In texts in this edition of Origins, both the board of directors of the Catholic Theological Association of America and Washington Cardinal Donald W. Wuerl, chairman of the U.S. bishops' Committee on Doctrine, mention the bishops' 1989 document, "Doctrinal Responsibilities: Approaches to Promoting Cooperation and Resolving Misunderstandings Between Bishops and Theologians."

The document appeared in Origins, Vol. 19, No. 7, the edition dated June 29, 1989.

Below is a list of the CTSA board of directors that signed the statement on these pages. Also listed is the college where they teach and their title within the CTSA, if any:

Sister Mary Ann Hinsdale, IHM, Ph.D., Boston College, president; John E. Thiel, Ph.D., Fairfield University, president-elect; Susan A. Ross, Ph.D., Loyola University in Chicago, vice president; Sister M. Theresa Moser, RSCJ, Ph.D, University of San Francisco, secretary; Jozef D. Zalot, Ph.D., College of Mount St. Joseph, treasurer; Father Bryan N. Massingale, STD, Marquette University, past president; Kristin E. Heyer, Ph.D., Santa Clara University; Michael E. Lee, Ph.D., Fordham University; Sister Judith A. Merkle, SND de N, Niagara University; Vincent J. Miller, Ph.D., University of Dayton.

The officers and board of directors of the College Theology Society also released a response to the Doctrine Committee's critique of Sister Elizabeth Johnson's book, saying, "Instead of cultivating a culture of open collaboration and mutual dialogue between bishops, theologians and the people of God," the committee's text "breeds disillusionment, fear and mistrust among younger theologians in their relation to bishops and increasing sadness and fatigue among more seasoned scholars."

Response to Doctrine Committee's Statement on *Quest for the Living God*

CTSA Board of Directors

The board of directors of the Catholic Theological Society of America has responded to the U.S. bishops' Committee on Doctrine's critical assessment of a Fordham University theology professor's popular book. The 10-member board April 8 questioned the process used by the bishops to assess the 2007 book written by St. Joseph Sister Elizabeth Johnson, suggested that the bishops misread the book's premise and expressed concern that the bishops' criticism "seems to reflect a very narrow understanding of the theological task." The doctrinal committee, chaired by Cardinal Donald W. Wuerl of Washington, said March 24 the book, "Quest for the Living God: Mapping Frontiers in the Theology of God," contained "misrepresentations, ambiguities and errors" related to the Catholic faith; the doctrinal committee statement can be found in Origins, Vol. 40, No. 43. The CTSA board of directors said the bishops failed to follow procedures established in the document "Doctrinal Responsibilities: Approaches to Promoting Cooperation and Resolving Misunderstandings Between Bishops and Theologians" approved by the bishops in 1989. The document calls for an informal conversation to discuss concerns with a theologian during any review of work. The CTSA statement also said the doctrine committee's assessment "is deficient in the way it presents Professor Johnson's work." Specifically, the theologians explained, the bishops made a "surprising leap in logic" in faulting Sister Johnson for holding that God is "unknowable" on grounds that she maintains that human words cannot completely capture divine reality. The CTSA statement follows.

We, the undersigned officers and directors of the Catholic Theological Society of America wish to comment on the statement by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops Committee on Doctrine, which was made public on March 31, 2011. Our intent here is to voice our serious concerns regarding three issues: 1) the fact that in this matter the bishops did not follow the procedures set forth in their own document "Doctrinal Responsibilities"; 2) a misreading of Professor Johnson's work in the statement; 3) the troubling implications the statement presents for the exercise of our vocation as theologians.

It is not our intention here to comment in detail on the Doctrine Committee's statement or on Professor Johnson's book, since responsible consideration deserves greater time and thought. However, we feel an urgency to respond since her book has received such a wide and favorable reception from so many

ISSN 0093-609X, Origins, CNS Documentary Service, is published weekly (except biweekly during July, August and December's last week) by Catholic News Service, 3211 4th Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017-1100. Periodical-class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Editor, Edmond Brosnan; Associate Editor, Mary Esslinger; Layout, Emily Thompson; Director of CNS, Tony Spence. Editorial: (202) 541-3284. Circulation: (202) 541-3290 - www.originsonline.com.

Subscriptions: One year, $114; two years, $199; three years, $284; foreign postage additional. Single copy: $8. Back issues: Inquire for availability and rates. Attach mailing label to change of address requests and subscription correspondence. Postmaster: Send address changes to Origins, CNS Documentary Service, 3211 4th Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017-1100.

