A Critical Exploration of the Distinction between Catechesis and Religious Education in the Magisterial Documents of the Catholic Church

The theology of communion as a unifying bond between catechesis and religious education

by

Leonardo Franchi

MA (Hons.), M.Ed., PGCE (Pr.), PGCE (Ac Pr.)

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) of the University of Glasgow

School of Education
College of Social Sciences
University of Glasgow
September 2013

CONTENTS

Abstract

The distinction between catechesis and religious education in Catholic schools is an important theme in contemporary Catholic educational thought. A firm and nuanced understanding of the nature of this relationship and its historical roots is essential to understanding both fields of study. The nature of this debate has been recognised by the Magisterium of the Catholic Church as crucial to the mission of the Catholic school. While Religious Education is vital to the unique identity of the Catholic school, too close an association with catechesis can lead to a blurring of distinctions. Contemporary Catholic thinking on this matter suggests the following accommodation: religious education is focussed on knowledge of Catholic thinking in theology and related cultural issues; catechesis explicitly focuses on faith development. The theology of communion (*communio*) assists Catholic educators to harmonise both concepts. Religious Education is thereby understood as a 'shared project' between catechesis and Catholic thinking on education.

Acknowledgements

I wish to record my thanks to all who have assisted me with this work. In the first place, I cannot adequately express my gratitude in words to my supervisors, Professor Robert Davis and Dr. Stephen McKinney. Their advice, helpful promptings and good humour were indispensable. Sincere thanks are offered to the staff of the former Department of Religious Education of the University of Glasgow for their contribution to my emerging ideas: Father John Bollan, Dr. Roisin Coll, Professor James Conroy, Clare Fodey, Mary Lappin, Catherine O'Hare and Leon Robinson. Colleagues such as Father John Keenan, Dr. Margery McMahon and Dr. Raymond McCluskey offered words of counsel along the way: I am indebted to them all.

Ideas emergent from my doctoral studies have given me the opportunity to present papers at international conferences in Rome, London and Glasgow. Related articles have appeared in prestigious journals such as *Religious Education, Journal of Catholic Higher Education* and *International Studies in Catholic Education.*

Finally, I express my thanks to my parents, Benedetto and Grace Franchi, for their support and encouragement.

Gratias tibi, Deus, gratias tibi

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS

Part One sets out the rationale of the work. Part Two offers some initial definitions of the key terms of 'catechesis' and 'Religious Education'. Part Three introduces the claims to originality of this thesis. Part Four explains the methodology adopted in the thesis. Part Five identifies the key sources of the thesis and analyses their claim to authority. Finally, Part Six provides an overview of the chapters.

Part One Rationale

The later years of the 20th century and early years of the 21st century was a period rich in teachings from the Magisterium of the Catholic Church on the topics of catechesis and Catholic education. The publication of three major Church documents on catechesis underlined the importance of catechesis to the contemporary Church: *Catechesi Tradendae* (Pope John Paul II 1979); *General Catechetical Directory* (Congregation for the Clergy 1971) and the *General Directory of Catechesis* (Congregation for the Clergy 1997). During the same period, the Magisterium published some key documents on Catholic education which included important sections on the nature of Religious Education in the school and the distinction between catechesis and Religious Education: *The Catholic School* (Congregation for Catholic Education 1977); *Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith* (Congregation for Catholic Education 1982); *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School* (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988); *The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium* (Congregation for Catholic Education 1997) and *Educating Together in Catholic Schools-A Shared Mission between Consecrated Persons and the Lay Faithful* (Congregation for Catholic Education 2007). In 2009 the Magisterium of the Church published the first document dedicated wholly to the subject of Catholic Religious Education: *Circular Letter to Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on Religious Education in Schools* (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009).

Contemporary Magisterial teaching on education proposes a clear distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the school. This distinction, however, is less clear when subject to critical examination. Brendan Hyde, for example, has described the close identification of catechesis with religious education in the Catholic school curriculum as a 'category mistake' (2013). The aim of the present thesis is to examine critically the relationship between the terms 'catechesis' and 'Religious Education' (or cognate terms viz 'Religious Instruction') as reflected in the relevant Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church. It is not possible to understand the nuances of the distinction without a clear understanding of the genealogy of Catholic thinking on both topics.

The present study explores the shifting conceptual frameworks of Catholic Religious Education in the dual context of a) the Church's history of catechesis and education and b) contemporary theological, catechetical and educational thought. As the term 'Religious Education' can refer to a school-subject in both Catholic and non-denominational schooling systems, the present thesis employs the term 'Catholic Religious Education' to describe the subject of Religious Education in the Catholic school. The use of this term reminds us that we are dealing with a debate rooted in the Catholic Church's theological and educational traditions. A further distinction within the Catholic tradition is reflected in the present study's use of the terms *catechetical paradigm* and *educational paradigm* with reference to two conceptual frameworks of Catholic Religious Education. The former term refers to models of Catholic Religious Education which are more heavily influenced by catechetical principles; the latter refers to models of Catholic Religious Education which are more heavily influenced by educational principles. This distinction, however, lends itself to many subtle layers of nuance.

Research questions

The following research questions set out the parameters of the study and reflect both the historical and contemporary lenses of the thesis. They are grouped below as *key* and *subsidiary* questions. Each research question informs the content of a particular chapter of the thesis.

Key questions

1. What is the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the contemporary Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church and in other writings on this theme? (Ch. 3)
2. What does the term 'Church as communion' reveal about the nature of the Catholic Church? (Ch. 4)
3. How does the application of the conceptual lens of 'Church as communion' illuminate the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education? (Ch. 5)

Subsidiary questions

1. How did catechesis evolve from the early Church until the twenty-first century? (Ch. 1)
2. How are we to understand the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as reflected in the national syllabus for Catholic Religious Education in Scotland? (Ch. 6)

The thesis answers these questions by a sustained *documentary analysis* of relevant Magisterial documents and associated academic literature.

Claims of the Thesis

The present thesis will make three claims.

1. The relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is most fully understood in a broader historical and theological context.
2. Catholic Religious Education is a dynamic partnership between the principles of catechesis and the principles of Catholic education.
3. The theology of ecclesial communion (*communio*) offers a suitable framework within which the partnership between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can be understood.

There follow some initial, or stipulative, definitions of three key terms which recur throughout the thesis: *Catholic education, catechesis* and *Religious Education*.

Part Two Stipulative Definition of Key Terms

Part Two offers some stipulative definitions of three key terms in the subject-matter of the present thesis: Catholic Education; catechesis; Religious Education

Catholic Education

The term 'Catholic education' expresses the totality of experiences, instruction, formation and support which the Church employs in order to foster the growth in virtue and wisdom of the human person (Maritain 1961; Elias 1999; Congregation for Catholic Education *passim*). Catholic education is expressed principally in a network of primary, secondary and tertiary institutions which are governed by an educational philosophy which flows from Catholic doctrine (Morey 2012). The philosophy of Catholic education is rooted in a specific anthropology: the human person is created *imago dei* and yet is subject to the effects of Original Sin (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* ((henceforth CCC) 2004: 356-361; Rausch 2012). The human person is in turn 'loved by God, with a mission on earth and a destiny that is immortal' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 76).

Catholic education is more than an institutionalised or scholastically-conditioned version of catechesis. Its scope goes beyond the world of school-based Religious Education (cf: Pope Benedict XVI 2008). Catholic education claims to promote the 'integral formation' of the whole person 'by means of a systematic and critical assimilation of culture' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1977: 26). 'Integral formation' connotes a complete education of the mind and the spirit of the human person and is an application of the relationship between faith and reason to education. In Catholic education there can be no separation between learning by means of a rigorous 'scholastic' method and the (related) formation of virtue and values (Congregation for Catholic Education 1977: 14). The shape of Catholic education ought to promote an openness to discussion and critical examination of

a range of religious and cultural ideas in the light of both faith and reason. This allows it to remain a valid and rigorous educational experience for those who do not belong to the Catholic or any religious tradition.

Catechesis

Catechesis is the term used by the Catholic Church to describe ongoing faith formation (*CCC* 2004: 5-7). This process 'which matures initial conversion to make it into a living explicit and fruitful conversion of faith' is clearly articulated in the Magisterial documents of the Catholic tradition (Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 82).

Catechesis has been traditionally understood as an 'echoing' or 'handing down' of the traditions, beliefs and practices of the believing community (*CCC* 2004:1697). The catechetical focus in the early Church was on the oral tradition as a means of communicating the message of the Gospel (Pope John Paul II 1979; Bauckham 2006). Some contemporary writers maintain that catechesis should retain this focussed definition (Groome 1980: 26; 2003: 1). Others, while aware of this tradition of orality, use 'catechesis' more as an overarching term to describe the general faith development of the believer (Devitt 1992; Kelly 2000). In this latter model, it comes close to the mode of operation of evangelisation as described by Pope John Paul II (1979) and developed by Willey et al. (2008).

Catechesis in practice can be divided into two broad pathways: first, the post-evangelisation faith formation process of those preparing to enter into full communion with the Church; second, the ongoing faith formation of the baptised members of the Church. While the former would normally operate within the framework of the *Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults* (RCIA), the latter can assume many forms: homilies during Church services or specific classes on a particular theme, for example, marriage. It also offers possibilities for more structured courses, possibly certificated, within the wider community of the Church. Whatever the context, pivotal to catechesis are the following: a) the assumption that faith in and intimacy with Christ is present (Pope John Paul II, 1979: 5); b) faith is developed and deepened in an atmosphere of ecclesial

harmony and c) the connection between faith formation and the liturgy as all catechesis has full participation, properly understood, in the liturgy as its objective (Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 1964:11). This liturgical aspect is particularly prominent in the RCIA process which culminates in the reception of the candidate into full communion with the Catholic Church at the Easter Vigil Mass.

The catechetical movement of the early 20th Century sought to re-energise catechesis in the light of scholarship in both theology and education. In the years following the Second Vatican Council, the term 'catechesis' was gradually reconfigured to refer more to the life-long faith journey of the Christian person as opposed to a term describing the approach taken in the Religious Education class in the Catholic school (Jungmann 1965; Kelly 2000). This broader vision of the scope and purpose of catechesis prompted further discussion on whether the Catholic school was a suitable locus for a model of Religious Education underpinned by a predominantly catechetical framework.

Religious Education

The definition of 'religious education' in the relevant Magisterial documents tends to be opaque. It remains a contested term both within and beyond the Christian traditions (Moran 2008: 332-341). As the focus of the present thesis is an exploration of the conceptual framework of 'Religious Education' as situated in the Catholic tradition – hence 'Catholic Religious Education' - any *definition* offered at this point is subject to further development throughout the body of the thesis.

In broad terms, definitions of 'religious education' are stretched along a continuum of meaning: at one end, religious education is closely related to, or co-terminous with forms of faith nurture (or catechesis); at the other end, religious education is a non-confessional study of religious ways of understanding the world and deals with the intersection of religion and education (cf: Smart 1973; Moran 1974; Groome 1980; Hirst 1981; Warren 1981; Boys 1981; Rossiter 1982; Groome 2003; Cunnane 2004; Buchanan 2005; Wright 2007; Rymarz 2011). A

fuller exploration of the nuances of this debate will be carried out in Chapter Three.

Bearing in mind, however, that the present thesis is concerned with a curricular subject in a *Catholic* school, it is helpful to show how the 'continuum of meaning' proposed above has been articulated in statements on the purpose of 'Religious Education' issued by official educational agencies of the Church.

In 1986, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales issued guidelines for Religious Education – *Statement on Religious Education in Schools* (in Gallagher 1986) - which reflected a model of religious education understood broadly as a study of religions and religious ways of thinking. According to this document, 'Religious education is *not primarily* concerned with maturing and developing Christian faith. Its aim is to help people to be aware of and appreciate the religious dimension of life and the way this has been expressed in religious traditions' (Gallagher 1986:12).

By way of contrast, the syllabus for Scottish Catholic School—*This is Our Faith*—published in 2011, pushed the meaning of religious education very close to Church definitions of the related term 'catechesis'. This syllabus defines Religious Education in Catholic schools as a process which both offers opportunities for evangelization and catechesis – here defined as 'the deepening of existing faith commitments among believers' (SCES 2011 a).
It needs to be borne in mind that these statements come from documents which are separated by a period of twenty-five years. During this time, the Church's position of the primary purpose of Religious Education underwent a substantial modification. This will become clear in Chapter Three. Nonetheless, the divergence in thought is striking. This juxtaposition serves as a thematic signpost to the issues at the heart of the present thesis.

Part Three The Claims to Originality

The present thesis makes five claims to originality rooted in the historical (Chapter Two), the theological (Chapter Four), the conceptual (Chapter Five) and

the applied (Chapter Six) fields. These claims are introduced below and are assessed fully in Chapter Seven.

Claim to originality: 1 (Historical)

The four selected historical contexts (Chapter Two) offer a genealogy for the catechetical and educational paradigms of Catholic Religious Education. This genealogy provides an original perspective on the evolution of the key themes of the thesis and is a wide although not comprehensive field against and within which the contemporary relationship between catechesis and Religious Education can be understood.

Claim to originality: 2 (Theological)

A second claim to originality is that the issues arising from the review of literature (Chapter Four) are considered using a clearly articulated theological hermeneutic. The thesis claims that reflection on the spirituality of *communio* enables Catholic Religious Education to be understood as a 'shared project' between catechesis and education.

Claim to originality: 3 (Conceptual - a.)

The third claim to originality is the use of 'shared project' to capture the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education. This term applies the theology of communion (see above) to the religious formation of young people. It anchors Catholic Religious Education within the intellectual and pastoral life of the Church.

Claim to originality: 4 (Conceptual - b.)

A fourth claim to originality is the use of 'integral religious formation' as a descriptor of the Catholic school's role in the religious formation of the Catholic pupils. This is a suitable conceptual framework to describe the Catholic school's contribution to the 'shared project' as described above.

Claim to originality: 5 (Applied)

A fifth claim to originality is case-study approach of the thesis in Chapter Six. One newly written and Holy See-approved national syllabus for Catholic Religious Education (*This is our Faith*) is explored in the light of the findings of the thesis. This is not a full study of the syllabus but an exploration of TIOF's articulation of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Part Four Methodology of the Thesis

Part Four explores the scope of the thesis before explaining why documentary analysis is the most appropriate method for this study.

Scope of the study

First, the present thesis is a critical exploration of the evolution of specific religious and educational ideas in the Catholic Christian tradition. The research is located in a set of wider frames of reference, notably the history of education and the contribution of theological investigation to developments in catechesis and Religious Education. It is neither a general history of education nor a history of Catholic education. This observation notwithstanding, the study of the history of catechesis in Chapter Two provides a critical and reflective examination of selected historical threads which remain pertinent to contemporary debates on the aims and purposes of both catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Second, this thesis brings together a cluster of ideas and movements which are most fully understood in the wider historical narratives which integrate the history of education with more general histories. This approach is in line with McCulloch's assessment of the value of the history of education as an heuristic tool in which an 'historical appreciation' informs an understanding of education and of the prospects of educational reform in the twenty-first century (McCulloch 2000:4).

Third, the study of the impact of education absorbs and contextualises the religious, social and cultural shifts of any given period. In this respect the present thesis agrees with Bowen's defence of the study of the history of education from an educational and historical viewpoint. Dealing with education, Bowen claims that the study of education 'carries almost all of its past with it into the present, even if this past rests in rather covert assumptions, practices, attitudes and beliefs' (Bowen 1975: xvii-xviii). With reference to historical process, Bowen shows that the historian is charged with clarifying and explaining the past in order to make the present intelligible (Bowen 1975: xvii-xviii).

Bowen's assessment applies to the Magisterial documents on catechesis and education in that the selected documents are part of a broader historical narrative of Catholic teaching on catechesis and education. The evolution of contemporary teaching frameworks is understood more fully in this context. Alongside this appreciation of the importance of history, Bowen's statement is aligned with the importance in Catholic theology of appreciating how the 'development of doctrine' – a theological term made famous by John Henry Newman – informs contemporary theological debate (Newman 1878/2003: chs 2 and 3).

Finally, the purpose of this research is multi-faceted in keeping with Cohen and Manion's key features of historical research in education (1994: 45f). The thesis aims to shed new light on issues which remain unresolved, provide guidelines for future policy and, most importantly, deal with data which already exists in official publications – understood in this thesis as the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church - which are open to study and critical analysis.

The Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church hence provide the terrain – or key field of activity - of the study (Aldrich 2000: 66). The documents are the written record of a teaching deemed authoritative by those within the Catholic tradition but not accepted as authoritative by those who are not part of the Catholic community.

Documentary analysis

This thesis applies 'documentary analysis' to the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church. This is the approach best suited to assessing the body of knowledge contained in the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church and hence allows said documents to be critiqued within the broader flux of ideas and movements which inform the Catholic mind.[1]

Documentary analysis would normally be applied to various forms of public and private records and thus allow these records to serve as evidence for the work of the scholar (McCulloch 2004: 1). These records 'provide potent evidence of continuity and change in ideals and practices, in private and in the public arena' (McCulloch 2004: 16-17). Crucially for the present thesis, documentary analysis allows texts to be considered in a proper historical context (McCulloch 2004: 6). Furthermore, they present the findings of a scholarly tradition in specific academic disciplines to contemporary scholars and, in so doing, offer opportunities for critical engagement with this academic body of knowledge (Bowen 2009). The subject-matter of the present thesis makes this method a suitable domain for the study.

It is important at the outset to recognise the limitations of documentary analysis as a methodological tool. Chapter Seven will offer a comprehensive study of this. With regard to the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church, a key limitations is that the exercise of the Magisterium remains a contested concept for many Catholic Christians (cf: Sullivan 1985; Wrenn 1991;Wrenn and Whitead 1997). To address this, it necessary first to locate the Magisterial documents in the broader question of how authority is articulated in the Catholic tradition,

Part Five An Exploration of the Sources of the Thesis

As the Church's Magisterial documents are the primary sources for this study, it is necessary to explain why this is the case. This is not an exercise in *apologia* but an attempt to explain the Catholic Church's self-understanding as the authentic

[1] 'Catholic mind' is shorthand for the Catholic intellectual tradition's findings in the fields of philosophy and theology. See Schall (2008).

guardian and teacher of a body of knowledge (*Lumen Gentium* 1965: 8; Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 2000). In order to contextualise this issue, Part Five explores the Church's 'claim to truth' and asks what this means for the Catholic scholar. Following this there will be a closer look at the primary and secondary sources.

The Claim to Truth

The definition and limits of authority in the Church is contested (cf: Kung 1973; Curran 2006). Indeed, in the educational and cultural climate of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, any appeal to authority in both the civil and the religious sphere needs justifying, not proclaiming (cf. Dewey 1938/86: chapter 7; Arendt 1968). To address this, the thesis has scope for a limited discussion on the claimed authoritative nature of the Magisterial documents.

The Catholic Church claims to possess the 'fullness of God's historical revelation of Himself' (Schmaus 1968/1995: 227-229). The use of the term 'revelation' suggests that truth may not always be obvious to the human mind (CCC 124; 890). In this line of thought, some form of authority is necessary in order to guide people to this truth. Alongside this is the notion that truth *qua* truth has authority over the mind and intellect and, therefore, has no need of an external validating authority (Sullivan 1985). The Catholic Church addresses this seeming conundrum by teaching that both reason (*ratio*) and faith (*fides*) offer a complementary pathway to understanding the order of creation (CCC 36-38; 50). Hence it can be claimed that while a *divinely revealed* truth has no need of human endeavours in order to retain this perceived truthfulness, human beings, with their limited horizons, require the guidance and direction of others. In the Catholic mind, the proper exercise of authority – as opposed to the exercise of power - is understood as an *act of service* towards the other both in the religious and the civil sphere (CCC 876; 2040; 2235).

The exercise of this teaching authority—known as the Magisterium—is manifested in the published teachings of the Holy See. The Magisterium is understood principally as pertaining to the teaching office of the College of

Bishops (Second Vatican Council *Lumen Gentium* 1964: 21; Orsy 1987). Some have claimed that in the first millennium, and beyond, there was a congruence between the scholarly office of theologian and the pastoral office of Bishop which brought about a (parallel) scholarly and pastoral magisterium related to the theologian and to the bishop respectively (Sullivan 1985). While this reading of history has been rejected by the Magisterium, it does allow us to hold in high regard the office of the theologian/scholar working at the heart of the Church (Figueiredo 2001; Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 1990). Indeed, more recently, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* has claimed that the Magisterium is exercised 'with the help of the works of theologians and spiritual authors' (*CCC* 2033).

Reflection on the bishop-theologian relationship offers a helpful lens for this discussion:

> Bishops and theologians have distinct callings and must respect one another's particular competence, lest the Magisterium reduce theology to a mere repetitive science or theologians presume to substitute the teaching office of the Church's pastors (International Theological Commission 2012: 37).

The nature of the bishop-theologian relationship is an essential element in the Church's desire to explore and explain its *sensus fidelium* (International Theological Commission 2012: 35). While the International Theological Commission (2012) refers to the role of the 'theologian', its arguments can also be applied to the work of the Catholic scholar. In this context, the scholar who *freely* chooses to work within the tradition of Catholic Christianity voluntarily abides by the claim of the Church to speak with authority. As stated above, the Catholic scholar seeks to develop the received tradition in the light of scholarship under the guidance of a Church which claims authority to teach. As such, he/she does not place his work and research findings in the public domain with the express intention of placing said findings in opposition to the essential features of the Catholic tradition.

Of course, too close an identification between a scholar and a religiously-conditioned worldview could be seen as inimical to the accepted notion of

academic freedom which is intrinsic to the modern university's 'calling to pursue truth' (Altbach 2001: 206).

While the scholar, rightly, values the academic freedom to research freely, the Magisterium puts the collective conscience first. In this light, it is important to explore how scholarship, the work of the intellect roaming within and across the disciplines, can be a suitable partner for a teaching office (Magisterium) which claims authority from God?

To address this concern, it is important to note that scholarship is exemplified not just by expert knowledge of the field of knowledge in a particular discipline but by distinct contributions to the development of knowledge by way of both publications and teaching (Boyer 1997). In the Catholic mind, the scholar is the *servant* of the wider Church community: Catholic scholarship, properly understood, supports the Magisterium through its intellectual work (Schonborn 2008). As Catholic Christians believe in the necessary link between faith and good works, (cf. *James 2*:21-22) an understanding of 'good works' can be broadened to include not just the performance of acts of practical charity towards our neighbour but also the work of the intellect. The aim of intellectual work is hence to broaden the field of human knowledge through research and scholarship and thus help others to understand what may be obscure to them. Clearly, the work of the intellect is not an optional accessory for the Christian, although the intensity of this work will vary depending on aptitude. If the Church is understood as a contributor to (or creator of) a culture originating in a system of ideas and beliefs, it follows that a Christian must view the work of the intellect, and his or her own continual intellectual formation, as integral to the correct living of the Christian life (Haldane 2008).

In the field of Catholic theology, the work of the intellect is one of clarification, investigation and analysis of Church teaching and is central to the development of a living faith community (cf. *Book of Sirach* (*Ecclesiasticus)* chapters 39:1-10). As theology is at the heart of the Church, the work of the intellect is at the heart of

theology: they cannot be separated.[2] The relationship between the scholar and theology is found in the common endeavour to understand and explain the truth of the human condition in the light of Revelation. This applies particularly to the Catholic theologian who is called to work in communion with the Magisterium (Pope Francis 2013: 36; Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 1990: 6). Building on this, it can be claimed that *all* Catholic scholars – not just theologians but also academics in the field of catechesis and Catholic education - are working in *communion* with the Magisterium in order to explain and clarify the mind of the Church on these topics.

When seen in this light, Catholic scholarship occupies a unique locus at the heart of Church. It provides a form of intellectual energy which works alongside the Magisterium in order to shape the received faith tradition in a way fitting to the times. It is not in opposition to the Magisterium but shares with it a common grammar of faith.

Primary sources

The primary sources for this thesis are the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church on catechesis and education from the second half of the twentieth century until the present day.

The term *Magisterial documents* refers to a range of authoritative documents from within the Catholic tradition. There is a five-fold level of authority in Church teaching (Orsy 1987: 53).

1) Infallible teaching
2) Non-infallible Papal teaching
3) Papal approved declarations by Offices of the Holy See
4) Declarations of Offices of the Holy See

[2] Pope Benedict XVI highlights the distinction between the scholar and the Magisterium in the Introduction to his work *Jesus of Nazareth* in which he makes it clear that this volume is an expression of his own 'personal search' and is not an exercise of the Magisterium (2007 c: xxiii).

5) General Pronouncements by Bishops and Bishops' Conferences

In specific terms, the operation of authority in the Church is a function of the office of the Bishop of Rome (*Code of Canon Law* 1983: 360). The Bishop of Rome is assisted in this mission by the Synod of Bishops which, in union with him, preserves and develops the Catholic faith (*Code of Canon Law* 1983: 342). An Ecumenical Council viz. Vatican II, is the 'highest' expression of a Synod of Bishops. Finally, the Bishop of Rome is assisted by the Roman Curia – the Civil Service of the Catholic Church - which performs functions by the authority of the Bishop of Rome for the good of the Church (John Paul II 1998 b; *Code of Canon Law* 1983: 360). The Roman Curia includes both the *Congregation for the Clergy*, which traditionally dealt with catechetical matters**,** and the *Congregation for Catholic Education*, which deals with matters relating to Catholic education and Catholic schools.[3] These Congregations are responsible for the production of the key sources in this study. [4]

The operational model described above seems to reflect a highly juridical and top-down structure of authority. In practice, however, there are levels of authority related to the difference between declarations of dogma and teachings on pastoral matters (*Lumen Gentium* 1964: 25). For example, the divinity of Jesus is a dogma binding on all Catholics but a Catholic would be free to say that he/she does not agree with the rationale for the existence of Catholic schools. Church teaching on the mode of operation of catechesis and religious education cannot be properly described as an expression of dogmatic theology.

In this light, it is not an easy task to assign a level of authority to a particular document (Orsy1987). Furthermore, an additional challenge arises in that the key

[3] The on-line profile of the *Congregation for the Clergy* explains fully its threefold function, including its catechetical function: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cclergy/documents/rc_con_cclergy_pro_31051999_en.html. The on-line profile of the *Congregation for Catholic Education* sets out the scope of this Congregation's work. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_20051996_profile_en.html

[4] In 2013, Pope Benedict XVI transferred responsibility for catechesis to the *Pontifical Council for Promoting the New Evangelisation* (2013). It is too soon to evaluate the consequences of this shift.

documents come from different offices of the Roman Curia and it is not clear how these relate to each other. It is important to note at this point that the multiple-authorship of the selected Magisterial documents across the three decades could be construed as a limitation of the sources: this important issue will be explored fully in Chapter Seven.

In the Catholic mind, pastoral teaching on catechesis and education is the fruit of reflection on the Church's body of doctrine. Relevant teachings in this area should be received with 'respect and gratitude, but do not require an intellectual assent in the strictest sense' (Ocariz 2012). Nevertheless they retain 'operational authority' as the expression of the Catholic mind and are not to be regarded simply as mere *contributions* to a wider scholarly debate (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 1990: 24-31).

The first chronologically-ordered table below illustrates the different provenance of the key documents on catechesis and education published since the Second Vatican Council. The second table exemplifies the complexity of awarding, or even suggesting, an appropriate level of 'authority' to particular documents and teachings issued by the Magisterium. The range of possibilities offered is itself a key factor in the ongoing debate on the most appropriate conceptual framework for Catholic Religious Education: the lack of a clear model in this field has not been an insignificant factor in the evolution of the debate. Chapter Three will explore this more fully.

Title and date	**Source**
Gravissimum Educationis (1965)	Ecumenical Council (Vatican II)
General Catechetical Directory (1971)	Congregation for the Clergy
The Catholic School (1977)	Congregation for Catholic Education
Catechesi Tradendae (1979)	Apostolic Exhortation based on a Synod of Bishops
Lay Catholics in Schools-Witnesses to Faith (1982)	Congregation for Catholic Education
The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School (1988)	Congregation for Catholic Education

General Directory for Catechesis (1997)	Congregation for the Clergy
The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium (1997)	Congregation for Catholic Education
Circular Letter to Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on Religious Education in Schools (2009)	Congregation for Catholic Education
Educating Together in Catholic Schools –A Shared Mission between Consecrated Persons and the Lay Faithful (2007)	Congregation for Catholic Education

The following table applies the five-fold taxonomy (see above) to the relevant documents. (NB This is the researcher's suggestion and is not the final word on the subject.)

Title and date	**Level of authority**
Gravissimum Educationis (1965)	Papal approved declarations by Offices of the Holy See /Declaration of Offices of the Holy See
General Catechetical Directory (1971)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
The Catholic School (1977)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
Catechesi Tradendae (1979)	Non-infallible Papal teaching
Lay Catholics in Schools (1982)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School (1988)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
General Directory for Catechesis (1997)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium (1997)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
Circular Letter to Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on Religious Education in Schools (2009)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;
Educating Together in Catholic Schools – A Shared Mission between Consecrated person and the Lay Faithful (2007)	Declarations of Offices of the Holy See;

Another primary source used is *This is Our Faith* (SCES 2011a). It is suggested here that the status of this National Syllabus for Catholic Religious Education in Scotland would be governed by 'General Pronouncements by Bishops and Bishops' Conferences' in that the syllabus is the work of an agency of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Scotland. The granting of a *recognitio* by the

Holy See to *This is Our Faith* accords this Scottish syllabus considerable weight in matters pertaining to doctrinal authority (SCES 2011a). This question will explored more deeply in Chapter Six.

Secondary Sources

In this section it is important to distinguish between the 'Catholic scholar' and the scholar who is a Catholic. This is an important indicator of positionality (Chavez 2008). The former term refers to scholars whose academic work is primarily concerned with making intelligible the doctrinal and cultural deposit of the Catholic Church to both the internal and external audience. The latter refers to scholars who bring their insights to a range of scholarly issues - which may not be directly linked to the life of the Church - from a position of faith. A binary distinction as here implied does not reflect adequately the fluidity between both positions. In the context of the present thesis, the writer would see himself as a 'Catholic scholar': see Chapter Seven for more on the question of positionality.

In keeping with the nuanced picture of the relationship between the Church and the academic world, it is important to explore how the exercise of academic scholarship articulates with the teachings of the Magisterium of the Church (Sullivan 1985; Orsy 1987).

The selected secondary sources reflect the wider academic debate on education and theology. The thesis, especially Chapter Two, is underpinned by two important academic texts which provide much of the primary research material examined in Chapter Two: James Bowen's three volume *History of Western Education* and the ten-volume *History of the Church,* edited by Hubert Jedin and John Dolan (see Bibliography for details). The former does not have an overt Catholic underpinning but offers a considered critical conspectus of key developments in education since classical times. The latter is a work produced by a range of 'Catholic scholars' as defined above. Prominent thinkers in the debates over the nature of catechesis and Catholic Religious education are the key secondary sources for the study, especially Chapter Three. These include the following key figures in the field of Catholic education: Josef Jungmann, Eugene

Kevane, Thomas Groome and Graeme Rossiter. All four are examples of Catholic writers who have contributed valuable insights to the key themes of the present thesis. Furthermore, all would see themselves as part of the wider and diverse academic community of Catholic scholars with its range of varying ecclesiological and cultural perspectives. Certainly the works of these authors on the specific themes of catechesis and education place them firmly within what we can call the 'Catholic intellectual tradition'. [5]

In summary, and for the purposes of the present thesis, the Magisterial documents on catechesis and education possess a non-infallible authority within the Catholic faith tradition. The fruits of scholarship from 'non-Magisterial' Catholic academic sources are part of the broader intellectual life of the Church and serve as reflections of, and commentaries on, the Magisterial teaching

Part Six Overview of the thesis

Part Six summarises the content of each chapter.

Chapter One Introduction

Chapter One (the Introduction) sets out the rationale of the thesis. The key research themes are outlined and there is an initial definition of the key terms of *Catholic education*, *catechesis* and *Religious Education*. The five claims to originality are introduced. A section on methodology sets out the important methodological features of the thesis. The primary sources of the thesis and their claim to authority are analysed. Finally, there is an overview of each chapter and an identification of the subsidiary research question for each chapter.

Chapter Two The Genealogy of the Catechetical and Educational Paradigms of Religious Education

[5] 'The Catholic intellectual tradition manifests its catholicity-its striving for wholeness-whenever the university encourages all its members to see their research, study, student formation and administrative services in the context of the largest questions that can be asked about human life and the world in which we live' (Boston College 2010).

Key question: How did catechesis evolve from the early Church until the twenty-first century?

Chapter Two offers a *meta-history* of key developments in catechetical thinking within the Catholic tradition. Four historical contexts have been selected for this study. Chapter Two offers a fresh and challenging interpretation of the existing sources in a manner consonant with the key theme of the thesis. The picture emerging from this chapter illuminates the current issues and serves as an historical reference point for the evolution of contemporary debates.

Four periods in history have been selected as historical contexts for this thesis. Each period offers historical material which illustrates the genealogy of the catechetical and educational paradigms of Catholic Religious Education. These are:

- Catechesis in the Apostolic and Patristic Ages
- Catechesis in the Middles Ages
- The Influence of the Catholic Reform on Catechesis
- The Catechetical Renewal of the Early Twentieth Century

An extensive use of historical detail would interrupt the flow of the text and it was decided at an early stage in the writing of the thesis that particular historical details would be better suited to footnotes although some important material, of necessity, remains in the body of the text.

Chapter Three Catechesis and Religious Education in the Contemporary Church

Key question: What is the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education in the contemporary Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church and in other writings on this theme?

Chapter Three is a sustained critical review of the Magisterial documents and wider academic literature dealing with the distinction between catechesis and

Catholic Religious Education. The analysis of the changing nature of an intellectual position is traced through a set of documents located within a specific time-frame. The thesis claims that in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century a major shift in understanding occurs in Catholic thinking on catechesis and Religious Education. This shift stands in contrast to thinking in earlier times.

The problematic nature of understanding the relationship between the concepts of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education will be set out systematically. Part One explores key developments in catechesis and in Catholic Religious Education in the late twentieth century. Part Two looks at the response of the Magisterium to this new thinking in catechesis. Part Three explores the emerging educational paradigm of Catholic Religious Education. Part Four analyses models of Catholic Religious Education which are influenced by catechesis. Part Five explores the Magisterium's response to debates on the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Chapter Four The Church as Communion: A Hermeneutical Key

Key Question: What does the term 'Church as Communion' (*communio*) reveal about the nature of the Catholic Church?

Chapter Four provides a conceptual key which addresses the issues raised in the Chapter Three. Ecclesiology – the study of the nature of the Church - provides the terrain on which the debate takes place. Chapter Four draws on recent developments in ecclesiology which have proposed the 'Church as communion' as a suitable model for the present age. What this ecclesiological model reveals about the nature of the Catholic school and the topics of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education will be integral to the argument of the thesis (see Chapter Five) and will serve as driver of some initial conclusions to broader questions arising from the research themes.

There are four sections in this chapter. Part One explores the consolidation of the 'political-society' model of Church in the years after the First Vatican Council. Part Two explores the emergence of the ecclesiological thinking beginning in the

early twentieth century. Part Three looks at the ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council and the twin forces of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento.* Part Four explores the emergence/recovery of 'Church as Communion' in the years following the Second Vatican Council.

Chapter Five Catechesis, Catholic Religious Education and *Communio*

Key question: How does the application of the conceptual lens of 'the Church as Communion' (*communio*) inform the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education?

Chapter Five is a deeper analysis and interpretation of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as viewed through the prism of theology. This chapter draws from existing theological thought to offer a lens through which the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can be understood. Chapter Five claims that reflection on the Church understood as communion sheds light on the correct ordering of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. This claim is explored over three parts. Part One explores the challenging nature of the Catholic Church's relationship with pluralism. Part Two argues that the application of the 'spirituality of communion' to catechesis and Catholic Religious Education allows for both concepts to be understood as related but distinct components of a broader process of 'integral religious formation'. Part Three argues that Catholic Religious Education is a 'shared project' between catechesis and the principles of Catholic education.

Chapter Six *This Is Our Faith*: a critical exploration of one local model of Catholic Religious Education

Key question: How is the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education reflected in the national syllabus for Religious Education in Catholic schools in Scotland?

Chapter Six applies the concept of 'shared project' to the document *This is our Faith* (TIOF) and explores how this major document reflects the workings of the 'shared project'. Part One explores the relationship between the Catholic system of education and the state in Scotland. Part Two considers how TIOF offers support to the 'shared project' in that its dependence on catechetical principles ensures that Catholic Religious Education is rooted in an orthodox body of knowledge. Part Three explores how TIOF's dependence on catechetical theory challenges the Magisterium's call for catechesis and Religious Education to remain conceptually distinct fields of operation.

Chapter Seven Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter Seven of the thesis will present the research outcomes related to the *key* and s*ubsidiary* research questions. It explores the strengths and limitations of the methodology of the thesis and assesses the claims to originality. It offers two concrete recommendations designed to develop the 'shared project'. The thesis concludes with some areas for future research in the field.

CHAPTER TWO

THE GENEALOGY OF THE CATECHETICAL AND EDUCATIONAL PARADIGMS OF CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Introduction

Chapter Two will mine the historical sources of Catholic thinking on catechesis and education in order to provide a critical study of selected historical contexts as a way to illuminate the contemporary scene. While these historical periods have porous boundaries, they offer a working structure in support of the core argument of the present thesis. Chapter Two will show that the development of Catholic teaching on catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is an example of the interaction of change and continuity: each historical period, in response to the changing social, cultural and political milieux, reshapes the tradition it has inherited. While the present chapter does not claim to offer a global evaluation of the educational, theological and political arguments of the selected periods, it does claim that the aftershocks of these debates remain pertinent to the configuration of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education today.

Any historical study of catechetical and educational ideas must take into account the relevant social and cultural contexts. Mass education as commonly understood today would be a concept unknown to those who lived before the nineteenth century. The limited involvement of 'the child' in education and the nature of the child's place in society at this time militate against drawing exact parallels between particular points in history and contemporary attitudes to education and schooling (cf. Bunge (Ed.) 2001; Bakke 2005; Horn and Martens 2009).

Chapter Two uses the terms *catechetical paradigm* and *educational paradigm* of Catholic Religious Education (see Chapter One - Rationale) as an heuristic tool to identify how the contemporary *distinction* between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education—as presently understood in the Magisterial documents of the

Church—was reflected in times when this conceptual distinction was not recognised.

Chapter Two will argue that the evidence from the selected historical periods suggests strongly the predominance of the *catechetical paradigm*. This approach is rooted in the theological and cultural resources of Catholic Christianity. Alongside this, it will be argued that an *educational paradigm* has evolved in response to dialogue with wider thinking. To demonstrate this relationship between the *catechetical* and *educational* paradigms, four selected historical contexts reflect how key landmarks in the history of Christian thought have been applied in the context of the Church's teaching on catechesis and education.

The first historical context, *Catechesis in the Apostolic and Patristic Ages*, covers the period from Apostolic times until the time of St. Augustine of Hippo (AD 354-430). As St. Augustine's writings on catechesis and educational matters form the first cohesive 'philosophy' of Christian education, it is reasonable to posit his life and work as a key pivot in the development of broader Christian educational ideas (Kevane 1964:24; Topping 2012).

The second historical context, *Catechesis in the Middle Ages*, covers a time when major and long-lasting developments in Christian educational thought took place. This section begins with the influence of monastic ideals on education and explores the influence of wider thinking on educational and catechetical thought up to the age of Reformation (*c.*16th century).

The third historical context is *The Council of Trent and its influence on catechesis*. The Council of Trent (1545-1563) reaffirmed the principles of Catholic thought in the face of opposition from the Reformed Christian communities of Europe. The key reforms set in motion by the Council prepared the ground for the rise of religious orders dedicated to education and provided the foundational blocks for modern educational structures and curricula.

The fourth historical context is the *Twentieth Century Catechetical Renewal*. The 20th Century saw increased demands for reform in Catholic thinking in Scripture,

liturgy and catechesis. This multi-pronged movement drew on broader educational research and was a crucial moment in the Church's ongoing reform in catechesis. This prepared the ground for the reforms in catechesis and Catholic Religious Education which came to prominence in the final quarter of the twentieth century.

Historical Context One: Catechesis in the Apostolic and Patristic Ages

Owing to the paucity of relevant primary texts on the question of children's religious formation in the period available to us, an element of selection is inevitable. These texts have to considered in the context of the wider patristic corpus where the Church Fathers and other elements of early Christian history are examples of a perceived theological freshness and energy.

An overarching methodological question arising from the continued study of the history of Christianity is whether it is appropriate to view the life of the Church at certain periods as normative for future generations. If so, Christian belief and practice would remain rooted in what was believed and practised at particular points in time and hence restrict theology and any form of Christian studies to the purely historical forensic domain (Jedin 1980). If it is accepted that Christian doctrine and practice develop over the ages, then the study of the thought of the early Church offers valuable insights into the emerging Christian community's self-understanding and praxis (Newman 1878/2003: chs 2 and 3; Evans 2005).

The present section will claim that the *catechetical paradigm* of early Christian education as here presented had three distinct - albeit broad - stages of development. The gradually emergent *educational paradigm* did not replace the *catechetical paradigm* but underpinned and reshaped it. Part One explores the moral and pastoral formation of the child in early Christianity. Part Two explores the evidence for catechetical processes for the child in the sacramental life of the Church. Part Three considers the implications of the growing encounter with Greek thought and the emerging 'philosophy of Christian Education'.

Part 1 The Moral and Pastoral Formation of the Child in Early Christianity

For the first Christians the key 'educational' question was one of evangelisation: how to pass on their faith in the risen Jesus to those around them (Matthew 28:19-20). Indeed, all Christian thinking on education is rooted in and developed from this broader call to evangelise (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009). The extant Christian writings from the first five centuries AD refer broadly to the question of children's human and religious formation (Castle 1954; Marmion 1986). They do not offer precise and practical details of this process beyond the restating of the direct responsibility of parents to rear their children in good living (cf: St. John Chrysostom in Laistner 1967: 30). This lack of evidence as such is not insignificant as it suggests that in early Christianity catechesis was part of the home-centred nurturing of the child and the clear responsibility of the blood-family assisted by the wider community of believers (Marmion 1986). The contemporary understanding of Christian education as a process involving a range of dedicated establishments would have been unrecognisable to the early Church.

There is a congruence between the Jewish notion of children's religious formation - a process centred on the home and the synagogue with no division between the notion of education and religious learning - and the approach adopted in the early Church (Deuteronomy 4:9; Grundy-Volf 2001). The Jewish 'school system', as organised in the first century AD, was a way of maintaining religious and cultural identity in the face of the perceived attractions of Greek philosophy (Strange 2006). It is reasonable to suggest that the children of the first Jewish converts to Christianity continued to attend these schools and received supplementary 'instruction' on the Christian Gospel at other times. This would align with the broader evidence that early Christians of Jerusalem continued to adhere to the 'inherited forms of piety' (Baus 1980 a: 83) by attending Temple worship before 'breaking bread in their homes' (Acts 2: 46).

The Gospel evidence on the place of children in the early Church community is scant but clear. Any discussion of 'children' in the New Testament needs to be aware of both figurative and literal use of the term. Nonetheless, children are included in the groups of people who heard Jesus preach (cf. John 6:9; Matthew

14:21); they are held up as 'models' of humility (Matthew 18-1-3); children are included, it seems, in the first missionary journeys (Acts 21: 1-6). Similarly, in the writings of St Paul there is clear evidence of the importance placed on the family's responsibility for the faith-formation of the young (cf. Colossians 3:20-21; Ephesians 6:1-4). While the term 'children' is clearly used in the Gospels in a figurative sense (cf. Mark 9:36-37), the available evidence suggests that there was little recognition of the need to have specific processes for children's catechesis (Horn and Martens 2009). This is not necessarily evidence of a neglect of the role of the child: on the contrary, children in the Gospel are depicted as models of fidelity and receptiveness to the message of Jesus (cf: Matthew 18:1-5; 19:14-15). By the late first century the inherited 'nurture' approach to education (from Judaism) had a distinct Christian flavour (cf. *I Clement* chapter 1; *Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians; Didache*). This nurture approach was pastoral in nature and characterised by eager impulses to foster and nurture faith in the context of the liturgical life of the believing community. It was a Christian interpretation of the Greek concept of *paideia* (Jaeger 1961/1977; Feldmeier 2012). This is an early and important example of what the present thesis calls the *catechetical paradigm o*f religious education.

By the late 3rd century, it is possible to speak of a Christian 'pastoral theology' for children (Guroian 2001:69). The key figure in this development, St. John Chrysostom (347-407 AD), argued that the raising of the child in virtue was the true end of parenthood and education (St. John Chrysostom in Laistner 1967 para 19). As Jewish education required study of the Torah, so St. John Chrysostom placed the study of the Christian Scriptures at the heart of the educational and nurture process (St. John Chrysostom in Laistner 1967 para. 39f). What makes St John Chrysostom's intervention crucial is that he encouraged the father of the family to use *story* as a medium to inculcate virtue in the child and, significantly, suggested the adaptation of Gospel passages to the age and intellectual stage of the listener (St. John Chrysostom in Laistner 1967 para. 39f). It is possible that St John Chrysostom was aware of and sought to apply St. Basil the Great's (330-

379) four principles of reading to Christian texts.[6] Whatever the truth of this, the focus on educational 'method' is a modest sign of a Christian engagement with the human person's developmental needs in the matter of religious formation. It is an initial and important stage in the Christian community's attempts to think through its educational methods. St. John Chrysostom's contribution is an indication of an emerging *educational paradigm* which moves in parallel with and is supportive of the established and predominant *catechetical paradigm.*

Such considered focus on the methods required to promote the moral and pastoral formation of young Christians was soon considered alongside their perceived sacramental needs. This led to the second stage in the development of the *catechetical paradigm.*

Part 2 The Child and the Sacramental Life of the Christian Community

The limited evidence available to us suggests that the religious formation of the child in early Christianity was integrated broadly into the overall process for the formation and instruction undergone by the wider body of catechumens. The *catechetical paradigm* was the principal conceptual framework at this time. Initiation into the sacramental and community life of the Church was at the heart of the process. There is little to suggest that particular processes or strategies tailored specifically to the needs of children were in use. Indeed, the lack of concrete historical evidence on the method and content of children's catechesis suggests that the Church continued to view the formation of children primarily as a matter for the family assisted by the wider Church community. The liturgy would have acted as a living curriculum through which Christian doctrine would have been explicated in the context of the Church as a worshipping community. Liturgical catechesis allowed children to play a full part as *lectors* (readers) and singers in choir (Bakke 2005: 226f; 252; Horn and Martens 2009: 296-297). The debates over the desirability of infant baptism and rise of the catechumenate offer

[6] Basil's four principles for reading poetry as charted by Schwab (2012: 153-155) are: the hermeneutical principle; the principle of selective reading; the principle of moral development and the principle of precaution.

further examples of the Christian community's broadening of the processes of Christian formation and reflect the ongoing *catechetical paradigm.*

It is hard to ascertain the exact date of origin of the practice of infant baptism. The New Testament tells us that many households were baptised (Acts 2:38; 16:15; 16:33; 18:8). This suggests strongly the possibility of children being baptised. Later accounts of the development of the catechumenate and the Easter Vigil ceremonies in the late 2nd early 3rd century state that children were baptised during the Easter Vigil along with their parents or another member of the extended family who would answer the priest's questions on the child's behalf (Baus 1980 b). In the third century, St Cyprian of Carthage (exact dates unknown) reinforces the tradition of infant baptism which, he states, 'is to be even more observed in respect of infants and newly-born persons' (Cyprian of Carthage Epistle 58:6). On the other hand, Tertullian favoured the delaying of baptism until the child was older (Tertullian on-line *On Baptism* ch.xviii).

As the Christian community expanded throughout the Mediterranean basin and beyond in the first two centuries AD, its approach to the 'religious education' of the community adapted to meet these new and challenging circumstances. The catechumenate was the Church's response to the increased numbers of adults who wanted to become Christian. As the demand for the baptism of infants belonging to these families increased, adult baptism became the exception, and not the norm (Sloyan 1958; Horn and Martens 2009). Broadly speaking, the catechumenate was a three year process of examination and instruction - a 'marriage of educational and ritual processes' (McGrail 2007: 7) - which culminated in the sacrament of Baptism at the Easter Vigil ceremonies (*Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, 17 and 21* on-line). The catechumenate - as evidenced by St Cyril of Jerusalem's 4th century catechetical lectures - was in itself a rigorous and intellectually demanding preparation for baptism (Cyril of Jerusalem in Yarnold (Ed.) 2000). While children were baptised at these ceremonies with the adults, it is unclear from the available sources just how the catechumenate was adapted, if at all, to the varying needs of the children of the early Christian communities (Baus 1980 b; Vogt 1980; Strange 2006). Once again, the paucity of available evidence

suggests that the ongoing family, community and liturgical life of the Church was the sum of the catechetical processes for children. [7]

To conclude this section, as the Church grew in numbers, the processes of faith formation for all Christians, including children, continued to be underpinned by the *catechetical paradigm*. In the late 2nd century, however, there emerged initial signs of a development in Christian attitudes towards other ways of thinking. The encounter with Greek philosophy become foundational to Christianity's identity and had significant implications for its catechetical and educational actions (Pope Benedict XVI 2006 a).

Part 3 The Encounter with Greek Thought and the Emerging 'Philosophy of Christian Education'

The encounter with Greek philosophy was the seed of Catholic Christianity's proclamation of the partnership between faith and reason (Pope John Paul 1998 a). This is when a 'philosophy of Christian education' - which is both catechetical and educational - begins to emerge.

The early 'Christian apologists' were willing to engage in dialogue on theological and cultural issues.[8] Their *educational method* was to set out clear, unbiased (in their minds) presentations of Christian beliefs before their critics (Baus 1980 a; Dulles 1999). However, it is the encounter of the doctrine of the risen Jesus with the intellectual apparatus of Greek thought which marks the key stage in the development of the Church's identity and, crucially, of the *educational paradigm* of Catholic Religious Education as understood today.

While a contemporary understanding of philosophy rests primarily on its identity as an academic discipline, the Greeks saw it first and foremost it as a way of

[7] The wider question of the desirability, or otherwise, of Infant Baptism is not our immediate concern and has been addressed elsewhere (cf. Yarnold 1997; Fergusson 2009).
[8] St. Irenaus of Lyon and St. Justin the Martyr (late second century AD) are the most famous of this group. St Justin the Martyr's *The Second Apology of Justin for the Christians* (Addressed to the Roman Senate) and his *Dialogue with Trypho* are examples of early Christian apologia. See also Chadwick (1984).

living and being: knowledge was understood as a path to virtue (Elias 1999; Hill, 2003; Hadot 2008; Topping 2012). In this respect, the Greek approach seemed to overlap with the Christian claim to truth and indeed the New Testament has examples of the initial encounters between followers of Christianity and the adherents of Greek philosophy (cf. Acts 17:16-34). In time, Clement of Alexandria (150-215 AD) was in a position to claim that the study of Greek philosophy was a precursor to or 'preparatory training to those who attain to faith through demonstration' (Clement of Alexandria *Stromata,* ch. v).

This willingness to engage with Greek philosophy was not shared by all Christian thinkers. St. Basil the Great, for example, suggested that young Christians should be selective in their use of Greek writers (Basil the Great, *Address to young men on the right use of Literature*: online: ch. 1). Similarly, Tertullian was dismissive of the value of the pre-Christian Greek philosophers (Tertulian *De spectaculis – On the shows* xxx). Tertullian's negative attitude towards Greek thinking stretched to saying that Christians could not in conscience teach in pagan schools (Baus 1980 b).

Within this shifting intellectual climate, the early catechetical 'schools'—although more of a process than a building (Bakke 2005:202)—became the focus of a profound intellectual dialogue between Christian thinking and traditional Greek philosophy (Pope John Paul II 1998 a). These initially private undertakings offered an integration of religious values, philosophy and high moral standards (Baus 1980 b). There is, crucially, no sense of dissonance between what the present study has identified as the *educational* and *catechetical* paradigms of Religious Education (Baus 1980b; Graves 1925/2004). It is hard, however, to identify specific indicators of the *modus operandi* of these institutions and of their locus—if any—in the education of children.

The most famous of these 'schools'—the *School of Alexandria*—allowed many of the ruling classes in this important metropolis to attain a high degree of cultural awareness and hence played a pivotal role in the development of the conceptual framework of early Christian education. One of the leaders of this school, St. Clement of Alexandria, argued that as God is the origin of all good things, the

good fruits of Greek philosophy must originate in God (Clement of Alexandria *Stromata* Book 1:7;19). Christian teaching, for Clement, can grow from non-Christian seeds and thus be part of the will of God for the world. The title of Clement's educational treatise, *Paedagogus,* is significant in that the standard Greek term for teacher is *didaskalos* whereas *Paedagogus* was used to describe the servant who accompanied the pupil to school (Bowen 1972). In choosing *Paedagogus* as the title of his treatise, Clement implied that the role of the *paedagogus* was to accompany and guide the believer on a journey to knowledge of God and a consequent life of virtue (Clement of Alexandria *Paedagogus* Book 1:1*).* Clement's work is at the root of what is now called the 'Emmaus Method' – a catechetical method which stresses the catechist's role as one who accompanies the catechumen on his or her journey of faith. Chapter Six will offer a fuller evaluation of this method in the context of one particular Catholic Religious Education syllabus.

