidly defenders of a pedestrian scholastic theology had laid down their arms and surrendered to a vague modernism.¹⁰ The omission of Thomas and the dismissal of the Thomist tradition in these remarks is notable, reflecting, one suspects, not only the state of Thomism at the time but also Ratzinger's personal and theological preferences.

These differences with regard to the theological inspiration of the texts of Vatican II suggest two lines of research which it may be useful to undertake for the history of Catholic theology in the twentieth century. The first is retrospective and concerns the nature of the theological renewal that prepared for Vatican II and which is often over-simplified today, as it was then by its critics, as 'la nouvelle théologie', the singular

term suggesting a single stream. If almost all the leaders of that renewal agreed on the necessity of a *ressourcement*, it is also clear that they drew their chief inspirations from various sources. Louis Bouyer, Jean Daniélou, Henri de Lubac, Joseph Ratzinger and Hans Urs von Balthasar, for example, were far more at home in the mental world of the Fathers, the monastic theologians and the medieval neo-Augustinians than they were not only in the watered down neo-scholasticism of the modern era but also in the scholastic milieu and dialectical methods of St Thomas himself. While certainly not neglecting the Scriptures or the Fathers or the liturgical renewal, in contrast, Chenu and Congar were great admirers of Aquinas and of what Congar calls the 'Albertine-Thomist revolution', and with them may be linked in this respect men such as Karl Rahner, Bernard Lonergan and Edward Schillebeeckx who attempted a reconciliation of Thomism and the modern philosophical turn to the subject. Within the ranks of the leaders of the twentieth-century renewal of theology there were not insignificant differences; which were almost bound to appear in full force once the hegemonic power of neo-scholasticism was broken at the Council.

My second suggestion is more prospective. It is striking to note that after the Council it was among those who chiefly promoted the recovery of the patristic and monastic traditions who were most critical of what was happening in the Church and in theology in the wake of the Council. One may think of the often very critical and at times even bitter post-conciliar writings of Bouyer, Daniélou, de Lubac, Ratzinger and von Balthasar. While not uncritical of post-conciliar developments, the great promoters of Aquinas, such as Chenu, Congar, Lonergan, Rahner and Schillebeeckx, displayed a greater sense of balance, offered more careful analyses of the problems and more nuanced responses to them, and took up a challenge

which they often compared in extent and seriousness to the one that faced Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Appreciation of St Thomas, of course, is not by itself the predictor of these differences in attitude, as the examples of Jacques Maritain and Étienne Gilson show. (But they, of course, were philosophers, not theologians.)

This line of research may be worth pursuing despite the fact that, as Gerald McCool has written, ‘The history of the modern Neo-Thomist movement, whose *magna charta* was *Aeterni patris*, reached its end at the Second Vatican Council.’¹¹ Its place has been taken by a very diverse plurality of theological methods, no one of which has gained anything like the hegemony enjoyed by the unitary method of neo-scholasticism. This is not the place to attempt an inventory of them all. Within their often chaotic variety, David Tracy has offered a distinction,¹² which might usefully be considered, between a correlation-theology, the contemporary equivalent of Aquinas’s engagement with Aristotle, illustrated in the work of Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan, and an epiphanic theology, the contemporary equivalent of a more Augustinian and Bonaventuran approach, illustrated in the work of Hans Urs von Balthasar and in ‘*der Positivismus des Glaubens*’ [a faith-positivism], as Joseph Ratzinger calls it.¹³ What is called ‘post-modernity’, with its critique of universal reason and of foundationalism and its insistence on the incommensurability of linguistically mediated worlds, is often considered to resemble the latter approach with its abandonment of the myth of pure reason and its insistence on the unbridgeable gulf that the Cross of Christ digs with regard to the very notion of rationality. In this line, Dossetti and Ratzinger would appear, at least temporarily, to have won the victory. One suspects, however, that Chenu would question whether this approach is faithful to the achievement of Vatican II.

Notes

- 1 This is a fuller version of my article 'What road to joy?', *The Tablet* (30 November 2002), pp. 11–12.
- 2 Giuseppe Alberigo, 'La Costituzione in rapporto al magistero globale del Concilio', in Guilherme Baraúna (ed.), *La Chiesa nel mondo di oggi: Studi e commenti intorno alla Costituzione pastorale 'Gaudium et spes'* (Florence: Vallecchi, 1966), p. 184n. Alberigo cited Joseph Ratzinger, 'Der Katholizismus nach dem Konzil', *Das neue Volk Gottes: Entwürfe zur Ekklesiologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1969), pp. 302–21 (316–17).
- 3 Gérard Philips, 'Deux tendances dans la théologie contemporaine: En marge du IIe Concile du Vatican', *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 85 (1963), pp. 225–38.
- 4 Joseph Ratzinger, *Die letzte Sitzungsperiode des Konzils* (Köln: Bachem, 1966), p. 28; *ET Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 1966), p. 148.
- 5 P. Hauptmann, 'Le schéma de la Constitution pastorale "De Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis"', *Études et documents*, no. 10 (25 August 1965), 11pp.
- 6 Ratzinger, *Die letzte Sitzungsperiode des Konzils*, p. 30; *Theological Highlights*, p. 151.
- 7 Dossetti to Lercaro, 27 September 1965, published in *Per la forza dello Spirito: Discorsi conciliari del card. Giacomo Lercaro* (Bologna: Dehoniane, 1984), p. 254n.
- 8 Congar, 'La théologie au Concile', *Situation et tâches présentes de la théologie* (Paris: du Cerf), p. 53.
- 9 Yves Congar, 'Église et monde dans la perspective de Vatican II', in *L'Église dans le monde de ce temps*, vol. III, (Paris: du Cerf, 1967), p. 31, where he adds in a note: 'This point about correspondence is, of course, one of those that allows good commentators to regard GS as profoundly Thomist in inspiration.'
- 10 Joseph Ratzinger, 'Zehn Jahre nach Konzilsbeginn – wo stehen wir?' in *Dogma und Verkündigung* (München: Wewel, 1971), pp. 437–9.
- 11 Gerald A. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989), pp. 230. See Joseph A. Komonchak, 'Thomism and the Second Vatican Council', in Anthony J. Cernera (ed.), *Continuity and Plurality in Catholic Theology: Essays in Honor of Gerald A. McCool, S.J.* (Fairfield, CT: Fairfield University Press, 1998), pp. 53–73.

- 12 David Tracy, 'The uneasy alliance reconceived: Catholic theological method, modernity and post-modernity', *Theological Studies*, 50 (1989), pp. 548–70; see also John McDade, 'Catholic theology in the post-conciliar period', in Adrian Hastings (ed.), *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After* (London: SPCK; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 422–43.
- 13 Joseph Ratzinger, *Einführung in das Christentum*, p. 32; *Introduction to Christianity* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990), p. 28.