Documentation in Origins is selected on the basis of interest and usefulness in reference to current issues. Publication does not signify endorsement by Origins or its sponsoring body, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

educated Catholic laity, including from the students many of us teach.

In sharing this pastoral concern, we are conscious of the complementary but distinct vocations of the theologian and the magisterium and are open to further conversation with the Committee on Doctrine regarding the understanding of our theological task.

1. Procedures

In 1983 "Doctrinal Responsibilities" was unanimously approved by both the Catholic Theological Society of America and the Canon Law Society of America. It was further refined by the bishops' Committee on Doctrine and formally approved by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1989.

Under the heading "ecclesial responsibilities" (which considers the responsibilities and rights of both bishops and theologians), it states: "It is inevitable that misunderstandings about the teaching of the Gospel and the ways of expressing it will arise. In such cases, informal conversation ought to be the first step toward resolution."[1]

Professor Johnson's response to the Doctrine Committee indicates that no discussion with her took place before the statement was published: "I would have been glad to enter into conversation to clarify critical points but was never invited to do so. This book was discussed and finally assessed by the committee before I knew any discussion had taken place."[2]

We are greatly disturbed that the Doctrine Committee did not follow the approved procedures of "Doctrinal Responsibilities," which advocate that an informal conversation be undertaken as a first step. Despite this procedural lapse, we applaud Professor Johnson's willingness to begin a dialogue with the bishops.

2. Misreading

We believe that the statement is deficient in the way it presents Professor Johnson's work. Professor Johnson is faulted repeatedly for holding the position that God is "unknowable" on the grounds that she maintains that our human words cannot completely capture the divine reality.

This judgment takes shape in the statement by ascribing to Professor Johnson the view that none of our words about God can be truthful (p. 8). The statement concludes that since God's divine revelation is found in truthful words, Professor Johnson presents an understanding of God that is incompatible with the Catholic tradition, "for it effectively precludes the possibility of human knowledge of God through divine revelation and reduces all names and concepts of God to human constructions" (p. 20).

This is a surprising leap in logic, not warranted by Professor Johnson's modest and quite traditionally Catholic claim that our human words cannot completely capture the divine reality. It is difficult for us to imagine that Professor Johnson, who has written so elegantly and movingly about the divine mystery throughout her career, lacks a heartfelt intention to say something modestly truthful about God based on God's revelation in Scripture and tradition.

3. The Theological Task

Finally, we are troubled that this criticism of Professor Johnson's work seems to reflect a very narrow understanding of the theological task. Theologians throughout history have promulgated the riches of the Catholic tradition by venturing new ways to imagine and express the mystery of God and the economy of salvation revealed in Scripture and tradition.

This is a Catholic style of theological reflection that very many Catholic theologians continue to practice today. The teaching of the Second Vatican Council in its Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spes*) is especially eloquent on this responsibility:

"From the beginning of its history [the church] has learned to express Christ's message in the concepts and languages of various peoples, and it has also tried to throw light on it through the wisdom of philosophers, aiming so far as was proper to suit the Gospel to the grasp of everyone as well as to the expectations of the wise. This adaptation in preaching the revealed word should remain the law of all evangelization. ... It is for God's people as a whole, with the help of the Holy Spirit, and especially for pastors and theologians, to listen to the various voices of our day, discerning them and interpreting them, and to evaluate them in the light of the divine word, so that the revealed truth can be increasingly appropriated, better understood and more suitably expressed" (No. 44).

Such endeavors, which theologians offer in service to and love for the church, should be encouraged by all in the church. To suggest that a theologian who engages in the difficult task of interpreting revelation for present times and cultures is denying the knowability of the very revelation — the Word of God — that theological reflection takes as its authoritative source, strikes us as a fundamental misunderstanding of the ecclesial vocation of the theologian.

In conclusion, we wish to affirm that Professor Johnson is a most esteemed member of our society. She is a person of the highest character, a respected theologian and teacher who pursues her theological vocation as service to the church.

Notes

1 "Doctrinal Responsibilities: Approaches to Promoting Cooperation and Resolving Misunderstandings Between Bishops and Theologians." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference (June 17, 1989), 4.

2 www.fordham.edu/academics/programs_at_fordham_/theology/faculty/elizabeth_a_johnson_/index.asp). ■