The dialogue between Christianity and Greek philosophy had implications for Christian thinking on catechesis and education. The work of St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD) offers an early defining example of the fruit of the marriage between Christianity and Greek philosophy as applied to catechesis and education (Augustine *De Catechezandibus Rudibus* ch. 8). By the late 4th century, St Augustine of Hippo's work offered glimpses of an emerging 'philosophy of Christian education'.[9] Augustine's works on catechesis and education have strong claims to be among the first attempts to map out a rationale for Christian education (Kevane 1964:124; Harrison 2006: 128; Franchi 2011; Franchi 2013). This focus on the pedagogy of catechesis reflected the growing importance of an *educational paradigm* which is gradually becoming a more relevant part of the now established *catechetical paradigm.* [10]

One of St. Augustine's distinctive contributions to the catechetical/ educational contours of the period lies principally in his work on the role of the Christian teacher. For Augustine, the teacher's role is to lead the student to the truth,

[9] *De Magistro* (AD 389); *De Catechezandi Rudibus* (AD 399); *De Doctrina Christiana* (AD 397-426)

[10] See Chadwick (1996) and Clark (2005) for accessible introductions to the life and thought of St. Augustine.

understood as *knowledge* of Jesus (St. Augustine *De Magistro* 11:38). Augustine, drawing on Clement's *paedagogus*, saw Jesus as the *Teacher* who teaches through the human teacher; it is the role of the teacher hence to point towards the truth (Drucker 1997).

While St John Chrysostom had recommended the use of story as a teaching medium with appropriate adaptation for children, St. Augustine promoted the use of the *narratio* in catechesis - the systematic mapping of the Christian story of salvation from Genesis to Christ.[11] This exemplified a key teaching process in early Christianity. The *narratio* was designed to include all catechumens (and believers too) in a Christocentric view of history in which all would be fulfilled in the world to come. The resultant teaching strategy—as set out in *de Catechezandi Rudibus*---is a major, if understated, development in the philosophy of Christian education. It is an educational strategy designed to use the study of the 'wonderful facts' contained in Scripture as a way to enhance the key *catechetical paradigm* (Augustine *de Catechezandi Rudibus* ch. 3; *de Doctrina* iv.v). In contemporary language, such an approach to the study of the Christian Scriptures offers *sacred history* as the curricular framework for the study of the Scriptures in the light of the 'divine pedagogy' (Willey et al. 2008: 80)

St. Augustine presented Christian education as a process in which the sinner moves away from vice towards knowledge of Jesus and the practice of virtue. Both adults and children were, he claimed, in need of the grace given freely at Baptism in order to lead them away from sin and towards growth in virtue (2001:79). While there is little in Augustine's wider corpus about adapting catechetical methodology to children, Augustine advocated the adaptation of methodology to different groups of hearers (Augustine *de Catechezandi Rudibus* ch 8; ch. 15). This acceptance of the principle of differentiation offered the possibility of similar adaptation for children although this is not stated explicitly. The overall lack of concrete evidence of catechetical strategies for children once again suggests the continuation of the family and community-centred model of catechesis. There is the possibility of children being included in the wider

[11] See Stortz (2001) for a critical exploration of St. Augustine's perspectives on childhood.

catechetical processes involving the *narratio,* but this does not exclude the possibility of children attending some form of 'school'.

Concluding Remarks for Context One: Catechesis in the Apostolic and Patristic Ages

The three 'stages' of development outlined in Context 1 reveal a Church which is determined to develop the faith of the members of the community. The predominant *catechetical paradigm* is centred on integration into its sacramental and community life. There appears to have been little explicit recognition of the needs of children in this enterprise. The dialogue between Christianity and Greek philosophy did however make the Church more aware of the need to consider how reason and educational methods and processes could make the *catechetical paradigm* more robust. The conceptual distinction of the twentieth century between the *catechetical* and *educational paradigms* of Religious Education is, at this stage, a mere shadow across the landscape.

Historical Context Two: Catechesis in the Middle Ages

This second historical context covers an era of wide-ranging ecclesial, social, educational and political development (McGrath 2011). It is in this period that the Christian message begins to make a significant impact on the cultural landscape of western Europe. Despite these advances, schooling remained the prerogative of an elite (Bowen 1975): the evidence gleaned from this period, therefore, must be treated with the same caution as the evidence from Context One.

The period known as the 'Middle Ages' provides a set of signposts to the key themes of the present thesis. The three parts of this section reveal the changing shape of catechesis in parallel with a) the gradual rise of broader Christian educational structure and b) the Church's dialogue with other ways of thinking. Part One explores the development of the catechetical paradigm by means of the liturgical and community life of the Church. Part Two explores in broad terms the emergence of Christianity and its educational structures as the major cultural force

in Europe. Part Three explores the influence of Scholasticism and Christian humanism on catechesis.

Part 1 Liturgical and Christian Community Life as Catechesis

Two issues provide a broad cultural context for this section. First, it is hard to separate catechetical practice for children from wider societal attitudes towards children. Bakke (2005) and Orme (2001) have argued convincingly that children in medieval times were recognised as more than simply 'adults in the making' but as humans beings at a different stage of development from the adult population. Nevertheless, there remains little evidence of much catechetical development for children. Second, by the seventh century the collapse of the western Roman Empire and the demise of its intellectual patrimony had left very low levels of literacy throughout the lands of its former empire (1925/ 2004). This required the Church to organise its catechetical methods in ways which would be effective for the minimally educated majority of its members.

Crucially, the Church was where people found the key to the meaning and purpose of their lives (Duffy 1992). It is helpful here to distinguish between how the faith is *taught* and how the faith is *learned* (Lawson 2012). The former connotes explicit methods designed to teach; the latter includes the more formal aspects of teaching but does so alongside the recognition of wider social and cultural influences on the formation of faith. Physical structures were part of the ways in which people learnt the Catholic faith. Although St. Paul had said that God does not dwell in sanctuaries made by human hands (*Acts* 17: 24), places of Christian public worship grew from the initial Christian homes and Roman *tituli* into a network of churches (Baus 1980b). Some medieval Church buildings were designed to resemble the *heavenly Jerusalem* with their physical structure and design in keeping with the high eschatological ideals represented by liturgical worship (Seasoltz 2005; Caldecott 2009; Stroik 2009). The Romanesque and Gothic churches and cathedrals became instruments of catechesis –the so-called 'stone bibles' - and examples of wider architectural beauty as pathways to the divine (Pope Benedict XVI 2009 b). The liturgical rites performed within and beyond these walls underpinned both the religious formation and the daily life of

the Christian community although there is a need for caution in drawing too sharp a distinction between life within and without the walls of the church at this time In late medieval Europe, the religious atmosphere was reinforced with the prominent social role played by guilds, confraternities and pilgrimages in the prayer life of the community with increasingly important roles assumed by the new orders of friars (MacCulloch, 2003; Lawson 2012).

Within this overarching atmosphere of religious nurture, there were distinct developments in specifically catechetical practices. Although the Synod of Albi in 1254 had decreed that children of seven years and over should be brought to so-called religious instruction, there was little said about the specific needs of children (Jungmann 1958). For the adults, the scripture-based *narratio* as expounded by St. Augustine in *De Catechezandis Rudibus* had gradually given way to a catechetical process centred on the homily at Mass, the recitation of the *Creed* and *Our Father* – and listening to subsequent explanations of these texts (Jungmann 1958:39). There were concomitant moves to classify knowledge in numerical sets, especially in sets of seven: number of sacraments, deadly sins etc. (Jungmann, 1965:13; Duffy, 1992: ch. 2). These are signs of a more systematised approach to catechesis - possibly inspired by the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer and the seven Beatitudes (Sloyan 1958) - with doctrinal knowledge organised in a way which a largely illiterate people could memorise.

The lack of any Church treatise dedicated to the theory and method of catechesis from this time suggests that the Church did not apply its mind specifically to this issue (Jungmann 1965). Following the example of the early Church, the liturgical and community life of the Church in the Middle Ages continued to serve as the principal framework for catechesis for both children and adults (Jungmann 1965). Children accompanied their parents to religious ceremonies where they absorbed fully the liturgical atmosphere around them (Bakke 2005). The initial nurturing role of the parents and the wider family was hence assisted by participation in liturgy and an associated Christian community life (Orme 2006; Vitz 2005).

The paucity of extant evidence of tailored catechetical initiatives for children suggests that the catechesis of children continued to be informed by the wider

liturgical and community life of the Christian community and which included participation in the catechetical developments mentioned above.

The ongoing catechetical paradigm contained the seeds which would, in due course, reshape the Christian vision of education.

Part 2 Christian Education as Cultural Renewal

Alongside the continued development of the catechetical methods, there arose another vision of education with roots in the Christian monasteries.

The conversion to Christianity of the northern Frankish tribes and the crowning of Charlemagne (742-814 AD) as Holy Roman Emperor in 800 was a crucial moment in the growth of what was to be called 'Christendom' (Bowen 1975; Ewig1980 a). The Emperor Charlemagne sought to renew the continent of Europe through a deepening of Christian culture and belief (Williams 2010). The reform of education was at the heart of Charlemagne's *renovatio* (Graves 1925/2004; McGrath 2011).

It has been claimed with some justification that the legacy of St. Augustine's educational 'philosophy' underpinned Charlemagne's commitment to enact educational reform (Kevane 1964). Charlemagne's religiously motivated cultural project sought to restore the 'civilization of antiquity' and stressed the importance of education as a unifying force in the restructuring of the continent (Bowen 1975). Charlemagne was intent on creating a new society which would be underpinned by a more educated and literate population (Williams 2010). The *renovatio* created the conditions in which the culture of Europe became fully intertwined with Catholic thought (Fletcher 1999). The term 'Christendom' became an apt description for a continent in which education was the handmaid of the Church (Bowen 1975:13; 29).[12]

[12] The *renovatio* could be understood as an historical inspiration for the current Catholic project of the 'new evangelisation' which seeks to reform education and catechesis as forces for cultural renewal (Synod of Bishops 2011).

The reforming energy for the *renovatio* was located in the Christian monasteries which evolved over time to become the principal agents of Christian education in Medieval Europe (Orme 2006). These monastic communities were places where Christian life was nurtured by total absorption into the liturgical life and tradition of the Church (Bowen 1972; Piltz 1981; Dunn 2000). Alongside the celebration of the liturgy, the monastic communities insisted on the reading of Scripture. Learning to read in medieval times was chiefly, but not exclusively, located in ecclesiastical foundations (Orme 2006; Williams 2010). St. Benedict had ruled that his monks should spend some time in this spiritual reading (*lectio divina*) every day (*Rule of St. Benedict* ch. 48). In order to provide reading material for the monks it was essential to gather and copy great texts from across Europe (Graves 1925/2004). This focus on reading necessitated a promotion of literacy among the members of the community and, by the 9th century, most Benedictine monasteries had a 'school' attached though the pupils were initially those destined to join the monastic life. Provision was not generally made for the wider population (Ewig1980 b). The curriculum in these monastic schools was, broadly speaking, a 'liberal arts' education with Latin as the medium of communication (Graves 1925/2004). Despite their limited intake, these 'schools' were the forerunners of the modern system of education (Piltz 1981).

The strengthening of the *catechetical paradigm* was underpinned by a growing engagement with other styles of thinking. In particular, the reading of the Latin and Greek classics -alongside the reading of and meditation on Scripture - became more common. There remained a focus on seeing wisdom as the goal of education (Hugh of St. Victor *Didascalion* 12th century/1961: 61). The continued emphasis on the value of the liberal arts as pathways to the contemplation of the divine allowed the later medieval mind to see the *ordering* of all knowledge as a way of glimpsing the hand of God in all things (Fitzgerald 2010).

More broadly, these developments were woven through a related concatenation of social and educational initiatives beginning with the rise of the Cathedral schools and the emergence of the European universities in the second millennium of Christianity (Bowen 1975; ch. 2). The universities played a major role in the

upcoming intellectual controversy over Scholasticism which would leave a profound mark on Catholic thought. Whereas the Church had been the determining source of influence in medieval Europe (Baus 1980 b), it soon had to respond to the intellectual challenge from other ways of thinking.

Part Three The Influence of Wider Intellectual Movements on Catechesis

The encounter between Christianity and the Muslim Empire which had expanded across Europe in late medieval Europe was another landmark event in Church history. The arrival of the Aristotelian corpus in Latin translation reopened the question of the relation between faith and reason, calling into question the philosophical *modus vivendi* that had obtained for centuries (Bowen 1975; Power 1991; Nichols 2002; Hill 2003; McInerny and O'Callaghan 2005). The ensuing debate on the place of *Aristotelianism* in Christian thought (the Scholastic debate) was a key moment in the rise of the *educational paradigm*.

Scholasticism as such was an educational *method* which sought to show the inter-relatedness of all Christian doctrine and how this was in accord with reason (McGrath 2011) Hence clerical training in the 'schools' was instrumental in reforming religious instruction for converts according to scholastic lines (Fletcher 1999). Although there is some consonance between this debate and the similar debate over the place of Greek thought in early Christianity, the (perceived) medieval conflict between reason and authority took the debate in a new direction as it seemed to sow seeds of division between learning and the Christian foundations of medieval society (Bowen 1975; Dulles 1999; Graves 1925/2004).

The work of St Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) epitomised the Christian position vis-à-vis reason and faith. Western (or Latin) Christianity became increasingly underpinned by his pioneering synthesis of faith and reason, which had a profound influence on educational thought of the time (McGrath 1998; Doyle 2007). Aquinas's focus on the God-given place of reason in the broader educational process hence offered a new perspective on the Augustinian vision of education (Mooney and Nowacki (2011). Additionally, Aquinas accepted the Augustinian concept of learning by *discovery*, but reinforced this by emphasising

the need to learn by more formal *instruction*. This was a significant move towards a more scholastic approach to learning in which the role of the teacher was that of 'instructor' as well as 'facilitator' (cf Aquinas (online) *On Truth* Question 11). Aquinas was writing in a cultural context in which attitudes towards children veered between models rooted in the so-called 'depravity of the child' and models rooted in the innocence of children and the related 'uniqueness of children's experiences' (Davis 2011). This cultural interplay casts a fresh light on the claim that Aquinas was the first to provide a theological rationale for a so-called 'developmental model of childhood' (Traina 2001). While verification of these claims requires further research, his *catechetical instructions* offer a glimpse of this twofold approach involving both faith and reason (Aquinas 13th century/1939).[13] For example, in discussing the fourth commandment, Aquinas mentioned the duty of parents to form their children religiously 'without delay', as part of their threefold gift to their children of 'birth, nourishment and instruction' (Aquinas *Catechetical Instructions* 13th century/1939:102). Nourishment refers in the first place to physical care, but it also infers a nurture approach to education which complements the instruction which he recommended. This synthesis between nurture and instruction in the rearing of children, with a clear awareness of the value of an intellectual diet (for adults) in the liberal arts domain, is a further and significant development of the *catechetical paradigm*. The importance of cultivating reason was now increasingly integrated with the catechetical paradigm.[14]

Scholasticism, however, came under critical scrutiny in the late medieval period from the variegated social and cultural movement known as 'humanism' (Bowen 1975). The use of the term 'humanism' is problematic owing to the contemporary understanding of 'humanism' as a school of thought which denies the relevance or existence of God (Bowen 1975; McGrath 1998). Nonetheless, it is this *classical* humanism which links the early Middle Ages with the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.

[13] This set of catechetical instructions was written in the final years of his life –late 13th century).
[14] Aquinas's contemporary, St. Bonaventure (1221-1274), was another who argued for the place of reason. Bonaventure's entry into academic life was, on balance, a recognition that scholarship should be taken seriously by Christians: all the world, all that touches the senses, can lead to God (Piltz (1981).

Humanism promoted a cultural rebirth (*il rinascimento/le rennaissance*) in which Classical texts were studied in the original languages. More importantly, these texts were deemed worthy of study in their own right and not just as adumbrations of the beliefs of Christianity and/or its ethical code. In Northern Europe this attachment to Classical texts was translated into a religious movement which sought to reassess Christian thought in the light of history (Chadwick 1972 Bejczy, 2001; Rummell 2004).

In essence, Christian humanists sought to re-establish the connection between the perceived simple message of the Gospels and the daily life of the believer. In their eyes, the Scholastic focus on philosophical method had fractured this relationship. This could only be healed, it was claimed, by a return to the study of the Gospels (*ad fontes*) in the original language (Bowen 1975). The scope of the influence of 'Christian humanism' was exemplified by a Dutch religious order/movement *The Brethern of the Common Life* whose focus was the education of the people in Christian humanist ways of thinking and living. The movement was initiated by Gerard de Groote (1340-1384) and used the classical educational tools of the liberal arts curriculum to study Scripture and find therein the true message of Jesus which, it was argued, had been obscured by many accretions and human traditions (Bowen 1975). From this movement there emerged the *devotio moderna* school which—recalling some aspects of the early Christian opposition to dialogue with Greek philosophy—argued that intense study of non-spiritual matters was damaging to a Christian's life of faith.[15]

Two key works illustrate the influence of this thinking on Catholic spirituality. *The Imitation of Christ* by Thomas à Kempis (c.1379-1471) is perhaps the most famous book to emerge from the *devotio moderna* school, although its intended audience was principally those in the monastic life. The question of catechesis for children was addressed by Jean Gerson (1363 -1429) in *On Leading Children to Christ* (in Cully 1960) This tract is located clearly in the *catechetical paradigm* and is an application of the principles of the *devotio moderna* to children's

[15] 'Woe to them that inquire of men after many curious things and are little curious of the way to serve me' (A Kempis 1954: ch. 43). This is an example of the principles underlying the *devotio moderna*

catechesis. In response to critics who thought that the teaching of children was beneath his dignity as a university professor in Paris, Gerson saw the his work with children as of equal status to the study of deeper theological issues (McGuire 2005). Yet a closer reading of his argument suggests that Gerson's preferred 'model of childhood' is not too clear. On the one hand, the child is a 'delicate plant that must be protected against every evil influence' (Gerson in Cully 1960). This suggests that Gerson is influenced by the childhood model of so-called 'religious innocence'. On the other hand, Gerson is clear that young children need regular confession owing to their being 'ensnared in sin' (Gerson in Cully 1960). In this latter statement, it is not clear if he is referring to a specific group of young people or is making a broader theological statement about children as a whole. What is noteworthy here is the importance placed by Gerson on the *spiritual direction* of children by means of the sacrament of confession and his stress on the need to teach and guide children with love - although this does not exclude direct instruction in doctrine (Sloyan 1958: 34-36). It is, in short, an example of the need to include children in the wider catechetical processes and to offer concrete spiritual direction to them.

Concluding Remarks for Context Two: Catechesis in the Middle Ages

The range of catechetical and educational developments in the medieval period offers a set of signposts for the argument of the present thesis. While there is little doubt that the catechetical paradigm remains predominant, what emerges is the growing influence of broader educational initiatives rooted in the desire to nurture Christian faith. The end of the medieval period was a crucial time for the Church as the internal clamour for broader and deeper Church reform was growing stronger throughout Europe (Chadwick 1972). There were other significant geo-political and theological contours to this historical era, the treatment of which are beyond the immediate scope of the present thesis. These were crystallized in the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Reform movements which radically altered the shape of early modern Christianity. The influence of the latter on catechesis will be examined in the third historical context.

Historical Context Three: The Influence of the Catholic Reform on Catechesis

In early modern Europe, population pressure, the pandemics, the rise of the cities and the intellectual discovery of classical antiquity all formed part of an atmosphere of intellectual and cultural ferment leading to the dissolution of the medieval order (Reinhard 1989). The moves to reform the Church from within, as well as dealing with external challenges, are a further reflection of the narrative of change and continuity (Janelle 1978; MacCulloch 2003; Orme, 2006; Mazzonis 2007).

This section argues that the Catholic Reform substantially strengthened the inherited *catechetical paradigm* of religious education. The Tridentine Church drew heavily on its own resources, especially Scholastic methods, in order to respond in a robust manner to the doctrinal and educational challenges it faced from the Reformers (McGrath 1998; Po-chia Hsia 2005). The analysis of these forces is set out over three parts. Part One looks first at the role of the Council of Trent in reforming catechesis in the years just after the Protestant Reformation. Part Two explores the influence of the *Roman Catechism* on catechesis. Part Three explores the interplay between the catechetical and educational paradigms which, post-Trent, shaped the framework for Catholic Religious Education as 'school-based catechesis'.

Part One The Council of Trent and Catechesis

The Council of Trent (1545-1556) was the foremost component of the Catholic Reform. Trent recognised and sought to reform many of the abuses which had taken root in the Church in the centuries since the Black Death (Gallagher 2001; Byrne 2004). It promoted unity of faith and defined the key points of Catholic doctrine in the face of opposition from the Reformers (MacCulloch 2003). The Council's tools in the Catholic Reform were the Vulgate Bible, the Roman (Tridentine) liturgy, the Code of Canon Law and the *Roman Catechism*.

The Council of Trent saw education as the vital force in the Church's ongoing *internal* reform. There were two aspects to this. First, and in response to the

Reformers' desire to use education and schooling as a driver for Church and societal reform, the Catholic Church recognised the necessity of fostering the printed word via printing presses and the construction of ecclesiastical libraries: these were visible manifestation of their prized inherited tradition. Second, and in response to the Reformers' successful focus on the preaching of the Word of God, the art of preaching was given renewed emphasis as a method of catechesis (MacCulloch 2003). In the Catholic Church, preaching had been traditionally reserved to members of (certain) Religious Orders but now the onus was placed on parish priests This shift required suitable preparation of priests and those intending to become priests.

To achieve this, a form of 'Higher Education' was established for young men preparing for priesthood (23rd session of the Council of Trent cited in Schroeder 1978:175). The founding of seminaries was a key moment of the Catholic reform and recognised the comparatively poor state of clerical preaching and indeed the deficiencies in the broader cultural and intellectual formation of parish priests throughout the Catholic Church. The seminaries brought together academic studies and a life of piety in a single institution – an important indicator of the merging of the catechetical and educational paradigms in response to a time of significant challenge. As these seminaries were under the direction of the diocesan Bishop, and not part of the network of universities, the link with the pastoral theme of religious nurture was inevitably highlighted.

Alongside the new initiatives in the formation of seminarians, the Council of Trent recognised that it was necessary to develop the knowledge and skills of the existing corps of parish priests. Hence it proposed that on Sundays and on the principal feasts of the liturgical year, the Bishop and parish priests would catechise the congregations in a manner suitable to the capacity of the audience. Crucially, the needs of children were specifically recognised although without precise details of how this could be done. Referring to the catechetical duties of the parish priest, Trent recommended as follows:

> …shall at least on Sundays and solemn festivals either personally, or if they are lawfully impeded, through others who are competent, feed the

> people committed to them with wholesome words in proportion to their own and their people's mental capacity…' (Session V ch II On preaching (1546).
>
> Preaching is a duty of the Bishop or their delegate, the parish priest. It should be done on Sundays, feast days, and on Lent and Advent either daily or three times a week. The Bishops shall also see to it that at least on Sunday and other festival days, the children in every parish be carefully taught the rudiments of the faith and obedience toward God and their parents…(Session XXIV Ch IV On Preaching (1563).

In broad terms, the liturgical year would serve as a programme of studies for the demanding enterprise outlined above. The devotional life of the Church would, ostensibly, provide the material for a more *scholastic* input in preaching and teaching. Such linking of worship and teaching recalled the teaching mission of the first Apostles (Matthew 18:19-20).[16] Furthermore, recognition of the catechetical needs of the child – albeit without specific instructions on how this could be done – seems, at first, to be in keeping with the medieval emphasis on the inclusion of the child within the broader catechesis undertaken by the wider community.

In this light, what is significant in the Tridentine age is the development of the earlier focus on community and liturgical life towards a more formal and systematic approach to catechesis centred on the priesthood, preaching and, with the support of groups like the *Confraternity of Christian Doctrine*, the use of printed catechisms (cf. *New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia* –online; Collins 1983). Jungmann (1965) has argued, however, that the Tridentine emphasis on catechisms actually diminished the importance of the life of Church community as a formative force and that the focus on the written word of the texts and catechisms detracted from liturgy and art as instruments of education. The Church sought to *counter* the effects of the Reformation by adopting methods which the Reformers themselves were adopting in their mission to rebuild the Church. Regardless of how we answer this, the historical evidence shows that the community, or parish dimension, remained at the heart of the catechetical process and was given renewed vitality by the Council of Trent which encouraged

[16] Consider also the Old Testament priesthood where teaching was the task of the priests (cf. Leviticus10: 11; Deuteronomy 33:10), as well

religious instruction in the vernacular tongue and a recognition of the differing needs of the members of community.[17]

Pace Jungmann, the substantial impact of the *Roman Catechism* on the theme of the thesis will now be addressed.

Part Two The Influence of the *Roman Catechism* on Catechesis

The Reformers' defining desire to promote a 'priesthood of all believers' demanded a (reformed) Church population with the literacy skills needed to have access to the Bible in the vernacular (Luther in Cully 1960: 135). Related to this, the 16th century saw a key development in catechesis with the publication in 1529 of Martin Luther's Catechism (MacCulloch 2003). While catechesis had traditionally operated in preparation for Christian initiation, and was marked historically by active participation in liturgical and Church community life, the advent of the printed catechism reconfigured this tradition by formally setting out key doctrine in a question and answer form. The invention of printing allowed the resultant texts to have a wide circulation and the use of catechisms soon became a distinctive and significant feature of catechesis from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards (O'Malley 1993).

Interestingly, the Tridentine Catholic Church took up Martin Luther's idea that catechesis should be represented in a written, detailed account of Christian doctrine - a process or system which had roots in earlier forms of instruction in the Byzantine methods of *erotapokeris (*question-and-answer) and dialogue (Papadoyannakis 2006). The *Roman Catechism,* however, published in 1566, adopted a discursive, not question-and-answer, style and thus facilitated the further development of the catechism as a specific genre of religious and

[17] 'Bishops or priests are advised to instruct the people before they approach the sacrament 'in a manner adapted to the mental ability of those who receive them, explain their efficacy and use, but also they shall see to it that the same is done piously and prudently by every parish priest, and in the vernacular tongue, if need be and it can be done conveniently, in accordance with the form which will be prescribed for each of the sacraments but the holy council in a catechism which the bishops shall have faithfully translated into the language of the people and explained to the people by all parish priests' Session XXIV ch. VII On sacraments).

educational literature alongside its original meaning as a process of Christian instruction (Gallagher 2001).

The stated aim of the *Roman Catechism* was to offer a conspectus of the Catholic theological tradition in the context of broader spiritual development (Preface to *Roman Catechism*). Significantly, the *Roman Catechism* offered clear direction on teaching methodology. In keeping with the approach of the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent on preaching and teaching, it recommended a differentiation according to age and capacity.[18] This is another important sign of an *educational* paradigm growing alongside the established *catechetical* paradigm.

This guide to methodology is a reminder that the *Roman Catechism* was not intended for a wide readership. Its primary audience was parish priests charged with improving the quality of their preaching and instruction by ensuring that they were aware of the theological foundations of the Catholic faith. Hence the *Roman Catechism* was one of the first *teacher's manuals* in education, incorporating material for a structured and detailed curriculum of catechesis to be adapted according to the needs of the audience. The systematic organisation of knowledge recalled the structure of the medieval encyclopaedia, but now this knowledge base was rooted in Christian doctrine with an apologetic, or confessional, focus.

Given the attention to broader methodological principles enunciated by the Council of Trent (*Session XXIV ch. VII On Sacraments*), there arose the opportunity to consider how catechisms designed specifically for children could aid catechesis. One example of this catechetical energy was the triple catechism of Peter Canisius which was published around 1555/8—before the *Roman Catechism*—and, significantly, had three parts aimed at young children, adolescents and young adults (Gallagher 2001). The explicit differentiation of content recognised the developmental needs of the young people and their place in the life of the Church and in catechesis. This development is a significant

[18] It refers to the necessity of differentiation: 'age, capacity, manners and condition demand attention, that he who instructs may become all things to all men, and be able to gain all to Christ' (*Catechism of the Council of Trent Preface*: Fourth section).

indicator that the Catholic Church was responding to the wider moves to prioritise catechesis and literacy in the reformed churches.

The *Roman Catechism*'s systematic exposition of doctrine was a clear strength. This does not mean that it did not have some limitations. First, it linked catechesis with theology, which is not in itself a problem, but it laid open the danger of reducing the study of theology to a textbook exercise at arm's length from liturgy and worship. Second, it was not clear if a more doctrinally-focused study of Scripture would impinge upon a *prayerful* study of Scripture in a broader programme of studies centred on the Roman Catechism. Finally, the textbook approach—and the move to classroom or 'Sunday School' instruction driven by the *Confraternity of Christian Doctrine* (on-line)—suggests that the study of Christianity could be reduced to a purely cognitive exercise separate from the pastoral life of the worshipping Church. This final point is what underpinned the critical work of the twentieth century catechetical reformer, Joseph Jungmann (see Context Four below).

These important issues notwithstanding, the importance of the *Roman Catechism* in the history of catechesis should not be minimized. It exemplified a clear progression from the medieval 'community' approach to catechesis. It retained the traditional four dimensions of catechesis – Creed, Sacraments, Moral Life and Prayer – and integrated these components within a format geared to meeting the doctrinal and structural challenges of the Protestant Reformation. This more systematic and scholastic conceptualisation of catechesis was developed further during the following centuries.

Part Three Post-Tridentine Catechesis and the School

In the turbulent years of late sixteenth century Europe, the Catholic Church and the communities emerging from the Protestant Reformation sought to use education as a key force in their ongoing religious and cultural conflicts (Bowen 1981). This was a reflection of the power of education 'to shape values, mould minds and transform nations' (Curtis 2000:5). This vibrant period is worthy of study as it is here that the roots of the 'school-based catechesis' model of Catholic

Religious Education are found. This was a reflection of the power of education 'to shape values, mould minds and transform nations' (Curtis 2000:5). This section will demonstrate that the work of the Jesuits and the De La Salle Brothers were important examples of the Catholic Church's conviction that its growing network of schools would also serve as loci of catechesis with an increasingly scholastic shape.

The 'interplay' between catechesis and education at this time was strengthened considerably owing to the gradual migration of catechesis to Catholic schools. The Catholic Church's catechetical methods at this time developed the inherited catechetical tradition and, in the light of the Tridentine reforms, continued the systematisation of catechesis and the development of broader reforms in education and schooling.

In the centuries after the Reformation, there was an explosion of Catholic religious orders with a charism for education (O'Donoghue 2012; Po-chia Hsia 2005; Hellinckx et al. 2009). Indeed, the Catholic orders were the vital link between the education offered by the monasteries and cathedral schools of the Middle Ages and the mass education of the nineteenth century (Curtis 2000). They continued the reforms in education which, although pre-dating the events of the Reformation, were given renewed impetus by the energy arising from the Catholic Reform. It is here that we find the roots of the modern curriculum, the importance given to the printed word in both textbooks and teachers' manuals and the formation of educators.

The post–Tridentine catechetical and educational reforms were driven by the Jesuits. [19] The influence of the Jesuits on education in general and in catechesis in particular rests on their claimed integration of faith and learning.[20] The Jesuits

[19] A complete history of Jesuit education is beyond the scope of the present thesis. See Scaglione 1986:7-74 for the key moments of this story.

[20] Although the Jesuits are not a *product* of the Council of Trent, they were caught up in the general wave of reform which permeated the Catholic world at this time (Scaglione 1986). The formation of Jesuit priests, based on the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius allied to a robust theological education, was without precedent in religious life at the time (Reinhard 1989). They had thus responded to the Tridentine call for better-formed clergy. Within a very short time, they had become the most influential Catholic order in education.

saw their mission as one of correcting the post-Reformation doctrinal confusion by the building of an integrated intellectual and pastoral culture in their growing network of schools (MacCulloch 2003). The Jesuits took the doctrinal heritage of Catholic Christianity and reconfigured this to suit the rise of mass schooling. This focus on doctrinal orthodoxy within an educational context is evidence of one robust paradigm of Christian education which is simultaneously catechetical and educational.

The Jesuit blend of 'theology and intellectualism' covered elementary, secondary and tertiary education (Hamilton 1989: 65). In their *Ratio Studiorum* (16th century/1970) the Jesuits set out their vision of an educational system centred on the four areas of: administration, curriculum, method and discipline.[21] The focus in the *Ratio Studiorum* on the links between cognitive learning and the development of good habits suggests that the Jesuit vision of education was a ground-breaking attempt to marry the best of Scholasticism and Christian Humanism (cf. *Ratio Studiorum* 62). This integrated Jesuitical vision was enlarged in the educational thought of Giambattista Vico (1668-1744) who, in opposition to the predominance of Cartesian logic in education, reasserted more ancient and abiding forms of the philosophical life rooted in the attachment to instinct, custom, tradition, myth, community, piety and faith (Davis, forthcoming).

The innovative pedagogy of the Jesuits was centred on a systematic and progressive arrangement of teaching - in particular, the practice of an introductory overview/mapping of the subject matter of a particular issue before a more detailed study of individual components and topics (Scaglione 1986). As such, it is reasonable to infer that specific catechetical classes would have adopted this method. If so, there are clear parallels with the early Christian *narratio* in which salvation history was presented to the catechumens as part of their gradual journey of initiation. By the post-Reformation period, doctrine, as presented in the

[21] This complemented the scope of the *Roman Catechism*: while the *Roman Catechism* set out the religious curriculum as a teaching handbook for priests, the *Ratio studiorum* offered a broader vision of education which encompassed the wider field of studies and amalgamated a number of earlier documents on education by Jesuits thinkers. In fact, the *Ratio studiorum* was nothing less than a handbook for a complete educational system (Devitt 1992). See Padberg 2000: 99 for a tabulated analysis of the Ratio.

key formulae found in various catechisms, formed a new *narratio* in succession to the 'Augustinian' story-method.

Educational method and the organisation of schools were key concerns of Jean Baptiste de La Salle (1651-1719). In common with the Jesuits, De La Salle's vision of education - as set out in *The Conduct of Schools* - was an expression of pastoral theology geared towards the spiritual and human needs of the pupils (De La Salle in Koch et al. 2004).[22] For example, De La Salle was revolutionary in his vetoing of the use of Latin in favour of the vernacular as he believed that a knowledge of French would aid his pupils' future *spiritual* growth by enabling them to read a wider selection of Christian doctrine when they left school (De La Salle cited in Koch et al. 2004). Furthermore, De La Salle favoured a more co-operative and collaborative methodology in the classrooms of his schools (Koch et al. 2004) In Catechism classes, for example, the teacher is directed not to speak to the pupils except by way of direct or indirect questions in order to assist their comprehension (Compayré 1905: 267). He was keen to avoid a narrow focus on doctrinal tenets bereft of a solid pastoral support system within a Catholic community of learners.

De La Salle's work was a crucial step in the development of a 'school-based catechesis' owing to the emphasis he placed on ordered learning in all subjects (Compayré 1905; Bowen 1981; Hamilton 1989). The desire to promote an ordered and pastoral learning environment required a corps of suitable teachers.[23] Where the Council of Trent established seminaries for future priests, De La Salle pioneered the spread of educational centres dedicated to the training of lay teachers in doctrinal orthodoxy and general pastoral care (Bowen 1981; Koch et al 2004). This challenged the link between the priest and the processes of catechesis which Trent had firmly established, complemented the Tridentine emphasis on the formation of seminarians and, crucially, recognised the importance of the (lay) educator in the broader life of the Church. De La Salle's initiative anticipated the

[22] See Compayré (1905): 254-277 for a fuller analysis of De La Salle's contribution to the history of education.
[23] In *Creating Catholics –Catechism and Primary Education in Early Modern France* Karen Carter argues that school teachers and parish priests were the agents of the Counter-Reformation in France at this time (2012: 137f).

Second Vatican Council's promotion of the universal call to holiness and the later related emphasis on the distinctive vocation of the lay Catholic teacher (Congregation for Catholic Education: 1982; 2002; 2007). This by-passing of the universities as a locus for the 'training' of teachers may suggest that he regarded an overly cognitive approach to the formation of educators as insufficiently pastoral in intent. Yet it is also possible to claim that De La Salle was applying the Ignatian approach to education to a specific context and was hence offering an innovative perspective on how prospective teachers should be formed. The broader question of the desirability, or otherwise, of university-based formation for teachers remains central to debates on teacher-education today (cf. Darling-Hammond 2008)

Concluding Remarks: The Influence of the Catholic Reform on Catechesis

The Catholic Reform brought together disparate religious practices to form a detailed 'code of practice' centred on the geographical structure of the *single parochial channel* of the diocese with prominent roles afforded to the Parish Priest and Bishop (Bossy 1999). There is once again no sense of a division between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

The confessionalization of post-Tridentine catechesis reflected the doctrinal divisions in Christianity but there was little or no questioning of the need for religious faith. This would soon change as new ideas originating in the 'Enlightenment' about the validity of the religious experience of humanity would challenge the whole spectrum of Christianity.

Historical Context Four: The Catechetical Renewal of the Early Twentieth Century

In the years following the Reformation, both Catholic and Reformed thinkers, although separated in key aspects of Christian doctrine, were component parts of a society which did not question the fundamental role of Christian faith in society. This arrangement was challenged when the new ideas arising from the Enlightenment and the French Revolution questioned the Christian intellectual

and philosophical heritage of the previous centuries (Bowen 1981; Porter 2001). Significantly, the Enlightenment thinkers saw education and configuration of schooling as the key driver of the people's liberation from the philosophical restraints of revealed religion (Porter 2001; Podgen 2013). By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century there was, in consequence, a complex and difficult relationship between the Church and the broader intellectual and cultural climate. This is encapsulated in the Church's reaction to the aggregation of intellectual and cultural forces identified as 'modernism' (Pope Pius X 1903; 1907a; Dulles 1999). Within this fervent intellectual climate, catechesis continued to evolve according to the catechetical and educational paradigms which the Tridentine reforms had both inherited from previous centuries and made stronger as part of its mission to use education as a cultural force in the battle for souls. The catechetical and educational paradigms were fully part of critical reforms in Church life which took place at this time. The wider impact of these reforms on catechesis will be considered in Chapter Three.

Historical Context Four explores separate stages of the catechetical reforms of the early twentieth century. Part One argues that the Catechetical Movement's focus on the reform of catechetical *method* was the fruit of a dialogue with broader thinking in education. This option for reform served as a strengthening of the *educational paradigm* of religious education. Part Two argues that the Catechetical Movement's focus on the reform of the *content* of catechesis was an attempt to balance the earlier educationally-inspired reforms and foster the catechetical paradigm in the light of scholarship in liturgy and Scriptural studies.

Part One The Early Catechetical Movement Stage 1: The Focus on Method

The reform of catechetical methods is an example of the influence of wider educational thinking on catechesis. The response to the doctrinal challenges of the Reformers had been built on a robust focus on the teaching of doctrine centred on the genre of the catechism to counter those with other (erroneous) interpretations of Christianity (Devitt 1992). The conceptual framework employed in this enterprise had its roots in the Catholic response to the Protestant Reformation and was more suited to students of theology and seminarians than to young children

and adults. This process remained framed within a wider Church lens which saw the catechesis of children as a training in Christian doctrine.

The role of the Catholic school in catechesis at this time is crucial. The determination of Christians to retain catechesis in the school was predicated on the Church's desire to use the classroom as the principal means of halting the perceived de-Christianization of society set in motion by the Enlightenment and associated ways of thinking (Bowen 1981; Porter 2001). The school, and more precisely the elementary (Primary) school is where the competing forces of Church, society and the modern state struggled for supremacy: social stability was seen as the fruit of primary education at this time (O'Donoghue 2012).

By virtue of the mass schooling arising from urbanization and industrialization, the catechesis of children at the end of the nineteenth century had become, in the main, a school-based activity (Jungmann 1965). It was taught by school teachers within the school timetable and thus gave an increasing scholastic dimension to what was intended to be a process of faith-formation (Bowen 1981). The loss of community ritual – a consequence of urbanization - was a key element in the desire of the schools to serve as points of reference for a Catholic population which had been largely displaced from its inherited network of rural religious traditions (Jungamnn 1965).

There were certainly many positive aspects to this school-based catechesis, most notably the integral formation which arose from having catechesis taught in harmony with other subjects in an ordered timetable. More problematic was the continued use of theological categories arising from Scholastic philosophical and theological frameworks with children. When allied to the prevailing use of the Roman and other catechisms as texts to be memorised, this amalgam of methods was seen as a less than effective method for proclaiming the Gospel at a time of intellectual and educational reform (Nolan 2007).

Against this backdrop, new ideas for reforming catechesis circulated in Europe, especially in Germany. These ideas were influenced in part by the work of the educational theorist, Johann Herbart (1776-1841). Herbart had emphasised the

importance of methodology and, in particular, the intervention of the teacher in this enterprise. Herbart's key point of emphasis was the vital importance of the 'lesson-plan' in education as this platform was where the teacher set out how to mould the child, control behaviour and develop learning (Bowen 1981).

This first stage of the catechetical reform hence was solely a *reform of method* based on the findings of wider educational research (Jungmann 1965). The early catechetical reformers took the existing catechetical practice—based largely on the memorisation of the catechism—and applied Herbartian ideas to it.[24] The results of this reform was a revised catechetical method based on three-stage process of *presentation, explanation* and *application* corresponding to the broader Herbartian stages of *perception, understanding* and *practice* (Marthaler 1978: 78).

This interplay between catechesis and educational psychology provides important evidence of dialogue between the Church and other fields of learning in a period when such exchange was often viewed suspiciously (cf: Pope Pius X 1903; 1907a; 1907b). (In this respect it recalls in part the experiences surrounding the early Church's gradual incorporation of Greek thought into Christianity.) There was some attempt to move away from a purely cognitive approach to learning by engaging with the reality of daily life in the *application* stage of the lesson (Curtis 2000: 91) However, this method-reform movement did little to challenge the *doctrinal* framework of the catechetical sessions. It continued to emphasise the role of story in catechesis, itself a faint echo of the *narratio* of the early Church. On the whole, the reforms failed to address in any depth issues arising from the intrusion of scholastic theology in a process designed to foster the faith of children.

A key example of the dialogue with educational psychology is the application of the 'age of reason' debate to the celebration of the ceremony of First Holy Communion (McGrail 2007: 13; 38). This is seen in the directive *Quam Singulari* issued under Pope St. Pius X's authority on August 8, 1910. Pope St. Pius was

[24] This used a revised lesson-plan based approach which began with Scripture followed by 'text-explanation', usually directed by the catechist/teacher and ended with the use of the Catechism to explain the point of doctrine set out in the lesson plan.

keen to dispel the (Jansenist) view that Holy Communion was a reward for goodness and virtue instead of the principal *means* to achieve these ends. Hence he allowed young children access to the sacrament of Holy Communion before they had demonstrated a 'full and perfect knowledge of Christian doctrine' - while reminding us that 'the child will be obliged to learn gradually the entire catechism according to his ability' (Pope Pius X 1910). From this we see that the place of the *Roman Catechism* in catechesis was not a question for debate yet there was still a recognition of the need for differentiation according to aptitude and development. Crucially, the reforms to 'First Communion' enacted by Pope Pius X are another indication of reform of the *catechetical* paradigm in the light of dialogue with other thinking and suggest a more nuanced approach to new ideas than is evident in his robustly anti-Modernist encyclical *Pascendi* (1907b).

In summary, the early stages of the twentieth century catechetical reform evolved in response to dialogue with other disciplines, especially educational psychology. While the radical edge of the early Catechetical Movement was highlighted in its adaptation of Herbartian pedagogy, this radicalism did not yet include a marked sense of the need to reform the content of catechesis. Soon, the second stage of the catechetical renewal would develop a more precise connection between the related Liturgical and Catechetical movements. This would be concretised principally in the work of the Jesuit priest, Josef Jungmann (1889-1975).

Part Two The Early Catechetical Movement Stage 2: Focus on Content

By the 1930s there was a change in perspective with regard to the development of catechesis. This second stage of the reform sought to refocus on the perceived joy of the Gospel in catechesis which had been lost, it was claimed, amidst the learning of layers of theological formulae derived from the *Roman Catechism*. At the heart of this was the strengthening of the links between catechetical renewal and other reform movements in the Church, especially the Liturgical Movement, leading to a vision of integral formation and religious nurture centred on the Christian community at worship. Catholic Religious Education was hence nothing less than the continuing proclamation of the 'good news' of salvation (Kerygma) which would elicit the response of good living from its subjects (Isomura 1962).

The key figure of this movement is Josef Jungmann whose work is best understood as an attempt to reclaim the *nurturing heart* of catechesis from what Jungmann saw as the arid scholastic approaches underpinning post-Tridentine catechesis. At the heart of Jungmann's theology is the intervention of *grace* within the life of the Church (Horan, on-line) and his endeavours to re-imagine catechesis in this light are reflected in two important works in the field: *The Good News and Our Proclamation of the Faith* (1962) and *Handing on the Faith* (1965).[25] Jungmann (1965) recognised the aims and objectives of the early reforms to method but felt that the perceived disproportionate focus on the effective presentation of content skirted round the key challenge then facing the Church's catechetical work: the lack of an appreciation of the concept of 'salvation history' rooted in knowing, celebrating and living the *Kerygma,* 'in all its beauty and in all its supernatural sublimity' (Jungmann 1965: 36).

Jungmann objected to the intrusion of largely cognitive approaches to learning in what, he insisted, should be a process of religious proclamation, driven by grace and rooted within the vibrant liturgical life of the Christian community (Jungmann 1962; 1965). Such cognitive approaches to catechesis, rooted in part in the Tridentine settlement and contextualised in the polarised religious atmosphere of late sixteenth century Europe and beyond, were, in Jungmann's eyes, no more than an unwelcome imposition of theology and its associated language and methodology on to the catechesis of the young (Jungmann, 1962). As a corrective to the perceived dominance of what he called the 'abstract language of theology' in catechesis (Jungmann 1962: 37), Jungmann sought inspiration in a somewhat idealised vision of the early Church which had, he claimed, a 'pristine spirit and single-mindedness of its Christian life and in the clarity of its ideals' (Jungmann 1962:17). This approach reflected the late medieval Humanists' desire to return 'ad fontes' as part of a *renaissance* of interest in early Christianity. Jungmann was in effect adopting the same hermeneutic as the early humanists.

Jungmann proposed to strengthen the existing systematic method of catechesis with a wider vision designed to proclaim what Christians saw as the joy—

[25] *The Good News and Our Proclamation of Faith* was initially published in the late 1930s but did not make a significant impact until the 1960s. See Ruff (2002) for comment on Jungmann's ideas.

kerygma—of the Gospel. Jungmann, for example, saw the Liturgical Year as a complete course in Christian teaching which presented afresh, through its liturgical feasts, all the key moments of salvation history (1962: 83). This appreciation of the Gospel message would provide a cultural challenge to Christians who had failed to assimilate the message and whose spiritual life, both personal and corporate, owed more to local customs and a burdensome list of poorly understood obligations (1962:3). Jungmann incorporated the vision of the Liturgical Movement in his catechetical work in order to provide an initial synthesis of reform-minded developments. The proclamation of the Christian message could not, therefore, be separated from the liturgy. Such a primary focus on the liturgy enhanced Jungmann's position as a key advocate of the *catechetical* paradigm of religious education.[26]

Certain limitations arise from Jungmann's approach, despite its initial appeal. First, the apparent focus on catechesis as an activity primarily for children sits uneasily with the early Church's focus on adult conversion (1965). More important, however, is the emphasis on the liturgy as means of formation. Although Jungmann never claimed that the liturgy is anything other than an act of worship, it is easy to read into his work a view of liturgy as primarily a catechetical enterprise or pedagogical tool (1965:98-99). In his proposal to learn from and draw on a particular period of Church history, Jungmann was also risking the charge of antiquarianism. While there is a certain degree of truth in his assessment of the 'vivid catechesis' of early Christianity, it is hard to deny the charge of a selective reading of history with little recognition, for example, of the vibrant educational and catechetical developments of late antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

These limitations should not blind the modern reader to Jungmann's contribution to catechesis as a worthy field of study. Recent thinking in catechetics has developed his original focus on liturgy as the framework for the *Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults* (RCIA). Furthermore, the important place of liturgy in the wider catechetical framework is now recognised in the mainstream of Catholic

[26] See also Willey et al. (2008) for a helpful examination of the connection between liturgical texts and catechetical principles

thought (Pope John Paul II 1979; Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 50, 71, 85, 87, 257, 258).

Concluding Remarks: The Catechetical Renewal of the Early Twentieth Century

By the 1930s, catechetical thought was embarking upon a phase of far-reaching development which would continue throughout the rest of the century. The two-stage reform of method and content reflected the Church's dialogue with other disciplines (method) and its willingness to draw on its own resources in order to address the challenges of the age (content). Catechesis was thus to become a distinct field of study with its own history and an associated need to develop and rediscover its own validatory theoretical corpus (Mongoven 2000). By the middle of the twentieth century there is little sense of Catholic Religious Education understood as other than a process of integral faith formation rooted in a catechetical vision while remaining part of the timetable and framework of the Catholic school. More importantly, there is still no hint of catechesis and school-based Religious Education - as it is presently understood - as separate, although related, conceptual fields, as found in later Magisterial documents.

Concluding Remarks for Chapter Two: The Genealogy of the Catechetical and Educational Paradigms of Religious Education

Chapter Two has demonstrated how catechesis has moved in tandem with wider Church and socio-cultural movements. In the early Church faith formation was centred on the family and the wider Church community in a context of faith nurture. In time this approach was enhanced by greater awareness of the insights offered by Greek philosophy. The work of St. Augustine of Hippo offers a synthesis of this relationship between nurture and scholastic frameworks of catechesis. In the Middle Ages catechesis retained its roots in the worshipping community and was further integrated into the *renovatio* of Charlemagne. The rise of the Scholastics ensured that catechesis developed a more cutting *educational* edge. In the years following the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church organised its catechetical endeavours to strengthen Church identity in the

face of the Protestant Reformation. This was the age of the *Roman Catechism* and the rise of the Jesuits and the De La Salle Brothers. Finally, the catechetical renewal of the early twentieth century reformed both the content and the method of catechesis and set the scene for the insights offered by the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s and the teaching on catechesis and education from the later years of the twentieth century.

Crucially, this set of historical contexts has also demonstrated that the contemporary understanding of catechesis and Religious Education as distinct concepts does not find strong support in the history of Christian catechesis and education. The terms *catechetical* and *educational* paradigms have been used to identify the key moments in the between these paradigms. The second half of the twentieth century is where the broader articulation of these separate, although related, conceptual fields emerge. The evolution of this relationship will be studied in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE
CATECHESIS AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH

Introduction

Chapter Two demonstrated that up to the early years of the twentieth century there was scant evidence of any firm conceptual dichotomy between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. This arrangement remained in place until the final quarter of the twentieth century when Catholic thinking began, cautiously at first, to consider a new alignment between both concepts.

Chapter Three is a critical review of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as set out in the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church. The chapter argues that the major shift in Catholic thinking on catechesis in the years following the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) had a profound effect on the conceptual framework of Catholic Religious Education. During this period, the so-called *catechetical* and *educational* paradigms—as articulated in Chapter Two—developed in response to two currents: a) the re-discovery of the Christian community—or parish—as the key context for the diffusion of the Church's catechetical mission and b) the rise of new thinking in liberal Religious Education which contested the concept of faith nurture as an integral component of the syllabus in an increasingly plural society. By the first decade of the twenty-first century, the historically-conditioned interplay between the *catechetical* and *educational* paradigms—although more implicit than explicit—had evolved into a fresh understanding of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as two related yet separate enterprises located within the mission of the Church.

Chapter Three explores the genealogy of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It sets out the key thematic frames of reference within which the relevant Magisterial documents and associated academic literature are explored chronologically (see Chapter 1). This allows for some cross-referencing across the themes as the range of the issues for debate resists a

neat packaging within specific time-frames. The five parts of Chapter Three will demonstrate that the initial thematic interplay between the academic literature (secondary sources) and the Magisterial documents (primary sources) led in time to the clear articulation of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the Magisterial documents.

Part One explores the major developments in catechesis and non-denominational Religious Education in the twentieth century. The latter's challenge to the concept of 'faith nurture' did not leave the Catholic tradition unaffected and it is essential to our argument to be aware of the roots of liberal Religious Education.

Part Two argues that the Magisterium's initial acceptance of the 'new' thinking in catechesis in the years during and following the Second Vatican Council became more nuanced in the 1970s owing to a perceived deficit in the teaching of the key doctrines of the Church.

Part Three claims that the new thinking in non-denominational Religious Education (see above) influenced Catholic scholars to reconceptualise Catholic Religious Education as a more academically respectable subject at the heart of the life of the Catholic school.

Part Four explores how some Catholic scholars sought to reclaim and enhance the place of faith nurture within Catholic Religious Education while affirming some of the key insights - in particular that of academic respectability - which had arisen from liberal Religious Education.

Part Five considers how the Magisterium of the Catholic Church responded to the wider thinking on education and liberal Religious Education by proposing an enriched relationship relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Part 1 Key Twentieth Century Developments in Catechesis and Liberal Religious Education

The present thesis claims that catechesis is a) the parent of Catholic Religious Education and b) authentic Catholic Religious education is a *legitimate development* of catechesis. It is hence necessary to begin a review of the literature on Catholic Religious Education with an exploration of Catholic thinking on catechesis. [27]

Section A looks at the Catholic Church's catechetical reforms of the early twentieth century. Section B explores the emergence of the new thinking in liberal Religious Education which aimed to reject wholly confessional approaches in favour of a more academic study of religion and associated ways of thinking.

A. New Models of Catechesis

The method and content reforms of catechesis of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (see Chapter Two) were followed by a third wave of catechetical reform influenced by the broader educational currents of the age. It had two component parts: the *anthropological* and *experiential* models of catechesis.

The Anthropological Model of Catechesis

The anthropological model of catechesis captured the post-World War II sense of expectation and hope arising from the growth of education and schooling. There remained, however, a profound ideological debate in the West over the merits of so-called progressive educational systems, particularly in the context of the Cold War and the division of Europe (Bowen 1981). These new ideas in education fostered more inductive and student-centred—as opposed to content-centred—approaches to learning (see Chapter Two). Within these highly charged political and cultural contexts, the new ideas in catechesis continued to draw inspiration

[27] See Fleming (2007) for a brief overview of the challenges arising from drawing a distinction between catechesis and religious education.

from the Catholic reform movements of the early twentieth century which had sought to refresh Catholic thinking in the light of the supposed practices of early Christianity.

The anthropological model of catechesis had two key frames of reference. First, it reflected a concern that the Kerygmatic school's seeming over-emphasis on the proclamation of the 'good news' might be interpreted as an anti-intellectualist stance which favoured a sentimentalism in catechesis at the expense of knowledge of a body of received doctrine (Gallagher 2001). Second, it aimed to tackle the alleged unreceptive attitudes of students, a situation not wholly unrelated to the social and cultural conditions in which many lived. This challenge was best addressed, it was argued, by the Church and its catechists making contact with people in *all* social conditions and responding to the pastoral challenges arising from the levels of material and cultural poverty which impeded any efforts at genuine evangelisation (Gallagher 2001).

A series of International Catechetical Study Weeks served as the intellectual and pastoral engine for this new thinking (Gallagher 2001). These Study Weeks were spread across the years 1959 – 1968 and the chosen locations of Nijmegen (1959), Eichstatt (1960), Bangkok (1962), Katigondo (1964), Manila (1967) and Medellin (1968) provided an international backdrop to this intellectual movement (Marthaler 1978). The agenda of the Study Weeks moved from the initial aim of the adaptation of the kerygmatic movement to the wider objective of the reform of the Church and its structures. What made this time particularly interesting is the juxtaposition between the Study Weeks and the important events of the Second Vatican Council and beyond. It seemed that the sense of optimism and hope of the post-World War II world (see above) had influenced Catholic thinkers to freshen Church thinking to meet the signs of the times and the needs of post-War society (Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes* 1965). An example of this move for change was the opening of the 'third world' in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the consideration of how to address the pastoral and social challenges facing the Church and wider society in those continents. *Gaudium et Spes* (1965) provides a primary example of the acceptance in the Church of the thinking behind the *anthropological* method of catechesis. Its opening paragraph outlining

the ‘joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted…’ reflects a desire on the part of the Church to align itself with political and cultural shifts in post–war Europe which sought a common home free from the conflicting ideologies which had produced two wars in the space of half a century.

The Study Weeks were influenced by two interrelated but by no means univocal intellectual currents. First, they reflected some of the radical educational theory of this time which drew on the behavioural sciences as a means of channelling educational outcomes towards the development of the skills and attributes deemed necessary for the continued upholding of the post-war social and economic settlement (Bowen 1981). Second, and perhaps unsurprisingly, they were inspired by the corpus of Catholic social teaching which sought to include improvements in education as part of the mission to improve the living conditions of the new ‘working classes’ (Pope Leo XIII 1891; Pope Pius X 1905; Pope Pius XI 1929).

The Study Weeks offered an ecclesial forum to educationalists like Paulo Freire (1921-1997) who had challenged the ‘banking model’ of education for preserving a perceived unjust cultural and economic *status quo* (Freire 2000). Freire’s thinking offered Catholic education another way to refresh its links with Catholic social teaching and his thinking was a more radical interpretation of the broader tradition of Catholic social teaching (Elias 1999). This desire to address economic and social inequalities anticipates some of the impulses behind Pope Benedict XVI’s *Letter for the World Day of Peace* (2012 b). Within such a wider context, the Study Weeks highlighted the political dimension to catechesis. The Medellin Study Week of 1968, for example, located the Church’s catechetical work within the Church’s broader commitment to social justice; the South American context facilitated an interface between catechesis and the emerging theologies of liberation which were circulating in South America at that time (Erdozain 1983). Furthermore, the early Study Weeks floated the concept of ‘pre-evangelisation’ as a way of preparing people to hear the Gospel. This ‘pre-evangelisation was defined initially as ‘an initial stage of purification, of acclimatization, of human contact’ (Erdozain 1983: 93). The Jesuit priest, Alfonso Nebreda (1926-2004), the director of the East Asian Pastoral Institute, clarified further this principle of pre-

evangelisation in the context of the new models of catechesis: 'The guiding principle of pre-evangelisation is anthropocentric because we must start with the individual as he or she is' (1983: 52). This short and important sentence by Nebreda encapsulated the direction in which the catechetical debate was heading and shows a clear overlap with the Freirian focus on the liberation of the human person from perceived unjust structures.

The anthropological model of catechesis recognised and gave credence to the different social, cultural and political realities faced by the Church across the world. It drew on the Freirian model of education to propose a radical vision of catechesis as an agent of ecclesial and social change. In the early 1960s the Second Vatican Council acted as an official ecclesial forum for the discussion of these views and many of the ideas emanating from the anthropological model of catechesis were expressed in the published teachings of the Council. In the years following the Council, the rise of the experiential model offered another perspective on catechesis to the Church.

The Experiential Model of Catechesis

The experiential model of catechesis sought to reorientate catechesis away from the understanding of Divine Revelation solely as the communication of a set of theological propositions towards a model of catechesis predicated on a recognition of the life experience and history of the student. In this new model, and in keeping with the student-centred approach of the anthropological model, the student was no longer understood as a *tabula rasa* on whose spirit the words of the Gospel and the *Roman Catechism* would be written. Critics of this model of catechesis claimed with some justification that the sociological factors (for example personal history and identity) were perceived as of higher importance than the receiving of a faith tradition (Pope Benedict XVI b 2006).

The experiential model was a reaction to the alleged dominance of the concept of 'salvation history' (see Chapter Two) which Jungmann had made the core of his catechetical work and which had remained at the heart of the Second Vatican Council's document on Divine Revelation - *Dei Verbum* (1965). The experiential

construction of catechesis built on the work of the anthropological model and drew on the Second Vatican Council's call for dialogue with other religions to develop a philosophy of catechesis which had implications beyond the immediate field of catechesis. Put briefly, if the Church were to accept that some elements of the truth were located beyond the boundaries of the Catholic Church (cf: *Gaudium et Spes*) then it followed that truth could not be identified solely with the Church's body of received teachings. Gabriel Moran (1935-), for example, claimed that Revelation lay at the heart of the student's own faith history (1967). He rejected the traditional understanding of Revelation understood solely as a faith tradition to be passed on in teaching and worship (see part B below). This line of thinking anticipated the doctrinal debates which would be part of Catholic life in the subsequent decades. In this context, Moran argued that the traditional understanding of Revelation as *sacred history* was no more than a modern construction of the events narrated in Scripture (1967).

The experiential method recalled the pedagogical reforms of the early twentieth century (for example, the Munich Method) which had drawn on the emerging insights of developmental psychology to improve the dialogue between catechist and student (see Chapter Two, Context Four). Furthermore, it could be argued that Moran's position was a fresh articulation of the Council of Trent's desire to match catechesis to the age and stage of the student (see Chapter Two, Context Three). The experiential model sought to redress the perceived imbalance between the respective emphases of content and method in previous catechetical reforms and allow the student's catechetical experience and personal history to be further enhanced in the light of the new catechetical ideas. In this respect it is questionable if the experiential method of catechesis was any more revolutionary than earlier methods of catechetical reforms in that it was looking to reconfigure the relationship between so-called cognitive and affective learning in order to improve catechesis.

The determined focus on the personal experience of the student encouraged a reconsideration of the importance of teaching doctrine in catechetical programmes. If catechesis had traditionally been focussed on the passing on of a revealed tradition of faith, the more explicit focus on the place of human

experience in catechesis could be interpreted as a new direction within the Catholic tradition.

Taken together, the anthropological and experiential models of catechesis were wide-ranging attempts to make catechesis more fulfilling and integrated by drawing on a range of insights in the field of education. In practice, both schools of thought afforded insights to catechesis which recognised the range of human experiences of those to be catechised. Many of the key principles of these models of catechesis informed the teachings of the Magisterium both in the Second Vatican Council and in the publication in 1971 of the *General Catechetical Directory.*

In summary, the new models of catechesis were designed to improve catechetical practice by drawing both on Church tradition and insights arising from other ways of thinking. This took place as the mode of operation of Catholic Religious Education in the school was challenged by other philosophies and worldviews.

B. New Models of 'Religious Education'

Part B explores three key aspects which underpin the emergence of new models of Religious Education. First, an exploration of the genealogy of the term 'Religious Education' is essential preparatory work to understanding the growth of the educational paradigm of Catholic Religious Education. Second, an examination of the growth of non-denominational Religious Education reveals the initial challenges to established faith nurture approaches. Third, this new direction in the wider picture of Religious Education influenced the Catholic tradition principally through the work of Gabriel Moran.

Genealogy of 'Religious Education'

'Religious Education' has its origin in a particular religious and social context. In the United States of America in 1903, the Religious Education Association (henceforth REA) was founded as a home for Protestant Christians who saw value in a specific approach to the place of religion in education (Boys 1981; Kravatz

2010). In this influential movement, 'Religious Education' (also used as the title of the Association's academic journal) was the preferred term for the teaching of Christianity in a way which integrated 'liberal theology, the social gospel and progressive education' (Scott 1982: 590). The emphasis on the *educational* nature of 'religious education' was designed to offer an alternative to Revivalist tendencies in the Protestant Christian religious instruction of the time (Scott 1982). It is here that the roots of a Christian critique of predominantly faith nurture approaches to religious education are found. [28]

The intellectual thrust of this movement came, it was claimed, from the growing awareness of the child as living organism and not as a figure ready to be pressed into any 'prearranged mould' (Coe 1903; Dewey 1903). As such, the REA drew inspiration from the wider progressive movement in American education at that time (Bowen 1981). 'Religious Education' in its earliest incarnation was not, therefore, and never claimed to be, a synonym for religious *instruction* nor for any 'Christian nurture' approaches to religious formation.[29] On the contrary, from its outset it was perceived by its proponents to offer a new experience located in the encounter between religion and the study of education (Rainey Harper 1903). This claim to interdisciplinarity foreshadowed the many layers of meaning which have become foundational to contemporary Religious Education (cf. Robinson 2011). Furthermore, this disparate set of thematic roots is reflected today in the lack of a shared understanding across Christian and other religious and philosophical traditions of terms like religious education, Christian education, Christian nurture, educational ministry and catechesis (Elias 1982; Scott 1982; Kravatz 2010).

While the REA become more influential in American Protestant circles, the Catholic tradition remained initially unaffected by the issues surrounding the emergence of this new understanding of 'Religious Education'. In time, increasing Catholic membership of the REA played a significant part in its

[28] This fertile ideological movement grew in an America where there was a clear separation between church and state. Kraynack (2005) has suggested that the separation of powers and the resultant distinction between laws and customs was a driver of a healthy religious pluralism.
[29] Horace Bushnell's seminal text *Christian Nurture* (1861) mapped out the key lines of this faith nurture approach within the American Protestant tradition. Kathan (2013: 41) has reassessed the contribution of Bushnell to the development of the REA to claim that Bushnell is the 'spiritual father' of the REA.

development as a multi-denominational, as opposed to liberal Protestant, organisation (Elias 2004). There was, however, no parallel Catholic movement to reconfigure approaches to Catholic Religious Education along the lines suggested by the REA (Scott 1982). The 'method' reforms of the early catechetical renewal movement valued a more structured and educational approach to catechesis; this reflected, albeit dimly, the educational spirit of the reforms undertaken by the REA. The kerygmatic movement, in its drive to recapture a perceived joy in Christian nurture approaches to religious formation, was a clear move in another direction and a rejection of the philosophy underpinning the REA.

The term 'Religious Education' is hence a recent arrival in the Catholic lexicon. Catholic thinking—as we have seen above—had traditionally emphasised the catechetical and instructional nature of any form of religious education and formation in the school. The use of the term 'Religious Instruction' was more common in the English translation of the Magisterial documents on catechesis and education from the first half of the twentieth century onwards (Congregation for the Clergy 1971: 19; Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 66-70) and only later in the twentieth century is the term 'Religious Education' used in Magisterial teaching (Congregation for Catholic Education: 2009). Indeed both terms are often used interchangeably alongside 'education in the faith' and 'religious training'. This varied usage might, of course, reflect the perspectives of the varied authors of these documents over a lengthy period and we cannot discount the role of the translator of Magisterial documents.[30] What is unarguable is that the use of a broad range of terms to describe the process of religious formation both within and beyond the school illustrates the complexity of the debate over the conceptual framework for Catholic Religious Education.

Religious Education as study of religion

While the Catholic Church in the years after the Second Vatican Council was hoping to 'enter with patience and charity into discussion and collaboration with members of other religions' (The Declaration on the Relation of the Church to

[30] For more on issues surrounding translation, see part 4 of chapter 4.

non-Christian Religions *Nostra Aetate* 1965: 2), thinkers from other traditions were examining the possibilities offered by cross-border initiatives in religion and education

In the 1960s, the educationalist, Ninian Smart (1927-2001), while remaining attached to Christianity, questioned the place of explicit faith nurture in Religious Education.[31] While it is unlikely that Smart's thinking had any immediate influence on the workings of the Magisterium, his contribution to the intellectual debate on the relationship between religion and education did influence Catholic thinkers like Gabriel Moran (2008; 1974; 1971; 1967), whose work reflected a shift from Religious Education as synonymous with catechesis to Religious Education understood as a broader study of religion and its influence on the human condition.

Ninian Smart was convinced that Religious Education in schools would be improved by the opening of its conceptual borders, at that time almost exclusively Christian, to the insights into the human condition offered by other religions and their related ways of understanding the world. Smart was influenced by the patterns of migration which had reshaped the 'cultural composition' of western countries and which had driven a concomitant growth in new forms of religious worship (Engebretson 2004).

In his desire to change the face of Religious Education and, in his mind, to strengthen its position in the academic framework of the school, Smart was initially following the reformist lines mapped out by the REA in early twentieth century America in favour of a theologically liberal and educationally progressive model of Religious Education. Nonetheless, the REA retained a Christian world-view as its underpinning philosophy. Smart's analysis of the problems surrounding Religious Education led to a diagnosis of 'schizophrenia' arising in part from the juxtaposition between the dominance of nurture-based Religious Education in schools and the provision of Religious Studies in Higher Education (secular) institutions (1968: 90). In response to this situation, Smart's proposed an

[31] See London (Online) for an in initial idea of Smart's religious allegiances.position

opening of the language and conceptual framework of Religious Education and theology to wider perspectives and to 'the sympathetic appreciation of positions and faiths other than its own. Christian theology, in brief, must be open, not closed' (1968: 91).

Smart's overall contribution to debates on the nature of Religious Education can be grouped into three strands (Barnes 2000; 2001). First, Smart's recognition of the pluralist nature of society helpfully nudged Religious Education away from a confessionalist paradigm which was ill at ease in this pluralist society. Second, Smart was in favour of the neutrality of the state in religious affairs in general and this too was an indicator of the desirability of non-confessional Religious Education. Finally, Smart was convinced that Religious Education should evolve into a multi-faith and disinterested study of religion

Given the broader multi-faceted revolution in Religious Education which took place throughout the 1970s (Sullivan 2007), it is necessary to assess Smart's overall contribution to a debate which, at that time, oscillated between *phenomenology* and *nurture* as the parameters of the debate. While there is a shared agreement as to Smart's status as an influential and hugely important figure in the modern history of theories of Religious Education, there is still a debate on how positive his contribution to the field actually was.

Philip Barnes has challenged approaches to Religious Education which are rooted in Smart's ideas (2001). Barnes agrees that Smart's critique of confessionalism in Religious Education is both timely and well-developed. However it does not follow, claims Barnes, that a phenomenological approach is the best, or even an appropriate, response to the challenges posed by confessionalism. Kevin O'Grady, on the other hand, welcomed Smart's ideas on Religious Education. O'Grady sees the Smartian corpus as a pioneering initiative which made contemporary Religious Education 'academically respectable' (2005: 235). Other and more profound challenges to Smart's legacy have come from a number of angles: phenomenology as parent of cross-religious models of teaching and learning has been deemed inadequate, especially for younger children (Hull 1984); an unforeseen legacy of phenomenology has been the removal from the

Religious Education curriculum of the conceptual and linguistic resources needed to combat the global threats to the same liberal values which initially inspired Smart's work (Conroy and Davis 2007: 188).

New Thinking in Religious Education in the Catholic Tradition

It is a moot point whether the new ideas on Religious Education penetrated the Magisterium or were even acknowledged as forming part of an intellectual debate by the Congregation for Catholic Education at that time. A possible explanation for this state of affairs might lie in the linguistic barriers separating Rome and the key debates in the field of Religious Education which took place principally in English language journals. Bearing this in mind, the works of Gabriel Moran became a conduit for this so-called liberal Religious Education into Catholic intellectual life although it would be unwise and unjust to Moran himself to interpret his substantial body of writings solely in terms of his interpretation of the writings of Ninian Smart.

The importance of Moran's work for the present thesis lies in the unique perspective he offers on Religious Education and on the parallels between Smart and Moran's vision of Religious Education as an academic field with outposts well beyond the confines of the Catholic Church and any other named Christian tradition. Moran's definition of 'Religious Education' needs prefacing by further terminological precision. Moran preferred the term 'crisis *of* Religious Education' to 'crisis *in* Religious Education (1971:12). The former term was, he believed, a more meaningful articulation of his belief that there was a need to redefine Religious Education in order to act on the insights offered by education and rationality. The latter term suggested a return to debates on the alleged doctrinal weaknesses of Religious Education in the post Vatican II Church (1971).

Moran drew on this distinction to propose a new conceptual framework and model of Religious Education. He favoured 'ecumenical education' (the words are part of the title of his book) as the descriptor of a new conceptual framework for a subject which would be developed by co-operation between those who were searching for a truth that was greater than any single truth professed by individual religions (1971). His understanding of 'ecumenical' in this case is interesting.

Moran seems to be proposing a model of religious education rooted in a framework which transcends firm attachment to any religious tradition. For Moran, the benefits of this model included a move away from the *preacher model* (ie faith nurture) of Religious Education and a willingness to engage with topics other than Scripture and Dogma (1971). In time Moran took a far more challenging stance against Church-centred Religious Education. In particular, he labelled traditional Religious Education as 'ecclesiastical thought-control for children' and saw the new field of 'Religious Education' as a way to encourage much-needed changes in the structures of organised religion (1974: 532-533).

Magisterial teaching on education and Catholic Religious Education shows little sign of Moran's influence. Finola Cunnane (2004), however, has drawn on Moran's thought in an attempt to understand better the nature and purpose of Religious Education for the modern world. Cunnane shares with Moran that view that Religious Education cannot be a component part of the catechetical process if it is to remain true to its identity as an academic subject. This particular position is summed up neatly below:

> Teaching religion in schools is an important aspect of schooling in Religious Education. Teaching religion in a classroom is an academic process. It is not concerned with initiating people in religious matters. Neither is it preoccupied with teaching a person a religious way of behaving (2004: 136).

Cunnane rejects the possibility of an accommodation between faith nurture and educational structures. The passage encapsulates Cunnane's perspective on the academic underpinning of Religious Education and reflects – albeit dimly - Pope Paul VI's call in *Evangelii Nuntiandi* for 'systematic religious instruction' (1975:44). Cunnane proposes an 'academic process' - which implies some form of 'systematic' approach - but with a wholly divergent conceptual understanding of Religious Education and its associated objectives for learning. The focus in contemporary Magisterial teaching on Religious Education (see Part 5 below) on giving 'pupils knowledge about Christian identity and Christian life' is a firm response to those, along with Moran and Cunnane, have advocated otherwise (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009: 17).

Cunnane's work summarises Moran's thinking in a twenty-first century context. For Cunnane, Moran and Smart, Religious Education is best understood as a developing subject which flourishes best when liberated from the (perceived) limitations of faith nurture conceptual frameworks. Alongside this model, some fresh and radical thinking in *Catholic Religious Education* emerged in the 1970s and 1980s. This school of thought sought a suitable template for an educational paradigm of Religious Education which was distinct from wholly catechetical and faith nurture frameworks yet recognised the contribution that effective Catholic Religious Education played in the student's own faith journey.

Part 2 The Magisterium's Response to the New Thinking in Catechesis

Section A explores how the catechetical reform movement was given further impetus by the Second Vatican Council's seeming embrace of the claims made by the new thinking in catechesis (Part 1 Section A above). The *General Catechetical Directory* (1971) offered an official forum for the 'new catechesis' which chimed with the progressive educational thought of the time. Section B explores the Magisterium's 'reform of the reforms' in catechesis in order to counteract a perceived deficiency in doctrinal knowledge while retaining key insights from the anthropological and experiential models of catechesis.

A. The Growth of Inductive Catechesis

The calls in the anthropological and experiential models of catechesis for more inductive forms of catechesis influenced catechetical thought in the years following the Second Vatican Council. The publication of the *General Catechetical Directory* in 1971 marked the Magisterium's recognition of the value of this approach to catechesis.

The Second Vatican Council and Catechesis

By the time of the Second Vatican Council, and *pace* the insights arising from the catechetical reform movement, the catechetical paradigm of Catholic Religious Education, as outlined by Pope Pius XI's *Divini Illius Magistri* (1929), remained

the principal conceptual framework. Interestingly, the Council did not produce a document dedicated to catechesis. This omission seems curious given the intellectual energy surrounding the Study Weeks which were taking place around the time of the Council. One interpretation of this 'omission' could be that the Church was not yet in a position to re-evaluate the traditional doctrinal focus to catechesis and was exercising an understandable caution in the face of the new thinking around catechetical matters. Nevertheless, two contrasting points about catechesis emerge from the wider teachings of the Council.

The Council reminded the Bishops that catechesis was their responsibility as chief pastors of the local Church. Bishops were called to develop programmes of catechesis based on the foundations of 'holy scripture, tradition, liturgy and on the teaching authority and life of the Church' (*Christus Dominus* - Decree concerning the Pastoral Office of Bishops 1965: 14). The focus on the role of the Bishop was an expression of a desire to keep the supervision of catechetical thought within the borders of the faith tradition and, perhaps, limit the influence of other and seemingly more radical voices in the wider debate about aims and purposes of education. In a similar vein, Pope Francis has reminded the Church of the 'ecclesial form of faith' and thus ensure that catechesis and theological study are partners in the Church's mission to transmit its heritage to new generations (2013: 22; 36).

Second, the wider theme in the Second Vatican Council of openness to other ways of thinking allowed for a reassessment of how best to deal with widespread societal change. This claim of openness to the wider world and its associated ways of thinking needs reading in a wider theological and educational context. The nature of Revelation was at the heart of the discussion. The Council's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum* (1965), had reiterated the traditional understanding of Revelation as a set of doctrinal propositions centred on the Paschal Mystery (1965: 3-8). This left the Church open to charges (unjust or otherwise) of a perceived bias towards an overly cognitive approach to teaching. It is no easy task to reconcile the insights of *Gaudium et Spes* with the more traditional view of Revelation as expressed in Dei *Verbum.* On the one hand, *Dei Verbum* (1965 passim) taught that Truth was found in the revealed doctrine of

the Catholic Church yet in *Gaudium et Spes* (1965 passim) there is an openness to, and a willingness to adapt to and learn from, various situations arising in the world. This juxtaposition is encapsulated in *Lumen Gentium'*s claim there is only one Church of Christ subsisting in the Catholic Church while 'other elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside its visible confines*'* (1964:8).

Given this range of views and the debates it engendered, it is not surprising that the years following the Council saw continued radical thinking in catechesis. There were now moves to embrace insights from outwith the Catholic and the broader Christian tradition in the experiential model of catechesis

Responding to the Catechetical Movement: The General Catechetical Directory

The publication in 1971 of the *General Catechetical Directory* (henceforth *GCD*) was a landmark occasion in the catechetical landscape. The catechetical reforms which had begun on the fringes of the Church and were gradually – and not without debate – integrated into Church teaching and practice over the twentieth century, had now coalesced into the core of a document which would guide all catechetical endeavours for the following twenty six years.

The Second Vatican Council had not mandated a new catechism to serve as a doctrinal pole to guide the Church in a dialogue with other ways of thinking. By rejecting the publication of a new catechism and offering the innovative - if undefined genre - of a *directory* as a way of devolving authority to local Bishops, the Council was recognising the broader educational trends away from over-reliance on codified and centralised curricula towards seemingly more democratic, or decentralised, approaches to education (Bowen 1981). This new genre was not co-terminous with 'catechism' and suggested a text with a looser structure yet still identified with the authority of the universal Church. These directories would include one with a special responsibility for 'catechetical instruction of the Christian people' and deal with all matters pertaining to this enterprise, including the preparation of suitable books (*Christus Dominus* 1965: 44). Interestingly, this choice of words does not rule out a new 'catechism'.

The *GCD* marked a radical shift away from the traditional use of catechisms and the associated scholastic scaffolding rooted in both the Tridentine model of catechesis and in the reforms arising from the 'Munich Method'. In its treatment of methodology – and following the insights of the progressive elements in education - the *GCD* favoured the *inductive* method (from below) over the *deductive* method (from above) of catechesis. It claimed that the *inductive* method was an accurate reflection of the original preaching methodology of Christ (1971: 72-74). While this observation reflected the acceptance of the insights of the wider catechetical and educational currents – or the 'spirit of the age' - it did leave the *GDC* open to accusations of partiality since the teaching methods of Jesus as recorded by Scripture cannot be fully identified with any one school of 'educational' thought (Keller 1998).

The *GDC* emphasised the nexus between evangelisation and catechesis in the broader context of the pastoral ministry of the Word (cf: Congregation for the Clergy 1971; Mongoven 2000). This new configuration of the relationship between evangelisation and catechesis reasserted the role of the wider parish community in catechesis. It acknowledged the traditional role of the school in religious formation but it had little to say about the nature of school-based Religious Education apart from one brief observation that in the older Christian countries (meaning Europe) 'catechesis often takes the form of religious instruction imparted to children or adolescents in school or outside of school' (1971: 19).

This line of thinking can be interpreted in three ways: a) it would suggest that there was no sense of necessary reform in school-based Religious Education; b) as a document dedicated to catechesis, the *GDC* did not see a *school* subject as falling within its terms of reference and c) it suggests that catechesis and school-based Religious Education (or instruction) were synonymous concepts with the only difference being one of location. There is an element of truth in each of these observations. More broadly, the *GCD* highlighted the scale of the cultural challenges facing the Catholic Church in the late 1960s and early 1970s and, in response, offered some contrasting lines of thought with Pope St. Pius X's important catechetical document *Acerbo nimis* (1905). Pope St. Pius X recalled

the Council of Trent's framework for catechesis in which Parish Priests had been encouraged to develop wide-ranging catechetical programmes to counter the widespread religious ignorance of the time (1905:11-12). The *GCD* moved in a different direction to the recommendations of Pope St. Pius X in its acceptance of the need to go beyond an improved 'in-house' catechesis in order to embrace the wider challenge of a necessary new evangelisation. The shift in emphasis would seem to be a recognition that the catechetical renewal called for by Pope St. Pius X had failed to penetrate to a sufficient degree the cultural milieu of modern Europe. It affirmed the position of those who had advocated the new models of catechesis as a way of addressing the perceived deficit in Christian formation arising from the older models of catechesis situated within and beyond the school.

The *GCD* also marked the move from *Catholic uniformity* to *inculturation* arising from the shift towards the anthropological and experientialist models of catechesis as advocated in the 1960s (Kelly 2000). This contrasts with the *Roman Catechism* of the sixteenth century and its perceived centralising tendencies. One way of promoting further inculturation was to consider how the worldwide Church could influence pastoral practice and the general theological direction of the Church. With the publication of the *GDC,* the renewal of catechesis rose to the forefront of the Catholic Church's mission and responsibility for the implementation of the new thinking on catechesis was given to local Bishops' Conferences (1971: Introduction). The new role of Bishops' Conferences had originated in the Second Vatican Council's reorientation of the decision-making processes of the Church. Its support for the formation of a Synod of Bishops (*Christus Dominus* 1965: 5) was a recognition of a perceived need to appear more open to the emerging Church in the developing world and to be less centralist in its decision-making processes. [32]

[32] A key example of the contribution of a Bishop's Conference to the catechetical debate was the Italian Bishops' Conference's publication of *Il Rinnovamento della catechesi* (CEI 1970). This document was translated into English with the title *Teaching the Faith The New Way* (Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales 1973) and was accompanied by a dedicated *Introduction* which reflected a desire to maintain an integrated vision of education. There was, as yet, little hint of future developments in the conceptual framework of Religious Education in the Catholic school and its relationship with catechesis.

The growth of this more inductive method of catechesis did not go unopposed. By the middle of the 1970s the Magisterium began to re-assess the shape of its teaching on catechesis with special reference to the teaching of doctrine.

B. The Recovery of 'Religious Instruction'

By the mid 1970s the Magisterium sought to recover a more deductive mode of catechesis in order to counteract perceived deficiencies inherent in the 'new catechesis'; at the heart of this was a concern over the seeming downgrading of traditional doctrinal instruction.

This new development had four related stages: (i) Pope Paul VI made a clear link between catechesis, evangelisation and religious instruction in his Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975); (ii) Pope John Paul II (1979) cautioned against forms of catechesis which, in both content and method, were not aligned with the teaching of the Magisterium; (iii) the genre of the catechism returned with the publication of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* in 1992 and the *Compendium of Catechism of the Catholic Church* in 2005 and iv) the publication of the *General Directory for Catechesis* in 1997 was an attempt to harmonise the various strands of catechetical thought which had arisen since the 1970s within the broader mind of the Church.

(i) Catechesis, Evangelisation and 'Evangelii Nuntiandi'

The important role of the Bishops in the development of strategies for evangelisation and catechesis was further highlighted by Pope Paul VI's convocation of two important Synods of Bishops.

The first of these Synods met to discuss evangelisation and led to Pope Paul VI's *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975). Pope Paul VI issued a renewed call to locate the Church's catechetical mission within the broader picture of evangelisation and defined catechetical instruction as a means of evangelisation to serve the whole Church (my bold text):

> A means of evangelization that must not be neglected is that of catechetical instruction. The intelligence, especially that of children and young people, needs to learn through **systematic religious instruction** the fundamental teachings, the living content of the truth which God has wished to convey to us and which the Church has sought to express in an ever richer fashion during the course of her long history No one will deny that this instruction must be given to form patterns of Christian living and not to remain only notional. Truly the effort for evangelization will profit greatly- at the level of catechetical instruction given at church, in the schools, where this is possible, and in every case in Christian homes- if those giving catechetical instruction have suitable texts, updated with wisdom and competence, under the authority of the bishops. (1975: 44).

In this important text, Pope Paul VI reminded the Church that the body of teaching which it had received needs preserving and taught afresh to new generations using the best pedagogy on offer. For Pope Paul VI, catechesis found its roots in the traditions of the past but remained in need of constant development. Given the suspicion, and at times hostility, in educational circles of the 1960s and 1970s to traditional forms of teaching and learning, the advocacy of 'systematic religious instruction', with its suggestion of a course of studies taught didactically, was (and remains) a counter-cultural statement. This methodology recalled the deductive approach and tone of the *Roman Catechism*: it recognised the many layers of tradition in the Church's own history while retaining the notion of episcopal authority in the approval of 'suitable texts'. In recalling the Church's commitment to the teaching of its own doctrinal heritage, Pope Paul VI countered the radical questioning of education understood solely as the preservation of the cultural and economic *status quo* (cf: Bowen 1981: 542-550).

More broadly, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* followed the *GCD* of 1971 in that it blended what were traditionally separate but related concepts of evangelisation and catechesis into one integrated process of Christian formation. This conceptual revision included a recognition of the place of the school in this process of formation alongside the home and the parish, but located catechesis primarily in the wider processes of evangelisation. Given that the traditional framework of Christian initiation saw catechesis as subsequent to evangelisation, the reconfigured process was an innovative reflection of the new thinking in catechesis. Significantly, the role of the school in the process is not explored in

any depth and there is no indication of the future developments which would lead to a reappraisal of the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education in the school.

ii) Catechesis as an Ecclesial Mission: Pope John Paul II's 'Catechesi Tradendae'

The second Synod of Bishops in 1977 had catechesis as its theme and led to Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Exhortation *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979). Pope John Paul II followed Pope Paul VI in recognising the challenges arising from non-assimilated catechesis. He regarded effective catechesis as a key feature in the Church's ongoing reflection on the work of the Second Vatican Council. Regarding catechesis and the Catholic school, Pope John Paul II affirmed that alongside the family, 'the school provides catechesis with possibilities that are not to be neglected' (1979:69). This line of thinking is clearly informed by *Evangelii Nuntiandi'*s comments on the nexus between catechesis and the school (1975: 44). It mirrors the *GDC*'s portrayal of catechesis within the school setting (1971:19) and reminds the Church that the Catholic school should offer high-quality catechesis/religious instruction as part of its curricular provision. To do this, Pope John Paul II proposed a balanced methodology which eschewed routine and embraced genuine renewal from within the ecclesial tradition.

The etymological roots of catechesis suggest an 'echoing' of learning and Pope John Paul II called explicitly for a rediscovery of 'the human faculty of memory' as a way of integrating 'the great events of the history of salvation' in the collective consciousness of the Church, thus recalling the early Church's focus on the *narratio* as pedagogy (1979: 55). In this he echoed Pope Paul VI's call for a 'systematic religious instruction' (1975: 44) to preserve the memory of the Christian tradition at the heart of the Church but goes a stage further in advocating memorisation as a tool of catechesis alongside dialogue, silence and written work (1979: 55). This blend of methods accords with the broader notion of education as the exploration of the treasures of human knowledge in contrast to methods overly driven by predetermined outcomes (Standish 1998).

In *Catechesi Tradendae,* Pope John Paul II identified both the successes and the limitations of the new thinking in catechesis. He recognised the challenges facing catechesis from those who favoured a looser relationship between catechesis and the teachings of the Magisterium and who, in consequence adopted an eclectic approach to catechesis driven by their own decision of what was, and was not, important (1979: 30).

Given the wider educational climate of the time, it is no surprise that many in the Church viewed with suspicion moves to regulate catechesis in line with a perceived traditionalist approach to teaching (cf. Wrenn 1991; Wrenn and Whitehead 1997). Pope John Paul II, however, recognised that a loose approach to catechesis was not in keeping with catechetical tradition; there is a hint of the necessity and indeed the desirability of some form of normative text to limit more speculative approaches to catechesis and theological study (Pope John Paul II 1979:30). This would be a key theme of catechetical thought in the following decades.

iii) The Genre of the Catechism as the Normative Text for Catechesis

As noted above, the anthropological and experientialist models of catechesis had not been universally welcomed in the Church. There was a perception that the post-Vatican II catechetical focus had been weighted too heavily in favour of a *horizontal* (or overly-inductive) dimension to catechesis which, in its more extreme manifestations, regarded the systematic teaching of revealed Christian doctrine as an unwelcome leftover from what was called the pre-Vatican II Church (Wrenn 1991; Wrenn and Whitehead 1997). The then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger shared the views of those who sought a reshaping of the catechetical landscape in order to counter the perception of religious illiteracy (Pope Benedict XVI 2006: 16). In particular, he expressed profound regret at the removal of the genre of the catechism from religious teaching and the related questioning of the relationship between method and content in catechesis.

In response to the general concerns expressed about the general level of doctrinal awareness, the Synod of Bishops of 1985 recommended the publication of a new

catechism to serve as a point of reference for all future catechisms, or compendia, of doctrine throughout the Church (*Fidei Depositum* 1994). This recommendation reflected Pope John Paul II's call in *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979) for the introduction of some form of normative doctrinal text to serve as point of reference for catechists.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (henceforth *CCC*) was published in 1992. As the *Roman Catechism* was written in the context of, and indeed called for by, the Council of Trent, the *CCC* was written in the context of the reforms mandated by the Second Vatican Council and the *GCD*'s call for the preparation of new catechetical texts (1971: Introduction).

The primary audience of the *CCC* is the Bishops of the Church and, by extension, all priests and those with an interest in catechesis. This is similar to the claim of the *Roman Catechism* to serve as a manual for parish priests but the *CCC* is wider-ranging in that it also has all catechists as its target audience. In its claim to serve as a reference point for catechisms composed in other countries, there is a recognition of the universality of the Church and of the status of the Bishops' Conferences as part of the Magisterium of the Church (2004: 12). Although the CCC allowed greater freedom to local Churches to compose their own catechisms, the CCC's historical significance lies in its counter-cultural exposition of a body of revealed doctrine to be placed at the heart of the catechetical life of the Church.[33] It is hence an official response to Pope Paul VI's call for 'systematic religious instruction' (1975: 44). It seemed that the catechetical landscape had shifted towards a more deductive model.

In 2005 the Magisterium heeded its own advice to use the CCC as a primary source for other catechetical texts. The publication of the *Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church* (henceforth *Compendium)* in 2005 illustrated the ongoing development of catechetical thinking. There are three points worth noting here. First, as a derivative text, the *Compendium* followed the order and

[33] There is no sense that the CCC was intended to be a centralized doctrinal straightjacket; on the contrary, it is a reference book for catechists and not as a template for catechesis (Mongoven 2000: 78).

structure of the parent Catechism but reconfigured the doctrinal sections to create a question – answer style text designed to facilitate memorisation of short focussed doctrinal statements. This raised the question of whether this move reflected a regression to a more cognitive approach to catechesis and a further denial of the perceived benefits arising from the anthropological and experiential models of catechesis. Second, the *Compendium* followed the CCC in its use of religious art as a pedagogical tool to support the short doctrinal formulae. This was a reminder of former times when art illustrated the stories of Scripture for the mainly illiterate Church congregations. In its inclusion of this traditional methodology, the *Compendium* broadened its appeal and complemented the use of the memory and the associated cognitive dimension to catechesis. Finally, the *Compendium* included a section of prayers at the end of the text. This section placed the cognitive dimension of learning in the wider context of Christian prayer and may be interpreted as a recognition that the ultimate purpose of learning is, for the Christian, right relationship with God arising from a balance between the cognitive and affective dimensions of learning in education (Buchanan and Hyde 2008).

Before the publication of the *Compendium* in 2005, the Church had recognised the need to support the doctrinal pillars of the CCC with a revised set of pastoral directives for catechesis in recognition of the changes in the Church and society since the publication of the GCD in 1971. This new 'directory' would serve as a timely and comprehensive map of the challenges and opportunities which the Church needed to address in order to offer support to all involved in the task of catechesis.

iv) Catechesis as part of the Church's Mission: The General Directory for Catechesis

If the GCD of 1971 was a partner volume to the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, the *General Directory for Catechesis* (GDC) of 1997 was published as a companion volume to the CCC and, crucially, as a necessary updating of the GCD in the light of the developments in educational and catechetical thought since the publication of the *General Catechetical Directory* in 1971.

The GDC makes some strong claims. It locates itself within the renewed catechetical tradition stemming from the Second Vatican Council and sees itself as making a major contribution to the ongoing development of catechesis to meet the needs of the contemporary Church. It affirms the delicate balance between catechesis as a necessary element of evangelisation and catechesis as a transmission of a body of doctrine as presented in the CCC (1997:7). There is too a recognition that while the criticisms of a 'light touch' doctrinal focus in the 1970s and 1980s had some validity, the wider pastoral approaches arising from the anthropological and experientialist approaches to catechesis were not to be lightly discarded.

It is important to note that there is no sense in the GDC that catechesis is an activity which is synonymous with, or even related to, Catholic Religious Education in the school. The few paragraphs afforded to the role of the Catholic school in catechesis reflects the primacy of the *parish,* and not the school, as the centre of the catechetical enterprise. The role of the Catholic school in catechesis is dealt with in two paragraphs in the final section of the document under the heading of 'Catechesis in the Particular Church' (259-260). These paragraphs recognise the important role of the Catholic school in the life of the Church and draw on *Catechesi Tradendae* where the vital role of 'religious instruction' in the Catholic school is emphasised (Pope John Paul II 1979: 69). Furthermore, and crucially for the argument of the present thesis, the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (here called 'religious instruction') is considered as an issue apart from the broader role of the Catholic school:

> Religious instruction in schools is developed in diverse scholastic contexts, while always maintaining its proper character, to acquire different emphases. These depend on legal and organisational circumstances, educational theories, personal outlook of individual teachers and schools as well as the relationship between religious instruction in the schools and family or parish catechesis (GDC 1997: 74).

What is noteworthy here is the scope afforded to wider theories of education and the recognition that the aggregation of agencies involved in the educational

process have an impact on 'religious instruction'. Two aspects merit highlighting: first, there is little sense of a 'school-based catechesis' model both here and in other parts of the document (cf: 1997: 76); second the recognition given to both catechesis and religious instruction offers a wider ecclesial context for their respective modes of operation (1997: 74; 76). It needs, of course, to be borne in mind that the GDC was written after the Magisterial documents on education had proposed that catechesis and Religious Education should be considered as separate although related enterprises (see Part 5 below for a more considered treatment of this relationship). This is not new ground but the explicit recognition of the distinction in the *GDC* shows the common approach between the Congregation for the Clergy and the Congregation for Catholic Education. The dual approval, so to speak, lends considerable weight to the established Magisterial distinction between catechesis and Religious Education.

Another important feature of GDC is its sense of pastoral perspective. Following the GDC of 1971, it recognises the limits of the genre of a catechetical directory and is aware that it can offer no more than broad lines of pastoral guidance as opposed to a more restricted target-setting approach focussed on the application of practical directives (1997:9). In this vein, it directs its vision to the Bishops of the Church and all involved in catechetical initiatives with the expressed hope that the *GDC* would serve as a reference point for future catechetical texts, including the publication of local directories and catechisms (1997:11).

Starting in the 1970s and gaining ground in the 1980s onwards, the renewed focus on the parish as the key locus of catechesis raised questions about the role of school in the faith-formation process of young people. This led to a rethinking of the conceptual framework of Catholic Religious Education and its relationship with catechesis and the wider Church.

Part 3 Philosophical and Pastoral Re-evaluations of Catholic Religious Education: the Emerging Educational Paradigm

In the gradual reconfiguring of the Catholic Religious Education landscape, there are two periods of particular interest. In the time between the Second Vatican

Council (1962-1965) and the publication of the *General Catechetical Directory* in 1971 the new thinking in catechesis in Catholic Church did not deal directly with the question of Catholic Religious Education. Soon, the new thinking in catechesis began to effect some modest reform in conceptualisations of Catholic Religious Education in the school. Section A shows how the new thinking in liberal Religious Education challenged the identity of Catholic Religious Education. Section B explores how the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education came under further and deeper scrutiny by Catholic scholars

A. Catechesis and Catholic Religious Education: An Uneasy Relationship

The nature of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education came under critical scrutiny in the years following the publication of the *General Catechetical Directory*. It was necessary to consider the most appropriate way of dealing with 'Religious Education' in the context of the academic environment of the Catholic school. This took place against a backdrop of a) external pressure—the traditional 'faith nurture' approach seemed increasingly inappropriate given the challenge of dealing with the pluralist nature of society—and b) internal Church reform which had shifted the catechetical focus away from the school and towards the family and the parish.

Brother Gerard Rummery's *Catechesis and Religious Education in a Pluralist Society* (1975) brought what had been a specialised debate on the fringes of the Catholic world into the mainstream of Catholic intellectual life. Rummery's book was the first comprehensive map outlining the problematic nature of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. This book was followed by more focussed, albeit derivative, conceptual maps of the field of Religious Education across the Christian traditions (cf: Scott 1984; Boys 1989).

The title of Rummery's book suggests a balanced exposé of two broad concepts. First, there is a laudatory Preface by Ninian Smart - which gives a thematic clue to Rummery's overall thesis. Second, an *Imprimatur* and a *Nihil Obstat* anchor the book firmly within the Catholic tradition. This gives the reader a sense of

anticipation of an innovative approach to reconciling the emerging liberal models of Religious Education with the doctrinal and educational tradition of the Catholic Church.

The keystone of Rummery's position was the need to strengthen what the present thesis calls the *educational* paradigm of Catholic Religious Education. Rummery argued that Catholic Religious Education needed strong academic foundations in order to flourish as part of a school curriculum. He recognised the tensions arising from the juxtaposition between the *catechetical* paradigm and the reality of the plural society in which the Catholic school operated. This position clearly echoes the line of thinking adopted by Smart. Rummery's position can be summarised as follows: catechesis is an integral part of a wider range of activities which belong to the category of Religious Education (1975: 171); the difference between catechesis and other forms of religious education is one of kind, not degree. For Rummery, educational paradigms of religious education are underpinned by a *cognitive and intellectual approach* which leaves the individual free to choose religious affiliation from an informed position (1975: 171-172).

Rummery proposed the educational paradigm of Catholic Religious Education as a 'platform towards faith'. This was an echo of the concept of 'pre-evangelisation' which had emerged from the International Catechetical Study Weeks (Rummery 1975: 179) and, interestingly, of the claims of some of the writers of early Christianity who saw a training in the classical arts as a preparation for accepting the Gospel (cf. Clement of Alexandria *Stromata*). Rummery's book opened Catholic intellectual life to the possibilities offered by a renewed conceptual framework for Catholic Religious Education. This influential volume was followed by a number of scholarly articles which developed and critiqued the ideas contained in Rummery's original thesis.

Writing from a non-religious perspective, Paul Hirst (1981) wrestled with the philosophical implications of Rummery's thesis and proposed a sharper and more rational edge to school-based Religious Education. Hirst claimed that the ends of education are 'an intelligent free response to the claim of truth whether that truth is the product of natural reason or presented as revelation' (1981: 90). He claimed

also that in the clash between Revelation and reason—with reason understood as the autonomy of human knowledge—the latter will always have the upper hand. When this criterion is applied to models of religious formation, Hirst concluded as follows: catechesis cannot be predicated on natural reason; education cannot proceed on the basis of faith (Revelation); hence there is a need to separate reason and faith, education and catechesis. The wholly autonomous model of education is, Hirst claimed, consistent with the Church's own tradition which favoured the autonomy of the disciplines (1981: 88) and this 'education in natural reason' could hence serve as a precursor of catechesis (1981: 91).

Hirst's critique of confessional approaches to Religious Education carries some intellectual weight. He rightly identified the limitations of Religious Education and broader Catholic educational approaches which fail to recognise the autonomy of the disciplines. Hirst's proposals, however, suggest that the deep-rooted suspicion towards the catechetical paradigm of Religious Education has been translated into a mistrust of the Catholic school and, indeed, any religious underpinning to education. Hirst's sharp division between reason and revelation, while helpful as an initial entry-point into the debate over the relationship between the educational and catechetical paradigms of Religious Education, ultimately serves as an exit from the integrated Catholic tradition of faith and reason as partners in the search for truth (Pope John Paul II 1998 a).

Michael Leahy (1990) developed Hirst's thesis and claimed that the use of the school classroom for purposes other than those which fall under the heading of 'education', understood as 'critical appraisal' of curriculum content, was illegitimate and, consequently, a violation of what he regarded as the public space of the classroom (1990: 142). At the heart of Leahy's analysis was a philosophical rejection of the possibility of insights from Revelation being transmitted within the classroom setting. Paradoxically, Leahy was open to the possibility of catechetical initiatives rooted in the wider life of the Christian school – indeed he claimed that such initiatives should be 'more explicit' (1990: 143). What is not clear in Leahy's analysis is how it is possible to reconcile a commitment to a wholly 'autonomous' classroom within an overall school ethos which promotes religious faith. This remains a key weakness in his argument.

Alongside the ongoing philosophical re-appraisal of the roots of Religious Education and the broader division between educational and religious uses of the classroom, there was considerable thought afforded to ways in which the educational dimension of Religious Education as proposed by Rummery could be reconciled with the broader catechetical mission of the Catholic school.

B. Catechesis and Religious Education: A 'Creative Divorce'

A new direction in the debate was spearheaded by Graham Rossiter who pioneered the phrase 'creative divorce' to explain what he saw as a wholly desirable separation between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (1981; 1982; 1988; 1998; 2005). In line with the sentiments expressed by Rummery (1975), Nichols (1978) and Hirst (1981), Rossiter diagnosed a conceptual problem, or 'lack of fit', between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (1982: 33). Rossiter suggested that a conceptual separation would allow for a 'more authentic catechesis' and allow an academically robust Catholic Religious Education programme to contribute towards the catechetical mission of the school (1982: 23).

Rossiter did not share Hirst's philosophical reservations about the specific locus of reason and revelation in the debate over appropriate conceptual frameworks for Catholic Religious Education. Rossiter's ideas remind us that the *reductio ad absurdum* of the catechetical paradigm is the loss of subject status of Religious Education leading to Religious Education understood solely as a space for a host of catechetical activities, for example, assemblies and various para-liturgies, without an obvious academic anchor. What makes Rossiter a significant voice in the debate is his desire to construct a model of Catholic Religious Education with clear academic scaffolding and his recognition that sharp divisions between a) catechesis b) the pastoral life of the Catholic school and c) Catholic Religious Education were artificial boundaries separating distinct but related approaches to one body of knowledge. This does not align with Rummery's stated view that the difference between catechesis and Religious Education was one of kind, and not of degree (1975:171-172).

Rossiter sought to maintain the intellectual respectability of Catholic Religious Education. It was this foundation which brought about the congruence between an academically credible approach and the desire to foster the emotional and affective development of young people (1988: 270f). For Rossiter, an intellectually robust approach made Catholic Religious Education a serious subject on the curriculum and, in consequence, a major contributor to the overall development of the pupil's religious faith (Engebretson 2004).

Alongside this movement, another group of Catholic thinkers challenged the growing conceptual division between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as had been proposed by Rossiter. This group recognised the need for 'education' and its associated apparatus yet was keen to retain a close relationship between both conceptual frameworks. Their work offers an interesting perspective on the developing conceptual journey of Catholic Religious Education.

Part 4 The Recovery of 'Faith' in Catholic Religious Education: the Catechetical Paradigm

In response to the perceived limitations of the educational paradigm, there were calls for a close relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious education. This was inspired by a recognition of the integral nature of religious formation. Two figures in this debate have been selected to illustrate this theme. Section A explores the scope of the 'apostolate of the classroom' with reference to Mgr. Eugene Kevane. Section B explores the notion of 'permanent catechetical education' with reference to the work of Thomas Groome.

A. Catholic Religious Education: The 'Apostolate of the Classroom'

Writing during the years of the Second Vatican Council, Monsignor Eugene Kevane (1913-1996) claimed that the traditional catechetical approach to Religious Education could be integrated within a sound academic setting. Kevane rejected any division between the work of the school and the process of catechesis. Kevane was anticipating the arguments which would be advanced in the 1970s in favour of a conceptual split (cf: Hirst 1981; Leahy 1991) and is

foreshadowing Rossiter's position in favour of a determined intellectual thrust to Catholic Religious Education (cf: Rossiter 1982).

In *Augustine the Educator* (1964), Kevane held up the educational vision of St Augustine of Hippo as a model for the contemporary Church. Kevane claimed that in Augustine's vision all education was a formation in holiness; the study of the liberal arts, philosophy and theology was integrated within a framework which combined both study and prayer in one model of formation (Franchi 2011). There are two substantial points from Kevane's comprehensive work which articulate with the argument in the present thesis and, interestingly, show crucial lines of convergence with the thinking of Rossiter (1982).

Kevane described the teaching of religion in the Catholic school as the 'apostolate of the classroom' (1964: 304). The juxtaposition of two terms which later thinkers would separate conceptually highlights the difference in approach between the more radical thinkers on the 'educational paradigm' side of the debate and those who sought to retain a strong element of catechesis. Kevane argued that the professional nature of the Catholic Religious Education course demanded the same degree of thoroughness as in other subjects (1964: 311). The subject, for Kevane, is more than a timetabled space for prayer. In keeping with the example of the Fathers of the Church, Kevane argued that there was no dichotomy between what the present thesis has identified as the educational and the catechetical paradigms of Catholic Religious Education because they form an integrated and demanding programme of personal and spiritual formation. Once again there is a shared understanding with Rossiter's vision (1982), but Kevane seemed more comfortable with the language of catechesis in the classroom: this is demonstrated by his use of the terms 'apostolate of the classroom' (1964: 304) and 'living catechesis' (1964: 314) as descriptors of classroom Religious Education.

In assessing Kevane's contribution to the issues discussed in the present thesis, it is hard to dislocate his work from the period in which it was written. Kevane was writing at a time when the practical reality for catechesis and Catholic education was very much that of a Catholic school firmly locked within the traditional home/school/parish triangle. In using St. Augustine of Hippo as his model

educator and key source, Kevane could be accused of reading into Augustine's catechetical and educational corpus his own ideas of how a Catholic school and its associated Religious Education programme should be shaped. Kevane's thesis is wholly consonant with Catholic catechetical and educational principles. Given that Kevane was writing in the mid 1960s, there remains a question of the suitability of this model for contemporary Catholic schools, the pupil population of which come from diverse religious backgrounds - a fact which militates against 'simple catechetical assumptions' (Rymarz 2011: 542). This is not to reject Kevane's argument *qua* argument but to identify the shifts in cultural capital which differentiate the early twenty first century from the middle years of the twentieth century. In short, the changing social and cultural make-up of the Catholic school population cannot be ignored.

Despite these limitations, Kevane's work is a valuable reminder of how the traditional integrated view of Catholic Religious Education can, from its natural home in the language and conceptual framework of catechesis, cross the border separating the so-called educational and catechetical paradigms. Chapter Six will offer a critique of one contemporary Religious Education syllabus - the Scottish syllabus *This is Our Faith* (SCES 2011) - which draws heavily on Kevane's vision of catechesis in the classroom.

B. Catholic Religious Education: A 'Permanent Catechetical Education'

While Kevane would have been unaware when he was writing *Augustine the Educator* in early 1960s of the intensity of the future debates on the nature of Religious Education, Thomas Groome was fully aware of the scope, depth and key lines of argument in the debates over the nature of Religious Education (1980). In broad terms, Groome favours the rediscovery of catechesis as a central driving force in Christian religious formation, a position shared with Michael Warren who favoured the term 'bi-lingual fluency' as a descriptor of a close and dynamic relationship between catechesis and Religious Education (1981:116). Groome's approach initially is to deal with precise definition of the key terms in the debate and locate these terms in a Christian historical context.

For Groome, it is important to rediscover the traditional meaning of the key terms employed in the debate. Groome defines the work of 'Religious Education' as a process which looked to the 'transcendent dimension of life' (1980: 22). He suggests that any educational endeavour which enables people to engage in this process of learning about the transcendent aspects of life merits the title 'religious education'. It is a valuable term, he claims, with *religious* pointing to its specificity in the world of religion and *education* to its commonality with wider educational principles. 'Christian Religious Education' is 'religious education' localized in the sources and practices of a specific religious community (1980: 25). While there is much to commend in Groome's understanding of the Christian community as an educational agent, a weakness of this position is that Groome's focus is on the broader understanding of Christian education within the Christian community. Groome stops short of applying his ideas to the Catholic school and the plurality of worldviews which are present in it. Thus he shares with Kevane a partiality which limits the full application of his often valuable insights to the subject of Catholic Religious Education in contemporary Catholic schools.

Groome defines 'catechesis' as the activity of *re-echoing* the Christian story that has been transmitted throughout history. Catechesis is an instructional activity which was experienced in the early Church as a verbal exhortation and has now fallen within the wider context of Christian religious education in the Christian community (1980: 25f). Once again, the focus in catechesis is the 'Christian community' as the locus of instruction.

This call to terminological precision in the debate challenged thinking where terms like 'catechesis' and 'Religious Education' had been used interchangeably. Groome was laying out the borders of a field on which key debates would take place over the coming decades and in which he himself would play a major role. By the final years of the twentieth century, the Magisterial documents of the Church had responded to the vibrant debates on the conceptual framework for Religious Education by making a working distinction between catechesis and Religious Education (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988). While the evolution of this process will be set out in the following section, the acceptance of

the distinction by the Magisterium has to be stated in order to provide a context for Groome's subsequent contribution to the debate.

By 2001, Groome had expanded his set of definitions to include 'catechetical education' as a suitable headline for the most appropriate model of Religious Education in the Catholic school (2001: 13). This is proposed in the context of the *GDC's* (1997) focus on catechesis understood as pastoral ministry; for Groome, this definition of catechesis is a weakness in need of some conceptual reworking. The basis for this reworking is a fresh understanding of 'evangelisation' which should now be understood as continual process of renewal for the whole Christian community. This line of thought developed the traditional understanding of evangelisation as prior to catechesis and reflected the link made by Pope Paul VI with 'systematic religious instruction' (1975:44). Furthermore, the *GDC*'s cursory treatment of the value of 'instruction' as evidenced by the use of terms like 'mere information' (1997: 29) and 'mere instruction' (1997: 68) suggest a downgrading of the academic rigour which, Groome believed, was intrinsic to effective Religious Education.

These observations support Groome's principal contribution to the debate which is worth citing in full (my bold text):

> During the past fifty years or so, Catholics have debated whether to use the term "catechesis" or "religious education." Generally, catechesis came to mean the socialization of people into Christian identity, whereas religious education become more the scholarly and reflective study of a faith tradition. I worry, however, about catechesis that shapes people's ecclesial identity without a thorough education in the whole tradition of Christian faith. On the other hand, Christian religious education that informs people's minds but neglects forming their identity in faith is equally troublesome. In other words, a dichotomy between these two is false and debilitating. I see them—**catechesis and religious education—as two essential aspects of the same endeavor.** Both values—socialization and education—*must be* and with an appropriate pedagogy *can be* realized within a Christian community. This is why I use the term "catechetical education" throughout—to emphasize the need for both (2001: 13).

This is the heart of Groome's thesis. Both 'religious education' and 'catechesis' are related lenses through which the heritage of Christianity is viewed, nurtured,

studied and communicated. *Pace* Hirst (1981) Groome is offering a remedy for the perceived 'irrationality' of catechesis and it is this recovery of the partnership between faith and reason which remains significant for the debate today. Interestingly, Groome's statement that 'pedagogy can be realized within a Christian community' allows Groome to apply a more *inductive* model of catechesis to the teaching of doctrine.[34] This is a claim that good educational principles rooted in 'reason' can be applied to the sharing of the Christian message. In this advocacy of educationally sound catechesis, Groome is following the lines of argument set out by Pope Paul VI (1975) and Pope John Paul II (1979) as well as providing a contemporary application of Kevane's thesis (1964). The logical conclusion to Groome's insights on the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education is found in the title of his important article *Religious Education and Catechesis –No Divorce for the Children's Sake* (2007). This piece is a clear response to Rossiter (1982) who had proposed a 'creative divorce' in order to promote a mutual enrichment and greater effectiveness of both fields.

The keystone of Groome's position, as explained in this article, is the rejection of the Enlightenment-inspired dichotomy between reason and faith (2007). Groome is providing a counter-argument to the negative criticisms of the faith-reason relationship in the field of religious education which Hirst (1981) and Leahy (1990) had provided. In setting the debate within the faith-reason framework, Groome is reinforcing both the catechetical and the educational dimension of Catholic Religious Education and claiming that philosophical considerations do inform approaches to the effective operation of both catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. Groome is pushing at the boundaries of any conceptual distinction as outlined in the present thesis. For Groome, Catholic Religious Education is *catechetical* in its commitment to faith and catechesis is *educational* in that faith commitment requires serious study of the implications of Christian faith for daily life. This accords with previous Magisterial statements on the desirability of systematic courses of religious instruction in the Church.

[34] Groome offers his famous 'shared praxis' as a methodological channel to lie at the heart of his favoured model of Christian religious education. A full critique of the advantages and limitations of this approach is beyond the scope of the present thesis. It will be addressed, however, in Chapter Six in the context of the Scottish Religious Education syllabus *This is Our Faith*.

By the end of the 1980s, the Magisterium had begun to understand the complexity of the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education. An exploration of Magisterial teaching on this area now follows.

Part 5 The Response of the Magisterium: Catechesis *and* Religious Education

The Magisterium offered a tripartite response to the fresh thinking on 'Religious Education' offered by the scholarly literature from both within and beyond the Catholic intellectual tradition. Section A explores how the dedicated catechetical documents identified the different aims and scope of Catholic Religious Education vis-à-vis catechesis. Section B tracks how the dedicated educational documents made explicit the difference between Catholic Religious Education and catechesis. Section C examines the claims of the first Magisterial document dedicated to Catholic Religious Education.

A. Catechesis *and* Religious Education in the Catechetical documents

Church teaching on education was initially unaffected by the issues arising from the debates in academic circles on suitable conceptual frameworks for wider forms of Religious Education. It seemed that the academic debates were encircling rather than penetrating the Magisterium. Pope John Paul II had argued that catechesis and evangelisation were both key parts of the Church's mission to education in the faith (1979: 18). Indeed Pope John Paul II saw catechesis as a specific moment in this broader process of evangelisation. This was in line with the new understanding of evangelisation as a rich process designed to bring the Good News to all in accord with the sentiments expressed in *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (Pope Paul VI 1975).

Although Pope John Paul II had written (in *Catechesi Tradendae*) about the role of catechesis in the school, he had not mentioned the specific *relationship* between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. Some recognition of the language of reform was evident in 1981 when Pope John Paul II commented on

the distinct but complementary nature of Catholic Religious Education in the school and catechesis in the parishes:

> L'insegnamento religioso, impartito nelle scuole, e la catechesi propriamente detta, svolta nell'ambito della parrocchia, pur distinti tra loro, non devono essere considerati come separati (1981: 3).[35]

This intervention by Pope John Paul II brought the Church into the heart of a wider academic debate which had been, until that point, largely conducted on the periphery: the Church had continued to draw on catechetical theory as the dominant conceptual framework for Catholic Religious Education. The unexpected shift in emphasis suggests that the intellectual energy arising from the debates in the wider academic world had effected some modest change in how the Church understood the role of Catholic Religious Education vis-à-vis catechesis. In addressing the priests of the diocese of Rome, Pope John Paul II (1981) had highlighted their essential link by saying that Catholic Religious Education could serve both as a necessary preparation for catechesis as well as a context for reflection on the content of catechesis. At this point, there is little doubt that catechesis was the primary component in the partnership.

This configuration kept any separate role for Catholic Religious Education at arms length from catechesis. However, Pope John Paul II later claimed that it was broader than, and must include, catechesis as the Catholic school has the transmission of the Catholic faith as its primary goal (1992). This implies that catechesis would draw on the school's syllabus either as a source of topics for study or in recognition of a possibly more extensive curricular framework offered by the school. This sense of unease is heightened further by Pope John Paul II's claim in the same document that materials used in Catholic Religious Education (ie resources, textbooks) should be based on the principles of sound catechesis (1992:6).[36] This suggests that, in Pope John Paul II's mind at least, Catholic Religious Education was no more than an application of catechesis in a school setting. These interventions are evidence of the Magisterium's rather limited body

[35] The teaching of religion in schools and catechesis, properly so-called, carried out within the parish, although distinctive, should not be considered as separate entities. (This is the author's own translation.)

[36] Pope John Paul II mentions the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* as a helpful aid in this enterprise.

of teaching on and awareness of the broader issues surrounding the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the later years of the twentieth century.

As noted above, the publication of the GDC in 1997 brought together catechetical thinking in one comprehensive document. The GDC reinforced both the primacy of the parish in catechesis and the complementarity between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (*Religious Instruction*) and stressed the latter's role in cultural dialogue (1997: *passim*). The *GDC* claimed that in order to have an effective dialogue with culture, Catholic Religious Education should sit alongside other subjects in the level of intellectual demands it places upon students and thus facilitate an encounter with the 'cultural patrimony' promoted by the school (1997: endnote 222) In line with Kevane, Groome and Rossiter's espousal of high standards in the teaching of catechesis/religious education, the GDC reiterated the necessity of scholastic rigour consonant with the demands of other disciplines (1997:73).

The GDC integrated both catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the wider mission of the Catholic community, or parish (1997: 62-63). While the GDC accepts (with Rossiter) the need to maintain separate but related spheres of influence, it also accepts (with Kevane and Groome) the desire to retain a unifying bond rooted in the mission to evangelise. This relationship between evangelisation and catechesis is a key development in modern catechetical thought. It realigns what was the traditional distinction between the initial proclamation of, and response to, faith (evangelisation) and the following stage of doctrinal formation within the community of faith (catechesis) (1997:63). The realignment was further enhanced by the Motu Proprio *Fides per Doctrinam* (Pope Benedict 2013) which transferred competence for catechesis from the *Congregation for the Clergy* to the *Pontifical Council for Promoting The New Evangelisation*. This significant change is a sign of the new pressing need for renewed faith formation among the 'old' Christian countries.

The evolving relationship between evangelisation and catechesis did not leave the debate on 'Religious Education' unaffected. Catholic Religious Education's

unique contribution to catechesis and evangelisation lies in the teaching of a distinct body of knowledge within the school setting. The GDC had little to say about the place of catechesis in schools. Its key contribution to the debate on the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is its affirmation of their separate conceptual frameworks.

> The relationship between religious instruction in schools and catechesis is one of distinction and complementarity: 'there is an absolute necessity to distinguish clearly between religious instruction and catechesis' (1997: 73).

This call to complementarity built on the Congregation for Catholic Education's initial definition of their distinctive identities in 1988 (see below) to ensure that there was little doubt as to their separate fields of operation. It is worth highlighting that the very directory which governed catechesis questioned models of Catholic Religious Education which drew heavily on the principles of catechesis. Chapter Six will explore this crucial issue in greater depth in the context of one local school syllabus.

In summary, the Church's major documents on catechesis do not deal in depth with Catholic Religious Education. In the Magisterial documents on education there is some evidence of a gradually increased awareness of the role that Catholic Religious Education plays in the wider catechetical journey of the student.

B. Catechesis *and* Religious Education in the Educational Documents

While the theory and practice of catechesis had been the subject of dedicated Magisterial documents (cf: Congregation for the Clergy 1971, 1997; Pope John Paul II 1979), Catholic Religious Education had been considered primarily in the broader context of dedicated educational documents (cf: Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 67-69; 2002: 54). In the early years of the twentieth century, there was no hint that school-based religious instruction was anything other than catechesis and linked to the emerging social teaching of the Church which marked the Church embrace of a social Catholicism (cf: Pope Leo XIII 1890; Nichols 1998: 91).

Pope Leo XIII's successor, Pope St. Pius X, was less keen to engage in dialogue with other political and cultural forces (1907 a; 1907 b). Pope St. Pius X emphasised the teaching of doctrine as a means to personal salvation and his Encyclical on catechesis, *Acerbo Nimis* (1905), offered a template for the systematic teaching of Catholic doctrine. Although written some two years after the founding of the REA in America - see Part Two above – Pope St. Pius X saw clear merit in the didactic approach implied in the English term 'religious instruction'. His own catechism, published in 1908 (online), reflected this didactic approach in its list of simple question and answers on the key points of Catholic doctrine.[37]

The thematic link between the teaching of Christian doctrine and social reform which Pope Leo XIII had proposed was picked up by Pope Pius XI whose Encyclical on Christian education *Divini Illius Magistri* (1929) provided a comprehensive framework for the understanding of Christian education as an integrated programme of formation with supernatural aims (1929). The final paragraphs of the Encyclical (1929: 84-102) go in a separate direction to that taken by the REA. For Pope Pius XI, any educational method which dispensed with the work of grace and relied on the 'sole powers of human nature' is unworthy and unsound (1929: 60).

The lack of a shared understanding of the role of religion vis-a-vis education between the Catholic Church and the REA can be summarised as follows: in the Catholic tradition, the role of 'religious instruction' is to form students doctrinally so that they – mindful of the need of salvation - can enter into dialogue with the world in order to convert the world to a Christian way of thinking. Conversely, the REA's approach is to see Religious Education as a fresh discipline which has arisen from the insights in other fields of learning and, by implication, offers a model for a new way of understanding Christianity. The divergence in understanding as described here provides an insight into the tension between two distinct interpretations of the aims of Religious Education within Christianity.

[37] This text is hard to source today in a printed version. It is available via this link: http://www.ewtn.com/library/catechsm/piusxcat.htm

The Second Vatican Council made significant shifts towards an apparent openness to the needs and anxieties of the age (*Gaudium et Spes* 1965). The short document on education, *Gravissimum Educationis* (1965), while aligning itself with the broader reform agenda of the Council, drew heavily on Pope Pius XI's encyclical of 1929. Indeed *Gravissimum Educationis* refers to Pope Pius XI's encyclical in twelve of its thirty six footnotes. *Gravissimum Educationis* offered a broad focus on the principles of education and hence recognised and accepted the changing social and cultural reality of the post-war world. This cautious engagement with educational reform is encapsulated in the call for a 'special post-conciliar commission' with the specific remit to develop the notion of 'Christian education' (*Gravissimum Educationis* 1965 Introduction). Nonetheless, *Gravissimum Educationis* would act as a charter for the evolution of Catholic thinking on education despite its reliance on a document by Pope Pius XI which seemed to be at odds with the Second Vatican Council's hope for an accommodation with the modern world. Given this broader context, it is no surprise that *Gravissimum Educationis* did not refer at all to the nature of the relationship between catechesis and education: the 'debate' had yet to begin.

Although the *General Catechetical Directory* (1971) had opted in to the broad Conciliar reforms in catechesis, it was some time before there were moves to engage with reform in subsequent Magisterial documents on education and Religious Education. This seems to have arisen as a result of the change in the catechetical locus from the school to the parish. The publication of *The Catholic School* (Congregation for Catholic Education 1977) signalled the beginning of a faint change of direction in the tone of the debate:

> It is recognised that the proper place for catechesis is the family helped by other Christian communities, especially the local parish. But the importance and need for catechetical instruction in Catholic schools cannot be sufficiently emphasised. Here young people are helped to grow towards maturity in faith (1977: 51).

The articulation of the place of the family and the wider community in catechesis was a recalling of the catechetical arrangement of early Christianity. The

emphasis on 'catechetical instruction' in the Catholic school could be interpreted as either an affirmation of the traditional 'catechesis in the class' model of Catholic Religious Education or perhaps, as a recognition of the need for catechetical instruction – possibly for the Sacraments of Initiation – outwith the standard timetable.

Whatever the intention, the tone of the document is urgent possibly owing to a perception—just or otherwise—that the 'catechetical renewal' and broader educational reforms were having a detrimental effect on the transmission of doctrine. Following this document, *Lay Catholics in Schools-Witnesses to Faith* (1982) turned the Church's attention to the increasingly important role of the lay (Catholic) teacher (1982). Given the decline in the numbers of Religious from apostolic congregations and orders with a dedicated charism for education, the Church had to ensure that the lay teachers were well formed doctrinally and pastorally. The integration of the pastoral and the academic dimension of education provided a helpful context for further development of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the professional activity of the (lay) Catholic teacher.[38]

The first major exploration of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in a Magisterial document comes with the publication of *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School* (1988).[39] What makes this document highly influential is its clear articulation *for the first time* in a Magisterial document of the distinctive and complementary spheres of influence of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (my bold text):

> There is **a close connection, and at the same time a clear distinction**, between religious instruction and catechesis, or the handing on of the Gospel message. The close connection makes it possible for a school to remain a school and still integrate culture with the message of Christianity.

[38] This document was the application to education and the profession of teaching of the principles of the lay apostolate which had been laid out by the Second Vatican Council in *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (1965). This second part of the educational trilogy focused on the promotion of a distinctive Catholic identity rooted in the synthesis of faith, culture and life (1982:29-31).

[39] The broad theme of this substantial document is that all education has a religious dimension and within this theme we find a major exposition of the aims and principles of Catholic education, an analysis of which is beyond the scope of the present thesis.

> The distinction comes from the fact that, unlike religious instruction, catechesis presupposes that the hearer is receiving the Christian message as a salvific reality. Moreover, catechesis takes place within a community living out its faith at a level of space and time not available to a school: a whole lifetime. The aim of catechesis, or handing on the Gospel message, is maturity: spiritual, liturgical, sacramental and apostolic; this happens most especially in a local Church community. The aim of the school, however, is knowledge. While it uses the same elements of the Gospel message, it tries to convey a sense of the nature of Christianity, and of how Christians are trying to live their lives. It is evident, of course, that religious instruction cannot help but strengthen the faith of a believing student, just as catechesis cannot help but increase one's knowledge of the Christian message. The distinction between religious instruction and catechesis does not change the fact that a school can and must play its specific role in the work of catechesis. Since its educational goals are rooted in Christian principles, the school as a whole is inserted into the evangelical function of the Church. It assists in and promotes faith education (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 67-69).

This passage shows clear echoes of Rossiter's notion of separate but adjacent fields of operation for catechesis and Religious Education (1982). It reflects Pope John Paul II's vision of Catholic Religious Education as a space for reflection on the content of catechesis (1981). The model proposed above, however, goes beyond Pope John Paul II's initial sketching of their lines of distinctiveness; it rejects sharp conceptual separations while holding on to a degree of separateness in order to avoid a merging of the disciplines of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

This crucial passage shows that the perceived *dichotomy* between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education, which had been the subject of much scholarly writing in the early 1980s (see above) had been integrated within the Magisterium's continuing focus on the faith formation of Catholic pupils. This allowed Catholic Religious Education to serve as a prism through which to reflect on culture and society (Congregation for Catholic Education 2002: 54). Furthermore, it developed the academic identity of Catholic Religious Education in the school and encouraged a strong scholastic framework which should include an approved syllabus, inter-disciplinary links and, when possible, public examinations (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 70). This is further evidence of the strengthening of the *educational paradigm* in the light of the

insights gathered from the wider field of educational studies *viz* objectives, syllabus and methodology.

A clear strength of this position is the proposal that *all* of life and culture be infused with spirit of the Gospel. The relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is an affirmation of the school's status as a civic institution. The Catholic Religious Education curriculum is not a derivative or second-rate catechesis but a body of knowledge with its own way of analysing culture and the human condition from a particular faith perspective. The school is hence accorded a unique status as a place of intense dialogue between Christianity and the world in keeping with the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, in particular the aspirations of *Gaudium et Spes* (1965). The status of the school as a civic institution allows it to serve as a home for people of all faiths and none. The Catholic school in its Catholic Religious Education syllabus is teaching 'about' Christianity but still offers the possibility of faith formation to those who are open to it while remaining respectful of people's freedom of religion.

There are some limitations to this twin-track approach. First, the claim that the Catholic school has a valuable role in the evangelising mission of the Church suggests that a separation between Catholic Religious Education and the broader faith formation of the pupil may be at variance with the Catholic school's broader mission to participate in evangelisation (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 69). If evangelisation is central to the total experience of the school community, there is limited space for activities which are not part of the mission to evangelise.

A second concern is the place of 'Other World Religions' in the Catholic Religious Education class. Although this dimension of Catholic Religious Education is underpinned by knowledge and not explicit faith formation, it is taken for granted in the Magisterial documents that the Catholic school will have the teaching of Christianity as its fundamental point of reference. There is little recognition of the place of 'Other World Religions' and other ways of thinking in this approach. This leaves the Church open to accusations, whether just or unjust, of a religious exclusivism at variance with the modern and wholly desirable vision

of the school as a place of encounter with the 'other'.[40]

These concerns arise from the lack of certainty surrounding the most appropriate conceptual framework and content base for Catholic Religious Education. There remained a need, therefore, for a Magisterial document dedicated to Catholic Religious Education which would address these concerns.

C. Catechesis *and* Catholic Religious Education: The *Circular Letter*

The publication of the *Circular Letter to the Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on Religious Education in Schools* (2009) (henceforth *Circular Letter)* was a ground-breaking initiative. The *Circular Letter* aims to clarify issues which had traditionally been dealt with in Magisterial publications dealing with a wider range of topics related to education. Although the *Circular Letter* is a short document and lacks the detailed introduction and structure of the GDC (1997), its status as the first dedicated document of the Magisterium on Religious Education in schools makes it a key resource for developments in Catholic Religious Education.

The *Circular Letter* articulates the key ideas which had been developed across a range of other documents on both catechesis and education (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988; 2002; Congregation for the Clergy 1997). This approach allows the Church's teaching to be more accessible, increases the status of the subject of Catholic Religious Education and, thus, avoids its misrepresentation as a form of catechesis in a school setting.

The *Circular Letter* presents the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in very plain terms. Those unaware of the antecedents of this document would be in danger of interpreting it as a denial of the Catholic school's role in the faith formation of the pupils.[41] Dealing with the specific question of the

[40] The term 'Other World Religions' is common in the Scottish syllabi for Religious Education. It is an unsatisfactory term as it suggests a cultural dominance of Christianity.
[41] See Pope Benedict XVI (2011 a) *Ad Limina to the Australian Bishops*. Note the implied distinction between catechesis and religious education in schools: 'All the members of the Church

broader school curriculum, the *Circular Letter* calls Catholic Religious Education an 'essential element' in the life of the school (2009: 10). It plays a role in the evangelising mission of the Church and, crucially for the purposes of the present thesis, it differs from and complements the broader catechetical initiatives from the family and the parish (2009: 17). Drawing on the GDC, the *Circular Letter* states unequivocally:

> Catechesis aims at fostering personal adherence to Christ and the development of Christian life in its different aspects whereas religious education in schools gives the pupils knowledge about Christianity's identity and Christian life (2009: 17).

This is a powerful reminder of challenges to contemporary Catholic education arising from the interplay between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It seems that the arguments advanced by Rossiter for a 'creative divorce' have been accepted by the Magisterium while the closeness of the 'new relationship' shows that Groome's advocacy of 'no divorce' has also been influential. This would suggest that the Church is looking for inspiration from more than one intellectual position and is still seeking ways of developing and concretising the complex relationship. While this openness to scholarship and intellectual life is welcome, those responsible for the writing and teaching of programmes of Catholic Religious Education lack a clear conceptual template.

In a more positive vein, we see here how Catholic teaching presents faith and reason as related although separate ways of coming to know God: the education of the mind to reason and the heart to love. The renewed emphasis on the relationship between faith and reason gives the lie to any claim that a commitment to rationality precludes any aspiration to faith commitment or faith nurture in the Catholic school curriculum.[42]

---

need to be formed in their faith, from a sound catechesis for children, and religious education imparted in your Catholic schools, to much-needed catechetical programmes for adults.'

[42] This is similar to the sentiments expressed in Pope Benedict XVI in his *Address to the Catholic Religion Teachers* (2009 c) where he makes the Christian case for the unity of religious and human formation.

Concluding Remarks

The Magisterium has responded to changes in the landscape of Religious Education and allowed its own traditional catechetical approach to Catholic Religious Education to be shaken by this new thinking. The Magisterium could have resisted this 'call to reform' and retained a strict catechetical paradigm within the school as a theological safety barrier against the advance of secularist ideas. The Magisterium's gradual embrace of the educational paradigm reflected the call in *Gaudium et Spes* (1965) to enter into dialogue with other ways of thinking. It recalled the early years of the Catechetical reform movement, with its embrace of insights into processes of learning culminating in the systematic planning which lay at the heart of the Munich method. Hence, the Magisterium was, once again, looking around at developments in the wider world of ideas and assessing whether, and to what extent, they could enhance its own ways of thinking.

Owing to the impact of these issues on pastoral and theological dimensions of Catholic life, they need addressing in a context wider than is provided by the fields of catechesis, education and Religious Education alone. The present thesis argues that only a deeper and theologically-driven investigation of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education will allow a satisfactory response to the issues mentioned above. To do this, Chapters Four and Five will apply the theological model of *the Church as communion* as a lens to investigate ways in which the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can be understood. In Chapter Six there will be an examination of how one contemporary model of Catholic Religious Education addresses the Magisterially-sanctioned distinction. Chapter Seven will offer some conclusions based on the themes addressed in this study.

CHAPTER FOUR
CHURCH AS COMMUNION: A HERMENEUTICAL KEY

Introduction

Chapter Three concluded that a lack of conceptual clarity over the respective fields of operation of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education merited further study in the light of theological models. It proposed the application of the model of the Church as communion (henceforth *communio)* as a way of understanding the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education within the wider thought and life of the Church.[43] Chapter Four offers a necessary theological rationale for the application to context which will be the substance of Chapter Five.

Chapter Four is grounded in the notion that *communio* is a key ecclesiological model for the Church today. It will argue that the notion of 'unity-in-diversity'—a key feature of *communion*—offers a viable hermeneutic for a renewed and richer understanding of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Chapter Four will explore the genealogy and contemporary significance of *communio* within the broader context of the dynamic connecting modernity, Catholic scholarship and Magisterial teaching in the twentieth and twenty-first century. The interplay between Catholic thought and the wider evolution of ideas in the modern period can be charted by a consideration of the relationship between *tradition* and *progress*: the former connotes the conservation of the deposit of faith; the latter connotes innovative responses to challenges to the deposit of faith. Within this partnership, it is possible to identify both the creative and limiting energies which marked the broader movements for reform in the Church and society at this time (Bellitto 2001).

[43] See CCC 781-798 for an overview of the principal ecclesiological paradigms in contemporary Catholic thought.

In the theological debates beginning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the relationship between *tradition* and *progress* was reflected in two dedicated terms: *ressourcement* and, much later, *aggiornamento*. The broad and influential movement of *ressourcemen*t—literally translated from the French as 'recovery' or 'resourcing'—was powered by the possibility of regeneration of the Church within the context of the culture of Christian humanism (McDade 2012). It is defined as the rediscovery of the writings of early Christianity as a balancing principle against both defensive reactions to the 'world' and a perceived over-reliance on the scholastic and 'manualist' methods in theology (O'Collins 2012: 374-5). As 'a strategy about how the past can be made to speak again to the present' (McDade 2012: 513-514), *Ressourcement* captured not just the insights of early Christianity but applied the energy of Christian humanism and the Enlightenment to Catholic thought at a time of intellectual ferment.

Aggiornamento—literally translated from the Italian as 'updating'— is defined as the process adopted around the time of the Second Vatican Council and beyond to refer to updating the teaching of the Church in the light of scientific and social progress. It can be understood as a way of ensuring that the 'theological method' of *ressourcement* can be applied to contemporary situations and hence act as a safeguard against interpretations of *ressourcement* with an inordinate focus on the value of historical antecedents as exemplars for contemporary practice. *Aggiornamento* hence can be understood as an expression of *ressourcement* suitable for the contemporary Church. Its conceptual richness cannot be fully appreciated if dislocated from the contours of the *ressourcement* movement (Ruddy 2012).

This range of definitions offers scope for deeper reflection on the *ressourcement*/ *aggiornamento* partnership. From a Catholic perspective, history, whether of ideas or events, cannot be categorised into 'reactionary' and 'progressive' movements with the former representing the Church's alleged tendency to respond negatively to new ideas and the latter representing the gradual triumph of liberal and Enlightened-inspired values (cf: Shannon 2008). Within this self-serving line of thought, modernity functions as the end-point of the history of these ideas. Within the contours of the Church's history of dialogue with ideas,

moments of challenge to established Church teachings can act as harbingers of new approaches to, or ways of understanding, established teachings. This *modus operandi* can be looked at from two contrasting perspectives: the 'outsider' sees it as a gradual loosening of the threads of the Catholic worldview in the light of modernity and the insights of science; the 'insider' sees it as the Church's drawing on its own substantial array of historical sources in order to apply its worldview to new situations.

The five parts of Chapter Four offer a critical map of the development of *communio* as an ecclesiological model. They will demonstrate how *communio* harmonised the various ecclesiological models which had come to prominence in the twentieth century. Chapter Five will show how a developed understanding of the dynamism of *communio* can be applied fruitfully to what remains a complex and richly-textured complementarity between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Part One of this chapter will explore the significance of the First Vatican Council's 'political-society' model of Church. This is a necessary backdrop to the emerging revival of Catholic theology in the nineteenth century.

Part Two will set out the principal lines of the early twentieth century revival of Catholic thought which included the retrieval of the 'Mystical Body of Christ' as an ecclesiological paradigm.

Part Three will explore the 'ecclesiology' of the Second Vatican Council through the related lenses of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento*

Part Four will analyse the value of *communio* in the decades after the Second Vatican Council when it became the dominant ecclesiological model for the contemporary Church.

Part Five will offer two examples of how a 'spirituality of communion' can offer significant pastoral capital in the life of the contemporary Church. This will prepare the ground for Chapter Five's application to context.

Part One The First Vatican Council: the Consolidation of the 'Political-Society' Model of Church

In order to provide the essential historical and theological background to the development of *communio*, it is necessary to explore the dominant model of Church which emerged in the post-Reformation period. Section A explores how the Church responded to the reformers. Section B explains how the 'political-society' model of Church came to the fore in the centuries between the Reformation and the twentieth century.

A. Responding to the Reformers

The robust response of the Catholic Church to the Protestant Reformations of sixteenth century Europe was manifested in a major re-appraisal, or renewal, of Catholic thought (McGrath 1998; 2011). The Reformations of the sixteenth century signalled the demise of the 'one Church in the one Christendom' designation which had marked the relationship between the sacred and the secular spheres in medieval society (Iserlow 1980: 4-5). Martin Luther (1483-1546) had sought to effect substantial reform in the practices and teachings of the Catholic Church but had not initially proposed the construction of new ecclesial groupings (McGrath 1998). It was the failure of the Colloquy of Regensburg (1541) to effect a reconciliation between the Lutheran Reformers and the Catholic Church which brought about a need for a fresh Protestant understanding of 'ecclesiology' as part of the broader construction of a systematic reformed theology.[44]

The 'second generation of reformers' (post-Luther) was aware that the new direction in Christian thought required a more systematic theology to underpin reform (McGrath (2011: 57). The French theologian, John (Jean) Calvin (1509-1564), who gave the initial shape to the Reformed concept of the essence of the Church (McGrath 1998: 205), epitomised the work of the 'second generation' (of reformers). The difference between the Catholic and this 'reformed' understanding of Church which then emerged was profound. Calvin devoted the

[44] The present thesis cannot accommodate a substantial critique of the myriad factors which contributed to the ecclesial events of this period of history.

fourth part of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, published in 1536, to countering the Catholic claims regarding the primacy of the Bishop of Rome and the question of sacramental authority. He challenged the established *tradition* and sought to make *progress* governed by a particular understanding of the life, beliefs and practices of early Christianity. The essence of Calvin's ecclesiology was his claim that the true *visible* Church had to conform to the *invisible* Church by adherence to two principles: the preaching of the word of God and the correct administration of the sacraments. Calvin's ecclesiology eschewed the papacy and the ministerial priesthood but still required a form of *internal* Church structure to underpin the work of the *visible* Church (Calvin 1536). For Calvin, the fourfold ecclesial structure of pastor, teacher, elder and deacon ensured that sinful humans were supported and directed towards God while publicly rejecting the Catholic notion of the institutional Church as a means of grace.

In response to the Reformers, the Council of Trent emphasised those aspects of Catholicism which had been most heavily criticised by the Reformers (Dulles 2002). Part One, Article IX of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, published in 1566, set out in detail the Catholic response to the Reformers in the specific area of ecclesiology.[45] This new teaching manual instructed Parish Priests to emphasise in their preaching and catechesis the nature of the Church as shaped by four marks (notes): unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity. The instruction contrasts sharply with the Calvinist vision of a Church without Bishops and priests and, in order to reclaim theological and sacramental continuity with early Christianity, stressed the roots of the Catholic Church in the Scriptures and the teachings of the Fathers. The Catholic Church hence saw some value in appropriating for its own purposes—just as the Reformers did too—the heritage of early Christianity.

The nature of the Catholic response was further exemplified by the work of the Jesuit theologian, Saint Robert Bellarmine (1542-1612).[46] Bellarmine's stress on

[45] See Chapter Two, Historical Context Three, for more on the Council of Trent.
[46] Bellarmine's description of the Church in *An Ample Declaration of Christian Doctrine* reflected the Council of Trent's focus on the notes/marks of the Church (text in modern English): A convocation, or congregation of men, which are baptized, and make profession of the faith, and law of Christ, under the obedience of the chief Bishop of Rome (Bellarmine 1602: 58-59).

the primacy of the Bishop of Rome is a rejoinder to Calvin's insistence that the claims to authority made by the Pope were without scriptural foundation.[47] Bellarmine's broader vision of the Church as a 'perfect society' set the tone for the Catholic Church's relationship with the fractious political and social world in Europe from the post-Reformation years and beyond. By the end of the nineteenth century, the authority of the Church and the role of the Papacy in the Church and the world had been subjected to intensified scrutiny as part of another wave of trenchant critique of religion rooted in the values of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution (Israel 2002). The 'political–society' model of Church which had evolved from the Council of Trent and was consolidated by the First Vatican Council (1869-1870) was a defiant and enduring response to these challenges to the Church and its way of thinking.[48]

B. Consolidation of the Political-Society Model of Church

The response of the Catholic Church to the 'ecclesiology' of the Reformers and the philosophical critique of religion arising from the Enlightenment was further highlighted by the First Vatican Council's stress on the centralisation of Church authority (cf: Alberigo et.al 1987; Dulles 2002). The Council's model of Church was designed to ensure a forceful Church presence in the turbulent political and cultural world of the late nineteenth century. The Tridentine model had allowed the early modern Church to retain its distinctive 'identity' in a time of political, religious and social upheaval and, crucially, had provided the theological capital for the workings of the First Vatican Council (1869-1870). In addition, the prevailing institutional model of Church supported a primarily deductive model of catechesis with a focus on 'teaching, sanctifying and governing' (Dulles 2002).

The Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ, *Pastor Aeternus* (1870), drew on the Bellarminian vision and affirmed the centrality of the Bishop of Rome to the life and the unity of the Church.[49] *Pastor Aeternus* also reinforced the claim to

[47] See, for example, Jean Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* iv.xi
[48] See Chapter Two (Context Three) of the present thesis for an exploration of the catechetical and educational issues arising from the Council of Trent.
[49] That apostolic primacy which the Roman pontiff possesses as successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, includes also the supreme power of teaching. This holy see has always maintained

apostolic authority of the Catholic Church which had responded to challenges to its teaching and worldview by creating, or reinforcing, a defensive wall around key Church teaching.

One manifestation of the centralisation of the Church was the question of the infallibility of the Pope. The claim to papal infallibility made in *Pastor Aeternus* juxtaposed the Church's claim to spiritual authority with the socio-political reality of the loss of the Papal States to the Kingdom of Italy and the ensuing marginalisation of Catholics in Italy from the mainstream of public life (Hearder 2001). The strong claims made by the First Vatican Council about Papal Infallibility, however, need reading in the context of the historical situation of the time. The premature termination of the First Vatican Council in 1870 as a result of the Franco-Prussian Wars had not allowed sufficient time for the Council to reflect on the role of the Episcopate and thus the Church was left with an ecclesiology which stressed the important role of the Papacy without a sufficiently mature reflection on the function of the Bishops (Nichols 1998). The role of the Bishops would be part of the deliberations of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s.

As the Catholic Church moved from the nineteenth into the twentieth century, a major re-appraisal of Catholic thought by a body of Catholic scholars was emerging. This would have a significant effect on the nature of the Church's teaching across a whole range of issues in the second half of the twentieth century. The Church was trying hard to conserve its deposit of faith (*tradition*) and would now seek, tentatively at first, new ways of presenting its message through interaction with new ideas (*progress*).

Part Two Reforming the Tridentine Model of Church

The relationship between *tradition* and *progress* in the nineteenth century gave birth to key developments in Catholic thought. This was part of wider social and

---

this, the constant custom of the Church demonstrates it, and the ecumenical councils, particularly those in which East and West met in the union of faith and charity, have declared it (First Vatican Council *Pastor Aeternus* 1870: Chapter 4).

cultural developments of the age: industrialisation, urbanisation and mass education were all signs of a society reassessing the medieval inheritance and moving towards a seemingly more centralised mode of living. Section A looks first at the key ideas underpinning the so-called 'Catholic Intellectual Revival' of this time. Section B explores the genealogy of one of the fruits of this revival: the emergence (or retrieval) of the Church understood as *communio*. Section C looks at the return of the 'Mystical Body of Christ'.

A. The Catholic Intellectual Revival: Drawing from the Sources

The Catholic intellectual revival was made possible through reflection on a range of 'forces and impulses lying outside the narrow bounds of systematic theological specialists' (Jedin, Reppen and Dolan, 1981: 261**).** Terms like 'narrow bounds' as used above capture the tension within the Catholic community regarding the most fruitful way of engaging with modernity. The new discoveries in science and Scripture scholarship, when allied to industrialisation and the rise of ideologies like Marxism and Darwinian theory—both apparently hostile to the Catholic worldview—created a climate in which the Catholic Church saw itself as surrounded by seemingly unsympathetic forces which sought expressly to marginalise Catholicism from the world of ideas (McGrath 1998).

The Church appeared to be left with a choice between adversarial resistance to change or submission. Instead, in the midst of this crisis, a new style of intellectual engagement emerged which drew upon the insights of tradition and the reforming impulse in the Church's own history. The Catholic intellectual revival was hence driven both by the need to 'conserve tradition' and the need to 'reform' Church teaching in the light of scholarship and critical reflection on the Church's own heritage. Given the cluster of reform-minded movements in circulation at this time, it is no surprise that a strongly defensive sense of 'conservation' emerged which sought to maintain and reinforce the Church's doctrinal boundaries. This mindset for some considerable time had suggested that the Church had no need of, and indeed was opposed in principle to, the fresh thinking which was circulating in the broader world of ideas.

The attitude of uncritical 'conservation' was shaken by the election of Pope Leo XIII in 1878. This key moment in the development of the Church in the modern era ushered in an era of 'social Catholicism' designed to offer Catholic thought to a wider audience (Nichols 1998). Pope Leo XIII's overall objective was not to oppose *per se* the contours and ideology of the modern state but to nudge this society in a more conservative direction by proposing Catholic ideas as the fundamental organising principle of society (Johnson 1976). His seminal encyclical on Catholic social teaching, *Rerum Novarum* (1891), was an unapologetic statement that the Church was fully interested in the affairs of the world. It marked a fresh engagement with the daily needs of the laity who, in the light of industrialisation and urbanisation, faced an unprecedented range of social and cultural challenges which were having a negative impact on their religious formation (cf: Pope St. Pius X 1905). Pope Leo XIII's interest in the condition of the working classes, while generated by Christian principles, was motivated by an anxiety that the often desperate situations in which the 'workers' lived would drive them towards the socialist parties who would, in turn, attack the right to own private property (Pope Leo XIII 1891: 4-5). This perspective lends weight to the argument that *Rerum Novarum* was a product of social conservatism and cannot easily be categorised as a socially radical charter for the 'workers' (Walsh 2012). It reflects the Church's struggle with how best to respond to the monumental societal changes which had followed in the wake of industrialisation.[50]

Pope Leo XIII's successor, Pope St. Pius X, continued the 'era of reform' identified with his predecessor, albeit with a significant shift in emphasis. His approach to reform was double-edged: he was an influential reformer in 'internal' Church areas like catechesis; for example, he pioneered liturgical reform with his *Motu Proprio* on Church music *Tra le Sollectitudini* (1903). In the wider field of political and intellectual life, however, Pope St. Pius X was a determined opponent of the new ideologies which were part of the political culture across Europe at the time. *Pascendi*, (1907 b) his Encyclical decrying Modernism, owed more to Pope Pius IX's isolationism than to Pope Leo XIII's instinctive, if conditional, desire to engage in dialogue with new thinking.

[50] See Pope John Paul II (1991) for a centennial review of *Rerum Novarum*.

Circulating below the surface of several Popes' efforts to come to terms with the effects of industrialisation on family and religious life, the intellectual life of the Church sought ways to refresh Catholic thought in order to address these demands. The resultant renewal was concerned with harmonising modern thought to the insights arising from the biblical-patristic tradition (Jedin, Reppen and Dolan (1981). At its heart, driven by *ressourcement*, was a radical reassessment of the nature of the Church as a re-creation of the Mystical Body of Christ.

B. *Communio:* A Fruit of *Ressourcement*

The 'return' of the ecclesiological paradigm of the *Mystical Body of Christ* in the nineteenth century is one obvious example of how *ressourcement* recovered previous understandings of Church. The mining of Church tradition reflected a clear desire to move beyond the 'juridical' understandings of ecclesiology which had dominated the post-Tridentine Church. The French Jesuit, Emile Mersch (1890-1940), was instrumental in recovering the doctrine of the Mystical Body as a recognition of the closeness of Christ to his followers and as a place where the Christian can become one with Christ.[51] For Mersch, Christian life had to embrace the 'sacramental reality which is the Church'; Christian life is, first and foremost, a quest for sanctity (1951: 80-81).

Within the Catholic intellectual revival, there were reform movements in catechesis, liturgy and scripture which, in keeping with the principles of *ressourcement*, sought inspiration from the practices attributed to early Christianity. These movements reflected the application of a broader reforming energy: the sources for renewal were found in 'seminal themes' in Scripture and the writings of the Church Fathers (McGrath 1998). Insights from the Christian tradition were retrieved and reshaped to address the theological challenges arising from a 'political-society' model of ecclesiology which seemed to be more aligned

[51]Pope Benedict XVI (as Cardinal Ratzinger) explored the scriptural basis for the term 'Mystical Body' and concluded that three ecclesiological traits were already present, if implicitly, in the writings of Luke: the pneumatolgical, the salvation historical and the liturgical (Pope Benedict XVI 2005: 62-63). Furthermore, the use in some early Christian creeds' of 'we believe' and not "I believe' in declarations of faith represented one small sign of the growing collective nature of faith underpinning the concept of the Church as *communio* (Congar 1966/1997: 252).

to dealing with threats from rival Christians in the post-Reformation era than to addressing contemporary secularist challenges to religion *per se*, and to Catholic Christianity in particular, arising from rationalist-inspired styles of thinking typical of the modern era.

Although *ressourcement* sought inspiration from the beliefs and practices of early Church, there is very little of what we would call explicit 'systematic ecclesiology' in the early Church. Nonetheless, some reflections on the nature of the Church are found in selected writings of St. Paul, St. Augustine of Hippo and St. Thomas Aquinas. It is in this corpus that the theological roots of *communio* are found and their relevance to these debates merits some assessment.

St Paul and Early Christianity

The writings of St. Paul are the primary sources for the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ as a model of Church. *1 Corinthians 12:12 -31* explores the concept by comparing the members of the 'Church' to the members of a physical body animated by the power of the Holy Spirit.[52] In the *Letter to the Ephesians* Paul developed the initial ideas inherent in *1 Corinthians 12*; he argued that the head of the Church is Jesus Christ 'from whom the whole body is joined and knit together' while not neglecting the individual gifts and talents of the people who make up the Church (*Ephesians 4:11-16*). Paul leaves us with the vision of the Church as a body united to and under the headship of Christ: a 'mystical body' of believers.[53]

Following Paul, early Christianity applied the imagery of the 'Mystical Body' to the wider question of 'authority' in the Church. The *First Letter of Clement to the Corinthians* (from late in the first century AD) uses the metaphor of the Church as a 'body' to encourage the Christians in Corinth to remain steadfast in Christian

[52] Pope Benedict XVI (as Cardinal Ratzinger) (1996:53f) explores this from three inter-related angles: the Pauline imagery of the 'body'; the Semitic notion of the corporate personality; the Christian Eucharist and the philosophy of love.
[53] See also Romans 12: 4-5

living.[54] The question of the perceived authority of the successor of 'Peter' in the life of the Church was also addressed by St Cyprian of Carthage (died 258 AD) whose *de unitate ecclesiae* (on the unity of the Church) is perhaps the only key text from that period which is dedicated to the study of the 'Church'.[55]

St. Augustine of Hippo

St Augustine of Hippo's ecclesiology, which provided the theological foundation on which John Calvin built, focussed on the relationship between the external and internal aspects of the Church: the external consisted of the structures and congregations; the internal was determined by the union of the baptised with Jesus Christ (Clark 2005). In his *Exposition on the Psalms* (online) Augustine summarised this position thus with reference to Psalm XVII:

> This prayer must be assigned to the Person of the Lord, with the addition of the Church, which is His body.[56]

For Augustine, the union of Christology with ecclesiology is grounded in the headship of Christ as articulated by Paul in *Ephesians*. *All* ecclesial activity is centred on knowing and loving the Person of Jesus: the role of the Church is as handmaiden to the *communio* of humanity with Jesus.[57]

St. Thomas Aquinas

For St. Thomas Aquinas, ecclesiology was not a separate reality to be explored. It was a Christian, Trinitarian, man-centred, Christ-centred and sacramental mystery

[54] This is evidence of one community of believers (in Rome) feeling a sense of responsibility to another community of believers (in Corinth). See also Ignatius of Antioch's *Epistle to the Romans* (Introduction) written between 97 and 117 AD.
[55] This was written around 251 AD in response to the schism of Novation (a third century event about the perceived purity of the Church and its members). Cyprian's key point is the authority of 'Peter' and by implication, the See of Rome. It is thus another (and early) example of theological thought arising from opposition to Church teaching and practice.
[56] This mention of the Church in the context of Psalm XVII, which is a psalm of lament, is problematic. A solution to this conundrum is beyond the scope of the present thesis.
[57] Augustine's ecclesiology is aligned with his vision of 'the teacher' (see Chapter Two). Augustine sees union with the Jesus Christ as the goal of catechesis/education: as the Church leads people to Jesus, so the teacher is the one who leads the student to find Jesus. For Augustine, the Church is the 'mother of Christians' and the teacher of mankind (Augustine online: *On the morals of the Catholic Church* Chapter 30:62).

which lay at the heart of all theological study (Congar 1966; Dulles 2002). Thomas's commentary on the Apostles' Creed offers some insights–Pauline in inspiration-into his way of understanding the Church as a single organism with many different members.[58] A more substantial reflection on the relationship between Christ and the Church is found in the third part of the *Summa Theologica*:

> As the whole Church is termed one mystic body from its likeness to the natural body of a man, which in divers members has divers acts, as the Apostle teaches (Romans 12; 1 Corinthians 12), so likewise Christ is called the Head of the Church from a likeness with the human head, in which we may consider three things, viz order, perfection and power'. (Aquinas (13th Century/1947: third part, question 8, article 1).

Thomas is explicitly linking his own theological reflection to the Pauline texts in order to offer a clear Christological focus to the Church. A different emphasis emerged in the post-Reformation ecclesiology; the four marks (or notes) of the Church (see above) recalled the formula of the ancient Baptismal (Apostles') creed and concretised the 'mystical body' by offering it definite characteristics centred on continuity with early Christianity. The application of these marks was a key moment in the shifting of the key paradigm of Church from 'Mystical Body of Christ' to the 'political–society' model of Church which emerged post-Trent onwards.

C. The Mystical Body of Christ – A Recovery of Tradition

This understanding of Church as both 'sacramental reality' and 'Mystical body' drew on, as we have seen, the Pauline imagery of the Church as the 'body of Christ' (cf: *1 Corinthians 1*2). The tone of the new thinking was encapsulated by Romano Guardini (1885-1968), whose lapidary statement - 'The Church is awakening in people's souls' (cited in Pope Benedict XVI (as Cardinal Ratzinger) 1992/2010: 62) - countered the popular perception that the Church stood above,

[58] 'We see that in man there are one soul and one body; and of his body there are many members. So also the Catholic Church is one body and has different members. The soul which animates this body is the Holy Spirit' (Aquinas *Catechetical Instructions* 13th century/1939**:** 56).

beyond and critical of 'the world'. For Guardini, the Church was essentially a movement of the Holy Spirit to be found principally in the heart and soul of each member. Guardini's intervention developed this 'new' dimension to ecclesiology and the term 'Mystical Body of Christ' became part of the lexicon of Catholic intellectual life and the leitmotif of the Catholic intellectual revival. In retrieving this term for the twentieth century, the Church was moving away from the 'political-society' model of Church towards one which retained the traditional Catholic theological 'boundaries' while being more open to expressions of legitimate diversity.

The publication of Pope Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis Christi* (1943) marked the arrival of the theology of the 'Mystical Body of Christ' into the Magisterial corpus. The liturgical reforms enacted during this pontificate show that Pope Pius XII, like Pope Leo XIII and Pope St Pius X before him, was open to modest and ongoing reform of Church life.[59] Crucially, it is in the pontificate of Pope Pius XII that the movement for liturgical reform intersects with the movement for reform in ecclesiology and prepares the intellectual ground for the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. Both Pius X and Pius XII were harbingers of the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council in that it is during their pontificate that the scholarship emanating from the various reform movements comes to inform the teachings of the Magisterium more directly.[60]

Mystici Corporis Christi (1943) is an example of the fluid relationship between the scholarly thinking of the Catholic intellectual revival and the more cautious approaches to reform of the Magisterium. While *Mystici Corporis Christi* used the language of reform, Pius continued to align the existing structures and corporate nature of the (Roman) Catholic Church with the 'Mystical Body'. For Pope Pius

[59] *Mediator Dei* (1947), for example, promoted the 'active participation' of the congregation in the Mass. Paragraph 4 of this Encyclical shows that Pope Pius XII was aware of the value of the private scholarship which informed the early years of the Liturgical Movement. See also Kerr (2011).

[60] To illustrate this point, the fostering of the active participation of the congregation in the Mass – a keynote of the ongoing liturgical reform movement – was mirrored by the new thinking in ecclesiology which, as noted above, sought to go beyond the merely juridical and structure-centred ecclesiology of the nineteenth century towards a Church understood as a source of spiritual strength and a principle of life.

XII, it was a step too far to contemplate the 'Mystical Body' as going beyond the sacramental jurisdiction of the Catholic Church (1943:13). The objective of Pius was to perform the difficult balancing act of welcoming the new thinking in ecclesiology while holding robustly to the status of the 'Roman Catholic Church' as the Body of Christ on earth.

By the second half of the twentieth century, the tension in the Church between *tradition* and *progress* was crystallised in the debates and documents of the Second Vatican Council. A wider debate on the nature of the Church and its relationship to the wider Christian community would, therefore, be at the core of the Council.

Part Three The Ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council: *Ressourcement* and *Aggiornamento*

In the years during and following the Second Vatican Council, ancient terms like 'People of God' and *communio* were recovered from the worlds of Judaism and early Christianity and reconsidered in the broad context of the *tradition/progress* relationship. The Second Vatican Council offered an example of how the *tradition/progress* relationship had the potential to effect substantial reform across many aspects of Catholic life. The Council revolved around the twin axes of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* and the fruit of its deliberations was a set of documents which made, and continue to make a deep impact on contemporary Catholic life. The document *Perfectae Caritatis* (1965) offered a neat form of words to express the dialectic between the concepts of *ressourcement* and a*ggiornamento* as iterations of the *tradition/progress* dynamic (my bold text):

> The **adaptation** and **renewal** of the religious life includes both the constant **return to the sources** of all Christian life and to the **original spirit** of the institutes and their **adaptation to the changed conditions of our time** (*Perfectae Caritatis* 1965:2).

Although set in a particular context, this paragraph captures the Second Vatican Council's desire to bring an end to the isolationism of the post-Tridentine Church (Alberigo 1987; Pottmeyer 1998). More broadly, the Council Fathers built on the

foundations laid by the continuing Catholic intellectual revival while seeking simultaneously to present Church teaching afresh to the modern world.

In his opening address to the delegates assembled for the Council, Pope John XXIII (1962) spoke of both *tradition* and *progress* as key constituents of the Church's role in the modern world. John outlined a vision of the Council as the latest stage in the Church's 'uninterrupted witness' and, significantly, recognised the need to develop new ways of teaching and giving witness to the modern world which retained the 'sacred patrimony of truth inherited from the Fathers' whilst recognising the 'changing conditions of the modern world' (Pope John XXIII 1962). Pope John XXIII wanted the Church's body of doctrine ('sacred patrimony of truth') to be preserved while ensuring that the Church was not regarded as an institution concerned exclusively with preservation of historical traditions for their own sake. This is fully in line with the notion expressed by John Henry Newman: all legitimate developments in doctrine must grow from established traditions (Newman 1878/2003 chs. 2 and 3). What is remarkable in Pope John XXIII's opening address is its sense of historical, theological and pastoral perspective. Alongside the call to 'conservation', he emphasised the need to be aware of the demands arising from the social and cultural changes in the world and thus offered scope for some form of 'innovation' in the Church's mode of engagement with such forces: the call to conserve the 'sacred patrimony' was not a summons to retreat behind the walls of a fossilised theological tradition.

Vatican Two was the first major Church Council to have as its core function the consideration of the nature of the Church. *Lumen Gentium* - the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (1964) - crystallised the historically-conditioned debate on the nature of the Church and set out the interpretive criteria by which other Conciliar teachings would be measured.[61] In this respect Vatican Two's broader consideration of the nature of the Church and the collegial responsibility of the Episcopate 'completed' the work of Vatican 1.

[61] 'Historically considered, it (ie *Lumen Gentium*) is the climax for it ended the Church's quest for its self-understanding which it had begun at the end of the thirteenth century, had led to the reform councils of the fifteenth century and at Trent to serious collisions, and had not been brought to an end at the First Vatican Council' (Jedin 1981).

The ecclesiology of *Lumen Gentium* challenged the political-society model of Church which had evolved from Trent through to the First Vatican Council and beyond. It marked the latest stage in the gradual journey of ecclesiological renewal from an understanding of the Church as 'political society' to the contemporary understanding of the Church as *communio* (Pottmeyer 1998; Sullivan 2007). By the opening of the Council in 1962, the Magisterium had integrated the concept of the Church as 'Mystical Body of Christ' into its teaching.[62] Alongside the growth and acceptance—albeit conditional—of this theological model by the Magisterium, another ecclesiological paradigm had come to prominence: the Church understood as the 'People of God'. [63]

The genealogy of 'People of God' is rooted in a sense of theological renewal, in keeping with the Council's stated *aggiornamento*, which regarded sacred history as the pilgrimage of all of God's people towards eternity.[64] Parallel to the image of the Church as the 'Mystical Body of Christ', the image of the Church as the 'People of God' reflected both the spirit of *ressourcement* which informed Catholic thinking of the twentieth century *and* the creative tension arising from the *ressourcement-aggiornamento* dynamic. The ecclesiological paradigm of 'People of God' had been recovered from history and placed at the heart of the Council (Kung 1969); *Lumen Gentium* sought to position 'People of God' at the heart of a revived understanding of Catholic ecclesiology as a way of broadening the understanding of 'Mystical Body of Christ' while drawing on rich traditions from the Old Testament.[65]

Hans Kung put 'People of God' at the heart of his ecclesiological thought. For Kung, 'People of God' expressed an ecclesiology in which ecclesiastical office was designed to act as servant to the people. This stood in contrast to the ecclesiology inherited from the Tridentine Church, especially post Vatican 1

[62] Pope Pius XII's Encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* (1947) is a major document in this area of theology.
[63] The whole of Chapter Two of *Lumen Gentium* is dedicated to an exploration of 'The People of God'.
[64] Pope Benedict XVI (as Cardinal Ratzinger) has shown that the New Testament writers used 'People of God' to refer to the Jewish people and not to the Christian community (1992/2010: 75).
[65] 'People of God' appears 41 times in the text as a way of understanding Church, far more than 'Mystical Body of Christ'.

(Kung 1969). Furthermore, *pace* Mersch (1951 - see above) Kung challenged the validity of models of Church which were underpinned by what he called a 'hypostatization' of the Church and argued that as people belong to the Church through personal decision, the Church cannot be placed above and beyond human experience (Kung 1969: 129). This questioning of the paradigm of the Church as the 'Mystical Body of Christ' called for a reconfiguration which married what Kung described as the *temporal category* of Church (People of God) with the spatial category (Mystical Body of Christ): the resultant Kungian definition of the Body of Christ as 'the People of God placed by Christ in history' was designed to move away from the allegedly abstract tone suggested by the 'Mystical Body of Christ' (Kung 1969: 225).

Another reflection of the *tradition/progress* dynamic lay in the question of how open to the world the Church should be. While *Lumen Gentium* focussed on the 'internal' aspects of ecclesiology, the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World - *Gaudium et Spes* (1965) - saw the Church as responsible for interpreting the 'signs of the times' in the light of the Gospel (1965: 4). As has been explored in Chapter Three, there is an interesting juxtaposition between the openness to the 'world' of *Gaudium et Spes* (1965 passim) and the perceived exclusivism of *Lumen Gentium* in stressing the uniqueness of the Catholic Church as the instrument of God's revelation (1964: 8). This is another example of a tension created by the poles of *tradition* and *progress* as indicators of the Church's relationship with other ways of thinking. The apparent disjuncture reflected in part the fact that the sheer volume of documentation emerging from the Council was not conducive to a harmonious understanding of the key documents. More crucially, it reflected a deeper theological issue which arose from the reality of Catholicism's position vis-à-vis religious pluralism.

In placing this debate within a wider context it is clear that the Church had to consider the best way to engage in dialogue with people of non-Christian traditions. Writing in the 1960s, the Jesuit, Karl Rahner (1904-1984), had recognised that pluralism of religion was a problem for Christians and proposed 'four theses' as a way of addressing this social and cultural reality (Rahner 1966: 118-134). In his third thesis, Rahner controversially suggested that the adherent of

a non-Christian religion could be identified as an 'anonymous Christian' owing to the supernatural elements of his or her religion arising from the grace given by God through Christ (Rahner 1966: 131).

Rahner's rich and theologically nuanced intervention could be interpreted today—if not at the time—as an extension of *communio* beyond the boundaries of the Church. *Communio* was a developing theological theme in the post-conciliar Church. A non-sophisticated interpretation of 'anonymous Christians' presents two dangers. First, it could be argued that it supports a perceived Christian 'imperialism' which only engages with other religions through the prism of the Christian theological vision. Alternatively, it could be used to support a form of religious syncretism which sees all religions as expressions of a more general religious consciousness. Such theological material absorbed the cultural and intellectual climate of the time, which had also influenced the work of scholars on educational matters like such as Ninian Smart (see Chapter Three). Given the broader debates of that era on the nature of authority (see below), it should not come as a surprise that the 'event' of the Council could be interpreted as the beginning of a 'new' Church that had rejected a so-called authoritarian past in favour of an innovative partnership between the democratic values of the modern age and the presumed Church order of early Christianity.

To conclude this section, the use of 'People of God' as an ecclesiological model provided a broader perspective than that offered by the 'Mystical Body of Christ'. 'People of God' chimed with the spirit of openness - a keystone of the Council. In keeping with the 'spirit of the times', it provided a key to dialogue with other religious traditions.

Alongside the positive aspects of 'People of God', however, lay some concern about whether 'People of God' had become an overly 'horizontal' model of Church which could be set in opposition to the established teaching authority of the Episcopate. This apparent intellectual and theological disjuncture was in need of healing. In response, *communio* gradually emerged as a key hermeneutic from the Council's teaching on the Church to become the primary ecclesiological paradigm of the late twentieth and early twentieth century.

Part Four Contemporary Catholic Thought on Ecclesiology: the Church as Communion

The theology of *communio* had much to offer Catholic thought at an important juncture in its history. It was a way of integrating the respective merits of the Church understood as the 'Mystical Body of Christ' and the Church understood as 'People of God' (Dulles 2002). As with 'People of God', *communio* was the re-discovery of the value for the contemporary Church of an ancient Christian term - *koinonia* (or fellowship) – and hence reflected the intersection of the twin themes of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento.*

The re-emergence of *communio* as an ecclesiological paradigm was part of the Catholic Intellectual Revival (see above) of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Catholicism. Dennis Doyle (1995;1997) has shown how the work of the Dominican, Yves Congar (1904-1995) and the Jesuit, Henri de Lubac (1896-1991) was instrumental in attempting to recovering the early Church's focus on *koinonia* (fellowship) and offer it, suitably refreshed, as a model of Church suitable for the modern age.[66]

Communio offered a rich vision of the Church designed to harmonise the necessary mystical and spiritual underpinning of Catholic ecclesiology with the concrete reality of people on a journey of faith.[67] Furthermore, the apparently wide parameters of *communio* was a shield against particularist, or exclusivist, interpretations of any existing model of Church lacking in any semblance of historical and theological subtlety (Healey 2006). This was another step away from the political society model of ecclesiology which had predominated in the late nineteenth century.

---

[66] See for example, De Lubac (1956/1986) *The Splendor of the Church* and Congar (1985) *Diversity and* Unity for examples of how the Catholic intellectual revival informed thinking in ecclesiology.

[67] Reflection on *communio* offers an image of unity in diversity/diversity in unity which flows from consideration of the nature of the Trinity. Despite the apparent strengths of the model, the question of unity in diversity/diversity in unity remains problematic. While 'unity in diversity' reflects the pastoral intentions of the Conciliar and post-Conciliar documents and offers some scope for outreach and inclusion, matters of Catholic teaching have, by definition, fixed outposts. There is clearly a limit to the diversity of belief and expression which can sit within any unified body of doctrine.

The concept of *communio* is, by definition, bound to the sacramental life of the Church: in Catholic teaching, sacramental communion is the source of and inspiration for, Christian unity and Christian living (Tjorhom 2010). This reflects the shared sacramental practice of early Christianity.[68] Hence the Pauline image of the Church as the 'Mystical Body of Christ' reflects the life of the Trinity: the *communio* of Father, Son and Spirit (CCC 2004: 813). In terms of the life of the Church, *communio* allows for participation in the life of God by all the baptised through the medium of grace (Healy 2006; Tjorhom 2010).

The emergence of *communio* broadened the theological basis of ecclesiology. While 'Mystical Body' was shaped principally by images drawn from Christology, *communio* retained the language of sacramentality while offering theological underpinning from the doctrine of the Trinity.[69] The use of Trinitarian imagery allowed the aspect of relationship and dynamism, intrinsic to the theology of Trinity, to influence ecclesiological thought. This innovative theological direction opened Catholic teaching to new ways of understanding the respective role of the priest and lay person and, crucially, encouraged the Catholic Christian to enter into deeper dialogue with Christian communities not *in communion* with the Holy See (cf: *Unitatis Redintegratio* 1964: 1; 3). Here are discerned the seeds of later ecumenical initiatives which would revolve around reflection on applying *communio* to concrete pastoral situations with the Anglican communion and the orthodox Church.[70]

Returning to the Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium* had invited the Church to consider itself as a sign of 'communion with God and of unity among men' (1964:1). *Lumen Gentium* gave particular weight to 'People of God' as an ecclesiological model while recognising other images of Church from agriculture,

[68] The *Didache* (ch. 9) and the *First Apology of St Justin the Martyr* are possible eyewitness or participant accounts of early Christian worship. The latter's account has been integrated into the text of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* in paragraph 1345.
[69] 'The divine persons are relative to one another. Because it does not divide the divine unity, the real distinction of the persons from one another resides solely in the relationships which relate them to one another' (CCC 235).
[70] See the following documents: Second Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission (*ARCIC II) The Church as Communion* (1991) especially paragraph 2; the Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church –better known as the *Ravenna Document* (2007).

the art of building, marriage and family life (1964: 5-6). The idea of *communio*, however, was implicit in all of these images and in the wider vision of the Council (cf: 1964: 4, 7, 8, 9, 13). From these seeds, *communio* developed into a broad and rich theological perspective which illuminated the complex network of relationships underpinning the mystery of the Church in the context of the *unity in diversity* of its members.

After the Second Vatican Council, the Church sought to formulate an ecclesiology which adhered to the principle of *aggiornamento* while retaining a close link to Sacred Tradition. While the gradual development of the value of *communio* as an ecclesiological model was rooted in the Council, the recognition of its value as an ecclesiological model was not made explicit until later in the century.[71] This delay was the possible result of the prominence afforded to 'People of God' which seemed to match the mood of the times and offer possibilities for a renewed and more 'democratic' Church which would speak to the modern world.

It is no surprise that, given the questioning of the concept of authority more generally at that time (see above), the holding of a major Church Council would lead to some diversity of interpretation. This was reflected in the emergence of two theological journals which encapsulated two key tendencies in Catholic thought after the Council (Kerr 2011; Faggioli 2012). These journals contested the interpretation of the Council along two broad lines: *Concilium* was aligned with *progress*/*aggiornamento*; *International Catholic Review: Communio* was aligned with *tradition*/*ressourcement.*[72]

Concilium, first published in 1965, aimed to offer an international forum for reflection of Church teaching in the light of the Council (Rahner and Schillebeeckx 1965). It claimed that a new theology based on Scripture and the history of salvation was at the heart of the journal's mission. There is an obvious link here with Josef Jungmann's efforts to place salvation history at the heart of catechesis while the focus on Scripture aligned the journal with the wider reform

[71] Its growing importance has led the Church to suggest, retrospectively, that *communio* (Latin for communion) was the leading idea of the Council (cf: Synod of Bishops1985).
[72] This apparently binary distinction does not do justice to the many theological nuances of the time.

movements rooted in *ressourcement*. The emphasis on 'new theology' (*nouvelle theologie*) reflected the notion of *aggiornamento* and there is a clear sense of missionary energy permeating the first issue. Interestingly, the first issue contains an article on episcopal collegiality by Joseph Ratzinger in which, referring to Church governance, he proposed 'unity in plurality' as a way of understanding the Church thus alluding to a key feature of the emerging *communio* theology (Pope Benedict XVI as Joseph Ratzinger 1965: 29). This is a seed from which the journal *Communio* grew.

The foundation of the journal *Communio* in 1971 offered an international platform for interpretations of the Council which differed from the vision underpinning *Concilium*. *Communio* arose from some theologians' disenchantment with *Concilium*'s interpretation of the Council. *Communio* was an attempt to draw on the method of *ressourcement* to enrich the notion of *aggiornamento.* Paradoxically, theologians like Henri de Lubac and Hans Urs von Balthasar were uncomfortable with the post-conciliar developments in Catholic thought even although they had made substantial intellectual contributions to the actual teaching of the Council (Boersma 2012). The theological direction taken by *Communio* (the journal) was consolidated by a group of theologians clustered around von Balthasar who recognised the existence of *communio* as a key, if loosely defined theological expression in the Conciliar documents. These theologians were uncomfortable with the appropriation of the important theological term of *communio* by those who principally understood it as quasi-synonymous with a horizontalist interpretation of 'People of God' (Pope Benedict XVI as Cardinal Ratzinger 1992/2010). For the group of thinkers aligned to *Communio*, the primary expression of *communio* was between God and man and the communion of the faithful (Pope Benedict XVI as Cardinal Ratzinger 1992/2010: 125). The theology of *communio* linked the ecclesiological imagery of the Council with Catholic tradition and hence provided a substantial framework for future theological discussion.

These differing lines of interpretation of the Council provided the theological capital for a range of hotly-contested debates in the 1970s and early 1980s over the nature of the Church and its mission in the world. The depth of this

'ecclesiological' challenge was recognised by the Magisterium in its calling of the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops in 1985. This Synod, which was called to celebrate, verify and promote the Council (1985:1), changed the terms of the debate with regard to post-Vatican II ecclesiology. It saw itself as a means of implementing the vision of the Council twenty years on in the context of the perceived 'deficiencies and difficulties' in the implementation of the Conciliar decrees. Some of these were the result, it was claimed, of an 'incomplete understanding' of the Council's intentions while others were not in any way caused by the Council (1985:3). A wider critique of the way in the Council was received and, indeed, interpreted is beyond the scope of the present thesis.

The Synod of 1985 acted as a retrospective 'balance sheet for the twenty years of the Council' (Pope Benedict XVI as Cardinal Ratzinger 2005: 129). It allowed the Church to reflect on how it had responded to the challenges of reform set by the Council. With regard to the images of Church which had emerged from the Council, the 1985 Synod, crucially, put *communio* at the heart of its thinking. The Synod defined the Church as follows:

> …the Church is sacrament, that is, sign and instrument of communion with God and also of communion and reconciliation of men with one another. The message of the Church, as described in the Second Vatican Council, is Trinitarian and Christocentric (1985:2).

This dual imagery—Trinitarian and Christological—drew on earlier images of the Church as the Body of Christ and allowed the Church to retain its sacramental language while simultaneously using the dynamism of Trinitarian theology as a driving force. The theological weight behind this statement marked the early stages of the journey of *communio* to become more than another ecclesiological model: *Communio* had now developed into a key hermeneutic for understanding the Catholic Church and its teachings and a prism though which other themes could be interpreted.

The value of *communio* as a hermeneutical key was stressed further in 1992 with the publication of *Communionis noto* - a Letter to the Bishops of the Church from

the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.[73] The purpose of *Communionis noto* was to restore some balance to debates on the nature of the Church, a sign perhaps that the proposals of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod had not made a significant impact on Catholic thinking on ecclesiology. The focus on *communio* in the 1985 Extraordinary Synod is revisited owing to a perceived lack of integration in Church life between 'People of God' and 'Body of Christ' as a matter, it was claimed, of 'doctrinal, pastoral and ecumenical importance' (1992: 2). *Communionis noto*'s key point is the precedence of the universal Church over the local, or particular Church (1992: 8-9). *Communionis noto* is rooted in and reflects on earlier teachings of the Magisterium, in particular in the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, and brought together neatly the key issues for ecclesiology today in the light of 'communion'.[74] As such, it serves as a clear indication of how the Church understands *communio* as a *hermeneutic of unity* which offers avenues for future theological investigation.[75]

Communio hence was a theologically rich expression of Church. It represented a vision of Church which recognised the value of Tradition but wanted to enter into dialogue with other ways of thinking. There now follow some examples of the application of *communio* to the life of the Church.

Part Five Implications of a 'spirituality of communion' for the contemporary Church

Chapter Five will explore the application of *communio* to the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It will suggest that a 'spirituality of communion in education' offers a fresh and intelligible way of harmonising the relationship. This section of Chapter Four will prepare the ground for Chapter

[73] The matter of letter from a centralised body of the Roman Curia to the Bishops of the Church on 'communion' might be interpreted by some as irony, by others as an example of collegiality in practice.
[74] The section headings of the document are helpful as signposts to the key themes: The Church, a Mystery of Communion; Universal Church and Particular Churches; Communion of the Churches, Eucharist and Episcopate; Unity and Diversity in Ecclesial Communion; Ecclesial Communion and Ecumenism.
[75] The section headings illustrate some key areas of theological discussion today.

Five in which *communio* will be employed as a way of articulating a properly ordered relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

'Spirituality of communion', as used by Pope John Paul II, is a descriptor of all formational activities (2001: 43). In keeping with the notion of unity-in-diversity, Pope John Paul II describes 'spirituality of communion' as a way of making room for and recognising what is positive in others and welcoming 'the other' as a gift from God. This suggests that *communio* is more than an ecclesiological model but is a dynamic force at the heart of the Church which underpins and shapes the wider life of the Christian.

There follows an outline of two challenging themes in the life of the Church today. The selected themes crystallise the role of *communio* in the Church today. They offer initial insights into the relationship between tradition and progress and show how the application of the 'spirituality of communion' offers a way of smoothing the contours of theological thought.

Theme 1 *Collegiality and Authority/ Leadership in the Catholic Community*

The relationship between the Pope and the Bishops offers a case-study of how the exercise of authority in the Church can be assisted by reflection on *communio* and framed by the relationship between *tradition* and *progress*. The Church, for example, must reconcile the teaching on papal infallibility from the First Vatican Council with the emphasis in the Second Vatican Council on the collegiality of Bishops and the need to have a broader basis of Church authority (*Christus Dominus* 1965: 2, 3). The Extraordinary Synod of 1985 followed the Second Vatican Council in claiming that the so-called collegial spirit is something expressed most fully in an Ecumenical Council (1985). The *Code of Canon Law* (1983: Canons 331-33) did not offer immediate solutions to the theological conundrum of reconciling both the claims of Papal authority and the notion of the collegiality of the Bishops of local Churches. One way forward is to reconsider the notion of authority as an expression of grace which must be poured out in service of *communio.*

The dynamic between *tradition* and *progress* lies at the heart of the debate on the workings of authority in the life of the Church today. *Communio* offers a theological framework within which the contemporary Church, drawing on Tradition, can reflect fruitfully on the nature of authority and, in particular, on the relationship between the local Bishop and the Bishop of Rome. The Council document proposed a *return* to a model of Episcopacy understood as a 'college or permanent assembly' of Bishops governing the Church in *communion* with the Pope who retained ultimate authority (cf. *Lumen Gentium* 1964: 19; 22). The choice of language - *return* is an expression at the heart of *ressourcement* – indicates the theological temperature at the time of writing (1960s) yet is also open to the charge of seeing particular historical situations as normative. The term 'Collegiality' referred to the harmonious relationship among all the Bishops of the Catholic Church in communion with the Bishop of Rome. This duality offers an important focal point for exploring the concept of unity-in-diversity.

For Pope John Paul II, the role of the Bishop is to act as an agent of *communio* and to encourage 'fruitful dialogue' on two levels: a) among the bishops and b) between the bishops and the layperson (2001: 44-45). In this understanding of authority, leadership is an act of service and not an act of power. The role of the Bishops is to ensure that the common patrimony of faith is conserved in line with tradition and updated, as appropriate, to address the fresh social, cultural and political challenges of the age. This expresses the unity of *tradition* and *progress* within the *communio* of the Church: authority does not come down from the Bishop but radiates from the life of the Church and is animated by grace. Ideally, this will lead to unity in what is essential and 'pondered agreement' in what is open to discussion (Pope John Paul II 2001: 45). *Communio* does not offer a theological 'free for all' but allows the 'Catholic mind' to embrace the fullness of the faith in all its legitimate expressions animated by 'an organic blending of legitimate diversities' (2001: 46). This is an antidote to the workings of clericalism which can often draw on and be inspired by the political-society model of Church and the over-eager adoption of executive decision-making processes in the life of the Church and its agencies.

Theme 2: *Communio in the Service of Relationships*

In a Church modelled on a political-society, the richness of the role of the lay person can be overshadowed by a clericalism which fails to appreciate the role of the laity in general. This theological and pastoral deficit can be addressed by reflection on how *communio* can serve as a theological framework which gives shape to the Christian's relationship with God and with his or her fellow Christians.

First, *communio* informs the wider debate on the individual's relationship with God and offers an insight into the bonds which unite the members of the Church with each other. For a Christian, *communio* with God cannot be lived without real concern for the well-being of humanity. *Communio* offers all humanity a gateway to a possible relationship with God. In the Catholic mind, the concept of Divine filiation—each baptised Christian is a child of God—expresses the notion of Church as family and thus offers a fluid theological expression for the contemporary Christian. It connotes belonging to a family and is thus aligned with the 'familiarity' of the Trinity. The bonds linking the members of this supernatural family express a universal, or catholic, identity stemming from a common baptism and a shared inheritance of faith. This allows all Christians to bring their own cultural/national identities to the broader life of the Church as expressions of a legitimate diversity. The integration of the Rahnerian notion of 'circle of belonging' within *communio* offers a way in which a the Church can make a contribution to humanity's wider search for truth and meaning. This is where the *Courtyard of the Gentiles* offers a forum in which Rahner's concept of the 'anonymous Christian' can both inform and be informed by the Christian worldview (see Chapter Five).

Second, *communio* addresses the distinction between the clerical and the lay state which, at its extreme end, can offer a skewed pastoral theology arising from an uncritical attachment to the 'political-society' model of Church which fails to appreciate the secular character of the lay apostolate (Pope John Paul II 1988: 15). In simple terms, this model suggests that the Bishops govern and the laity are governed. In contrast, reflection on *communio* requires the lay person and the ordained to respect the role of the other. The multiple reference to 'communion' in Pope John PaulII's apostolic exhortation on the role of the lay person highlights

the centrality of *communio* to the life of the Church today (1988 *passim*). What is clear is that lay people are not the agents of the Bishops and the lay apostolate is not primarily expressed in the acceptance of 'lay ministries' within the Church; rather, the lay apostolate consists of the faithful fulfilment of the duties attached to particular states in life and in the living of a life of virtue. These practical expressions of the duties of the lay state emerge from consideration of the lay person's identity within the *communio* of the Church as this is where the dignity of the lay person is revealed (Pope John Paul II 1988: 8). Emergent from this, however, is the possibility of the lay person assuming some ecclesial ministry within the Church (Pope John Paul II 1988: 23). Examples of this could be in the distribution of Holy Communion, where necessary. Within the Church understood as *communio* the lay person and the ordained retain their complementarity and welcome the contribution and gifts of 'the other' (Pope John Paul 2001: 43).

Concluding Remarks: *Communio* as an Expression of the Church for Today

Chapter Four has explored the emergence of *communio* in the Catholic Church today. The importance of *communio* in the Church challenge any sense of compartmentalisation of doctrine: Trinity, Christology, sacramental theology and ecclesiology, for example, are bound together as expressions of the dynamism of the Church's patrimony.

The limitations of *communio* as an ecclesiological model, paradoxically, lie in the very openness and fluidity which it connotes. Although the Catholic tradition does accept the concept of developing doctrine, it does so within the boundaries set by it own body of knowledge. As we have seen above, tradition/progress as reflected in *ressourcement/aggiornamento* is a helpful guide to understanding the theological developments of the twentieth century.

In summary, *communio* offers sufficient theological capital to allow for application to other areas of Church life. As was noted above, Pope John Paul II has linked *communio* with education by proposing a 'spirituality of communion, thus making it the guiding principle of education wherever individuals and Christians are formed' (2001: 43). In the light of Pope John Paul II's linking of

communio and education, and drawing on the argument that *communio* offers a wide and dynamic model of Church for today, the present thesis will now make the claim in the following chapter that reflection on the implications of *communio* offers a way of understanding more fully the complex question of how best to address the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education today.

CHAPTER FIVE
CATECHESIS, CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND COMMUNION

Introduction

Chapter Four explored various aspects of the Church understood as communion *(communio*). It was shown that a key feature of *communion*—a theological expression which had been recovered from the history of theological thought and which was now used as a popular model of Church—is the notion of unity-in-diversity. *Communio* hence provides the theological architecture which allows catechesis and Catholic Religious Education to share a common language of faith while respecting their differing modes of operation.

Chapter Five will make two original contributions to the ongoing debates on the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. Both contributions are grounded in the notion that *communio* serves as an *internal hermeneutic* which clarifies the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as found in the Magisterial documents (see Chapter Three).

First, Chapter Five argues that 'integral religious formation' is a suitable term to describe the creative union of academic learning and the broader promotion of human flourishing which emerges from a cross-fertilisation of the key principles of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. 'Integral religious formation' acknowledges the specific although not exclusive spheres of operation of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the family/parish and school respectively. Furthermore, it draws on phrases like 'integral human formation' in Magisterial teaching which capture the value of education as the development of 'physical, moral, intellectual and spiritual gifts' (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009:1). 'Integral religious formation' refers to and is part of this broader human development with a focus on the cultivation of specifically religious faith.

Second, Chapter Five argues that 'integral religious formation' is a manifestation of a 'shared project' between the principles of catechesis and the principles of Catholic education which, together, form a clearly delineated school subject entitled *Catholic Religious Education*. While the term 'shared project' is used in the Magisterial documents principally to describe the relationship between lay teachers and teachers from Religious orders/congregations, the present thesis claims that the conceptual parameters of 'shared project' can be extended to include the relationship between the fields of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Part One provides a backdrop to the two key claims of Chapter Five. It explores first the challenging nature of the relationship between the worldview of the Catholic Church and pluralism. Following this, it analyses the relationship between *communio* and the role of the Catholic school in a plural society.

Part Two explores how the term 'integral religious formation' reflects the 'spirituality of communion' as applied to education and provides a context for understanding the complementarity between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as found in the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church.

Part Three explores how Catholic Religious Education is a 'shared project' between the Church's catechetical tradition and the principles of Catholic education. This follows from the Magisterium's insistence that human and religious formation is the responsibility of the 'whole Church, " the home and school of communion"' (Congregation for Catholic Education 2007: 56).

Part Four explores the limitations of *communio* as a way of harmonising the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It will examine challenges arising from within the Catholic tradition and challenges arising from other ways of understanding the subject of Religious Education.

Part One The Complex Relationship Between Catholic School Education and Pluralism

Chapter Four identified unity-in-diversity as a key component of *communio*. Paradoxically, the acceptance of unity-in-diversity as a viable internal Church hermeneutic is problematic when it is extended and applied to the Church's relationship with wider society. The complex nature of the relationship between the Catholic Church and pluralism can be summed up thus: how can the institution of the Catholic Church, which claims to be the guardian and promoter of the revealed truth about the human person's relationship with the divine, relate to other religious or philosophical contexts which are indifferent or hostile to this claim?

Part A explores the issues related to the relationship between Catholic education and pluralism. Part B considers the application of *communio* to the Catholic school.

A. Exploring the Relationship between Catholic Education and Pluralism

It is beyond the scope of the present thesis to consider all the implications of the relationship between pluralism and Catholic education, but the setting out of the lines of the argument illustrate the complexity of the territory which Catholic education occupies. Three aspects of this relationship will be considered below: Catholic Education between the 'sacred' and the 'profane'; two models of plurality and dialogue and contemporary Catholic responses to pluralism.

Catholic Education: Between the 'Sacred' and the 'Profane'

In Catholic teaching, the educational mission of the Catholic school flows from and is integrated within the Church's claim to truth (cf: Second Vatican Council *Lumen Gentium* 1964: 8; Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes* 1965: 22; Congregation for Catholic Education 1977: 60). The challenge for the Catholic school today is to find ways to engage with a pluralist culture which –as seen above—rejects the Catholic Church's claim to truth.

Pluralism is one contemporary expression of the broader challenges to Catholic education from a particular understanding of secularisation which seeks to limit, or remove, the influence of religiously-inspired ways of thinking from the public square (Markus 2006; Arthur 2009; Arthur et al. 2010). The significant shift in the meaning of 'secular' has serious implications for Catholic education. Originally it was a term nested between the 'sacred' and the 'profane' and referred to a shared space where free discussion about the affairs of the 'age' (saeculum) could be held (Markus 2006: 4-7). Its current use originated in the perceived division between faith and reason which arose from the Enlightenment in which education was expected to dethrone revealed religion from its influential position in education and in broader society (Arthur et al. 2010). In the context of a binary and unsophisticated distinction between education as the exercise of reason and religious belief as mere superstition, any espousal of the merits of a Christian or any other form of religiously-inspired education would be a conceptual contradiction. The so-called neutral space for freedom of religious expression—which the term 'secular' connoted—had been superseded by views expressing an incompatibility between the claims of religion and the pursuit of education (Conroy and Davis 2010).

One exponent of this position, Paul Hirst, has described the claim that there is a specifically Christian view of education as 'a nonsense' (1974:77). For Hirst, the goal of education was the creation of autonomous and rational beings: he saw no place for 'faith-inspired Religious Education' in schools (see Chapter 3 of the present thesis). This is the logical outcome of Hirst's wider reservations about the influence of religion and religious ways of thinking on education and society more generally. Hirst distinguished between 'primitive' and 'sophisticated' concepts of education and applied these terms to education rooted in religious ways of thinking and education based on reason respectively. Hirst described 'primitive' education as the passing on of what is of value to a particular community without exploration of why it is valuable. 'Sophisticated' education, for Hirst, is the passing on of objective knowledge as opposed to what he claims is mere belief (1974: 80).

The conceptualisation of religious belief as no more than a private matter which cannot be allowed to influence the polity seems to deny religious believers—who, as argued by Bergdhal, make up a substantial part of the constituency of democracy—the appropriate space in which to offer their own contribution to the common good (Bergdahl 2010). A similarly polarised response from religious believers would seem to be fruitless and lead to a society in which barriers, and not bridges, would be built between people with different worldviews. More fundamentally for Catholic Christians, any so-called retreat from the 'world' in favour of the creation of exclusive 'Catholic' ghettoes—be it in education or elsewhere—would not be in keeping with the Church's oft-stated desire to engage with and influence other views (cf: Pope Leo XIII 1891; Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes* 1965: 23, 25, 92; Pope Benedict XVI 2006 a). In this context, the Church has to consider how a process of fruitful dialogue can be actualised given the suspicion towards religious ways of thinking in contemporary western society.

Plurality and Dialogue: Two Models

Before considering how pluralism relates to and challenges the aims of Catholic education, it is necessary to distinguish 'pluralism' from the related term 'plurality.[76] 'Plurality' recognises the existence of a multi-ethnic society with its diversity of religious and philosophical positions. 'Pluralism' is a related normative term which seeks to accommodate the range of religious and philosophical positions which emerge from 'plurality'. There is a risk of it veering towards a relativist position which challenges the claim to truth of Catholic Christianity with regard to other religions (Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith 2000: 4).

The Second Vatican Council emphasised the importance of dialogue between the Church and other religious and philosophical traditions.[77] Given the unique claims

[76] See Skeie (1995) for a deeper consideration of the plurality/pluralism relationship. The challenge to the Catholic, or any religious worldview, is heightened when Skeine's position is refracted through the lenses of ethnic and ideological pluralism. (See also Jackson 2004).

[77] Historical examples of this dialogue include: the relationship between ancient philosophy and early Christianity; the dialogue between St Thomas Aquinas and Jewish and Arab philosophy

made by Catholic Christianity (cf: Second Vatican Council *Lumen Gentium*, 1964: 8) it is necessary to explore the range of interpretations afforded to the processes of dialogue in the contemporary Catholic Church.[78] There are two models of dialogue which will frame this discussion: a) 'dialogue for shared understanding' and b) 'dialogue for encounter'.

'Dialogue for shared understanding' is, on an initial level, a commendable way of fostering good relations across the range of religious and philosophical positions which exists in a plural society (Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue 1991). More importantly, it is a way of developing a shared understanding of key theological and philosophical concepts which draws on the call in *Gaudium et Spes* for the Church to address 'the whole of humanity' (1965:2). This model of dialogue recalls the original use of 'secular' as a neutral space for the sharing and seeking of common ground. It resonates with Avery Dulles's model of the 'Church as servant', a model designed to express the Church's desire to serve others without an *explicit* desire to convert them to Christianity (Dulles 2002: 89-90). The Church hence recognises the seeds of truth which lie in other religious and philosophical positions (Second Vatican Council *Nostra Aetate* 1965). In so doing, it limits the influence of a highly stratified 'Tridentine' ecclesiology which would not be in keeping with the principles of *communio.*

'Dialogue for encounter' views dialogue as a precursor to, or an initial stage in, the process of evangelisation. This model of dialogue, which seeks an encounter between humanity and the salvific message of Christianity, is sharper-edged than the model described above and, on an initial reading, seems more aligned to the wider mission of the Church to 'teach all nations' (Matthew 28:19). Given that the Church has consistently made it very clear that evangelisation is a primary duty of all the faithful, it is logical to conclude that all activities in which the Church is engaged must make some form of contribution, however modest, to the processes of evangelisation. In 'dialogue for encounter', the Church is taking part in the

(Pope John Paul II 1998). The 'Courtyard of the Gentiles' initiative—mentioned later in Chapter Five—is another and more recent example of this desire to engage in dialogue with other ways of thinking.

[78] This topic is fundamental to the wider issue of religious literacy in education. For a Catholic perspective on these issues, see Second Vatican Council *Nostra Aetate* (1965) 2 and 4 and Pope Benedict XVI (2004).

processes of dialogue in order to lead, teach and guide (Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue 1991).

Communio's stress on the importance of dialogue offers a theological context for discussion of these models. Indeed *communion*, properly understood, allows different practices and traditions within Catholic Christianity to retain a common bond in the Church's teaching tradition. The appreciation and fostering of diversity of practices and traditions within the Church, however, cannot be translated into a wholesale embrace of pluralism in wider society as the Church continues to claim to possess and guard the truth about the human condition. It is this claim to universal truth which acts as a challenge to pluralism.[79]

Contemporary Catholic Responses to the Challenge of Pluralism

The debate on the aims and purposes of dialogue has the potential to clash with the Church's mission to evangelise. Two recent initiatives in the Catholic Church have made the tension between both models of dialogue more explicit. The intellectual energy behind these initiatives is provided by the concept of the 'new humanism' which Pope Benedict XVI (2007 a) has encouraged in response to the considerable cultural shifts which have marked modern society. At the heart of this 'new humanism' is the need to widen the scope of reason in order to offer a transcendent vision of the human person to all.

The first of these initiatives, the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles' (henceforth *Courtyard)* is designed to explore ways of fostering dialogue between the Church and non-believers. Interestingly, this initiative is under the auspices of the Pontifical Council for Culture and not any Curial body charged with more *explicit* forms of evangelisation. Its 'terms of reference' were laid out by Pope Benedict XVI:

[79] The *Lineamenta* for the XIII Synod of Bishops on *The New Evangelisation for the Transmission of the Christian Faith'* leaves one in no doubt as to the centrality of evangelisation in the contemporary Church and lends support to the view of dialogue as precursor to evangelisation. Kozinski (2010: xxiv-xxv) has challenged the Church to counter the 'intrinsically defective and provisional character of ideological pluralism' and has urged the Church to build a 'new Christendom' (Adkins 2011).

> I think that today too the Church should open a sort of "Court of the Gentiles" in which people might in some way latch on to God, without knowing him and before gaining access to his mystery, at whose service the inner life of the Church stands. Today, in addition to interreligious dialogue, there should be a dialogue with those to whom religion is something foreign, to whom God is unknown and who nevertheless do not want to be left merely Godless, but rather to draw near to him, albeit as the Unknown (Pope Benedict XVI 2009 a).

This initiative seeks to offer a space where the Church can take the first steps in encouraging people of other philosophical traditions to consider how the insights of religion can contribute to a deeper understanding of the broader questions of existence. In this respect, the *Courtyard* seems, initially, to echo the original understanding of 'secular' as expressed in the first model of dialogue explored above.

The appeal of the *Courtyard* as a model for fruitful dialogue need not be restricted to a range of initiatives between Catholic Christians and atheists. It also offers interesting possibilities for supporting dialogue between different traditions of Christianity in order to address the common challenges to religious belief presented by the myriad forces of contemporary secularism (cf Arthur et. al. 2010).

A key aspect of the *Courtyard* initiative is the possibility it offers for building relationships with broader culture and the desire to use 'art' (broadly understood) as a means of drawing all people into wider discussions about the human condition. What gives this initiative a critical edge is its continuing claim that God exists as the origin and source of beauty, truth and goodness.[80]

It is possible to consider the *Courtyard* in the wider theological context of the Church understood as *communio*. This draws on Rahner's concept of the 'anonymous Christian' (see Chapter Four) and represents some form of 'outer circle' of *communio* in which the Church reaches out to people who are not

[80]See, for example, the 'Courtyard' event in Barcelona in May 2012. http://www.sagradafamilia.cat/sf-eng/docs_serveis/spiritActual.php

committed to, and are maybe even suspicious of, the Christian message yet seek some form of engagement with the Christian mind. The image of the *Courtyard* expresses the rich layers of meaning in the specifically Christian understanding of dialogue as a means of building bridges between cultures and different worldviews. The *Courtyard* hence is a re-creation, or new understanding of, the *saeculum* as a space where believers and non-believers recognise and share their common humanity. For the Christian, it offers a privileged moment for evangelisation (Synod of Bishops 2012 a: 54).

The second initiative, the Pontifical Council for New Evangelisation (established October 2010), is charged with the spread of the Gospel to those parts of the world where Christianity has lost ground to secular indifferentism (Pope Benedict XVI 2010 c). The clarity of its stated missionary objectives is a reminder of the tension which emerges from the encounter between Christianity and pluralism (Synod of Bishop 2012 a; Synod of Bishops 2012 b). The term 'new evangelisation' refers specifically to those countries which have an established Catholic Christian heritage but where religious practice has fallen (Fisichella 2012). This initiative extends to the domain of education where the so-called 'educational emergency' stems from the difficulties of 'an anthropology marked by individualism' (Synod of Bishops 2012 a: 126; 151). To remedy this, the Church offers the insights of its educational heritage to all with an interest in education (Synod of Bishops 2012 a: 150-151). This 'claim to truth' places the Church at the heart of a wider cultural debate on the anthropological foundations of education. The Church is proposing here an alternative vision of the human person in which ultimate happiness is living in *communion* with God and our fellow men and women. The claim that schools can play a role in the 'new evangelisation' is a reminder of the Catholic school's integration in the wider life of the Church. It brings to the fore the broader tensions over the validity, or otherwise, of faith-based education to offer a critical exploration of ideas and concepts in the spirit of freedom which the Catholic school is asked to foster.

The emergence of two high-powered yet thematically distinct initiatives from the Holy See is, on one level, an expression of the Church acting in keeping with the theology of communion: both initiatives reflect diverse approaches to dialogue

with wider society. Nonetheless, a synthesis can be found if the *Courtyard* initiative is considered as a way of allowing the Church's intellectual heritage to drive discussion on what it means to be human. In so doing, it will encourage the flourishing of the human virtues and thereby create the conditions for the Gospel message to take root in a society which is *open* to the transcendent. The 'Courtyard' is an initial step in the 'new evangelisation' and, indeed, is a partner movement to it. This would accord with the view, originating in medieval times, that the study of the liberal arts and sciences opened the way to the study of philosophy and ultimately, theology (Conroy and Davis 2010). This pedagogical approach is true to the etymological root of 'pedagogy' as it accompanies broader studies in order to bring people to the Catholic vision of life. Such an arrangement, while taking a cautious perspective of 'open-ended' views of the purpose of dialogue, is clear about its ultimate objective (Conroy and Davis 2010).

The examples offered above indicate the broad parameters of the challenges which arise from the relationship between Catholic education and pluralism. These issues are concretised in the consideration of the Catholic school's relationship with the education systems of the plural society in the light of *communio*.

B. *Communio* and the Catholic School: an *Ecclesial Enterprise* and a *Cultural Project*

Part B offers an insight into broader issues referring to the challenges faced by the theology of communion in the context of pluralism. The Catholic school is a place of evangelisation and education which seeks to bring faith into harmony with culture and life (Congregation for Catholic Education 1997:11-14). It is both an 'ecclesial enterprise' and an expression of a 'cultural project'.

The Catholic School as an 'Ecclesial Enterprise'

The relationship between *communio* and the Catholic school finds expression in a vision of the Catholic school where *all* activity is animated by the ecclesial nature

of the school (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988; 1997). In this vision of education, the Catholic school is a Trinitarian and Christocentric community of faith where all are encouraged to live according to the Gospel (Congregation for Catholic Education 1977; 1982). The alignment between the mission of the Church and the life, work and educational goals of the Catholic school comes from the mutual and historically-conditioned reciprocity between Church and school (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988). This model of Catholic education is dependent on the continued existence of committed and well-formed teachers who are instrumental in shaping the vision and the mission of the Catholic school (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: passim). The 'spiritual capital'—defined by Gerald Grace as the array of faith, traditions and values which have emerged from the Catholic Christian tradition—acquired by key staff in Catholic schools allows said staff to serve as both good professionals and authentic witnesses in the school (Grace 2002). The 'spiritual capital' at the heart of the institution ensures that the Catholic school is shaped by a distinctive 'faith-based' vision of education.[81]

The realisation of this vision of the Catholic school is limited somewhat by the exigencies of the modern secular state. Catholic schools which are part or wholly funded by the state are required to align themselves with public policies to varying degrees. For example, Gerald Grace has cited the importation of the language and 'systems' of contemporary 'quality assurance' in the policy frameworks of Catholic schools in England and Wales (2002: 4). Even Catholic independent schools need to work with the various syllabi and curricular guidelines for public examinations. The state may, of course, express support for Catholic schools as a desirable reflection of diversity or in recognition of a shared cultural inheritance (Salmond 2008).

The previously mentioned 'models of dialogue'—for shared understanding and for encounter—can be applied specifically to the debate on the Catholic school's role in a plural society. Insights from selected works of John Sullivan and James Arthur offer illustrative examples of the tension engendered by the debates on the

[81] See McKinney (Ed.) (2008 b) for a succinct overview of the key issues re 'faith-schools' in a plural society.

purpose of 'dialogue'. In referring to the need for dialogue in the Catholic school, John Sullivan (2001) uses the phrase 'distinctive and inclusive' to encapsulate the two 'polarities' which, he claims, reflect diverse understandings of the Catholic school (2001: 1-7). These 'polarities' emerge from what he claims are 'conflicting imperatives within Catholicism' (2001:27): the need to teach from within the safe and recognised doctrinal boundaries of the Catholic Church is placed alongside the Church's duty to meet the needs of 'all God's people in a way that is open to and inclusive of the diversity of their circumstances and cultures' (2001:27). Sullivan is critical of an overly robust interpretation of the distinctiveness of the Catholic vision in the school and favours the 'inclusive' model of Catholic education as more representative of a Church which needs to focus more on the 'reception' than on the 'promulgation' of Church teaching (2001: 206).

James Arthur (1995), on the other hand, argues for the Catholic school as a 'distinctive' model of education. For Arthur, the Catholic school is 'an expression of the Church's salvific mission' (1995:46). It is an enterprise which remains focused on the firm foundation of Catholic traditions. Arthur describes this model of the Catholic school as 'holistic': the educational activity of the Catholic school, he claims, must be inspired from the 'whole' – understood as the Church's worldview and theological resources (1995: 246). For Arthur, the Catholic school's failure to anchor itself firmly within this tradition leads first to the adoption of 'dualist' models and then to 'pluralistic' models of the Catholic school (1995: 246).

Sullivan and Arthur's contributions are indicative of the two ends of the spectrum of positions on the role of the Church in education. They demonstrate the nexus between theological thought and the world of Catholic education. It is reasonable to conclude that their respective proposals on the most desirable shape of Catholic education reflect wholly or in part their own broader ecclesiological positions and related reflections on Catholic schooling. As such, any 'conclusions' arising from their work need to be treated with some caution. The dialogue between Catholic education and wider cultural forces is one of partnership in which the Church acts out its mission to serve all people and is in turn transformed by this encounter with other ways of thinking. Ye the Church has a duty to lead, teach and guide as

a contribution to the public good.[82] Focusing on and drawing from the what is known as the 'divine commission' (Matthew 28: 19-20) the model of 'dialogue for encounter' is distinctive in its message yet also inclusive as all are invited to engage with the message and demands of Christianity.[83]

The Catholic School as a 'Cultural Project'

The nature of the dialogue between the Church and public authorities on the provision of Catholic school education is crucial. This dialogue can be on two levels: first, it can be a politically-inspired process which sets out to defend the right of Catholic schools to exist within a plural education system; second, the dialogue can focus on how the Church and the many strands of its educational heritage can contribute to the broader public debates on the very nature and purpose of all models of schooling. In the latter model, the Catholic school acts out the politically sensitive role of offering a distinctive vision of education which simultaneously offers a philosophical challenge to the foundations of the selfsame plural society. This model of the Catholic school promotes an integral vision of academic learning and human formation which eschews a narrow focus on academic success or on any other performative indicator. Pope Benedict XVI's reflections on the so-called 'educational emergency' are an indicator of a way of thinking which is concerned with broader educational issues—in this case the challenge to the exercise of legitimate authority and norms of behaviour in society—and not solely with matters concerning the working of the Catholic system.[84]

This model of the Catholic school is an innovative way of engaging the Catholic school with contemporary life and gives a radical edge to the Catholic school's relationship with both the state and the surrounding culture. In the context of the theology of communion, it places the Catholic school at the intersection between the Church's worldview and the necessary responsibility of the state to oversee

[82] See also Engebretson (2008) who maps the debate on the 'Catholic' identity of the Catholic school on to the traditional 'four marks of the Church' (CCC 813).
[83] See Haldane (1996) on questions of identity and Catholic education.
[84] Pope Benedict XVI's (2007 b) address to the assembly of the Diocese of Rome in 2007 contained a profound concern arising from developments in modern educational thought which were, he believed, inimical to the development of truly human values.

education systems. Within this context, the Catholic school's philosophy is one which seeks to 'create increasingly more profound relations of communion which are themselves educational' (Congregation for Catholic Education 2007: 14). The Church's intellectual heritage—a critical aspect of the bonds of *communion*—overflows into the Catholic school's relations with wider society. The resultant synthesis of faith and culture challenges the 'settled pluralism' of contemporary education as it promotes an educational programme which coheres with the Catholic worldview and assists students 'to see beyond the limited horizon of human reality' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 510). This challenging 'mission statement' of Catholic education emphasizes the importance of the Catholic school to the human person's encounter with the transcendent. It assists the development of a wisdom which opens the pupils' horizons beyond the limitations of present experience (Caldecott 2012).

A particular example will highlight the general principles explored above. The *Progetto Culturale* ('Cultural Project') of the Italian Bishops' Conference is a prototype of a new way of configuring the Church's relationship with cultural pluralism (Conferenza Episcopale Italiana (CEI) 2001). The *Progetto* seeks to explore how the Church can re-engage with a society which has lost sight—either partially or completely—of its Christian roots The *Progetto* can be understood broadly as a localised (in Italy) 'testing' of the ideas which have come to maturation in the *Courtyard* initiative and, to a lesser extent, in the instruments of the 'New Evangelisation'. Both the *Courtyard* and the *Progetto* initiatives are driven in part by the quest for a 'new humanism' in which the human person as *imago dei* is central to the Church's educational vision (Benedict XVI 2007 a). The *Progetto* hence seeks to counter ways of living which leave little room for the Christian vision of the world and is designed to offer a renewal of Christian anthropology as an antidote to cultural relativism (CEI 2001). It has a wide scope and includes considered reflection on how to respond to philosophical challenges in areas as diverse as work, the mass-media and education.

The nature and purpose of education is a key component of the *Progetto*. This is a claim that the Church's educational mission is in the front line of the Church's desire to reclaim the ground apparently lost to cultural relativism. The Italian

Bishops' Conference decision to take education as its principal theme for 2010-2020 is a significant indicator of the role education will play in the evolution of the *Progetto* (Pope Benedict XVI 2010 a). The role of the school, a key agent of the Church's educational mission, is hence central to its success:

> La scuola è o almeno dovrebbe essere, il luogo in cui l'educazione si realizza attraverso la trasmissione di un patrimonio culturale elaborato dalla tradizione, mediante lo studio a la formazione di una coscienza critica' (Comitato per il Programma Culturale della Conferenza Episcopale Italiana, 2001: 51). [85]

This powerful statement is a call to re-evaluate the role of education as the critical study of the intellectual achievements of the great minds of the past. It is this shared tradition of learning which both provides the bedrock for further study and the cultural continuity between past and present. There is no sense in these words that tradition is static and that the human person is to be other than critically engaged with his or her studies. In offering this rationale for education, the Catholic school provides a valuable place of 'encounter' for the contemporary seeker of truth. It is here that the Church proposes the Christian vision of the human person to all who seek it.

There are, nevertheless, some limitations to this vision. First, is the *Progetto* a nostalgia-driven enterprise which seeks to rebuild an exclusively Christian culture and implicitly or otherwise, limit the influence of non-Christian sources on wider society? In other words, is it an attempt to construct a modern and Carolingian-inspired educational and cultural *renovatio* (cf. Williams 2010: 24)? Second, how could such a development in Catholic schools respect the 'religious freedom and the personal conscience of individual students and their families' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 6)? This line of thinking, when placed alongside the clearly-stated aims of the 'new evangelisation' and of the role of the school in evangelisation (Synod of Bishops 2012 a: 151-152), does seem to propose a holistic vision of Catholic education driven more by the 'distinctive' as opposed to the 'inclusive' model. Third, is the model of Catholic education proposed by

[85] The school is, or at least should be, the place where education is carried out in the context of the transmission of a cultural patrimony developed by tradition. This is done by study and the formation of a critical conscience (my translation).

the *progetto* limited by its stated Italian context (see Part Three below)? It remains to be seen how transferable this approach is, especially in countries which lack the strong historical and cultural links to Catholicism which permeate Italian society (Garelli 2007 b).

In response, the *Progetto*'s approach rejects a pessimistic narrative of decline. It proposes a restoration of civil society which is underpinned by a robust vision of Catholic culture and by extension, Catholic education. The Italian experiment offers some initial fresh thinking on the role of the Catholic school's role in the Church's engagement with culture and the intellectual space for an encounter between Catholic Christianity and contemporary pluralism.

The *Progetto* furthermore, offers an integrated vision of Catholic education which goes beyond a strictly catechetical formation. Part Two below draws on this notion of 'integration' to propose that 'integral religious formation' offers an appropriate conceptual underpinning of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Part Two The 'Spirituality of Communion' and 'Integral Religious Formation': Towards a 'Shared Project'

Pope John Paul's proposal for a 'spirituality of communion' in education provides a key link between *communio* and the Church's educative mission. The 'spirituality of communion', in his words, should serve as 'the guiding principle of education wherever individuals and Christians are formed' (Pope John Paul II 2001: 43). This locates the mission of Catholic education firmly within the Church's broader evangelising mission yet would seem to allow some space for the legitimate diversity which lies at the heart of *communio*. Part A argues that 'spirituality of communion' is a suitable hermeneutical key for understanding the dynamic nature of Catholic education. Part B argues that the term 'integral religious formation' provides a robust underpinning for the developing relationship between catechesis and Religious Education. Part C explores how *communio* offers the theological architecture for re-imagining the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

A. 'Spirituality of Communion' as a Hermeneutical Key for Catholic Education

Pope John Paul II defines 'spirituality of communion' as the 'heart's contemplation of the mystery of the Trinity' (2001: 43). This emphasis on the Trinity illustrates the thematic links between theology and the principles, processes and loci of education. It reveals how theological knowledge of the mystery of the Trinity can be applied to all expressions of Christian life (Pope John Paul II 2001; Guroian 2001).

Chapter Four explored the nuances inherent in any exploration of the term 'theology of communion'. It is equally important to explore the term 'spirituality' before applying it to both communion and education and hence articulating how 'spirituality of communion' can serve as a hermeneutical key for Catholic education.

A precise and universally satisfactory definition of 'spirituality' remains problematic and elusive (Wright 2000). The related challenges arising from reflection on the place of spirituality and spiritual education in what academics often call the 'common school' are no less pressing (Mott-Thornton 2003; McLaughlin 2003). Nonetheless, some attempt must be made to find a way of understanding spirituality if we are to interrogate Pope John Paul II's term 'spirituality of communion'.

In the first instance, Christians need to be aware of the paradox that an overly 'spiritual' understanding of the term—if this were to lead to a dichotomous relationship between 'body' and 'spirit'—would not be in keeping with the Christian theology of the Incarnation.[86]

[86] 'The human person, created in the image of God, is a being at once corporeal and spiritual. The biblical account expresses this reality in symbolic language when it affirms that "then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." Man, whole and entire, is therefore willed by God' (CCC 362). A further exploration of this relationship is beyond the scope of the present thesis.

The term 'spirituality' is used within a range of religious and philosophical traditions to express personal and communal values allied to the broader seeking of meaning. Marian de Souza, for example, sees spirituality as a critical component of human development with a particular emphasis on the context of relationality (2009). Brendan Hyde, who has a special interest in children's spirituality, recognises the broad range of meanings attached to 'spirituality' and offers a tripartite understanding of 'spirituality' as a) an essential human trait or natural human predisposition; b) a movement towards 'Ultimate Unity' - admittedly a complex idea and c) a given expression of a sense of unity which can be expressed in religious traditions (Hyde 2008: 43-44).

'Spirituality', for theists, will always have a connection to a particular understanding of God (Sheldrake 2007). Within the Christian tradition, the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967: 594), described spirituality as 'how the soul may live as integrally as possible the life of Jesus' while Alister McGrath described it as a 'fulfilled and authentic Christian existence' (McGrath 1999: 1-2). These latter definitions, however unsatisfactory their vagueness may be, do anchor 'spirituality' firmly within Christianity and Christian life. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* does not define 'spirituality' as such, but, in referring to prayer, locates spirituality at the convergence of liturgical and theological currents. This offers the possibility of defining Christian spirituality as a way of living an integrated Christian life (*CCC* 2684), one in which all aspects of human life are shaped by the demands arising from the commitment to Christianity. It is this marriage of Catholic spirituality and rich learning experiences which offers Catholic education its distinctive educational vision. The term 'spirituality of communion' is not a specific 'school of spirituality' which sits alongside other such 'schools'.[87] It is a theological expression which places the varied processes and institutions of Catholic education at the heart of the life of the Catholic community.

Catholic education is not limited to participation in formal processes of education in, for example, the school, the college, and the university. Rather, it offers a

[87] See the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967: 603f) for a comprehensive overview of the 'schools of spirituality' in the history of the Church.

wider conceptual field which marries all of the above with the education carried out in the family and the parish community in the context of a life-long and holistic process of human development. The application of *communio* to Catholic education hence allows for a conversation across the various loci of Catholic education and challenges the continued existence of conceptual barriers arising, for example, from notions of the Church as the perceived locus of religious and faith formation and the school as the perceived locus of education/instruction (cf: Rymarz 2011; Congregation for Catholic Education 2007:14). Such a binary arrangement would not reflect the 'spirituality of communion' in Catholic education.

The links between the theology of *communio* and the principles of Catholic education are indicative of an understanding of education which is both dynamic and relational. Part B explores the notion of 'integral religious formation' as the conceptual underpinning of the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education.

B. 'Integral Religious Formation' as a Conceptual Framework

It is the theology of communion which promotes and underpins the creative union of academic learning and the broader promotion of human flourishing – the definition of 'integral religious formation' in the present thesis. The adoption of 'integral religious formation' as the underpinning conceptual framework for the religious formation of young Catholics is significant for the following reasons.

The Church recognises that 'the integral formation of the human person' includes the physical, moral, intellectual and spiritual dimensions of education (Congregation for Catholic Education 1977:26; 1988:99, 101 2009:1). 'Integral religious formation' acts within this broad process as a catalyst for the specifically *religious* dimension of Catholic education and contributes towards the broader doctrinal formation and pastoral support which the Church favours (Sullivan 2001). Catechesis and Catholic Religious Education are life-long processes and not simply pre-determined periods undertaken in preparation for the next stage of

Christian life, for example: catechumenate – Baptism; marriage preparation - Matrimony.

The use of 'integral religious formation' addresses the seeming lack of cohesion in contemporary Magisterial teaching on how the religious formation of young people should be addressed. The involvement of a range of Curial bodies in the production of Magisterial documents relating to religious formation illustrates this complex situation.[88] Furthermore, the various Papal interventions on these matters over the years—allied to the varied localised interpretations of Magisterial teaching across the Church—lends credence to the need for more robust yet flexible guidelines.[89] Arguably, a diversity of provision is of value as a multi-layered and dynamic expression of *communion*. In this case, it is the role of the local Bishop to ensure that the religious formation of young Catholics reflects the universal principles of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education and are expressed in terms which meet the needs of the particular Church.

In addition, the notion of 'integration' is a reminder of the role of the wider Church community in education. Education is not an endeavor carried out in isolation in formal institutions. The term 'integration' connotes the bringing together of disparate elements and is hence a suitable expression for *communio* in the context of education and schooling. More specifically, a commitment to 'integration' aligns the so-called affective and cognitive aspects of learning. (See Part 3B below and Chapter Six for a deeper exploration of 'affective' and 'cognitive' aspects of learning.)

Catholic education, understood as an expression of the 'spirituality of communion', is fully part of the life of the Church and brings together the

[88] For example, the *Congregation for Catholic Education* deals with the broader picture of education, including Religious Education; the *Congregation for the Clergy* dealt with catechesis until 2013 when responsibility for catechesis was transferred to the newly-established *Pontifical Council for Promoting the New Evangelisation* (Pope Benedict XVI 2013); the *Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments* deals with the question of liturgy – a key component of catechesis. Added to this mix is the complex question of the correct 'age' for reception of the sacraments of Christian initiation—most noticeably the sacrament of Confirmation—and the associated catechetical frameworks (McGrail 2007: 69-71).

[89] See Chapter Three for selected examples from the literature of this 'localisation'. Chapter Six will offers a specific practical example and Chapter Seven will suggest ways in which this mixed picture can be brought into fruitful harmony.

formation of the mind and heart in one process of integral human development: this includes specifically religious formation. The following section explores in more detail the issues arising from the relationship of communion to catechesis and education.

C. Catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in *communio*

The study of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education follows on from the Church's gradual absorption of the implications of the theology of communion for wider Catholic life and identity. The intellectual currents around *communion*—and the rise of the theological journal *Communio*—had a profound influence on the Church's thinking on catechesis. This development is another example of the ongoing and wider interplay between Church teaching and theological scholarship in the years following the Second Vatican Council. *The General Catechetical Directory* had drawn on the Second Vatican Council and the fruits of Catholic theological scholarship to make initial links between the Church as *communio* and the field of catechesis (1971: 66). This influence was implicit at first and grew in importance in parallel with ongoing reflection on the implications of *communio*. Drawing from this body of scholarship, the Magisterial documents now began to consider how *communio* had the theological potential to reshape thinking on Catholic education.

An exploration of the key Magisterial documents in this field reveal the growing importance of the relationship between *communio* and education. This came to maturation with the publication of *Educating Together in Catholic Schools – A Shared Mission between Consecrated Person and the Lay Faithful* (2007) (henceforth *Educating Together*). The importance of this document goes beyond the mere exploration of the relationship between the lay teacher and the teacher from a Religious Order.[90] *Educating Together* finally made explicit the thematic links between *communio* and education which had been largely implicit in Church teaching since the early 1970s (cf. Congregation for Catholic Education 1982: 18,

[90] *Lay Catholics in School Witnesses to Faith* (1982) and *Consecrated Persons and their Mission in Schools* (2002), although separated by a period of twenty years, are partner documents which deal with these issues in some detail.

28; 1988: 44, 81; 1997:11-13, 18; 2002: 15).[91] The document applies the key aspects of *communio* to Catholic education and hence acts as an important thematic bridge between theological reflection on aspects of *communio* and Catholic teaching on education (2007: 8-19). The use of 'communion' in the headings of two of the three parts of the document illustrates how the theology of communion had penetrated Church teaching on education. Under the sub-heading 'Educating in communion and for communion', the document offers three *communio*-inspired perspectives through which the mission of the Catholic school can be viewed (my bold text):

> It is not by chance that the first and original educational environment is that of the natural community of the family. Schools, in their turn, take their place beside the family as an educational space that is **communitarian, organic** and **intentional** and they sustain their educational commitment, according to a logic of assistance (Congregation for Catholic Education 2007:12).

The use of words like 'communitarian, organic and intentional' reflect a definite *communio*-inspired vision of the Catholic school. *Communitarian* offers a vision of the school as a) a site of shared understanding which recognises the wider role of the pupils and parents in its life and b) as a community integrated within the wider community of the Church. *Organic* shows that the school is not fixed in its structures and curricular approach but evolves appropriately in response to a range of challenges. Finally, *intentional* proposes that clear and purposeful steps designed to assist its growth as an educational community will anchor Catholic schooling firmly within the life of the Church. The Catholic school is hence called to be an educational community which forms the human person in integral unity and a place where 'profound relations' of communion are found (Congregation for Catholic Education 2007: 14).

A crucial feature of *Educating Together* is its description of Catholic education as a 'shared project' between the lay person and communities of Religious (2007:4).

[91] *Educating Together in Catholic Schools* (2007) offers a summary of the key themes of c*ommunio*: it is defined as the 'essence' of the Church and the Church is depicted as the 'icon' of the love of God.

As discussed in Chapter Three, John Baptiste De La Salle had introduced Religious Brothers as teachers in seventeenth century France. The growth of this and other orders and congregations with an interest in education widened the Catholic teaching force beyond the priesthood (cf: O'Donoghue 2004; Hellinckx et al. 2009; Kehoe 2010). In the Magisterial documents, the 'shared project' between the teachers from Religious orders/congregations and the lay teacher has emerged in response to the drop in vocations to Religious orders/congregations with a charism for teaching. 'Shared project' is thus used retrospectively to describe a situation which has arisen from this decline in vocations to those Religious orders/congregations. The altered demography of the teaching force in Catholic schools has allowed the Church to reconceptualise the role of the lay teacher: he or she is not as 'substitute' for the absent Religious teacher but is a key person in what is now called a 'shared project'. The staffing profile of the Catholic school—in which lay people fulfill the vocation of Catholic teacher—is a vital feature of the contemporary Catholic school (cf: Congregation for Catholic Education 1982:1988).

A case could be made that the use of 'shared project' is no more than a necessary and limited intervention in response to the changing demographic of the teaching force. The decline of Religious orders/congregations in teaching, however, offered an opportunity for the Church to appreciate in greater depth the growing participation of lay people in teaching. It is clear that the 'shared project' is an example of the 'spirituality of communion' as applied to education. The Church's acceptance of the principle of the 'shared project' between the lay teacher and the teacher from a Religious order/congregation leaves open the possibility of other ways of understanding the term. Part Three will hence explore 'shared project' as a way of harmonising the fields of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Part Three The 'Shared Project' of Catholic Religious Education

In response to the conceptual challenges arising from the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education, the present thesis now makes the claim that Catholic Religious Education is a 'shared project' between the principles of catechesis and education. This claim is a considered response to the

challenges arising from the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. The 'shared project' is thus a satisfactory articulation of the theology of communion as applied to the Magisterially-sanctioned distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Catholic Religious Education shares a body of doctrine with catechesis. In the Catholic school, this 'body of knowledge' is taught with full academic standing.[92] This arrangement is both a reflection of the subject's roots in catechesis and of the critical engagement with culture which contemporary understandings of Catholic Religious Education are designed to promote. Part A defines the parameters of 'shared project' and explores how this 'shared project' can be developed; Part B looks at relevant teaching and learning issues.

A. Defining and Developing the 'Shared Project' of Catholic Religious Education

The theology of communion allows us to make some sense of the complex relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. The lack of clear direction in the Magisterial teaching of the Church on the concrete nature and curricular shape of the subject of Catholic Religious Education is problematic when set against the thorough Magisterial treatment of catechesis as evidenced by the publication of two Directories related to catechesis since the Second Vatican Council (Congregation for the Clergy 1971 and 1997). Before dealing with how this 'shared project' can be developed, it is necessary to clarify precisely what is meant by the use of 'shared project' in the broader context of 'integral religious formation' given its original use as descriptor of the relationship between the lay teacher and the teacher from a Religious order (Congregation for Catholic Education 2007).

First, the use of the term 'shared project' recognises the contribution of the different loci of Catholic education: the parish, the school, Bishops' Conferences and associated Church agencies with the family as the key influence

[92] Compare Pope St. Pius X (1905: 4) and the Congregation for Catholic Education (1997: 851) for statements from both ends of the twentieth century on the importance of teaching doctrine.

(Congregation for Catholic Education 1997: 20). It is also important to remember that Catholic education in most modern settings cannot ignore the role of the state, especially where the state is a lead provider of education. Each stakeholder operates within a particular sphere of influence: ideally they each retain links with the others and hence express the 'spirituality of communion' as *reflections* and *agencies* of communion.

Second, the present thesis claims that the term 'shared project' identifies Catholic Religious Education as having roots in both catechesis and much broader educational influences (see Chapter Three). This is in line with the claim of the Magisterium that catechesis and Religious Education are complementary processes. The Magisterium has not suggested how the complementarity could be encouraged, far less achieved. The evolution of Catholic Religious Education from 'school-based catechesis' to full academic subject status hence remains a work in progress in its operation. In the light of the complex nature of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as noted above, the theology of communion as internal hermeneutic offers a *modus operandi* which teases out the principles of the 'shared project' and helps to identify some points of consonance and dissonance between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as found in the life of the Catholic school.

Consonance between Catechesis and Catholic Religious Education

There are two key areas of consonance between catechesis and Catholic Religious education.

In the first place, Catholic Religious Education shares a body of knowledge with catechesis, its complementary process. This body of knowledge—the Church's deposit of faith—lies at the heart of both catechesis and Catholic Religious Education and firmly aligns the Catholic school with the broader life and mission of the Church (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988:44). Catholic Religious Education, as a complement to catechesis, thereby presupposes some form of family/parish catechesis to support Religious Education in the school (Congregation for the Clergy, 1997: 226). Returning to this notion of a 'body of

knowledge', the Church claims that 'religious education in schools gives the pupils knowledge about Christianity's identity and Christian life' (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009: 17). The knowledge and understanding which lie at the heart of Catholic Religious Education is the fruit of study and personal reflection on the Church's doctrinal heritage and requires the pedagogical tools of silence and dialogue, both oral and written (Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 154). Furthermore, the Church claims that 'there is no separation between time for learning and time for formation, between acquiring notions and growing in wisdom' (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1997: 14). For example, while memorisation is a key component of developing knowledge and understanding in catechesis and Catholic Religious Education, the memorised texts are more than providers of religious data: they serve as the primary material on which the student can apply the pedagogical tools of silence and oral/written dialogue (Pope John Paul II 1979: 55). This is not to say that the student's response to the Church's doctrinal heritage will be one of uncritical assent. Chapter Six will return to this issue in the context of one local syllabus of Catholic Religious Education.

In the second place. Catholic Religious Education is a legitimate *development* of catechesis in the context of the Catholic school. The question of what is understood by 'legitimate development' is crucial to understanding the 'shared project'. Newman argued that Christian doctrine could not remain a static and unchanging body of knowledge but that this body of knowledge grew throughout history (Newman 1878/2003: Ch. V). What makes this process one of 'development', as opposed to one of 'corruption' of earlier ideas is, he argued, the clear continuity between the later and earlier stages of development (Newman 1878/2003: Ch. V). Although Newman was concerned with demonstrating doctrinal continuity between the early (apostolic) Church and the Catholic Church of the nineteenth century, the present thesis claims that the principles he enunciated can be applied to the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education today.[93]

[93] Newman (1878/2003: Part II) identified seven 'notes' which ascertained the development of, as opposed to the corruption of, an idea. These seven notes are as follows; preservation of type;

The proposal that Catholic Religious Education is a legitimate development of catechesis accords with the Newmanian notion that all developments in Church teaching must have clear roots in (and be implicit in) what went before. The distinction is crucial given the claim above that catechesis shares a body of knowledge with Catholic Religious Education. It is clear that this argument could be skewed to conceptualise Catholic Religious Education as 'school-based catechesis' whereby the 'shared project' was, in practice, little more than a full-scale migration of the language and conceptual framework of faith development into Catholic Religious Education. Magisterial teaching on (Catholic) school-based Religious Education, however, has moved away from this overtly 'catechetical' approach towards a more nuanced vision designed to offer pupils a clear knowledge and understanding of Christianity and Christian life' (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009: 17).

Dissonance between Catechesis and Catholic Religious Education

'Integral religious formation', as proposed in the present thesis, consists of both catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It is a way of bringing into harmony related but distinct concepts. Their distinctiveness is as important to the debate as their complementarity. Although catechesis is deemed a component part of broader faith development which includes but is not limited to school activity, it is important to clarify how the Catholic school can contribute towards specifically *catechetical* activity while avoiding an overly catechetical approach to Catholic Religious Education. This is an area of vital importance given the complex mix of confessional and cultural pluralism increasingly found in the contemporary Catholic school (Heft 2011).

The catechetical mission of the school is expressed in the wider life of the school and especially in the availability of the sacraments, especially school Masses. This would also include retreats, opportunities for social initiatives and recognition of the value of personal encounters between staff and pupils. This broad and rich

---

continuity of its principles; power of assimilation; logical sequence; anticipation of its future; conservative action upon its past; chronic vigour

area of activity is clearly consonant with the idea that, owing to decline in opportunities for parish and family catechesis, the Catholic school might be the only site of genuine religious formation for Catholic young people in contemporary society (cf. McKinney 2011).

The subject of Catholic Religious Education draws on and is inspired by this deep-rooted faith tradition. Its contribution to the catechetical life of the Catholic school lies precisely in its educational credibility as a subject taught within a scholastic framework and its synthesis of culture and life (Congregation for Catholic Education 1997: 14). The subject would boast of the same academic credentials as other subjects: visibility on school timetables; systematic planning of content according to recognized criteria; suitably qualified teachers; due consideration of appropriate methods of teaching and methods of assessment; the provision of suitable graded textbooks and other curricular resources; reporting of achievement to parents and other agencies and the motivation of pupils.[94]

The arrangement proposed above is a convincing expression of the relationship between *communio* and the 'shared project'. Catholic doctrine and a consonant worldview are experienced in the interrelated contexts of a catechetical setting and a scholastic setting. This has wider implications for teaching and learning.

B. The Shared Project: Teaching and Learning Issues

It is not the position of the Church that Catholic schools should be open only to Catholics (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988:6). Such a situation would not be a true reflection of the desired dialogue between and across cultures which the Church claims to seek (Congregation for Catholic Education 1997: 14-16). Alongside this openness to others, however, sits the requirement for Catholic

[94] While Groome (1980) has argued that some form of academic rationale could be beneficially applied to catechetical programmes in parishes, a key difference seems to lie in the student audience and the intention of those who teach. The 'catechetical audience' gathers with a shared intention of developing faith. How strong this commitment to faith development is for younger children who, for example, have not elected to attend a First Communion programme outwith school hours, is a matter of debate. This caveat notwithstanding, there are still clear lines separating this audience from the generality of the pupils in a Catholic school who attend a Religious Education lesson.

schools to have educational goals firmly aligned to the religious mission of the school. This is another reflection of the perimeters of the 'shared project' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 100-102).

The religious diversity of the Catholic school population has implications for the planning, teaching and assessment of Catholic Religious Education.[95] It is necessary to address the crucial question of how young people of varying levels of Catholic faith commitment and who, in some cases, practise other religions, can engage critically with the content of Catholic Religious Education? If Catholic Religious Education were planned and taught as 'school-based catechesis' with clear *expectation* of faith commitment, this situation would be problematic and unjust. The present thesis claims that genuine Catholic Religious Education can address this concern by applying the principles of *educational differentiation* to the teaching of Catholic Religious Education. This would not be the importation of some 'new' pedagogical tool but rather the application of a practice which is integral to teaching and learning and designed to enhance the overall experience of the student (O'Brien and Guerney 2004).

Differentiation is a two-pronged subset of the contested principle of academic selection (Hayes 2010; Ireson and Hallam 2001, 1991). Differentiation applies the principle of 'selection' to teaching and learning issues within specific teaching and learning situations. It can be both explicit and implicit. Explicit differentiation comes from matching the planning of lessons and the use of resources to the needs and interest of the student in order to maximize student learning. Catholic Religious Education would use this explicit differentiation as a teaching strategy as and when appropriate to context.[96]

Alongside this theme lies the more complex concept of implicit differentiation. While effective and explicitly differentiated teaching is intended to address the various academic needs of the student body, students will experience a range of what can be called the 'faith response' outcomes in Catholic Religious Education.

[95] For a further exploration of issues anent the inclusion of students of other religious traditions in the Catholic school, see Maurice Ryan's chapter in McKinney (Ed.) (2008 b).
[96] Context Three of Chapter Two refers to differentiation in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. See also Gregory of Nyssa's (4th century) *Address on Religious Instruction* (in Hardy (Ed.) (1954).

Church teaching does recognize the challenge of varying levels of faith commitment even in what appear to be, relatively speaking, culturally homogenous student populations (Congregation for Catholic Education 1982: 28; Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 627). What needs to be stressed in this debate is that all students should have an understanding of the body of knowledge (academic ability notwithstanding) that is taught in the lessons: the implicit differentiation is the degree of reflexivity: the personal and possibly transformative response to this body of knowledge (Jackson 1997: 131-132). To offer an example, the same lesson on the Catholic understanding of Revelation, could be a form of catechesis for students who practise their Catholic faith *or* a form of evangelisation for those with limited or no Catholic religious practice. For many others, however, it would be an opportunity to engage critically with a range of contested ideas and hence inform and develop their broader religious literacy and cultural awareness. In Catholic thinking, this mode of operation could be configured as an expression of the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles' initiative in which 'knowledge' of Christianity is explained to those who seek to understand the Catholic worldview (Pope Benedict XVI 2009 a). Chapter Seven looks more closely at the links uniting the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles', the 'New Evangelisation' and education.

This aspect of differentiation can also be framed within the distinction between the catechetical (affective) and educational (cognitive) aspects of Religious Education (Rymarz 2011: 544; 2012: 87). Such a distinction is helpful, if limited, because it fails to address the wider issues related to affectivity and cognition in education in general, and Religious Education in particular (Buchanan and Hyde 2008). A process of 'integral religious formation' as proposed in the present thesis, would see both affective and cognitive 'outcomes' as intrinsic to the teaching and learning processes and recognise the wider contribution of agencies of education located outwith the school.

In the situations outlined above, the lines separating catechesis and Catholic Religious Education cannot be drawn too finely but they do need drawing. The theology of communion offers a way of bringing them together without, however, completely resolving the issue. Some of these challenges are indicated below.

Part 4. Limitations of the Theology of Communion as the Key Hermeneutic for Understanding the Relationship between Catechesis and Catholic Religious Education

The so-called complementarity between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is hindered not just by the nuances of the debate but by some considerable stumbling blocks. These limitations emerge from the broader issue of the relationship between secular ideas and religious ways of thinking as expressed in the theory and practice of the subject of Religious Education in schools. To complicate matters further, the subject of Religious Education remains a subject whose place on the school curriculum is contested (cf. Haldane 1986; Jackson 2004; Conroy and Davis 2010; Durham 2013).

The challenges to the effectiveness of *communio* are both internal and external. Part A explores the internal challenges which arise from certain linguistic inconsistencies within the Magisterial documents. Part B. looks at the external challenges arise from the conceptual frameworks of Religious Education which have origins beyond the Catholic tradition.

A. Internal Challenges and the Limitations of Language

The use of *communio* as an internal hermeneutical key is limited by the constraints of language. The official English translations of the Magisterial documents on catechesis and education highlight the lack of consistency in the translation of key terms in the debate. According to Rummery (2001), American delegates at a catechetical congress in 1971 wished to translate the Italian term 'catechesi' (meaning 'catechesis') as 'religious education'. This revealed a lack of awareness, Rummery rightly argued, of the gradual development in understandings of 'Religious Education' which had emerged in the 1960s from beyond the Catholic community. The incident mentioned above is the seed of a much more profound debate within the Catholic community and illustrates the challenge to the principle of unity-in-diversity in a worldwide organization when translations of important terminology in key documents are unchallenged. This terminological imprecision is double-edged: a) it reflects the existence of local

expressions of Religious Education with varying awareness of the teaching of the Magisterium; b) paradoxically, it can feed future practice as these imprecise terms can evolve into more normative terms. (Put more simply, the more an imprecise term is used without clarification, the more likely it is that this imprecise term will become standard usage.) An example from one Magisterial document will illustrate this complex situation and show how unity-in-diversity is stretched to its outer limits.

The text of *Catechesi Tradendae* (Pope John Paul II 1979) deals with catechesis in schools in paragraph 69. It is an important text dealing with the place of catechesis (not Religious Education) in the Catholic school. The English translation of three key phrases in this paragraph illustrates the complexity of this issue. In the table below, three columns show the parallel translations of a particular section of *Catechesi Tradendae*. The Latin text comes first as Latin remains the first language of Catholic documents and all translations ought to show fidelity to the Latin text. The Italian translation is included as Italian is the 'working language' of the Roman Curia. The relationship between the Latin and the vernacular translations is another example of unity-in-diversity represented by the Latin (unity) and the vernacular (diversity).

Example	**Latin**	**Italian**	**English**
1	*Institutionis proprio modo religiosae*	*L'educazione propriamente religiosa*	*Strictly religious education*
2	*Religiosae educationis*	*Insegnamento religiosa*	*Religious instruction*
3	*Institutionis religiosae*	*Una formazione religiosa*	*Religious training*

Example One has a consistent translation with the Latin *institution*—giving *institutionis*—meaning *education/instruction* in English. Example Two uses

educationis – from *educatio* which means *rearing*. The Italian *insegnamento* meaning *teaching* and the English *instruction* seem to be harder-edged that the Latin would admit. The third example is the most problematic. The Latin *institutionis* is now translated as *formazione* whereas earlier in the paragraph *educazione* was used. Both terms have similar meanings in Italian but the English translation of *religious training* is not a phrase that was in common use at the time of writing in 1979. The use of *training* to refer to education is problematic from a conceptual point of view owing to the contested distinction between education and training.[97]

The table also illustrates the depth of the challenge facing those who wish to clarify terms in this debate. Unity-in-diversity—a key feature of *communio*—is clearly stretched to the limits here as the translations used are inconsistent and lend themselves easily to a range of interpretations. Indeed there are three different English terms used in one paragraph to translate what is essentially the same concept: the religious formation of the child in the Catholic school.

Of course, it is necessary to appreciate the local contexts. The use of varying terms as descriptors of the processes of the young person's religious formation would be less problematic in Italy than in most Anglophone countries. In Italy, owing to the status of Catholicism as an institution in wider society, concepts like 'religious training' and 'religious education' would be viewed principally through a Catholic lens.[98] It is a situation that flows from Italy's 'unique privilege' of hosting the See of Peter, 'the centre of Catholicism' (Pope Benedict XVI 2011 b). Apart from the question of the location of the See of Peter, it has also been argued, perhaps controversially, that the Catholic Church in Italy has a greater resilience vis-à-vis its relationship with the 'challenges of pluralism' than

[97] This is captured in the debates on the merits, or otherwise, of competence-based education and on how 'training' articulates with 'education'. The broad parameters of these debates are explored by Hyland (1993), Winch (1995),Bridges (1996) and Deakin Crick (2008). See also Pope Benedict XVI (2010 b): 'The task of a teacher is not simply to impart information or to provide training in skills intended to deliver some economic benefit to society; education is not and must never be considered as purely utilitarian.'

[98] Despite increasing plurality, the 'footprint' of Catholicism is felt across Italian society. For example, there are many public religious processions and, more importantly, the high and often sympathetic profile given to the Church and its affairs on Italian state television offers the Church an opportunity to enter every home: weekly televised Mass on Sunday morning, full live coverage of all major Church events. A weekly religious affairs programme on state tv called 'A sua immagine' offers a digest of events in the Catholic world. See Grimaldi and Serpieri for an exploration of the recent historical context (2012: 150-151; 160).

Catholic Churches in other European countries (Garelli 2007 a; Garelli b). Carter (2010:245-247), on the other hand, challenges this favourable assessment of the Church's role in wider Italian society since the Second World War and proposes instead a greater recognition of the 'complex and contradictory' influence of Catholicism on Italian civic society.[99]

B. External Challenges: The Question of Nomenclature

In the context of education—and specifically in the case of 'Religious Education'—the challenge to *communio* is rooted in the tension between the Church's call to enter in dialogue with the modern world and the development of doctrine in response to this dialogue.

The question of nomenclature is fundamental as subject titles in academia offer a window into the underpinning conceptual framework. The breadth and complexity of the debate on the nature of Religious Education is manifested in the many associated subject titles in use today: *Religious Education*, *Religious Studies*, *Religious and Moral Education*, *Religious, Moral and Philosophical Education*. Each title has a related wide conceptual field yet what they have in common is a commitment to a broader study of the phenomenon of religion, a critical engagement of the claims made by a variety of world religions and the exploration of ethical issues.[100] All of this is done with varying degrees of emphasis on religious nurture in specific religious traditions. Smart's assertion that teachers are called to teach, not preach, underpins the secularist outpost of this way of thinking (Smart1968: 97).

Despite the existence of different subject titles, 'Religious Education' seems to have become a common, if not generic, descriptor of a subject with very broad

[99] Further exploration of these arguments lie beyond this scope of the present thesis but it can be claimed that, given the Church's continuing role in Italian society, any disjuncture between Catholic formation and wider 'religious studies' would not be as pronounced as in Anglophone countries. The influence of wider understandings of 'religious education', however, in the plural Anglophone democracies of the West offers a different challenge to the theology of *communio* as an internal hermeneutic.

[100] For example, there is the 'interpretive' approach of Robert Jackson (2004) and the 'critical realism' approach of Andrew Wright (2007). For a succinct overview of these issues, see Gabriel Moran's chapter on 'Religious Education' in Curren (Ed.) See also Strhan (2010): 24-32.

conceptual parameters.[101] As the present thesis has a focus on the understanding of Religious Education as expressed in the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church ('Catholic Religious Education'), a detailed and forensic analysis of other understandings of 'Religious Education' is beyond its scope.[102] What is worthy of comment, however, is the relationship between the liberal models of Religious Education and the subject of Catholic Religious Education in the Catholic school. The common use of 'Religious Education' can be interpreted in two ways. First, it has become a gateway subject title under which are nested the broader range of conceptual frameworks available. The second interpretation suggests that there is little difference between the conceptual frameworks of the subject in both the Catholic and the common school. If this were the case, Religious Education in Catholic schools would be no more than an adapted, or 'Catholicised', version of a subject whose contours, language and value system are firmly, if not rigidly, set in place by state authorities and curriculum bodies which have, in turn, been shaped by liberal philosophies of Religious Education (Stern 2006; Barnes 2009).

This configuration of 'Religious Education' has value as a generator of religious literacy and broader cultural awareness. It is limited, however, when viewed in the context of the Catholic educational tradition and the boundaries of the 'shared project' as explored in the present thesis. While it is possible that insights from so-called liberal Religious Education could enhance the Catholic tradition—looking at other world religions is certainly one of these areas—the generality of these approaches would not be in keeping with Church teaching which, as we have seen, locates Catholic Religious Education in the intersection between Christian faith and culture and which is complemented in turn by catechesis in the family and the parish.

A further and related challenge lies in developing the expertise of those who specialise in the teaching of Catholic Religious Education. This is a further implication of the need for 'integral religious formation'. Given the argument of

[101] The title of the research project 'Does Religious Education Work?' (Conroy et al. 2011) seems to assume this common position.
[102] Wright, for example, has suggested that the fostering of 'religious literacy' –defined as a 'cultivation of wisdom' – comes from the 'scrutiny of religion' (2007: 280; 288). See also Holman (2004).

the present thesis that Catholic Religious Education is a legitimate development of catechesis and should be firmly rooted in Catholic intellectual tradition, the 'specialist teacher' of Catholic Religious Education should possess an academic qualification which is aligned to these considerable demands. Magisterial teaching has emphasised the importance of such academic and pastoral formation in the declaration that teachers of Catholic Religious Education should have a 'thorough cultural, professional, and pedagogical training' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 96). Furthermore, this formation should be carried out in dedicated ecclesiastical institutes, not in institutions which are 'pluralistic' (Congregation for Catholic Education 1982: 64). These recommendations put clear doctrinal and academic water between the requirements for a teacher of Catholic Religious Education and the teacher of Religious Education in other forms of schooling. This distinction raises further questions about how the Church can provide the resources necessary to provide a corps of suitably qualified teachers of Catholic Religious Education. While the Church requires compliance with Canon 812 of the *Code of Canon Law* (1983) for teachers of theological disciplines in Higher Education,[103] a similar provision for those who teach Catholic Religious Education would be a helpful addition to the support offered to Catholic education and would serve the bonds of communion with the Holy See (Pope Benedict XVI 2012 a).

Concluding Remarks

Chapter Five has claimed that the theology of communion allows the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education to be understood in terms that permit both domains to be seen as constituent parts of a 'shared project' between the principles of catechesis and education. Such a relationship is in turn a reflection of the 'spirituality of communion' as applied to education. 'Catholic Religious Education' is understood in this model as a legitimate development of catechesis in the context of the Catholic school and as an expression of communion between the life of the school and the wider mission and vision of the Church. These responses cannot be removed from consideration of the Church's

[103] 'Those who teach theological disciplines in any institutes of higher studies whatsoever must have a mandate from the competent ecclesiastical authority' (*Code of Canon Law* 1983: 812).

wider relationship with pluralism, which remains a key issue for Catholic Christianity.

In order to apply this theory to current understanding of Catholic Religious Education, Chapter Six will analyse the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in the specifically Scottish context generated by the approved syllabus *This is Our Faith* (SCES 2011 a). Chapter Seven will consider the wider issues arising from this study and offer some suggestions for the future direction of the debate.

CHAPTER SIX
AN EXAMINATION OF ONE LOCAL MODEL OF CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Introduction

Chapter Five argued that Catholic Religious Education is a 'shared project' between the principles of catechesis and education. Catholic Religious Education syllabi are conduits for this 'shared project' and ought to be underpinned by Catholic theological and educational principles (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009). Any conceptual or theological disjuncture in this matter would not be a reflection of the 'shared project'

Chapter Six will explore the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as found in one such syllabus in Scotland.[104]. Chapter Six argues that the locally-produced syllabus *This is our Faith* (henceforth TIOF) (SCES 2011 a) is a significant contribution to the wider Church debate on how to configure Catholic Religious Education for the twenty-first century. TIOF is an important and timely reminder that authentic Catholic Religious Education is rooted in, and grows organically from, orthodox Catholic doctrine. It is not a derivative version of, nor should be overly influenced by, other models of so-called liberal Religious Education.

Chapter Six argues that TIOF anchors Catholic Religious Education in Scotland firmly, but not exclusively, within a conceptual framework which is heavily influenced by catechesis while affording due recognition in selected areas to key educational principles. As such, TIOF offers a challenging perspective on recent Magisterial teaching which has sought to differentiate between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (see Chapter Three).

[104] It is important to distinguish between 'curriculum' and 'syllabus'. The former describes all the planned learning and associated activities which take place in formal institutions of learning. The latter refers to particular documentary material for academic disciplines which sets out the areas to be studied. TIOF is clearly in the latter category. See Kelly (2009: 5-17) for a useful overview of definitions of curriculum. See also Arthur and Gaine (1996) for an exploration, albeit dated, of the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education in the context of resources used in English schools.

Part One explores how the historically-conditioned uniqueness of the Catholic school system in Scotland continues to have a major impact on the *mode of operation* of the Catholic school and the associated provision of Catholic Religious Education today.

Part Two argues that TIOF's emphasis on catechetical principles offers some support to the claim that Catholic Religious Education is a 'shared project' between catechesis and education. The alignment of TIOF with the conceptual framework of catechesis emphasises the distinctive nature of Catholic Religious Education as a legitimate development of catechesis.

Part Three argues that TIOF's emphasis on catechetical principles offers some challenges to the claim that Catholic Religious Education is a 'shared project' between catechesis and education. In particular it will consider how TIOF does not fully reflect the understanding of Catholic Religious Education as defined in the *Circular Letter* on Religious Education (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009).

Part 1 Catholic Education: The Scottish Context

Catholic schools in Scotland today are fully part of the state system of education. This public manifestation of the integrated nature of the Catholic school sector ensures that Catholic schools contribute to and are affected by broader discussions on educational reform while retaining the institutional right to shape the Catholic Religious Education curriculum in a way consonant with the Catholic worldview.

The key sources for the chapter are presented first. There follows a deeper analysis of issues related to the relationship between the Scottish curriculum and the place of Catholic Religious Education therein.

An Exploration of the Sources for Chapter Six

The sources for the present chapter come from both the Scottish Government and the *Scottish Catholic Education Service* (henceforth SCES). This dual provenance

reflects the accommodation between the Catholic Church in Scotland and the Scottish education system arising from the political and educational settlement dating from 1918 whereby Scottish Catholic schools became part of the state system yet retained distinctiveness in the teaching of Religious Education (McKinney 2012).

Four policy documents inform the 'faith-dimension' of the contemporary Catholic school in Scotland. These documents need to be set against the horizon of the latest curricular reform initiative in Scotland entitled *Curriculum for Excellence* (henceforth CfE). There is no dedicated CfE documentation which sets out the unique features of how a Catholic philosophy of education ought to influence the provision of Catholic education in Scotland (cf: Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 24; 1997:14). The CfE documentation for Catholic Religious Education, however, forms only part of a wider corpus of initiatives from SCES which deals with the broader Catholic identity and mission of the Catholic school in a Scottish context. These documents form a comprehensive guide to the mode of operation of the Catholic school in contemporary Scotland. The four documents are as follows:

From the Scottish Government

a. *Curriculum for Excellence Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools Principles and Practice* (henceforth *Principles and Practices*) (Learning and Teaching Scotland 2008), explains the distinctive nature of the Catholic Religious Education syllabus in the context of the broader *Curriculum for Excellence* portfolio. This is part of a wider series of *Principles and Practices* documents designed to underpin all areas of the curriculum in Scotland.

From the *Scottish Catholic Education Service*

b. *TIOF* was produced by SCES as a syllabus for Catholic Religious Education for pupils in the first year of primary education up to and including the third year of secondary education. *TIOF* is a mapping of orthodox Catholic doctrine on to an age-stage configured teaching web with an accompanying rationale for Catholic Religious Education. It is

important to note that the *Congregation for the Clergy* gave a *recognitio* to TIOF in August 2011 thereby declaring it a suitable programme for use in Catholic schools (SCES 2011a: ii). TIOF differs from *Principles and Practices* in that it (TIOF) is a SCES-produced document. Nonetheless, TIOF is shaped in accordance with the nomenclature and shape of CfE. There is (at the time of writing) no such detailed syllabus for other curricular areas.

c. Two SCES documents - *Shining the Light of Christ* (SCES 2009) and *Having Faith in the Curriculum* (SCES 2011b) – set out in considerable detail the key features of a Catholic school system as interpreted by SCES. Both SCES documents address *inter alia* the challenges facing a Catholic school network which operates within a state system. These documents do not carry the 'badge' of *Curriculum for Excellence* and hence remind the wider educational community in Scotland that the Catholic school is more than just another expression of state education: Catholic schools are underpinned by a specific Catholic worldview and associated vision of education (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 25; 1997: 11-2).

The partnership between Church and the state in matters of Catholic education, while offering a necessary and valuable mechanism for dialogue, is limited if the subject of Religious Education is perceived as the exclusive locus in the curriculum for expressions of religious identity and the study of religiously-inspired ways of thinking. If this were to happen, there could arise legitimate concerns about how 'free' the school is to adhere to Catholic principles in its broader life and mission. In other words, if the catholicity of the school appears to be confined to one discipline, its influence of the wider life of the school is apparently restricted. Broader issues related to the relationship between Church and state will be explored below.

Church, State and Curricular Reform in Contemporary Scotland

The relationship between the state and Catholic schools in Scotland offers an interesting canvas for our study. The 1918 Education (Scotland) Act bequeathed a unique situation whereby Catholic schools in Scotland are not just funded by the state but are an *integral* part of the state education system. (McKinney 2008 a;

2012) This transfer of Catholic (and Episcopalian) schools to the state in early twentieth century allowed the Catholic Church in Scotland to retain some form of distinct 'religious identity' in its schools and come in from the margins of Scottish society (O'Hagan and Davis 2007; Kehoe 2010). Under the terms of this Act, three concessions were offered to the Church in return for the transfer of its schools to the state: full access of the clergy to the schools; the right to conduct appropriate 'religious instruction' (sic); the right to approve teaching staff in matters of faith and morals (Paterson 2003: 58-60; Devine 2006: 486-494). This was, on the surface, a settlement which was highly favourable to the interests of the Church and its desire to provide religious instruction to its congregations. The handing over of the apparatus of Catholic schools to the state, despite the safeguards identified above, also ensured that the manner in which Catholic schools were managed became the *responsibility* of the state (Conroy 2002). In consequence, reforming initiatives in Scottish education continue to inform the life of the Catholic school.

The most recent curricular reform package in Scotland, the *Curriculum for Excellence*, aims to bring about a substantial re-shaping of the curriculum both in terms of subject-content and in methodology.[105] CfE emphasises the 'breadth, challenge and depth' of the curriculum in the context of the 'entitlements of learners' while simultaneously accepting the need to define 'key areas of knowledge' (LTS Scotland: 2008: 4). CfE also aims to free schools and teachers from the perceived disciplinary constraints of its predecessor, the *5-14* programme, and strives to chart a middle course between a localised approach to curricular design and the need to place a coherent and defined body of knowledge at the heart of the curriculum. [106]

[105] *Curriculum for Excellence* is underpinned by four capacities which serve as overall goals for the young person: successful learner, confident individual, responsible citizen and effective contributor (Education Scotland 2011). Building on these four capacities are curriculum design principles which seek to challenge a view of teaching and learning which has a perceived over-reliance on the transmission of curricular content.

[106] For a critical overview of CfE's underpinning principles set within the context of recent Scottish educational history, see Clare Cassidy's chapter (pp. 23-32) in Bryce and Humes (Eds.) (2008)

It is important to recognise the drivers for reform which inspired the development of CfE. CfE grew out of the National Debate on Education in the early years of the 21st century (Humes et al. 2009). In broad terms, it sought to challenge models of education which gave the impression that education was a process solely rooted in the transmission of inherited knowledge. Rather, it sought to adopt a forward-looking vision which would channel the best traditions of Scottish education in a new adaptive framework.[107]

CfE , while a keystone of the Scottish Government's educational policy, has yet to undergo much serious academic scrutiny.[108] What has been written, however, is broadly critical. For example, the perceived juncture in CfE between 'knowledge' and 'skills' is problematic (cf: Priestley and Humes 2010; Priestley 2012 a; Paterson 2012; Priestley and Minty 2012). It also remains unclear, for example, how the desire to define 'key areas of knowledge' accords with the claim that the 'entitlements of learners' are paramount.[109] Populist critics of the CfE claim that the seeming lack of focus on the transmission of knowledge in favour of the processes of learning make it a 'thin gruel that will do little to nourish intellect and ability' (McAlpine 2009). To take a specific example beyond the subject area of Religious Education, there was substantial criticism of the CfE's *draft* guidelines for literacy and English, Expressive Arts and Social Studies (Royal Society of Edinburgh 2008). This line of criticism had a particular focus on CFE's allegedly weak understanding of both interdisciplinarity and underpinning structure of learning. Drawing on his own recent research on teachers' attitudes to CFE, Mark Priestley (2012 b) has suggested that there remains a major issue over the 'dominant discourses in education' expressed *inter alia* in the chasm between the implicit 'constructivist view of learning' of CFE and the content-delivery

[107] The National Debate on Education offered eight priorities: reduce overcrowding in the curriculum; make learning more enjoyable; make better connections between academic subjects; achieve a better balance between 'academic' and 'vocational' subjects; broaden the range of learning experiences offered to young people, equip young people with the skills they need now and in future employment' make sure that approaches to assessment and certification support learning; offer more choice to meet the needs of individual young people (in Hume et. Al. 2009).
[108] The drive by the Scottish Government to ensure that universities are 'on side' might have hindered the desire of academics to offer research which would be critical in case this would have a negative (financial) outcome for their institutions.
[109] Curriculum design is influenced by the worldview and associated educational philosophy of those who are charged with the shaping of the curriculum. This is, unsurprisingly, a contested process. For a broad outline of the different schools of thought in curriculum theory, see Print (1993:1-24).

model which remains widespread in schools. Such fractured lenses have implications far beyond the model of teaching and learning adopted in TIOF.

To conclude this short section, CfE breaks learning into broad aims and smaller, incremental, objectives (or learning outcomes).[110] This approach, when allied to the language of competences in the outcomes, leads to an instrumentalist view of education (cf. Kelly 2009: Priestley and Humes 2010). An alternative and more plausible position is that CfE is the product of a degree of conceptual confusion arising from the relationship between curricular content—or knowledge—and methodology. Issues arising from this conceptual tension as applied to TIOF will be explored in Part Three.

Scottish Education, the Catholic School and Catholic Religious Education

Catholic schools in Scotland, as schools which are managed by the state, are required to adhere to the principles of CfE. The genealogy of TIOF illustrates the close working relationship between the Scottish educational system and the Catholic Church and allows us to understand why TIOF is shaped as it is.

The development of Catholic Religious Education has to be set in the context of broader curricular reform in RE/RME in Scotland. The *Millar Report* of 1972 offered an audit of non-denominational Religious Education provision in Scotland and sought to raise the professional status of the subject through the introduction of a significant and far-reaching reform package (Whaling 1980; Kincaid 1985). It noted that Religious Education was poorly-resourced and often taught by non-qualified teachers. In addition, its almost exclusive focus on Christianity was deemed unsuitable for a society which was moving towards pluralism (McKinney 2012). In time, and alongside the consequent reconfiguring of Religious Education in the non-denominational school as *Religious and Moral Education*, the Catholic Church in Scotland sought to reaffirm, through wide-ranging dialogue with the then Scottish Office, the unique curricular identity of Catholic Religious Education (Coll and Davis 2007).

[110] Priestley and Humes quote as examples the outcomes for Science and Literacy and English (2010: 352). Other subject areas have been shaped in a similar way.

During the writing process for the 5-14 curriculum in the early 1990s, much high-level discussion took place between the then Scottish Office Education Department and the Catholic Education Commission on how to design the most appropriate framework for Religious Education in the Catholic schools. The Church's eventual rejection of a common *5-14 Religious and Moral Education* document for Catholic and non-denominational schools and the introduction of a separate 5-14 document for Religious Education in Catholic schools (Scottish Office Education Department 1994) marked the beginning of a creative and politically unique process which has continued to emphasise the place of Catholic thought in the Scottish education system (Coll 2002; Coll and Davis 2007). The emergence of SCES in 2003 as the operational arm of the Catholic Education Commission enabled the Church and its educational agencies/representatives to strengthen its working relationship—which had not always been smooth—with the Scottish Government (Coll 2002). This accommodation is manifested in the previously-mentioned policy documents related to the organisation of Catholic education. The publication of TIOF in 2011 as a distinctive syllabus within the CfE and the *Principles and Practices* document (Learning and Teaching Scotland 2008 a) is part of the latest stage in this collaborative process.

Given the unique accommodation between the Catholic Church and State in Scotland, it is necessary to address the unavoidable question of how the unique 'religious identity' of the Catholic school in a centralised state system can be maintained (Congregation for Catholic Education 1997: 11). To what extent does the state, as the *manager* of the curriculum in Scotland, influence the shape and direction of the Catholic Religious Education syllabus?[111]

As has been shown, TIOF, as a distinctive curricular manifestation of the specific religious and cultural identity of the Catholic Church, is part of the wider SCES

[111] Coll and Davis (2007) explore the question of Church state relations in the early 1990s in the context of the *5-14 Religious Education for Roman Catholic Schools* guidelines. They concluded that 'a creative and dynamic relationship can indeed be maintained between the Church and the state, even in conditions of full-state funding, provided there is transparent communication, recognition of identity, and mutual trust.' TIOF, for example, is very clear in its espousal of Catholic identity.

corpus. [112] Although the SCES documents are produced and written by key personnel from the Catholic educational community, they align the ways of working in the Catholic school with the management and (related) performative processes favoured by the state. This is unsurprising given the unique educational settlement in Scotland. The accommodation between Catholic educational and the state is shown in two ways.

First, the division of TIOF into age-related 'levels' (*early, first, second and third*) which come from the *Curriculum for Excellence* is one clear and visible sign of an accommodation between the Church and the state. The knowledge-rich learning experiences and outcomes in TIOF are mapped on to a grid of levels which are applied across the CfE portfolio.

Second, and more significantly, the *mode of operation* suggested by these SCES documents—especially *Shining the Light of Christ*—owes much to the processes of self-evaluation against pre-determined 'quality indicators' which is the key feature of Inspectorate-driven self-evaluation tools like *How Good is our School?* (HMIE 2007). [113] This policy direction is clearly designed to improve the life and the mission of the Catholic school. The SCES documentation attempts to offer a suitable rationale for the use of such tools in the world of Catholic schooling. *Shining the Light of Christ* intentionally embeds the Catholic school into the wider performative processes by showing how Catholic education can be managed internally by employing the methods favoured by the state.

The adoption of performative methods of self-evaluation is not unique to Scotland and has been promoted in other systems of Catholic schooling (cf: SCES 2009; 2011b; Catholic Education Office Sydney 2006). The focus on performativity reflects a so-called 'model of efficiency' and related institutional and personal performance which, some commentators would suggest, is not wholly in line with a broader understanding of education as the promotion of human flourishing

[112] The broader question of the relationship between the curriculum, the school and cultural groupings is addressed in Tamir (2008: 502-503).
[113] For example, the publicity leaflet for *Shining the Light of Christ* claims that it is 'identical to key areas in HGIOS, covering all aspects of school provision' (SCES online).

(Mooney and Nowacki 2011). While it can be argued that all schools need to reflect on practice, and that this reflection necessarily requires some standard against which the reflection takes place, such methods of self-evaluation—with their strong focus on pre-set performance indicators—are rooted in an instrumentalist and managerialist view of education which does not sit easily with the broader Catholic educational tradition (cf: Pope Benedict XVI 2008; 2012 b; Piderit and Morey 2012)

Taking this further, the alignment of Catholic education policies with the language of 'performance targets' is another sign of an accommodation between Catholic education and other ways of thinking. While there is some merit in the use of targets, it fails to reflect the wider and deeper claims of Catholic education and social teaching to offer an *alternative* vision of how to organise society and its institutions (Cf: Pope John Paul II 1991: 36, 46, 54). This is not a call to the *ghettoization* of Catholic education but a recognition that, in the Catholic mind, the Catholic vision of education must offer a distinctive contribution to the common good of society.

Returning to the question of the *Catholic identity* of the school, the SCES documents mentioned above offer an explanation of what this entails. Nevertheless, their status as primarily *internal* documents—although freely available on the web, they are designed to support the provision of the broader dimensions of Catholic Education—minimises their influence on those who are not part of the Catholic system and who would not, ordinarily, be aware of the resources provided by SCES.

To develop this point: the state has set the agenda for the foundations of the Scottish curriculum and has allowed the Church to influence and shape the specific subject of Catholic Religious Education within the various parameters and structures which have been set in place by the state. This raises—and fails to answer—deeper misgivings concerning the relationship between the state and Catholic education.

In the first place, it is unclear, for example, how the state and its agencies would deal with areas where the vision of Catholic education is antipathetic to particular policies of the state.[114] Second, is the distinctiveness of Catholic education weakened over time by its 'enmeshing' within the broader apparatus of the state (O'Hagan and Davis 2007:93). Is the role of the Catholic (and Episcopal) schools much more constrained post-1918 than it would have been had they continued in the voluntary sector (Paterson 2003: 195). Such comments offer another perspective on the prevailing and underlying educational discourse. Looking ahead, any ideological 'stand off' between Church and state must inevitably challenge the legacy of the 1918 settlement.[115]

To conclude this section, we should note that the life of the Catholic school in Scotland is shaped not just by the teachings of the Church but also by the policies of the system of which their educational provision is a part. Serious exploration of the relevant policy documents for our study offers an insight into the complex situation arising from the integration of Catholic schools into the secular state system in Scotland. Further exploration of the *mode of operation* of Catholic schools in the state system is outwith the scope of the present thesis. The remainder of this chapter will explore how the guidelines for Catholic Religious Education in Scotland articulate with the distinctive doctrinal and pedagogical flavour which the 'shared project' would require. Part Two will look at how TIOF is supportive of the 'shared project'. Part Three will explore the limitations of TIOF for the 'shared project'.

Part Two *This is our Faith* as a Reflection of the 'shared project'

TIOF is one manifestation of how Catholic Religious Education can be configured in the contemporary Church. It is far more, however, than simply an *in-house* guide to the content of Catholic Religious Education in Scottish Catholic schools. Bearing in mind the tension (mentioned above) in *Curriculum for Excellence*

[114] This is related to the question of state management of Catholic schools (cf: Coll and Davis 2007; Conroy 2002:23).

[115] An example of this is how Catholic schools in Scotland respond to the legislation on 'equal marriage': will Catholic schools be required to modify their traditional teaching in response to political demands?

between the favouring of local design of the curriculum and the definition of key bodies of knowledge, the focus in TIOF on the transmission of a distinct and concrete body of knowledge challenges the more constructivist approach (cf: Fox 2001) to curricular design which is a key feature of *Curriculum for Excellence* itself. This disjuncture arises from TIOF's status as an independently-produced syllabus for a state system of education. Catholic Religious Education is hence at the cutting-edge of the Scottish educational scene both as a *challenge* to contemporary educational practice in Scotland and as a *valuable local contribution* to the development of broader Catholic thinking on the shape of Religious Education.

Part Two will explore how TIOF supports the 'shared project' by looking at the following: the question of subject identity and nomenclature; the function of TIOF's *Strands of Faith*; the relationship between doctrinal orthodoxy and Catholic Religious Education.

The Question of Subject Identity and Nomenclature

The lack of precise definition in Magisterial teaching of how the complementarity between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can be achieved has allowed some creative testing of the boundaries at a local level. The inclusion of the language of catechesis in a Catholic Religious Education document reflects a conceptual interplay between the different fields of catechesis and education and is, hence, an appropriate reflection of the 'shared project'.

TIOF, for example, examines 'faith development'—a key feature of catechesis—with repeated references to the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997) especially paragraphs 92 and 145. Furthermore, the 'language of catechesis' is threaded through TIOF: indeed TIOF's own glossary has an entry for 'catechesis' but not, curiously, for 'Religious Education'. Similarly, the entry for 'pedagogy' refers to the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997) and not to any of the contemporary Magisterial documents on education which discuss methodology (and, by implication, pedagogy) albeit in broad terms (cf Congregation for Catholic Education 1997: 5, 10; 2007: 1, 20, 21, 23:). This confirms that a

catechetical mindset has shaped TIOF and that the *General Directory for Catechesis* has some perceived *higher status* than the Magisterial documents dealing with broader educational issues. The recognition that catechesis is the parent of Catholic Religious Education is to be welcomed although the restricted recognition afforded to Catholic educational documents is problematic and will be explored in Part Three.

The relationship between the terms 'Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools' and Catholic Religious Education' merits some comment. The former is used in the sub-title of TIOF while the latter is used as the title of *Section One* and in other places throughout the text.[116] While TIOF is a multi-authored document, it is hard to judge if this has been a factor in its apparent terminological inconsistency. While the former title identifies the link with the CfE, there is a strong impression that change in nomenclature (to the latter) is an indicator of a subtle move within Scotland to reinforce the notion of *Catholic Religious Education* as a distinctive approach to Religious Education and a looser attachment to the liberal paradigms of Religious Education as a discipline.[117] This would cohere with the claim of the present thesis that Catholic Religious Education is not a sub-set of broader 'Religious Education' but is a legitimate and ongoing *development* of Catholic theology and catechesis.[118]

The ideological position of TIOF is made more explicit in its guidance on the teaching of other 'world religions': 'In particular, teachers should avoid taking a phenomenological approach, thus presenting all denominations or faiths as equally true' (SCES 2011a: 16). Aside from the misleading construction of phenomenological approaches to Religious Education, this safeguard is designed

[116] 'Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools' is the title used for the 'Experiences and Outcomes' section and in Section Two of TIOF

[117] Unsurprisingly, there is no reference in the body of the text to any of the key thinkers and advocates of so-called liberal religious education from both within and beyond the Catholic community (cf. Moran, 1974; Hirst, 1981; Hammond et al. 1990; Wright 2007). See Chapter Five of the present thesis for a fuller discussion of this topic.

[118] It is worth noting that the website for Learning and Teaching Scotland has the headline term 'Religious and Moral Education' (RME) (Learning and Teaching Scotland 2008 b) which then leads to both sets of guidelines. Given that RME is the term used in non-denominational schools in Scotland, does this suggest that, for the Scottish Government, the Catholic guidelines do not have equal status with the RME package?
http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/learningteachingandassessment/curriculumareas/rme/index.asp

as a shield against perceived relativism in the teaching of Catholic Religious Education.[119] It is interesting that 'phenomenology' is highlighted here as an example of a liberal Religious Education position which is best avoided. There is no mention of other models of liberal Religious Education. While it could be argued that a phenomenological approach, broadly understood, to Catholic Religious Education cuts across the requirement for Catholic schools to teach from a position of faith, phenomenology is not the only available model of liberal Religious Education. [120]

The ideological position adopted by the Catholic guidelines crystallises the tension between the Catholic worldview and the pluralist culture within which the Catholic school—in Scotland and elsewhere—is located. It is a stark reminder of unique claims made by Catholic Christianity and which should be reflected in its programmes of study in its educational establishments.

The Function of TIOF's 'Strands of Faith'

The doctrinal orthodoxy of TIOF provides a fertile channel for Catholic doctrine to be shared among the Catholic school population of Scotland. It offers a robust sense of Catholic identity which draws on and concretises the *distinctive* as opposed to the *inclusive* model of Catholic education (Sullivan 2001). TIOF has reshaped the traditional four pillars of Catholic catechesis (creed - sacraments – moral life - prayer) into eight 'strands of faith' designed to provide an overarching set of principles and related core learning.[121] These 'strands of faith' arise from traditional theological thinking and are used in TIOF as core areas for the planning of teaching and learning. The use of the term 'strands of faith' is not a direct product of the thinking behind the *Curriculum for Excellence* although the

[119] 'Phenomenological religious education' is not wholly consistent with a confessional approach. It is, however, much more complex than TIOF's description of it would suggest. See Cox (2010) for a comprehensive study of the phenomenology of religion.

[120] There is room for some fruitful accommodation between Catholic Religious Education and other contemporary models: viz the 'critical realist' approach (Wright 2007) and the 'interpretive approach' (Jackson 1997).

[121] The traditional pillars as used in the Catechism of the Catholic Church are: the Creed, Moral Life, Sacraments, Prayer. TIOF's 'Strands of Faith' are: Mystery of God, In the Image of God, Revealed Truth of God, Son of God, Signs of God, Word of God, Hours of God, Reign of God.

'strands of faith' are configured according to a four-part division of age/stage common to other curricular areas in the *Curriculum for Excellence* (see above).

The *Strands of Faith* provide a comprehensive framework for showcasing the dynamic relationship between and across the different theological areas of Catholicism and of their modes of application across the stages.[122] This arrangement is a reflection of a 'spirituality of communion' in education and is, therefore, a major contribution towards the realisation of Catholic Religious Education as a 'shared project' between catechesis and education. The 'Strands of Faith' are supported by the inclusion of summaries of Catholic doctrine designed to aid teachers in their planning and teaching (SCES 2011 a: 23-53). These 'summaries' should be unnecessary given the existence of, for example, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and the *Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Yet they can be understood as initial responses to the *communio*-inspired call in the *Catechism* of *the Catholic Church* for local Bishops' Conferences to adapt the text of the *Catechism* for use in their own territory (CCC 11). Furthermore, they provide a gateway to wider study of doctrine and support the necessary ongoing doctrinal formation of Catholic teachers (Congregation for Catholic Education 1988: 96-7) When seen in this light, TIOF makes a substantial contribution to the growth of the reserves of 'spiritual capital' which set the Catholic school apart from the non-denominational sector.[123]

The Relationship between Catholic Doctrine and Catholic Religious Education

Given the lack of clarity in Church teaching on how the complementarity between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education should be experienced, local manifestations of Catholic Religious Education, such as TIOF, take on a greater importance in the wider debate. These are key signs here of a broader 'work in progress' which contributes to the Church's continuing reflection on how to configure Catholic Religious Education in a pluralist culture. Crucially for this

[122] For example, aspects of the Church's teaching on Pentecost are spread across the curricular stages. Cf. 1-04a, 1-09a, 1-18a, 2-18a, 2-04a, 2-09a, 2-18a, 3-07a, 3-08a.
[123] See Grace (2002) as cited in Chapter Five of the present work for the importance of this 'spiritual capital' in the Catholic school.

debate, the emergence of TIOF has allowed a substantial ideological gap to develop between the conceptual frameworks of Catholic Religious Education and Religious and Moral Education in non-denominational schools in Scotland. The distinct and defined body of doctrinal knowledge at the heart of TIOF as a nationally-produced syllabus questions the claim, albeit contested, of the *Curriculum for Excellence* to offer a new and localised curricular design model (cf: Priestley and Humes 2010). Of course, the definition of 'localised' is crucial: does this refer to individual schools, local 'school clusters' or could it be applied to the network of Catholic schools in Scotland?

Moreover, TIOF's doctrinally orthodox approach challenges those from within the Catholic tradition who draw on so-called progressive educational and theological principles as the underpinning principles for (Catholic) Religious Education. Kieran McDonough and Richard Rymarz's journal-based debate on 'faithful dissent' in Religious Education is a case in point (cf. McDonough 2009; Rymarz 2012). For McDonough, 'conventional religion pedagogy contravenes the progressive norms that are present elsewhere in the school' (2009:197). The so-called 'progressive norms' imply a challenge not just to the 'conventional' pedagogy' but to the thematic integrity of the doctrinal corpus. In contrast, Rymarz, following Rossiter (1982), suggests that an improved 'educational vision of religious education' is the means to improving the quality of classroom religious education (2012: 89). This does not preclude expressions of 'dissent' but sets Catholic teaching within the broader Catholic intellectual and doctrinal tradition.

The 'claim to distinctiveness' aligns the TIOF position with the increasingly robust focus on the role of catechesis and education in the 'new evangelisation' (Synod of Bishops 2011). Chapter Two of the *Lineamenta* for the 2012 *Synod on the New Evangelisation* supports TIOF's approach to Catholic Religious Education. The *Lineamenta*'s claim that transmitting the faith means a 'personal encounter of individuals with Jesus Christ' supports the language of personal faith response which is part of TIOF's chosen pedagogy (cf. *Lineamenta* 11 and TIOF section 1 *passim*). TIOF hence reflects recent moves within the Catholic Church to fortify its claim to *distinctiveness* of content and pedagogy.

TIOF is further identified with the 'shared project' in that it offers a unique form of religious education in schools which affords pupils knowledge about Christianity's identity and Christian life (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009:17). An example from the theological area of Christology—in TIOF this is the strand called *Son of God*—will illustrate how this has been done. Across the 'core learning' for this strand, the noticeable shift in the language of the outcomes—from the language of 'catechesis' in the early stages to the language of 'education' in the later stages—displays an interesting relationship between the cognitive and affective aspects of learning as applied to Christology (Rymarz 2011).

The following examples illustrate this shift in emphasis.[124] In the early stages of the syllabus, children of 5-7 years are asked to gain an understanding of the life of Jesus on earth: 'I have examined some political, social, historical and religious elements in first-century Palestine and gained an understanding of Jesus's life on earth' (RERC 1-06a). The language here does not imply any form of personal or community faith commitment. There is a significant conceptual shift in the outcomes for children aged 7-9 where the catechetical influence is far more evident: 'I know that Jesus is truly divine and truly human and I can acknowledge Him as our Saviour who brings the New Covenant' (RERC 2-05a and repeated for children of 9-11 years in RERC 3-5a). By the *Fourth level* (for pupils aged between 12-14 years) there is a move towards a seemingly more 'detached' study of the life of Jesus couched in language which does not imply faith commitment but remains firmly anchored in orthodox Catholic teaching: 'I have explored the Christian belief that in Jesus, God enters and transforms human nature, and exists at the centre of all creation' (RERC 4-05a) and also ' I have reflected upon the centrality and significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus to the Christian understanding of Jesus as Son of God and Son of Man' (RERC 4-07a).

This significant development of discourse as here outlined offers an example of how curricular content can remain rooted in orthodox doctrine yet allow for a

[124] I have not used page numbers but have given reference to the 'Experiences and Outcomes' of the Strands of Faith in brackets: for example, RERC 1means Level 1 and so forth. (RERC stands for 'Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools' the nomenclature used in TIOF to identify the strands of faith.

mature reflection on how said doctrine enters into dialogue with the wider community and the world of ideas. This configuration of teaching and learning rightly involves both affective and cognitive approaches to learning (Buchanan and Hyde 2008). The early nurture, or faith-formational, aspect of learning is preparatory to the more rigorous academic study of the later years. Of course, a strong case could be made that this more academic/cognitive approach in the later years is a valid form of *faith nurture* for those who already have an attachment, however loose, to Christianity. The interesting relationship between the affective and cognitive aspects of learning proposed by TIOF is evidence of how both catechetical *and* educational approaches can merge to form one integrated process of Christian formation (Kevane 1964; Groome 1980; Franchi 2011). In this model, Catholic Religious Education is firmly located within the Church's teaching tradition while offering opportunities for those who are not of the Catholic tradition to engage critically with, and respond creatively to, this comprehensive body of knowledge. This brings the debate back to the 'distinctive' and 'inclusive' paradigms explored earlier with reference to the positions of Arthur (1995) and Sullivan (2001).

To conclude, TIOF's close identification with the principles of catechesis and a perceived 'pedagogy of transmission' of Catholic doctrine offers some support to the development of 'integral religious formation' in the context of the 'shared project'. It is evidence of the claim that Catholic Religious Education is a legitimate development of catechesis, one which unites the mind and the heart in a study and prayer (cf: Tartaglia 2011). It sets in clear lines the territory of Catholic Religious Education and offers a model of how Catholic Religious Education can draw on its deep-rooted theological and catechetical base to propose an active engagement with culture. However, there are aspects of TIOF which challenge the dynamics of the 'shared project' owing to its (TIOF's) excessive dependence on conceptual frameworks of catechesis. This will be explored in Part Three.

Part Three *This is our Faith* as a challenge to the 'shared project'

TIOF's use of predominantly catechetical language in its guidelines for methodology challenges the Magisterium's stated desire for catechesis and Catholic Religious Education to remain separate yet related concepts (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009). It is evidence of the fluid nature of the debate that a *Recognitio* can be awarded to a document which actually offers an alternative view of the future direction of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education than that hitherto expressed in the relevant Magisterial documents. Four aspects of the TIOF documentation shed light on how this disjuncture is manifested: the importance of linguistic and conceptual issues; assessment principles; general methodological issues and the relationship between 'inductive' and 'deductive' methods.

The Importance of Linguistic and Conceptual Issues

The *Recognitio* granted to TIOP by the *Congregation for the Clergy* in August 2011 is a sign of TIOF's doctrinal orthodoxy, and consequently, a valuable reminder that TIOF is, in the mind of the Church, a suitable local expression of the universal Catholic faith (SCES 2011a: ii). One of the functions of the *Congregation for the Clergy* is the overseeing of materials to be used in catechesis and religious formation.[125] It is not clear, however, how this important 'watching brief' articulates with the role of the Congregation for Catholic Education which claims that the *Office for Catholic Schools* will work with other Curial bodies 'on questions of mutual interest'; it seems that there is little evidence of any collaboration with its sister Congregation in the approval process for TIOF.[126] This state of affairs could be interpreted in different ways: is it a reflection of the challenges which arise from the existence of many channels of communication

[125] The on-line profile of *the Congregation for the Clergy* explains fully its threefold function, including its catechetical function, until the emergence of the *Pontifical Council for Promoting the New Evangelisation* in 2010 (cf: Pope Benedict XVI 2010 c): http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cclergy/documents/rc_con_cclergy_pro_31051999_en.html

[126] See the profile of the Congregation for Catholic Education: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_20051996_profile_en.html

between the local and the universal Church and its associated Curial offices? Does it betray a lack of awareness of the conceptual distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education or is it a sign of congregational 'independence' and hence of a failure to act in keeping with the principles of *communio?*

According to the SCES website, the *Recognitio* claims that TIOF is 'a valuable tool for orienting catechesis in Catholic schools in Scotland'.[127] The version of the *Recognitio* reproduced in the printed version of TIOF does not contain this statement (SCES 2011 a: ii): the juxtaposition of terms like 'catechesis' and 'Catholic schools' in a document approving a Catholic Religious Education syllabus encapsulates the conceptual issues at the heart of the present thesis.[128] The *Recognitio*'s reference to Canon 775 (2) of the *Code of Canon Law* and paragraph 282 of the *General Directory for Catechesis* complicates matters further as both references deal explicitly with the approval of *catechetical* materials in the Church.[129] This lends support to the view that TIOF, while designed primarily for use in Catholic schools, is inspired by the principles of catechesis. While the present thesis claims that Catholic Religious Education is a legitimate development of catechesis, there remains a need for ongoing reflection on how Catholic educational thought will inform TIOF and make the 'shared project' a reality.

A closer look at TIOF in the light of the *General Directory for Catechesis* (Congregation for the Clergy 1997) gives rise to the paradox whereby an approved syllabus for Catholic Religious Education in schools (TIOF) is heavily reliant on another Magisterial document (*General Directory for Catechesis*) which refers to school-based religious formation on very few occasions, but most

[127] http://www.sces.uk.com/mediamail/display.php?m=1487&C=9274557ce7613b1951668d3fa5338451&L=20&N=65 last accessed July 2013

[128] Part Two of the present chapter noted how 'catechesis' but not 'Religious Education' was included in the Glossary for TIOF.

[129] The text from the *Code of Canon Law* 775 §2 states: 'If it seems useful, it is for the conference of bishops to take care that catechisms are issued for its territory, with the previous approval of the Apostolic See.' The text from the *General Directory for Catechesis* states: 'Together with the programme of action—focused above all on workable options—many Episcopates prepare, at national level, catechetical materials of an orientational or reflective nature which provide criteria for an adequate and appropriate catechesis… such documents, before their publication, must be submitted to the Apostolic See for its approbation.'

notably in paragraphs 73-75 (see Chapter Three). Crucially for the argument of the present chapter, the paragraphs in the *General Directory for Catechesis* make it very clear that 'Religious Instruction' (sic) in schools, while related to broader processes of evangelisation and catechesis, must adopt a scholastic shape which sets it apart from catechesis.

This distinction was reiterated, indeed strengthened, in the *Circular Letter* (Congregation for Catholic Education 2009) and a comparison between this important document and TIOF makes for interesting reading. The following table captures the respective positions of each document. Although there is a need for caution in juxtaposing short extracts from documentation from different sources without a recognition of the wider contextual and conceptual nuances, these examples make explicit the complexity of the debate, both locally and internationally, on the appropriate shape of Catholic Religious Education (my bold text:

Circular Letter (2009)	*This is Our Faith* (2011)
Religious education in schools fits into the evangelising mission of the Church. It is different from, and complementary to, parish catechesis and other activities such as family Christian education or initiatives if ongoing formation of the faithful. Apart from the different settings in which these are imparted, the aims that they pursue are also different: **catechesis aims at fostering personal adherence to Christ and the development of Christian life in all its aspects** (cf: Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 80-87), **religious education in schools gives the pupils knowledge about Christianity's identity and Christian life** (2009: 17).	Religious education in the Catholic school is distinctive because of its **focus on the faith development of children and young people within the context of a faith community**… Because of its focus on faith development, religious education in the Catholic school endeavours to promote the relevance of the Catholic faith to everyday human life and experience (SCES 2011 a: 12).

These documents are chronologically close but conceptually distant. They do not sit easily together and thus present significant challenges to the operation of the Catholic school today. The *Circular Letter*, perhaps idealistically, assumes that

some form of parish-based catechesis exists alongside the school-based curriculum for religious education. The linking of religious education with the 'evangelising mission of the Church' needs some developing especially in the light of Pope Benedict XVI's statement to (some) Bishops of the USA that the Catholic school will be a key resource in the 'New Evangelization' (Benedict XVI 2012 a). His intervention would seem, superficially at least, to offer support for a more catechetical approach to Catholic Religious Education and reinforce, it seems, TIOF's attachment to explicit 'faith development'. A closer reading of Benedict's wider writings on education offers a more nuanced interpretation of this complex field (cf: 2007 a; 2007 b; 2008 b; 2010 b). Benedict is referring to what it means to be Christian: Christian identity, he believes, has been eroded by pluralism and needs recapturing in the life of the Catholic school and in the public square. Given the arguments offered in the present thesis, there are strong reasons for believing that the role of Catholic Religious Education in evangelisation ('new' or otherwise) is to offer an academically valid and doctrinally orthodox presentation of Catholic thought. It is this 'knowledge' of Christianity's unique claims that provide the bedrock for the 'new evangelisation'.

Returning to the issues arising from the *Recognitio* awarded to TIOF (see above), there are various plausible explanations of how this situation came about. The weakest interpretation is that the *Congregation for the Clergy*—which granted the *Recognitio* to TIOF—was not convinced by the merits of a 'distinction' between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. Another interpretation is that the writers of TIOF opted to set to one side the direction suggested by the *Circular Letter* (2009) in order to offer the wider Church an innovative, or *prophetic*, mission statement of the conceptual framework of Catholic Religious Education. The direction adopted is more in keeping with the intellectual thrust implicit in the initiatives directed towards 'new evangelisation' (Synod of Bishops 2011). (The writing team was set up before the publication of the 2009 *Circular Letter* although previous Magisterial documents on education had made the same point.) The most likely interpretation is that the writers of TIOF, while accepting the need to make a claim for doctrinal and cultural distinctiveness, drew heavily on the established 'catechetical' tradition of Catholic Religious Education in

Scotland and identified this approach as the most appropriate conceptual underpinning for a contemporary Catholic Religious Education syllabus.[130]

The final linguistic/conceptual issue is TIOF's use of the phrase 'teacher as catechist'. This form of words is located within a section which has five footnotes to the *General Directory of Catechesis,* a document which, as was noted earlier, has little to say about school-based Religious Education (TIOF 2011: 57). This is another example of a perceived interchangeability in TIOF between *catechesis* and *Catholic Religious Education*. A brief illustration will highlight the issues arising here. The specific role of the catechist is to speak in the name of the Church and explain the meaning of the message of salvation (Willey et al. 2008; Willey 2009;). The designation 'teacher as catechist' is hence appropriate for the teacher who is in charge of programmes of sacramental preparation - a clear example of explicit formation in faith and hence a definite expression of catechesis (Tartaglia 2008). A broader use which refers to the teacher's role in Religious Education would seem to be problematic as it might give rise to both conceptual *and* vocational confusion owing to the different fields of catechesis and school-based Religious Education and, importantly, does not do justice to either term. TIOF is here pushing at the boundaries of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. The term 'teacher as catechist' shows that TIOF is a contemporary articulation of previous models of confessional Religious Instruction/Education: this is a challenge to the Magisterium's call for catechesis and Religious Education to be seen as related but distinctive enterprises (cf Congregation for Catholic Education 1988; 2009).

Assessment of the Core Learning

The assessment principles for Catholic Religious Education in Scotland are set out in the accompanying *Principles and Practices* document*:*

> Assessment in religious education in Roman Catholic schools (sic) should assist children and young people to become increasingly more able to

[130] This approach would be wholly in keeping with the catechetical approach to Catholic Religious Education in Scotland since the 1970s. (See McKinney 2012 for an overview of these documents.)

> understand and make informed, mature responses to God's invitation to relationship. Personal faith commitment is not being assessed in any shape or form. In the educational context, the assessment of children and young people's responses to God's invitation to relationship demonstrates the knowledge, understanding and skills that learners have gained to support their response to learning in religious education and the wider life of the school (Learning and Teaching Scotland 2008 a: 4).

This pointed and nuanced summary of assessment principles rightly distinguishes between the 'educational context' and the broader faith-development issues which are part of the process of religious education in any Christian context. The distinction seems to be informed by the Magisterium's call for Catholic Religious Education to develop a scholastic shape which, of course, could include various forms of assessment. It stands as a model of how assessment of 'knowledge' in Catholic Religious Education can be done. The assessment of 'faith commitment' is a more complex issue which brings together elements like freedom of conscience and so-called stages of faith development (Fowler, 1976; MacDonald 1995). *Principles and Practices* rightly, claims to rule out assessing the faith commitment of the pupils, yet an exploration of the language of some of the *Core Learning* in TIOF raises questions as to how the assessment principles outlined above have been applied.

In the first place, it is necessary to address issues arising from the personalisation of learning - itself a key feature of the *Curriculum for Excellence*. TIOF has imported this pedagogical feature without a sufficiently critical understanding of where it leads. This gives weight to possible criticisms that TIOF, when set against the horizon of Maurice Ryan's three 'pathways' for the inclusion in non-Catholic students in the Catholic school, has adopted the 'exclusivist' model in preference to models governed by inclusion and plurality (Ryan 2008). A fuller exploration of Ryan's tripartite model is beyond the scope of the present thesis but it does offer a set of helpful, if limited, lenses for the work of personalisation. Of course, personalisation is wholly desirable, if not essential, in catechesis, and this explains why TIOF has used this pedagogical approach, especially in the early stages. There is a parallel with the language used in the rite of Baptism and the use of the 'I' in the recital of the Creed. In these liturgical contexts, the language

of catechesis and faith commitment uses the 'I' in the context of the 'we' of the faith community.

In the context of a Catholic Religious Education syllabus, the language of personalisation, when added to expressions of faith commitment in some of the *core learning*, suggests, for example, that the non-Catholic pupil (or even the non-practising baptised Catholic) in the Catholics school would be unable to participate fully (nor be assessed) in Catholic Religious Education classes. For example, the use of the *first person singular* in the wording of much of the core learning for TIOF reflects not just an understanding of, but also a desire to promote a positive personal response to a particular article of faith. The implications of this will be explored below.

Further exploration of this core learning in the context of TIOF's stated assessment principles offers a deeper educational challenge owing to a close identification of the core learning with the language of catechesis and explicit faith development. In the strand 'Son of God', there is a core-learning base which is clearly catechetical in the years up to early secondary school (cf.; SCES 2011 a 2.05a; 3.05a). Logically, this leaning towards catechesis would mean that Catholic schools would have to make available an alternative syllabus and/or means of assessment for those pupils who are not Christian and who cannot assent, for example, to the divinity of Jesus. Furthermore, it is questionable if a child of primary school age has the necessary sophistication to understand the implications of making such a personal response to core learning in Christology. This leads to a danger that such statements become 'role-play' type responses rather than examples of genuine cognitive and affective development.

Nonetheless, it has to be asked how the core learning for TIOF can be assessed in a pluralist context given the explicit catechetical language employed in the outcomes. Returning to the strand *Son of God*, (see above) it seems perplexing that the verbal formulae found, for example, in the core learning for pupils aged 12 and above have not been reflected in the lower years. This would address the assessment issue by focussing on the 'knowledge of doctrine' as opposed to the

explicit personal response, be it positive or negative, to this core Christian doctrine.

More broadly, this is where the debate over curriculum design intersects with the specific core learning and structure of TIOF. In line with *Curriculum for Excellence*'s favoured approach—and hence supportive of the strategic engagement with the state favoured by SCES—the core learning of TIOF veers close to a competency-based approach to assessment in which the *expression of belief* could be interpreted as a competency. This approach, if unchallenged, would seem to be somewhat problematic for the Catholic school owing to the nature of Catholic Religious Education in particular, and Catholic education more broadly, as an engagement with culture which moves beyond utilitarianism and the teaching of skills (Pope Benedict XVI *passim*). Another way of looking at this is to argue that TIOF is more than just a setting out of a pre-determined body of knowledge to be taught, assimilated and assessed. TIOF's dependence on catechetical theory and its self-identification—albeit limited—with the historical narrative of catechesis (2011: 59) is an antidote to a utilitarian approach to education in that its rationale strives to blend the cognitive and the affective aspects of learning in a broader framework of spiritual and faith development.

General Methodological Issues

Catholic schools are more than a vehicle for the dissemination of a specific body of doctrinal knowledge. Catholic schools seek to communicate a specific worldview: this has implications for the methodologies adopted across the curriculum and it is not surprising that this stance is contested in a plural society (Strhan 2010). Further reflection on how the 'spirituality of communion' informs methodology suggests that there must be some scope for the Catholic school and individual teachers to adopt particular approaches to teaching in keeping with local circumstances.

Part Two of the present chapter explored how the core learning for the strand *Son of God* offered space for Catholic Religious Education to act as a catalyst for the propagation of Catholic thinking among the school population. The move towards

a more 'educational' style in the core learning for older pupils could be the result of different groups of authors failing to collaborate sufficiently in the matter of pedagogy. This, however, is an unconvincing explanation given the level of detail evident elsewhere in TIOF. A more plausible interpretation is that the explicit 'faith nurture' approach of the material for early years was deemed to be insufficiently rigorous for more mature pupils deemed capable of handling sophisticated nuances between faith knowledge and faith commitment.

To be clear, there is little explicit indication of how established models of 'faith development'—however contestable these may be—have informed, if at all, the pedagogy and 'content model' proposed by TIOF (cf. Goldman 1965; Fowler 1976; Groome 1980: 66-73; SCES 2011a: 12, 14). Given that TIOF is underpinned principally by catechetical theory, it would seem appropriate for TIOF to offer the same methodological freedom for teachers which the Church offers to catechists (Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 10). Two issues need further exploration: a) TIOF's use of the term 'divine pedagogy' and b) the question of 'inductive' and deductive' methods.

TIOF uses the term 'divine pedagogy' to refer to two different issues: i) the subject of Catholic Religious Education (2011: 57-60) and ii) the vocation and mission of the Catholic teacher (2011:59). The term 'divine pedagogy', of course, is not unique to TIOF (cf. Farey et al. 2011). Magisterial documents offer clear definitions and scope of the term: *Dei Verbum* described it as God's gradual self-revelation (Second Vatican Council 1965: 15); more recently, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* has placed it in the context of the Revelation of God (CCC 51-66). The *General Directory for Catechesis* describes it more fully as an attribute of Christ and his Church (Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 142-144). TIOF seems to be stretching its meaning to reflect a particular understanding of the role of the 'teacher as catechist' yet this definition seems to lose some of the theological dynamism it has in the Magisterial documents.

Catholic teaching on catechetical methods is underpinned by two key concepts: a) there is no favouring of a particular method; b) there is no neutrality in the choice of method (cf. Congregation for the Clergy 1997: 148 and 149). This allows the

catechist some flexibility, albeit limited, in methodological matters. TIOF, by contrast, offers clear direction on methodology and draws on 'the history of catechesis' to explore briefly the key points of both the *inductive* and *deductive* approaches to catechesis (SCES 2011 a: 59). Issues arising from this will be explored further below. Suffice it to say at this point that TIOF's selection of examples from history of the 'rich patrimony of teaching approaches' is interesting from a number of perspectives (SCES 2011 a: 59). Reference is made to St. Justin Martyr, an early apologist and to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose catechetical lectures offer a valuable insight into the methods of the early catechumenate and the multi-sensory approach to catechesis of the Middles Ages. While these selected examples offer valuable insights from history, the omission of arguably more important figures in the history of catechesis and Christian education like St. Augustine of Hippo, St. John Chrysostom and St. Clement of Alexandria is brought into sharper relief.

Furthermore there is no mention of the major catechetical and educational initiatives which came from the Council of Trent and its aftermath and which have played such a key role in shaping the 'school-based catechesis' mode of Catholic Religious Education of which TIOF is an important contemporary example. It may be the case that the writers of TIOF wish to draw on the pre-Reformation vision of Catholic formation as a model for contemporary practice. Paradoxically, TIOF's use of the language of 'outcomes' and 'strands' owes more to the educational and catechetical ideas which were pioneered by the Council of Trent and developed by the catechetical renewal movement (see Chapter Two).

Inductive and Deductive Approaches

TIOF claims that both the *inductive* and the *deductive* approaches are needed in 'Religious Education' (2011:59; 296-298). *Principles and Practices* states that the Catholic Religious Education is a 'journey of faith, a quest for personal growth and response within the community of faith' (*Learning and Teaching Scotland 2008:* 2). The terminology suggests not just a complementarity between, but a close identification of, catechesis with Religious Education in the school: the use

of ‘teacher as catechist’ is but one example of the interchangeability of concepts (SCES 2011 a: 57).

While the overview (see above) of catechetical methods from Church history is a valuable—if chronologically limited—reminder of the spiritual and educational capital of the Church, TIOF offers a fuller explanation of what it claims are, *pace* the *General Directory for Catechesi*s, (1997: 148-149), the favoured teaching approaches in the Catholic school (2011: 296-299). The close identification between Religious Education and catechesis is maintained through the advocacy of the ‘Emmaus approach’ as a supposed example of *inductive catechesis* (Learning and Teaching Scotland 2008: 2-3). The assertion that such an approach ‘can provide coherent and deep learning in religious education’ again conflates catechesis with Religious Education (SCES 2011 a: 297). The favouring of a particular methodology associated with catechesis demonstrates TIOF’s alignment with catechetically-inspired conceptual frameworks.

In brief, the ‘Emmaus approach’ to catechesis is based on the ‘Road to Emmaus’ episode recounted in the Gospel of Luke (24: 13-35). TIOF claims that this story is an example of effective catechesis as the risen (and unrecognised) Jesus accompanies two unnamed disciples on a journey to the village of Emmaus. Through the use of questions, Jesus elicits from them their anxieties and worries before explaining the history of salvation to them. The ‘Emmaus Approach’ as understood in TIOF presents us with two further issues related to the interpretation of Scripture.

First, this ‘method’ appears to draw on a particular reading of Thomas Groome’s ‘five stage’ process of catechesis which is centred on the catechetical strategy of ‘shared dialogue’ (Groome 1980: 185). For Groome, such an approach is conditional on a ‘learning environment’ that is Christian and which is ‘sponsoring its members towards lived Christian faith’ (Groome 1980: 188). Underpinning Groome’s method is the catechetical concept of faith-development which is recognised by Groome as a complex experience involving many processes of learning (Groome 1980: 20-28). While there is scope for the use of the *Emmaus Method* in distinctly catechetical initiatives within the school such as retreats and

chaplaincy work, it is not clear how it could be used as the primary methodological approach in the pluralist context of the contemporary Catholic school and its associated Religious Education syllabus.

Second, a deeper and more faithful engagement with the *Road to Emmaus* story would counter a reading of this important scriptural passage principally as an example of the *inductive* method of catechesis. St. Luke uses this story to illustrate the themes of journey, hospitality, the Eucharist and on how it is the Risen Christ and His Church who accompanies the people of God on their journey. Paradoxically, TIOF recognises the deeper layers of meanings inherent in the Emmaus story on other occasions: it is suggested as a suitable source text for study of 'post-Resurrection appearance' of Jesus (RERC 4-07); it is an example of Jesus calling his disciples into 'the community of faith' (RERC 1-02a); it is a 'Eucharistic narrative' with four related teaching themes (RERC 2-09b). When studied in these contexts and used as the starting point of a learning process, the Emmaus story is actually closer to an example of *deductive* rather than *inductive* catechesis (McKinney and Hill 2013: 91). TIOF's advocacy of the Emmaus story as an example of *inductive* catechesis stretches the meaning of this particular story beyond its fundamental purpose.

In summary, the predominantly catechetical underpinning of TIOF offers some significant methodological challenges to the 'shared project' between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. The focus on personal response to doctrine and faith development at particular stages of the syllabus minimises the space for the broader exploration of Christian identity and culture.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has explored the Catholic Church in Scotland's guidelines for Catholic Religious Education in the light of the Church's teaching on catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It has demonstrated that TIOF has drawn heavily from the language and conceptual framework of catechesis and offers a substantial contribution to wider debates on the appropriate shape of Catholic Religious Education. A loosening of the language of catechesis would not mean a

dilution of doctrinal orthodoxy but would provide the foundations for a robust programme of Catholic Religious Education as an expression of a 'shared project' between catechesis and education.

TIOF is an important document not just for the Church in Scotland but also for Catholic Religious Education internationally. TIOF's considered synthesis of the principles of catechesis within a curricular framework for education provided by the state authorities is a valuable local contribution to a long-standing debate which has been running since the early 1970s. This study of TIOF is limited by the newness of these guidelines. It remains to be seen what impact, if any, this chosen approach to the shaping of programmes of Catholic Religious Education has on the international stage. It is possible that other Bishops' Conferences will re-evaluate approaches to Catholic Religious Education and in turn draw even closer lines, or not, between catechesis and Religious Education. The recent publication of a *Religious Education Curriculum Directory* by the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales is a case in point. While this is not a syllabus and does not contain TIOF's level of detail, it does explicitly acknowledge the separate spheres of influence of catechesis and Religious Education (2012: 3-4).

TIOF's reliance on catechetical theory presents a range of challenges for those who seek to implement it in schools. The adoption of catechetical language would appear to 'exclude' those who are not of the Catholic tradition from full participation in the teaching and learning adopted in the Religious Education class. The focus on 'faith formation' does not leave sufficient space for an exploration of the relationship between Catholic identity and culture. Furthermore, the clear commitment to the unique claims of Catholicism in TIOF challenges the place of the Catholic Religious Educator within broader 'Religious Education' networks and academic associations which are more comfortable with a so-called liberal approach to Religious Education.

This chapter has highlighted some of the key issues which have emerged from the wider thesis. Although based on the study of one local syllabus, it has brought into sharp relief the ongoing debate on the broader implications of the relationship

between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. There is a need now to consider how these issues can be addressed. In Chapter Seven, some practical recommendations for the future direction of the debate will be offered.

CHAPTER SEVEN
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In the present thesis I have explored the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as found in the Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church. I have looked in detail at a range of issues arising from the interaction of theology, history and education on this evolving distinction. In Chapter Seven I bring together the principal insights which have emerged from the study and, in the light of the research, offer further clarification of key issues and some recommendations for the future.

In Part One I show how the present thesis has answered the *key* and *subsidiary* questions set in Chapter One. In Part Two I explore the strengths and limitations of the methodology of the thesis. In Part Three I examine the claims to originality in this thesis. In Part Four I offer two recommendations for the future. Finally, in Part Five I look at areas for further research in this field.

Part One Research Outcomes

In Part One I show how the three *key* and two *subsidiary* questions set out in Chapter One have been addressed. The five questions are as follows:

Key questions

1. What is the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education in the contemporary Magisterial documents of the Catholic Church and in other related writings on this theme?
2. What does the term 'Church as communion' reveal about the nature of the Catholic Church?
3. How does the application of the conceptual lens of 'Church as communion' inform the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education?

Subsidiary questions

4. How did catechesis evolve from the early Church until the twenty-first century?

5. How is the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education reflected in the national syllabus for Catholic Religious Education in Scotland?

Summary of Responses to the Key questions

Question 1 was addressed in Chapter Three. Church teaching proposes a clear distinction between catechesis and school-based Religious Education. The primary aim of catechesis is faith-formation. The primary aim of Catholic Religious Education is knowledge of Christian doctrine and its relationship with culture. The latter is hence an *invitation* to or a *deepening* of catechesis but is not necessarily configured according to catechetical concepts and language. In sum, faith-formation is its proximate, not primary aim. This distinction has both emerged from and fostered a wide body of secondary literature on the conceptual shape and practical application of the distinction. Despite the apparent distinction, there is recognition that both concepts enrich each other.

Question 2 was addressed in Chapter Four. *Communio*, an ancient theological term recovered in the early years of the twentieth-century, underpins the notion of the Church as a reflection of the Trinity—a communion of persons—and a place of encounter with Jesus Christ. *Communio* moves ecclesiology beyond the limitations of the 'political-society' model and encourages a deeper reflection on the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the Church.

Question 3 was addressed in Chapter Five. The dialogic thread in *communio* can be usefully applied to the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. A 'spirituality of communion' allows us to

conceptualise catechesis and Catholic Religious Education as component parts of a 'shared project' and contributors to an 'integral religious formation' emerging from the broader 'integral human formation' which lies at the heart of Catholic education.

Responses to the Subsidiary Questions

Question 4 was addressed in Chapter Two. The development of catechesis and broader approaches to Catholic education were charted through four pivotal periods in the history of the Catholic Church: i) Catechesis in the Apostolic and Pastoral Ages; ii) Catechesis in the Middle Ages; iii) The Influence of the Catholic reform on Catechesis; iv) The Catechetical Renewal of the Early Twentieth Century. This historical genealogy exemplified the fluid nature of catechesis and the evolving relationship between Church thinking and broader events in society.

Question 5 was addressed in Chapter Six. The Scottish Catholic Religious Education syllabus, *This is Our Faith*, provided a focussed case study of the issues at the heart of the thesis. This chapter offered two conclusions: i) this approved syllabus is an innovative response to the Magisterially-sanctioned distinction between catechesis and Religious Education. *TIOF* is orthodox in content and firmly aligned to the broader Scottish curricular initiatives arising from the *Curriculum for Excellence*; ii) *TIOF*'s reliance on catechetical principles, while helpful as a reminder of the doctrinal and pastoral basis of Catholic Religious Education, does not fully reflect the Magisterially-sanctioned distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. While the *Recognitio* affirms the suitability of TIOF for use in a Catholic school, there remain some questions about what are, and what are not, suitable conceptual frameworks and associated methodologies in Catholic Religious Education.

Part 2 Assessing the Methodology of the Thesis

In Part Two I will set out the strengths and limitation of the methodology of the thesis. This is a *qualitative* study based on documentation belonging to a defined religious body: the Catholic Church. All Magisterial documents are available in a multiplicity of languages on the website of the Holy See.

Those who do not belong to the Catholic tradition are not expected to accept the validity of the content of the Magisterial documents on catechesis and education *per se* but can accept the principle that this body of teaching is foundational to contemporary expressions of Catholic education (see Chapter One).

Strengths of the methodology

A. The question of positionality is important (Chavez 2008). McCulloch (2008) notes that a rigid binary division between 'insider' and 'outsider' status in educational research cannot accommodate the complexities of multi-faceted approaches to study. Banks's fourfold 'typology of cross-cultural researchers' is more helpful. The four categories of this typology are: i) indigenous-insider; ii) indigenous-outsider; iii) external-insider; iv) external-outsider (Banks 1998: 8). The typology proposed by Banks offers a crucial level of nuance to the insider/outsider framework. In the context of the present study, I argue that my 'indigenous insider' status is a major strength of the methodology. There are three ways in which this 'insider status' is manifested: I am member of the Church which was responsible for the writing of TIOF; I am a professional colleague of some members of the writing team; as an experienced teacher in schools and Higher Education, I am aware of both the tension and goodwill surrounding the production of a new syllabus or other large-scale initiatives in all curricular areas. My 'indigenous insider' status afforded me unique insights into the wider theological, catechetical and educational issues which underpin Catholic Religious Education in general and TIOF in

particular. Without this knowledge, any critique of TIOF would have been substantially diminished and liable to accusations of limited understanding of its theological and cultural genealogy, both internationally and locally. As Banks claims, the 'indigenous insider' speaks with some authority about concepts which are central to the community's self-understanding. This lends weight to particular research findings from the 'inside' which seem to challenge the beliefs and practices of the insider's own community (see 'Claim to originality 5' below).

B. The method of documentary analysis facilitated critical access to a wide range of key documents: Magisterial teaching; related academic literature from both Catholic and other sources; one example of a contemporary approved syllabus for Catholic Religious Education. Taken together, this material provided the *terrain* of the study and offered a suitably diverse body of primary and secondary source-based evidence (cf. Aldrich 200; McCulloch 2004). The study of these rich and varied historical contexts allowed me to draw out the 'genealogy' of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in a way which had not been done before. The selected approach allowed for a degree of thematic unity across the four selected historical periods. It offered a much-needed conceptual, philosophical and theological framework for future studies in this field, be they qualitative or quantitative.

C. In the analysis of the primary documents, it became clear that the content of the Magisterial documents on catechesis, education and religious education, while anchored in a theological vision, reflects a range of historical, educational and cultural contexts (cf. McCulloch 2000). This level of engagement with the primary sources reveals many layers of nuance and emphasis. The documentation is the fruit of the Church's dual role as observer of, and participant in, intellectual and cultural fields. There is scope for further research into how this body of teaching has been received and applied in the local churches and schools. The present study recognised this and anticipates that its findings will underpin such studies in the future.

D. The provision of a set of *key* questions and *subsidiary* questions provided a necessary framework for the direction and arguments of the thesis. It acted as a driver of the search for meaning from *within* and *across* the documents, a key feature of documentary research (Shank and Brown 2007). The differentiation between the *key* and *subsidiary* questions reflected the levels of importance of the subject-matter underpinning each question. It framed the arguments of the thesis, gave direction and allowed a focus on key issues related to the genealogy of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

E. The use of the lenses of *tradition* (conservation) and *progress* (innovation) allowed the contemporary evidence to be viewed against the horizon of the selected historical contexts. These related lenses are aligned with the theological concept, or 'method', of doctrinal development. According to John Henry Newman (1878/ 2003), authentic development in Catholic doctrine does not engender rupture between historical epochs but reflect an organic growth in knowledge and understanding. The use of the lenses of *tradition* and *progress* allows the Newmanian position to be tested in a catechetical and educational context. They show how the Church's traditions in catechesis and religious education evolved in a spirit of dialogue with wider historical and cultural developments.

F. The analysis of one school syllabus, *This is Our Faith*, allowed this Scottish document to be analysed in the broader contexts of i) other documentation for the curriculum in Scotland, ii) other documentation relating to the provision of Catholic Education from the *Scottish Catholic Education Service* and iii) the wider corpus of teaching on education and Religious Education from both Magisterial and other Catholic sources. This supports the statement above (e) that dialogue with other thinking has shaped the Church's catechetical and educational provision in a specific local context.

Limitations of the methodology

A. A limitation of 'insider status' is the potential failure by the researcher to adopt a suitable nuanced and critical approach to the body of knowledge available for study. This would leave the researcher open to accusations of partiality and of not occupying the important 'space between' – that unique field where 'insider' and 'outsider' status enrich each other and allow the researcher to move beyond attachment to apparent 'constructed dichotomies' and 'entrenched perspectives' (Dwyer and Buckle 2009: 62).

B. Given that the institutions of Catholic education are part of the educational and cultural fabric of many countries, debates about the aims, rationale and scope of said institutions and their curricula should, ideally, have significant international implications. This is manifested in part in the selected case-study of *TIOF* in Chapter Six where this particular Catholic Religious Education syllabus is shown to be the fruit of a dialogue between wider Scottish curricular initiatives and Catholic theological principles. In the light of the unique funding and administrative settlement for Scottish Catholic schools, comments about *TIOF* cannot normally be extrapolated and used as a firm indicator of broader international trends within the field of Catholic education.

C. As noted in Chapter One, questions arising from multiple authorship merit further consideration. To take one specific example, the *Congregation for Catholic Education* is the 'author' of some of the primary sources used in this thesis (1977; 1982; 1988; 1997; 2002; 2007; 2009). Any Congregation of the Roman Curia, of course, depends on its staff to compile the documents it issues. It is not clear, however, in what manner the changing personnel of the Congregation for Catholic Education over the years has affected the content and style of the documents studied. Furthermore, there is no indication in the final text of the documents of the process of writing and of the level of consultation, if any, with 'stakeholders' in the world of Catholic education. It could be argued, however, that the teaching contained in the documents of the Holy See is rooted in the tradition of the Church and that the different layers of authorship are

reflections of *communio*. In this reading of the situation, the teachings of the Holy See have authority *qua* teachings of the Holy See. The question remains open and with many layers of nuance.

D. The issue of language and the translation process are complex yet relevant. The documents studied are the official translations available freely on the Holy See's website. These translations are undertaken 'in-house' in the Roman Curia. Clearly, the process of translation of important teaching needs translators who are both linguistically fluent and theologically literate: a mechanistic translation process would not be satisfactory as it could fail to capture the wider cultural influences on education across a range of different cultures. An example of this was offered in Chapter Five with the issues surrounding the Italian and English versions of Latin terms. A deeper study of this issue would clarify the extent of 'local influences' in determining what is/is not a satisfactory translation of nomenclature.

This exploration of the strengths and limitation of the methodology is now followed by an assessment of the claims to originality.

Part Three Assessing the Claims to Originality and Related Action Points

The relationship between catechesis and Religious Education is a vibrant field of study in the academic literature. Rummery (1975) identified many of the thematic threads of the implications of the relationship. The thesis captures the flavour of both the subsequent Magisterial teaching and academic 'commentary' on Rummery's seminal publication.

The originality of the present thesis is reflected in a number of dimensions: the historical (Chapter Two), the theological (Chapter Four), the conceptual (Chapter Five), the theological (Chapter Four), and the applied (Chapter Six) fields. In the light of the research process, the five claims to originality are now explored.

Claim to originality: 1 (Historical)

The first claim to originality is the analysis of the historical data in Chapter Two. While this body of evidence is not the result of original research, the lenses of *tradition* (conservation) and *progress* (innovation) offer a fresh hermeneutic on this important backstory and hence provide an important contextualised overture to the review of the literature in Chapter Three. The four selected historical contexts in Chapter Two provide an original perspective on the evolution of the key themes of the thesis (see Part 2 *Strengths B* above). This is a wide although not comprehensive field within which the contemporary relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can be understood.

Claim to originality: 2 (Theological)

A second claim to originality is that the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is analysed in the context of an ecclesiological model: *communio*. While other studies have proposed that catechesis and Catholic Religious Education merit considering as two component parts of one formative initiative (cf. Groome 1980; Kravatz 2010; Franchi 2011), the application of this particular theological/ecclesiological lens offers an original and granular perspective on the distinctive and fluid nature of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. It serves as a reminder that the frame of reference of Catholic education, although rooted in the desire to offer a solid education to all, is best understood and appreciated by those keen to engage with the Church's theological vision.

Claim to originality: 3 (Conceptual - a.)

A third claim to originality is the use of the term 'shared project'. The term itself is used in the Magisterial documents to refer to the partnership between lay teachers and teachers from Religious orders. The thesis applies this term innovatively to the partnership between catechesis and Catholic religious education. 'Shared project' thus captures the dynamism of

communio and offers a way to unite the catechetical life of the parish with the educational work of the school. The necessary partnership between the Catholic school and the wider Catholic community - a key principle of authentic Catholic education thought - is foundational to a solid educational experience and is an indispensable conduit for 'integral religious formation'.

Claim to originality: 4 (Conceptual - b.)

A fourth claim to originality is the use of 'integral religious formation' as a descriptor of the Catholic school's role in the religious formation of Catholic pupils. This is the school's unique contribution to the 'shared project' as described above. This innovative phrase is related to the better-known term 'integral human formation': the latter connotes the union of the spiritual, moral, intellectual and affective domains of education; the former, as used in the present thesis, reflects the 'spirituality of communion' in that it brings together the explicit faith formation of catechetical initiatives and the more cognitive approach of Catholic Religious Education. In keeping with the fluidity suggested by *communio*, these mutually enriching areas draw on *communio*-inspired thinking to show how unity-in-diversity informs Church life. Importantly, 'integral religious formation' allows catechesis and Catholic Religious Education to act as partners and hence heal the divisions caused by an overly robust conceptual division between the two (Franchi 2011).

Claim to originality: 5 (Applied)

A fifth claim to originality is the 'case-study' approach in Chapter Six of the thesis. Chapter Six applies the findings of the research to one particular expression of Catholic Religious Education and examines whether *TIOF* reflects the ideal of the 'shared project'. At the time of writing no academic studies of TIOF were in the public domain. (See above: Methodology *strengths F*)

Part Four Developing and Looking Beyond the 'Shared Project': Two Recommendations

This section will draw on and distil issues raised in chapters 1-6. It will offer suggestions on the future shape and application of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education.

Chapter Three traced the evolution of Catholic thinking on the most appropriate conceptual framework for Catholic Religious Education. Chapters Four and Five explored how *communio* offersed a theological rationale for a 'shared project' informed by a 'spirituality of communion'. In the light of the major developments in Catholic thinking as charted therein, there remain two areas for further study and two corresponding recommendations.

Areas for Further Study

Despite the continual re-stating in the Magisterial documents of the distinctive yet complementary relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education (see Chapter Three), there is a lack of an adequate operational model for the planning and teaching of Catholic Religious Education. Those involved in the work of catechesis can draw on the principles laid out in the *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997), and, before that, the *General Catechetical Directory* (1971). Catholic Religious Educators have no such universal template on which to draw. Given the findings of this research and the insights arising from claims to originality, there is a need for the following: a) a replenished rationale for Catholic Religious Education; b) a wider exploration of how Catholic school education can look beyond the 'shared project'.

While the Catholic school is called to retain and indeed celebrate a distinct *ecclesial* identity, it must also ensure that its educational vision is attractive and, indeed, open to those belonging to other religious and philosophical traditions. The Catholic school, as a civic institution, is a key partner in

dialogue on how best to shape *all* education systems and practices for the future. The breadth and depth of knowledge required in Catholic Religious Education both emerges from and contributes to an educational vision rooted in Catholic anthropology. Such an approach has implications for both content and pedagogy in the Catholic school's curriculum (Davis and Franchi 2013).

There now follow two recommendations designed to take this debate forward. They correspond to the two areas of discussion above which have themselves evolved in response to the issues raised in the key and subsidiary questions of the thesis.

Recommendation 1: An Official 'Directory' of Catholic Religious Education

Recommendation 2: The Catholic School as a site of the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles'

Recommendation 1: **A 'Directory' of Catholic Religious Education**

While there are major Magisterial documents on catechesis, there is a paucity of Magisterial documents dealing specifically with Catholic Religious Education (see Chapter Three). Since the Second Vatican Council, the field of catechesis has been supported by two 'Directories' and one Synod of Bishops with the associated Apostolic Letter *Catechesi tradendae* (Pope John Paul II 1979). While 'education' has been the subject of a range of important Magisterial documents since the Second Vatican Council, the field of 'Catholic Religious Education' as a school subject lacks a dedicated document of similar status to the documents on education. The *Circular Letter* of 2009, for example, aims simply to clarify the locus of Catholic Religious Education in the life of the school. Given the existence of a wide range of academic literature on the subject of (liberal) Religious Education and the related fact that, unsurprisingly, much of this literature comes from outwith the Catholic community, I argue that the time

is ripe for the publication of a universal 'directory' of Catholic Religious Education.

In line with Newman's notion of the development of doctrine (1878/2003), the proposed 'directory' for Catholic Religious Education would draw on catechetical principles but offer a supportive educational framework suitable for schools. It would recognise that an overly catechetical approach could weaken the academic status of school-based Religious Education (Rymarz 2011: 544). The 'directory' would show how Catholic Religious Education has grown from distinct catechetical roots but has a different, although related, conceptual framework.

The proposed 'directory' would be more than a differentiated version of the *General Directory for Catechesis.* Its aim would be to enhance the academic standing of Catholic Religious Education within the Catholic community and beyond. This move would serve *communio* by offering clear direction from the centre as an encouragement for the crucial local discussions on the appropriate shape of Catholic Religious Education syllabi. The 'directory' would synthesise the various references to school-based Religious Education in existing Magisterial documents and set these in a wider academic and pastoral context. This would recognise the key influences of theology and catechesis while identifying the unique position of the Catholic school as a centre of Catholic culture.

I recognise that the suggestion of a 'directory' could be interpreted as antithetical to the 'spirit of communion'. A heavily-centralising document which attempts to harmonize the many manifestations of Catholic Religious Education across the world would be hard to achieve. Even if it were achievable, it could be unwelcome to those who would regard this as another mechanism designed to thwart local initiatives. More seriously, it would place at risk the key role of the local Bishop in determining the shape of Catholic education and formation in his diocese.

The supposed 'tension' between the universal and the local Church in this respect can be eased by close examination of the declared scope of both the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and the *General Directory for Catechesis*. Both documents actively encourage local adaptations of their content while reminding the Church of the need to adhere to shared foundational principles. Any proposed 'Directory for Religious Education' would be similarly constructed: it would present the key features of Catholic Christian theology and its associated socio-cultural teachings in a systematic way and outline the indicative content and associated pedagogy of a Catholic Religious Education syllabus. This would allow the Catholic school to remain firmly within the *communion* of the Church while serving as a place of meaningful dialogue/encounter with the Catholic Christian tradition for those belonging to other theological and philosophical traditions. As the *General Directory of Catechesis* accepted the need for some form of pre-catechumate/pre-catechesis (1997:62), a case can be made for Catholic Religious Education as the primary conduit for the initial proclamations of faith (see Recommendation 4 below).

Recommendation 2: The Catholic School as site of the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles'

The convergence of key Church initiatives viz. the 'New Evangelisation' and the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles' has implications for Catholic schooling (see Chapter Five). It is essential for the Catholic educational community to consider how the intellectual and pastoral energy inherent in both initiatives can contribute positively to the life of the Catholic school.

I argue here that the Catholic school can be suitably classed as a site of the 'Courtyard of the Gentiles' initiative. This proposal has implications for the nature of the Catholic school, the articulation of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education and the preferred pedagogy for a Catholic school shaped by the 'Courtyard'.

In the first place, and given the wide range of worldviews of pupils who attend the contemporary Catholic school, it is clear that the Catholic school is not, and should not be, a 'school for Catholics'. This position, of course, seems to question what is called the 'ecclesial identity' of the Catholic school: how can a Catholic school, it may be asked, retain its distinctive identity if a substantial number of its pupils and teachers do not belong to the Catholic tradition? [131]

In response to this concern, the Catholic school needs the 'space' to articulate a distinctive Catholic vision of education while avoiding any sense of a 'ghetto mentality'. I argue here that the *Courtyard* offers a framework in which such important issues can be suitably explored. To be clear, the rationale of the *Courtyard* has no explicit theme of 'education' in the sense of institutionalised schooling: neither education nor schooling appears as a sub-theme on the official website. This state of affairs might seem problematic and suggests that applying the *Courtyard* principles to Catholic education is a step beyond the original scope of the initiative. Proposition 55 from the Synod of Bishops on the New Evangelisation, however, recommended that Catholic educational institutions could draw on the *Courtyard* approach as an incentive to promote 'a dialogue which is never separated from the initial proclamation' (Synod of Bishops 2012 b). This was the first indication in a document of the Holy See on the potential of the *Courtyard* to influence Catholic education. It is not clear what has driven this welcome shift in thinking.

Looking ahead, the *Courtyard'*s promotion of broader cultural agenda will increasingly afford it the status of an educational initiative which will support the life of the Catholic school and, by extension, the curriculum for Catholic Religious Education. In this model of schooling, the *Courtyard* becomes a contemporary manifestation of the Second Vatican Council's call for profound dialogue between religious ways of thinking and other philosophical positions (cf. Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes*,

[131] Further studies are needed to analyse the phenomenon on pupils of other religious traditions in the Catholic school. See Engebretson (2008) for a critical overview of this matter.

1965). This is a manifestation of the rich potential of the theology of *communio* to justify innovative forms of engagement with those who hold intellectual positions that cannot be accommodated within the Catholic intellectual tradition. The key drivers of this new model of Catholic schooling will be the *Courtyard*'s influence on the Catholic Religious Education curriculum and, crucially, the pedagogical approaches adopted in all curricular areas.

The 'Courtyard' and Catholic Religious Education

The *Courtyard* offers a contemporary rationale for the argument of the present thesis that Catholic Religious Education at its best is an exploration of Catholic thinking on philosophy, theology and broader cultural issues. I argue that the *Courtyard* offers a pastoral justification of the distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education with the latter understood as an academic subject which is open to people of all religious and philosophical traditions.

The key area of intersection between the *Courtyard* and the conceptual framework of Catholic Religious Education is Pope Benedict XVI's concept of an 'authentic humanism' grounded in the notion of the human person as a union of a physical body and immortal soul (Pope Benedict XVI 2007 a; 2007 b). There are three key points emergent from this position which merit analysis because they offer the compass points for the future: i) Pope Benedict challenges the idea of a humanism which studies the human person solely from an anthropocentric level; ii) he seeks to broaden our understanding of the role of reason to 'embrace those aspects of rationality which go beyond the purely empirical'; iii) he asks what contribution Christianity can make to the humanism of the future. The systematic exploration of these and other themes contributes to the 'new evangelisation' and brings key metaphysical themes to the heart of debates on education and especially religious education, today.

In the light of this, the *Courtyard* cannot be separated from the 'new evangelisation' since it (the *Courtyard*) is designed as a means of reaching out to atheists. The *Courtyard* model of Catholic schooling is also a suitable vehicle for the presentation of the Catholic worldview to those who are reluctant to embrace atheism but are unwilling to give assent to a religious tradition. Bearing this in mind, the Catholic Religious Education curriculum as shaped by the principles of the *Courtyard* certainly could be proposed as a means of pre-evangelisation in which the open dialogue around religion in general, and Christianity in particular, is seen not as a destination but as the first of many steps leading to possible acceptance of the Gospel.[132] This body of knowledge, as we have already seen, provides the field of study and its associated pedagogy has implications for the wider curriculum in the *Courtyard*-inspired Catholic school

The Pedagogy of the 'Courtyard' School

Central to the successful operation of any proposed curriculum for the 'Courtyard'-inspired Catholic school is the underpinning pedagogical vision. I argue here in favour of a retrieval of a 'pedagogy of transmission' suitable for contemporary circumstances.

The 'pedagogy of transmission' as here proposed is a suitable approach for the Catholic Religious Education syllabus in a Catholic school shaped by the vision of the *Courtyard*. It also applies across the curriculum and is a direct product of the hermeneutic of *tradition* and *progress* articulated earlier in the present thesis. To be successful, it requires teachers who are themselves immersed in intellectual culture and recognise the value of knowledge, of both content and pedagogical approaches, in the integral development of young people.

[132] The concept of 'pre-evangelisation' recalls in part the arguments made by some of the early Christian Fathers who saw the study of the Greek and Latin classics as preparatory to reception of the Gospel. The early works of St. Augustine of Hippo are clearly in this camp (Topping, 2012). In the model of dialogue mentioned above, the building of bridges is not an end but a *means* towards the eventual proclamation of the Gospel.

As with all educational proposals, there is a need for caution and subtlety in implementation. There is always a risk of restricting learning to contemporary fads. Neither should we place undue weight on older educational traditions for their own sake without a suitable critical edge. To be clear, I recognise the value of a blended approach to learning: this is *not* a call to return to Gradgrindian rote-learning (Davis and Franchi 2013). The 'pedagogy of transmission' would, at its best, recognise the value of content-rich presentation of human achievements in the arts and sciences.[133] These indispensable foundations of learning offer well-trodden paths of knowledge for the young people of today, allow them to insert themselves into the history of ideas and, crucially, open intellectual doors which could otherwise remain closed.[134] This method of teaching is another clear sign of distinctiveness of Catholic education. A wide-ranging 'pedagogy of transmission' seeks to direct and influence 'the student experience' in the light of the received wisdom and our intellectual traditions. Catholic education will conserve this 'traditional' pedagogy and offer it anew to other educators.

To conclude, these important matters - appropriately configured to age and stage - will underpin the Catholic school as a site of the 'Courtyard'. They form a curricular framework which accepts the Catholic's school's role in the catechesis of those with an attachment to the Catholic faith but also responds to the Church's desire to find new ways to engage in purposeful dialogue with those who have little or no experience of a Catholic life.

Part Five Areas of Future Research

There was no scope in the present study for further and deeper exploration of how the relationship between catechesis and Religious Education is applied in different educational settings. There is hence ample opportunity

[133] See Crick (2009) for an interesting perspective on 'critical-enquiry'. The website of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) offers good examples of how to put this method into practice: http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/hlst/resources/a-zdirectory/enquiry_based_learning

[134] Within the wider curriculum of the school, the 'truths' pointed out by the teacher are those key ideas and narratives which from the bedrock of the curriculum and serve as the 'raw material' for study and response.

for future studies centred on important related areas. Essential to this 'programme' is an ongoing commitment to exploring the relationship between religion and education more broadly and to continuing dialogue with those who challenge religion's right to influence public policy in education and to promote wider cultural initiatives.

I now offer some areas for future study in field of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education,

First, it is essential to find out how aware parish catechists and practising teachers are of the Magisterially-sanctioned distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in schools. Following on from this, we need to enquire how this affects, if at all, the manner in which they perform their duties and how they understand their respective role as catechists and teachers?

Second, how do syllabi of Catholic Religious Education, as configured by a range of local Churches and their educational agencies, reflect the Magisterial teaching as outlined in the present thesis? Related to this, what are teachers' views of the potential strengths and limitations of a Catholic Religious Education curriculum as proposed in the present thesis, especially for the following groups: a) Catholic pupils in a Catholic school and b) pupils in a Catholic school who belong to other traditions? This would allow for extended research on the evolving nature of the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education across a variety of local contexts

Third, what is the relationship between programmes of Catholic Religious Education in the Catholic school and the various catechetical programmes - not just in sacramental preparation - offered to children who, for whatever reason, do not, or cannot, attend a Catholic school?

Fourth, what is the significance of the local educational context for the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education? For

example, what role does the state play in the operation of the Catholic education and how does this inform the shape of the curriculum? These issues are informed by the wider discussion referred to in the opening remarks of this section.

Fifth, there is a need for further exploration of how a properly-articulated distinction between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can offer substantial theological, educational and pastoral capital for future debates on the place of religion/religious ways of thinking in public life. How can the Catholic school, while part of the mission of the Church, remain a civic institution where all are invited to explore the 'good life' in a spirit of dialogue and freedom?

Finally, in what way will the Catholic school as a site of the *Courtyard* shape the life and mission of Catholic schooling and Catholic education in the future? For example, will the *Courtyard* model have the energy to influence and broaden the life and mission of the Catholic university?

Concluding Remarks

The thesis made three claims at the outset as follows (see page 13):

1. The relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education is most fully understood in a broader historical and theological context.
2. Catholic Religious Education is a dynamic partnership between the principles of catechesis and the principles of Catholic education.
3. The theology of ecclesial communion (*communio*) offers a suitable framework within which the partnership between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education can be understood.

This study has supported these claims by a critical exploration and analysis of a wide and varied range of perspectives on the nature of catechesis and Catholic Religious Education. In particular: i) it has rooted the relationship between catechesis and Catholic Religious Education in a series of interesting historical contexts; ii) the application of the theological lens of

communio to this complex relationship offered some clarity for the future; iii) it provided a robust critique of one contemporary model of Catholic Religious Education and iv) made two recommendations based on the findings of the research.

There can be little doubt that Catholic Religious Education cannot operate successfully without a robust vision of education and schooling in other parts of the curriculum of the Catholic school. The recovery and re-shaping of inherited religious and cultural traditions must be a key component of the contemporary vision of Catholic education in all its manifestations. This allows the Catholic school not just to remain faithful to its own mission but to stand as an example of good pedagogical practice to other models of schooling

There is much more to be done. This research will serve as the conceptual basis for wider international studies of the conceptual framework and underpinning principles of syllabi of Catholic Religious Education. Indeed, the territory of Catholic Religious Education, this unique interplay of theology, catechesis, educational philosophy and cultural studies, needs to be proposed as a worthy field of study in the academy. It is my hope that the present study will play an important part in this endeavour.

Bibliography

Adkins, A. (2011) *The Political Problem of Religious Pluralism –Thaddeus Kozinski Makes an Argument for a Catholic Confessional State.* http://www.zenit.org/article-31584?l=english Last accessed: May 2013

A Kempis, T. (1954) *My Imitation of Christ.* Brooklyn: Confraternity of the Precious Blood

Alberigo, G. Jossua, J. Komonchak, J. (Eds.) (1987) *The Reception of Vatican II.* Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press. (Translated by Matthew O'Connell.)

Aldrich, R. (2000) A Contested and Changing Terrain: History of Education in the Twenty-first Century. In Crook, D. and Aldrich, R. (Eds.) (2000) *History of Education for the Twenty-First Century.* London: Institute of Education

Altbach, P (2001) Academic Freedom: International Realities and Challenges. *Higher Education* 41 (1-2) pp. 205-219

Aquinas, St. Thomas (13th Century/1947) *Summa Theologica*. Benzinger Bros Edition. (Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province.) http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.i.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (13th century/1939) *The Catechetical Instructions of St. Thomas Aquinas.* Manila: Sinag-Tala. (Translated by Joseph B. Collins.)

- (1994) *Truth Vol II Questions X-XX.* Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company Inc. (Translated by James V. McGlynn.)

Arendt, H. (1938/1968) *Between Past and Future.* Middlesex: Penguin Books

Arthur, J., Gearon, L., Sears, A. (2010) *Education, Politics and Religion – Reconciling the Civil and the Sacred in Education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer

Arthur, J. and Gaine, S. (1996) Catechesis and Religious Education in Catholic Theory and Practice. In: Francis, L. Kay, W and Campbell W. *Research in Religious Education.* Leonminster: Gracewing

Arthur, J. (2009) Secularisation, Secularism and Catholic Education: Understanding the Challenges. *International Studies in Catholic Education*. 1(2) pp. 228-239

- (1995) *The Ebbing Tide Policy and Principles of Catholic Education.* Leominster: Gracewing

Augustine of Hippo, St. *Against the Academicians* and *The Teacher.* (King, P. Ed.

- (1995) Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company

- (no date) *On the Catechizing of the Uninstructed.* Whitefish:Kessinger Publishing Rare Reprints

- *(on-line) On the Morals of the Catholic Church.* http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1401.htm Last accessed: May 2013

- (1995) *Against the Academicians* and *The Teacher.* (King, P. Ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company

- (1959) *On Christian Doctrine.* Indianapolis: The Bobb-Merrill Company Inc. (Translated by DW Robertson.)

- (online) Exposition of the Psalms. In Schaff, P. (Ed.). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series 1 Volume 8*. Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library

Bakke, O.M. (2005) *When Children Became People The Birth of Childhood in Early Christianity.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press. *(*Translated by B. McNeil.)

Banks, J. (1998) The Lives and Values of Researchers: Implications for Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society. *Educational Researcher* 27 (7) pp. 4-17

Bauckham, R. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Baus, K. (1980 a). The Beginnings. In Jedin, H. and Dolan J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church vol. 1 From the Apostolic Community to Constantine.* London: Burns and Oates pp. 59-214

- (1980 b). The Great Church of Early Christian Times (c. AD 180-324) in Jedin, H. and Dolan J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church vol. 1 From the Apostolic Community to Constantine* London: Burns and Oates, pp. 215-432

Barnes, P. (2009) *Religious Education: Taking Religious Difference Seriously.* Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain

- (2001) The Contribution of Professor Ninian Smart to Religious Education. *Religion* 31 pp. 317-319

- (2000) Ninian Smart and the Phenomenological Approach to Religious Education. *Religion* 30 pp. 315-332

Basil the Great (On-line) *Address to young men on the right use of literature* http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/315-basil-greek-literature-link Last accessed: May 2012

Battersby, W. (1949*) De La Salle Pioneer of Modern Education.* London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Bejczy, I. (2001) *Erasmus and the Middle Ages.* Leiden: Brill

Bellarmine, S. Robert (1602 on-line) *An Ample Declaration of Christian Doctrine.* Scholars Press (Translated by Richard Hadock.)
http://archive.org/stream/AnAmpleDeclarationOfTheChristianDoctrine_407/Bellarmino_Roberto_Francesco-An_ample_declaration_of_the_Christian-STC-1834-562_07-p1to139#page/n0/mode/2up Last accessed: May 201

Bellitto, C. (2001) *Renewing Christianity –A History of Church Reform from Day 1 to Vatican Two.* New Jersey: Paulist Press

Benedict, Saint (6th century/1982) *The Rule of St. Benedict in English.* Minnesota: The Liturgical Press

Benedict XVI, Pope (2013) *Fides Per Doctrinam.* Motu Proprio.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_ben-xvi_motu-proprio_20130116_fides-per-doctrinam_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2012 a) *Address to the Bishops of the United Sates of America (Regions X-XIII) on Their 'Ad Limina' Visit.*
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2012/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20120505_us-bishops_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2012 b) *Annual message for the World Day of Peace 2012: Educating Young People in Justice and Peace.*
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/messages/peace/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20111208_xlv-world-day-peace_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2011 a) *Address of the Holy Father Pope Benedict XVI to the Bishops of Australia on their Ad Limina visit October 20.*
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2011/october/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20111020_bishops-australia_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2011b) *Address on the 150th Anniversary on the Unification of Italy.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2011/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20110317_150-unita_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2010 a) *Address to the Bishops of the Italian Bishops Conference.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2010/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20100527_cei_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2010 b) *Address to Teachers and Religious.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2010/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20100917_mondo-educ_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2010 c) *Ubicumque et Semper*. Apostolic Letter http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_letters/documents/hf_ben-xvi_apl_20100921_ubicumque-et-semper_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2009 a) *Address of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI to the Members of the Roman Curia and Papal Representatives for the Traditional Exchange of Christmas Greetings.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2009/december/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20091221_curia-auguri_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2009 b) *The Cathedral from the Romanesque to the Gothic Architecture: The Theological Background. Wednesday Audience*. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/audiences/2009/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20091118_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2009 c) *Address to Catholic Religion Teachers* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2009/april/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20090425_insegnanti-religione_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2008) *Letter to the Faithful of the Diocese of Rome on the Urgent Task of Educating Young People.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2008/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20080121_educazione_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2007 a) *Address to the Participants in the First European Meeting of University Lecturers.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2007/june/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20070623_european-univ_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2007 b) *Address to the Participants in the Convention of the Diocese of Rome.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2007/june/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20070611_convegno-roma_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2007 c) as Joseph Ratzinger) *Jesus of Nazareth.* London: Bloomsbury

- (2006 a) *Address to University of Regensburg.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2006 b, as Joseph Ratzinger) Handing on the Faith and the Sources of the Faith. In Ratzinger, J. Danneels, G. Macharski, F. Ryan, D. (2006) *Handing on the Faith in an Age of Disbelief.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

- (2005, as Joseph Ratzinger) *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith –The Church as Communion*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press

- (2004, as Joseph Ratzinger) *Truth and Tolerance Christian Belief and World Religions.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

- (1996, as Joseph Ratzinger) *Called to Communion: Understanding the Church Today.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

- (1992/2010, as Joseph Ratzinger) Communio: A Programme. In *Joseph Ratzinger in Communio Volume 1 The Unity of the Church.* Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing Company

- (1965, as Joseph Ratzinger) The Pastoral Implications of Episcopal Collegiality. *Concilium* 1. pp. 20-34

Bergdahl, L. (2010) *Seeing Otherwise-Renegotiating Religion and Democracy as Questions for Education.* Sweden: Doctoral Thesis in Education at Stockholm University

Bettenson, H. (Ed) (1956) *The Early Christian Fathers.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Boersma, H. (2012) Analogy of Truth: The Sacramental Epistemology. In Flynn, G. and Murray, P. (Eds.) with the assistance of Kelly, P. (2012) *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bossy, J. (1999) The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe. In Luebke, B. (Ed.) (1999) *The Counter-Reformation.* Oxford: Blackwell

Boston College (2010) *The Catholic Intellectual Tradition: A Conversation at Boston College.*
http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/top/church21/pdf/Catholic%20Intellectual%20Tradition%20cropped%20pages.pdf Last accessed: May 2013

Bowen, G. (2009) Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal* 9 (2) pp. 27-40

Bowen, J. (1972) *A History of Western Education Vol. I.* New York: St. Martin's Press

- (1975) *A History of Western Education Vol. II.* London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- (1981) *A History of Western Education Vol. III.* London: Methuen Ltd.

Boyer, E. (1997) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Boys, M. (1989) Religious Education: A Map of the Field. In Boys, M. (Ed.) (1989) *Education for Citizenship and Discipleship.* New York: The Pilgrim Press pp. 98-129

- (1981) The Standpoint of Religious Education. *Religious Education* 76 (2) pp. 128-141

Bridges, D. (1996) Competence-based Education and Training: Progress or Villainy. *Journal of Philosophy of Education.* 30 (3) pp. 361-376

Buchanan, M. (2005) Pedagogical Drift: The Evolution of New Approaches and Paradigms in Religious Education. *Religious Education.* 100 (1) pp. 20-37

Buchanan, M. and Hyde, M. (2008) Learning Beyond the Surface: Engaging the Cognitive, Affective and Spiritual Dimensions within the Curriculum. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*.13 (4) pp. 309-320

Bunge, M. (Ed.) Bunge (Ed.) (2001) *The Child in Christian Thought.* Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing Company

Burns, J.M (2009) The Processions of the *Ordo Missae*. *Antiphon A Journal of Liturgical Renewal.* 13 (2)

Bushnell, H. (1861) *Christian Nurture.* London: T. Nelson and Sons

Byrne, J. (2004) *The Black Death.* Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group

Caldecott, S. (2012) *Beauty in the Word Rethinking the Foundations of Education.* Tacoma: Angelico Press

- (2009) *Beauty for Truth's Sake – The Re-enchantment of Education.* Michigan: Brazos Press

Calvin, J. (1536) *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (on-line) http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes/ Las accessed: May 2013

Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (1941) Illinois: Tan Books. (Translated by H. Schroeder.)

Carter, K. (2012) *Creating Catholics-Catechism and Primary Education in Early Modern France.* Indiana: University of Notre-Dame Press

Cassidy, C. (2008) Scottish Primary Education: Philosophy and Practice. In Bryce, T. and Humes, W. (Eds.) (2008) *Scottish Education Beyond Devolution* (3rd edition). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Castle, E. (1954) The Christian Fathers and the Moral Training of the Young. *British Journal of Educational Studies.* 3 (1) pp. 24-32

Catechism of the Catholic Church (2004) London: Burns and Oates
Catechism of the Council of Trent (1975) The Christian Book Club of America. (Translated by J. Donovan.)

Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales (2012) *Religious Education Curriculum Directory.* http://www.catholiceducation.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/RECD_2012.pdf Last accessed June 2013

- (1973) *Teaching the Faith The New Way.* Slough: St. Paul Publications

Catholic Education Office Sydney (2006) *How Effective is our Catholic School?* New South Wales: Catholic Education Office Sydney

Chadwick, H. (1984) *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Chadwick, O. (1996) *Augustine.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

- (1972) *The Reformation.* London: Penguin Books

Chavez, C. (2008) Conceptualizing from the Inside: Advantages, Complications and Demands on Insider Positionality. *The Qualitative Report* 1 13 (3) pp. 474-494

Clark, M. (2005) *Augustine*. London: Continuum.

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* Ch. V. In Roberts, A and Donaldson, J. (Eds.) (1867) *Ante-Nicene Library Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark

Clement, Pope, First Letter of Clement. In Louth, A. & Staniforth, M. (Eds.) (1987) *Early Christian Writings.* London: Penguin

Code of Canon Law (1983) http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/__P1.HTM Last accessed: May 2013

Coe, A. (1903) Religious Education as part of General Education. Originally published in *The Religious Education Association: Proceedings of the First Convention*, *Chicago 1903.* pp.40-52

Durham, W. (2013) W. Introduction. In Davis, D. and Miroshnikova, E. (Eds.) (2013) *Routledge International Handbook of Religious Education.* Abingdon: Routledge pp. 1-12

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge

Coll, R. (2009) Catholic School Leadership: Exploring Its Impact on the Faith Development of Probationer Teachers in Scotland. *International Studies in Catholic Education* 1 (2) pp. 200-213

- (2002) Examination of the Consultation and Development Process for the Scottish Catholic Religious Education Guidelines. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 6 (2) pp. 431-450

Coll, R. and Davis, R. (2007) Faith Schools and State Education: Church-State relations and the Development of the 5-14 Religious Education Programme in Scotland. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 11 (1) pp. 67-82

Collins, J. (1983) Religious Education and CCD in the United States: Early Years (1902-1935). In Warren, M. (Ed.) (1983) *Source Book for Modern Catechetics.* Minnesota: Saint Mary's Press pp.158-175

Comitato per il Programma Culturale della Conferenza Episcopale Italiana (2010) *La Sfida Educativa.* Roma/Bari: Editori Laterza

Compayré, G. (1905) *The History of Pedagogy*. London: Bloomsbury (Translated by W. H. Payne.)

Conferenza Episcopale Italian (CEI) (2001) *Progetto Culturale Che Cos'e*? Milano: Edizioni San Paolo

- (1970) *Il Rinnovamento della Catechesi* - – http://www.chiesacattolica.it/documenti/2002/12/00007996_il_rinnovamento_della_catechesi_documento.html Last accessed: June 2013

Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (Online) http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03711b.htm Last accessed June 2013

Congar, Y. (1985) *Diversity and Communion*. New London: Twenty-third Publications.

- (1966/1997) *Tradition and Traditions.* San Diego: Simon Schuster. (Translated by Michael Nasby and Thomas Rainsborough.)

- (1966) *The Mystery of the Church.* London: Geoffrey Chapman. (Translated by AV Littledale.)

Congregation for Catholic Education (2009) *Circular Letter to the Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on Religious Education in Schools.* http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_20090505_circ-insegn-relig_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2007) *Educating Together in Catholic Schools A Shared Mission between Consecrated Persons and the Lay Faithful.* http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_20070908_educare-insieme_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (2002) *Consecrated Persons and their Mission in Schools Reflections and Guidelines.*

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rccon_ccatheduc_doc_20021028_consecrated-persons_en.htmlLast accessed May 2013

- (*1997) The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium.* London: Catholic Truth Society

- (1988) *The Religious Dimension of Education in the Catholic School.* London: Catholic Truth Society

- (1982) *Lay Catholics in School: Witnesses to Faith*. London: Catholic Truth Society

- (1977) *The Catholic School.* London: Catholic Truth Society

Congregation for the Clergy (1997) *General Directory for Catechesis*. London: Catholic Truth Society

- (1971) *General Catechetical Directory.* London: Catholic Truth Society

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (2000) Declaration *Dominus Iesus on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church.*
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (1990) *Instruction Donum Veritatis on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian.*
http://www.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19900524_theologian-vocation_en.html

- (1984) *Instruction on Certain Aspects of 'Theology of Liberation'.*
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19840806_theology-liberation_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

Conroy, J. et al. (2011) *'Does Religious Education Work'? A Three Year Investigation into the Practices and Outcome of Religious Education*: *A briefing paper*. AHRS funded research project.

Conroy, J. and Davis, R. (2010) Religious Education. In Bailey, R., Barrow, R., Carr, C. and McCarthy, C. (Eds.) (2010) *The SAGE Handbook of the Philosophy of Education.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

- (2007) Citizenship, Education and the Claims of Religious Literacy. In Peters MA. Britton A. and Blee H. (Eds) (2007) *Global Citizenship: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Rotterdam*:* Sense Publishers

Conroy, J. (2002) Catholic Education in Scotland. In Hayes, M. and Gearon, L. (Eds.) (2002) *Contemporary Catholic Education.* Leominster: Gracewing

Cox, J. (2010) *An Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion.* London: Continuum

Crick, R. (2009) Inquiry-based Learning: Reconciling the Personal with the Public in a Democratic and Archaelogical Pedagogy. *Curriculum Journal* 20 (1) pp. 73-92

Cully, K. (Ed.) (1960) *Basic Writings in Christian Education.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press

Cunnane, F. (2004) *New Directions in Religious Education.* Dublin: Veritas

Curran, C. (2006) *Loyal Dissent –Memoirs of a Catholic Theologian.*
Washington: Georgetown University Press

Curtis, S. (2000) *Educating the Faithful: Religion, Schooling and Society in Nineteenth-Century France.* Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press

Cyprian of Carthage, St. (on-line) *To Fidus, On the Baptism of Infants* (Epistle 58)

http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/050658.htm Last accessed: May 2013

Davis, R. (forthcoming) Giambattista Vico and the Wisdom of Teaching. *Asia Pacific Education Review*

- (2011) Brilliance of a Fire: Innocence, Experience and the Theory of Childhood. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 45 (2) pp. 379-397.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2008) The Case for University-Based Teacher Education. In Cochrane-Smith, M. Feiman-Neiser, S. McIntyre DJ (Eds.) (2008) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education.* Abingdon: Routledge

Deakin Crick, R. (2008) Key Competencies for Education in a European Context: Narratives of Accountability or Care. *European Educational Research Journal* 7(3). pp. 311-318

De La Salle, John Baptiste, Memoranda on not using Latin to teach reading, cited in Koch, C., Calligan, J.,Gros, J. (Eds.) (2004) *John Baptiste de la Salle: the Spirituality of Christian Education.* New Jersey: Paulist Press

De Lubac, H. (1956/1986) *The Splendor of the Church*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press

De Souza, M. (2009) Spirituality and Well-Being. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality* 14 (3) pp. 181-184

Devine, T. (2006) *The Scottish Nation 1700-2007.* London: Penguin Books

Devitt, P. (1992) *That You May Believe - A Brief History of Religious Education.* Dublin: Dominican Publications

Dewey, J. (1903) Religious Education as Conditioned by Modern Psychology and Pedagogy originally published in *The Religious Education Association: Proceedings of the First Convention*, *Chicago 1903.* 1903. Chicago (60-66)

Dewey, J. (1938; 1986) Experience and Education. *The Educational Forum* 50 (3) Didache-the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. In Louth, A. & Staniforth, M. (Eds.) (1987) *Early Christian Writings.* London: Penguin

Doyle, D. (2007) Integrating Faith and Reason in the Catholic School. *Catholic Education A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 10 (3) pp. 343-356

- (1999) Henri Lubac and the Roots of Communion Ecclesiology. *Theological Studies*. 60 pp. 209-27

- (1997) Journet, Congar and the Roots of Communion Ecclesiology. Theological Studies 58 pp. 461-479

Drucker, J. (1997) Teaching as Pointing in 'The Teacher'. *Augustinian Studies* 1 28, (2) pp. 101-132

Dulles, A. (2002) *Models of the Church.* New York: Doubleday

- (1999) *A History of Apologetics.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Dunn, M. (2000) *The Emergence of Monasticism.* Oxford: Blackwell

Duffy, E. (1992) *The Stripping of the Altars - Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Dwyer, S. and Buckle, J. (2009) The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 8(1)

Education Scotland (2011) *Building the Curriculum 5*

http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/buildingyourcurriculum/index.asp

Elias, J. (2004) Catholics in the REA. *Religious Education* 99 (3) pp. 225-246

- (1999) Whatever Happened to a Catholic Philosophy of Education. *Religious Education* 94 (1) pp. 92-110

- (1982) The Three Publics of Religious Educators. *Religious Education* 77 (6) pp. 615-627

Engebretson, K. (2008) The Catholic School Called to Dialogue; A Reflection on some Consequences of the Ecclesial Unity of the Catholic School. *Journal of Belief and Values* 29 (2) pp. 151-160

- (2004) Conversations about Religious Education. *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 25 (3) pp. 267-281

Erdozain, L. (1983) The Evolution of Catechetics: A Survey of Six International Study Weeks on Catechetics. In Warren, M. (Ed.) (1983) *Source Book for Modern Catechetics.* Minnesota: Saint Mary's Press pp. 86-109

Evans, G. (2005) Introduction. In Evans, G. (Ed.) (2005) *The First Christian Theologians.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Ewig, E, (1980 a) The Conversion of the Franks and Burgundians. Origin and Organisation of the Merovingian National Church. In Jedin, H. and Dolan, J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church Vol. II Inner Life of the Church Between Nicaea and Chalcedon*. London: Burns and Oates, pp. 517-557. (Translated by Anselm Biggs.)

Ewig, E. (1980 b) Early Christian Monasticism: Development and Expansion in the East. In Jedin, H. Dolan, J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church Vol. II Inner Life of the Church Between Nicaea and Chalcedon*. London: Burns and Oates, pp. 337-374. (Translated by Anselm Biggs.)

Faggioli, M. (2012) *Vatican II The Battle for Meaning.* New Jersey: Paulist Press

Farey, C. Linning, W and Paruch, J. (Eds.) (2011) *The Pedagogy of God: Its Centrality in Catechesis and Catechist Formation.* Ohio: Emmaus Road Publishing

Feldmeier, R. (2012) Before the Teachers of Israel and the Sages of Greece: Luke-Acts as a Precursor of the Conjunction of Biblical Faith and Hellenistic Education. In Tanaseanu-Dobler, I. and Dobler, M. (Eds.) (2012) *Religious Education in Pre Modern Europe.* Boston: Brill pp. 77-95

Fergusson, E. (2009) *Baptism in the Early Church; History, Theology and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries.* Cambridge: Eerdmans

Figueiredo, A. (2001) *The Magisterium-Theology Relationship: Contemporary Theological Conceptions.* Pontificia Universita Gregoriana: Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 75

First Vatican Council (1870) *Pastor Aeternus-First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ* http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0063/_PD.HTM last accessed: May 2013

Fisichella, R. (2012) The New Evangelisation as a Fruit of Vatican II. Keynote speech at *Vatican II: Fifty Years On.* *http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9XY-HDCXh1k&feature=relmfu* last accessed: May 2013

FitzGerald, B. (2010) Medieval Theories of Education: Hugh of St. Victor and John of Salibury. *Oxford Review of Education* 36 (5) pp. 575-588

Fleming, G.P. (2006) Catholic Church Documents in Education. In de Souza, M et al. (Eds.) (2006) *International Handbook of the Religious, Moral and Spiritual Dimensions in Education Part One*. Dordrecht: Springer

Fleming, J. (2007) Is There Anything Religious about Religious Education Any More? In Felderhof, M., Thomson, P., Torevell, D. (Eds.) (2007) *Inspiring Faith in School: Studies in Religious Education.* Aldershot: Ashgate

Fletcher, R. (1999) *The Barbarian Conversion from Paganism to Christianity.* Berkley: University of California Press

Fowler, J. (1995) *Stages of Faith: the Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning.* California: Harper

Fox, R. (2001) Constructivism Examined. *Oxford Review of Education* 27 (1) pp. 23-35

Franchi, L. (2013) Words are not Enough: The Teacher as Icon of the Truth in St. Augustine. In McCluskey and McKinney (Eds.) (2013) *How the Teacher is Presented in Literature, History, Religion and the Arts: Cross-cultural Analyses of a Stereotype*. Lampeter: Mellen Press

- (2011) St. Augustine, Catechesis and Religious Education. *Religious Education* 106 (3) pp. 299-311

Francis, Pope (2013) *Lumen Fidei.* Encyclical Letter. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20130629_enciclica-lumen-fidei_en.html Last accessed July 2013

Freire, P. (2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum. (Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos).

Gallagher, J. (2001) *Soil for the Seed.* Essex*:* McCrimmon Publishing Co.

Gallagher, J. (1986) *Living and Sharing Our Faith-National Project of Catechesis and Religious Education.* London: Collins Liturgical Publications

Garelli, F. (2007 a) The Church and Catholicism in Contemporary Italy. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 12 (1) pp. 2-7

- (2007 b) The Public Relevance of the Church and Catholicism in Italy. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 12 (1) pp. 8-36

Gerson, J. On Leading Children to Christ. In Cully, K. (Ed.) (1960) *Basic Writings in Christian Education.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. (Translated by Robert Ulich.)

Goldman, R. (1965) *Readiness for Religion.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Grace, G. (2002) *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets, Morality.* London: RoutledgeFarmer

Graves, F.P. (1925:2004) *A History of Education Before the Middle Ages.* Hawaii: University Press of the Pacific

Gregory of Nyssa (4th century/1954) Address on Religious Instruction. In Hardy, E. (Ed.) (1954) *Christology of the Later Fathers.* London: SCM Press. (Translated by Cyril Richardson.)

Grimaldi, E. and Serpieri, R. (2012) The Transformation of the Education State in Italy: a Critical Policy Historiography from 1044 to 2011. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education* 1

Groome, T. (2007) Religious Education-No Divorce for the Children's Sake. *Catholic Education* 16 (4) pp. 12-14

- (2003) Total Catechesis/Religious Education A Vision for Now and Always. In Groome, T. and Horell, H. (Eds) (2003) *Horizons and Hopes-The Future of Religious Education.* New Jersey: Paulist Press

- (2001) Conversion, Nurture, or Both: Towards a Lifelong Catechetical Education –A Cautious Reading of the GDC. *The Living Light* 37(4)

http://old.usccb.org/education/catechetics/livlghtsum2001.shtml Last accessed May 2013

- (1980) *Christian Religious Education –Sharing Our Story and Vision.* San Francisco: Harper and Row

Grundy-Volf, J. (2001) The Least and the Greatest: Children in the New Testament. In Bunge (Ed.) (2001) *The Child in Christian Thought.* Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing Company

Guroian, V. (2001) The Ecclesial Family. In Bunge (Ed.) (2001) *The Child in Christian Thought.* Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing Company

Hadot, P. (2008) *Philosophy as a Way of Life*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. (Translated by Michael Chase.)

Haldane, J. (2008) *The Church and the World Essays Catholic and Contemporary*. Leominster: Continuum

- (1996) Catholic Education and Catholic Identity. In McLaughlin, T., O'Keeffe, J., and O'Keeffe, B. (Eds.) (1996) *The Contemporary Catholic School-Context, Identity and Diversity*. London: The Falmer Press

- (1986) Religious Education in a Pluralist Society: A Philosophical Examination. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 34 (2) pp.161-181

Hamilton, D. (1989) *Towards a Theory of Schooling.* East Sussex: The Falmer Press

Hammond, J., Hay, D., Moxon, J. Netto, B., Robson, K. Straughier, G. (1990) *New Methods in RE Teaching An Experiential Approach.* Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd

Hardy, E. (Ed.) (1954) *Christology of the Later Fathers.* London: SCM Press. (Translated by Cyril Richardson.)

Harrison, C. (2006) De Doctrina Christiana. *New Blackfriars* 87 (1008) pp. 121-131.

Hayes, D. (2010) *Encyclopedia of Primary Education.* Abingdon: Oxford

Healey, N. (2006) Communio: A Theological Journey. *Communio: International Catholic Review* 33 (Spring 2006) pp. 117-130

Hearder, H. (2001) *Italy: A Short History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Heft, J. (2011) *Catholic High Schools: Facing the New Realities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hellinckx, B., Simon, F., Depaepe, M. (2009) *The Forgotten Contribution of the Teaching Sisters.* Leuven: Leuven University Press

Higher Education Academy (HEA) (on-line) Enquiry-Based Learning http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/hlst/resources/a-zdirectory/enquiry_based_learning Last accessed: May 2013

Hill, J. (2003) *The History of Christian Thought.* Oxford: Lion Hudson

Hirst, P. (1981) Education, Catechesis and the Church School. *British Journal of Religious Education* 3(3) pp. 85-93

- (1974) *Moral Education in a Secular Society.* London: University of London Press

HMIe (2007) How Good is Our School? The Journey to Excellence Part 3

www.hmie.gov.uk/documents/publication/hgiosjte3.pdf Last accessed: May 2013

Holman, R. (2004) Religion and Literacy: Observations on Religious Education and the Literacy Strategy for Secondary Education in Britain. *British Journal of Religious Education* 26 (1) pp. 21-32

Horan, M (on-line) *Christian Educators-Josef A. Jungmann.* Talbot School of Theology
file:///Users/leonardofranchi/Desktop/Context%204/Info'%20on%20Jungmann.webarchive Last accessed: May 2013

Horn, C. and Martens, J. (2009) *'Let the Little Children Come to Me'-Childhood and Children in Early Christianity.* Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press

Hugo of St. Victor (12th century/1961) *Didascalion*. New York and London: Columbia University Press. (Translated by Jerome Taylor.)

Hull J. Religion in the Service of the Child Project - The Gift Approach to Religious Education. In: Grimmit, M. (Ed) (2000) *Pedagogies of Religious Education.* Essex: McCrimmons

- (1984) *Studies in Religion and Education*. London: The Falmer Press

Hume, M. Baumfield, V. Livingston, K. and Menter, I (2009) The Scottish Curriculum in Transition: Curriculum for Excellence. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester 2-5 September 2009
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/187593.pdf

Hyde, B. (2013) A Category Mistake: Why Contemporary Australian Religious Education may be Doomed to Failure. *Journal of Beliefs and Values: Studies in Religion and Education* 34 (1) pp. 36-45

- (2008) *Children and Spirituality.* London: Jessica Kingley Publishers

Hyland, T. (2003) Competence, Knowledge and Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 27 (1) pp. 57-68

Ignatius of Antioch, St. (online) *Epistle to the Romans.* http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/ignatius-romans-lightfoot.htmlLast accessed May 2013

International Theological Commission (2012) *Theology Today: Perspectives, Principles and Criteria.* http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_cti_doc_20111129_teologia-oggi_en.html Last Accessed June 2013

Ireson, J. and Hallam, S. (2001) *Ability Grouping in Education.* London: SAGE

- (1999) Is Ability Grouping the Answer? *Oxford Review of Education* 25 (3) pp. 343-358

Iserlow, E. (1980) Martin Luther and the Coming of the Reformation. In Jedin, H. and Dolan J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church Vol V Reformation and Counter Reformation*. pp. 3-31. (Translated by Anselm Biggs and Peter Becker.)

Isomura M. (1962) The New Approach to Catechetics. *Religious Education* 57 (5) pp. 334-339

Israel, J. (2002) *Radical Enlightenment-Philosophy in the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jackson, R. (2004) *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality –Issues in Diversity and Pedagogy.* London: RoutledgeFalmer

- (1997) *Religious Education An Interpretive Approach.* London: Hodder and Stoughton

Jaeger, W. (1961/1977) *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press

Janelle, P. (1978) *The Catholic Reformation.* Southampton: The Camelot Press Ltd

Jedin, H. (1981) The Second Vatican Council. In Jedin, H. Reppen, K. and Dolan, L. (Eds.) (1981*) History of the Church Vol X The Church in the Modern Age.* London: Burns and Oates pp. 96-151. (Translated by Anselm Biggs.)

- (1980) General Introduction to Church History. In Jedin, H. and Dolan J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church vol. 1 From the Apostolic Community to Constantine.* London: Burns and Oates, pp.1-58

Jedin, H. Reppen, K. and Dolan, J. (1981) The Church in the Modern Age. In Jedin, H. Reppen, K. and Dolan, L. (Eds.) (1981*) History of the Church Vol X The Church in the Modern Age.* London: Burns and Oates pp. 260-298. (Translated by Anselm Biggs.)

John XXIII, Pope, (1962) Opening Address to the Second Vatican Council. http://www.catholic-forum.com/saints/pope0261i.htm Last accessed May 2013

John Paul II, Pope (2001) *Novo Millennio Ineunte*. Apostolic Letter at the Close of the Jubilee Year. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_20010106_novo-millennio-ineunte_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (1998) *Fides et Ratio.* Encyclical Letter. London: Catholic Truth Society

- (1992) *Address of His Holiness John Paul II to the Bishops of Great Britain on the Ad Limina visit*

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1992/march/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19920326_gran-bretagna-ad-limina_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (1991) *Centesimus Annus.* Encyclical Letter http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (1988) *Christifidelis Laici.* Apostolic Exhortation http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_en.html

- (1981) *Address of the Holy Father John Paul II to the Priests of the Diocese of Rome* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1981/march/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19810305_sacerdoti-diocesi-roma_it.html Last accessed: May 2013

- (1979) *Catechesi Tradendae.* Apostolic Exhortation. London: Catholic Truth Society

Johnson, P. (1976) *A History of Christianity.* Norwich: Penguin Books

John Chrysostom, St. Address on Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring up Their Children. In Laistner, M. (1967) *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire.* New York: Cornell University Press

Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church (2007) *Ecclesiological and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church: Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority (*also known as *The Ravenna Document).* http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20071013_documento-ravenna_en.html Last accessed May 2013

Jones, C. Wainwright, G. Yarnold, E. Bradshaw, P (Eds.) (1997) *The Study of Liturgy.* London: Oxford University Press

Jungmann, J. (1965) *Handing on the Faith.* London: Burns and Oates. (Translated by A.N. Fuerst.)

- (1962) *The Good News and Yesterday*. New York: Sadlier Inc. (Translated by William Huesman.)

- (1958) Religious Education in Late Medieval Times. In Sloyan, G. (Ed.) (1958) *Shaping the Christian Message-Essays in Religious Education*. New York: MacMillan. pp. 38-62

Justin Martyr (on-line) The First Apology of Justin
http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0126.htm last accessed: May 2013

- (on-line) The Second Apology of Justin For the Christians (Addressed to the Roman Senate). http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0127.htm Last accessed: May 2013

Kathan, B. (2013) Horace Bushnell and the Religious Education Movement. *Religious Education* 108 (1) pp. 41-57

Kehoe, SK. (2010) *Creating A Scottish Church.* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Keller, M. (1998) Jesus the Teacher. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 7(1) pp. 19-36

Kelly, A. (2009) *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice.* London: SAGE Publications

Kelly, L. (2000) *Catechesis Revisited: Handing on the Faith Today*. London: Darton Longman

Kerr, F. (2011) Catholic Theology. *The Expository Times* 122 (8) pp. 365-373

Kevane, E. (1964) *Augustine the Educator-A Study in the Fundamentals of Christian Formation.* Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press

Kincaid, M. (1985) Curriculum Development in Religious Education. *British Journal of Religious Education* 8 (1) pp. 4-45

Koch, C., Calligan, J.,Gros, J. (Eds) (2004) *John Baptiste de la Salle: the Spirituality of Christian Education.* New Jersey: Paulist Press

Kozinski, T. (2010) *The Political Problem of Religious Pluralism and Why Philosophers Can't Solve It.* Plymouth: Lexington Books

Kravatz, M. (2010) *Partners in Wisdom and Grace-Catechesis and Religious Education in Dialogue.* Maryland: University Press of America

Kraynack, R. (2005) *Church-State Relations in America and Europe Part 1.* http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/church-state-relations-in-america-and-europe-part-1 Last accessed June 2013

Kung, H., (1973) *The Church.* London: Search Press

Laistner, M. (1967) *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire.* New York: Cornell University Press

Lawson, K. (2012) Learning the Faith in England in the Later Middle Ages: Contributions of the Franciscan Friars. *Religious Education* 107(2) pp. 139-157

Leahy, M. (1990) Indoctrination, Evangelization, Catechesis and Religious Education. *British Journal of Religious Education* 12 (3) pp. 137-144

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2008 a) *Curriculum for Excellence: Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools Principles and Practices.* http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/Images/rerc_principles_practice_tcm4-540177.pdf Last accessed June 2013

- (2008 b) *Curriculum for Excellence: Religious and Moral Education*. http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/Images/rme_principles_practice_tcm4-540203.pdf Last accessed June 2013

Leo XIII, Pope (1891) *Rerum Novarum* – Encyclical Letter http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html Last accessed May 2013

London, S. (online) The Future of Religion: An Interview with Ninian Smart. http://www.scottlondon.com/interviews/smart.html Last accessed July 2013

Louth, A. & Staniforth, M. (Eds.) (1987) *Early Christian Writings*. London: Penguin

Maritain, J. (1961) *Education at the Crossroads*. New Haven:Yale University Press

Markus, R. (2006) *Christianity and the Secular*. Notre Dame Indiana: Notre Dame Press

Marmion, J. (1986) *Catholic Traditions in Education.* Macclesfield: St. Edward's Press

Marthaler, B. (1978) The Modern Catechetical Movement in Roman Catholicism: Issues and Personalities. *Religious Education* 73 (5) supp. 1, pp. 77-91

Mazzonis, Q. 2007) *Spirituality, Gender And The Self In Renaissance Italy.* Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press

MacCulloch, D. (2003) *Reformation: Europe's House Divided* 1490-1700. London: Penguin Books

MacDonald, M. (1995) Assessing Knowledge And Evaluating Faith -Dual Approaches To Determining Outcomes Of Religious Education. *Journal of Religious Education* 43 (2) pp. 9-14

McAlpine, J. (2009) 'Offering 'skills for future' is philistine' *Sunday Times* June 28 2009

McCulloch, G. (2008) Historical Insider Research in Education. In Sikes, P. and Potts, A (Eds) (2008) *Researching Education from the Inside-Investigations from Within*. Abingdon: Routledge pp 51-63

- (2004) *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences.* London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer

- (2000) Publicizing the Educational Past. In Crook, D. and Aldrich, R. (Eds.) (2000) *History of Education for the Twenty-First Century.* London: Institute of Education

McDade, J. (2012) Epilogue: Ressourcement in Retrospect. In Flynn, G. and Murray,. P. (Eds.) with the assistance of Kelly, P. (2012) *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

McDonough, G. (2009) Can There be 'Faithful Dissent' within Catholic Religious Education in School? *International Studies in Catholic Education* 1(2) pp. 187-199

McGrail, P. (2007) *First Communion Ritual, Church and Popular Religious Identity.* Aldershot: Ashgate

McGrath, A. (Ed.) (2011) *Christian Theology An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

- (1999) *Christian Spirituality: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

- (1998) *Historical Theology An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

McGuire, B. (2005) *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press

McInerny, R. and O'Callaghan, J. (2005) Entry on St. Thomas Aquinas. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aquinas/ Last accessed: May 2013

McKinney, S. (2012) Religious Education in Scotland. In Barnes, L. Philip (2012) *Debates in Religious Education.* Abingdon: Routledge pp. 39-44

- (2011) A Rationale for Catholic Schools. In Franchi, L. and McKinney, S. (Eds.) (2011) *A Companion to Catholic Education.* Leominster: Gracewing pp. 147-161

- (2008 a) Catholic Education in Scotland. In Bryce, T. Humes, W. (Eds.) (2008) *Scottish Education Beyond Devolution.* 3rd edition Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

- (Ed.) (2008 b) *Faith Schools in the Twenty-first Century.* Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press Ltd.

McKinney, S. and Hill, R. Jesus as Teacher: Reading the Gospels from a New Perspective. In McKinney, S. and Sullivan, R. (Eds.) (2013) *Education in a Catholic Perspective.* Aldershot: Ashgate pp. 81-94

McLaughlin, T. (2003) Education, Spirituality and the Common School. In Carr, D. and Haldane, J. (Eds.) (2003) *Spirituality, Philosophy and Education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer pp. 185-199

Mersch, E. (1951) *The Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ*. London: Herder. (Translated by Cyril Vollert.)

Mill, John Stuart Inaugural Address Delivered to the University of St. Andrews in Mooney, T. and Nowacki, M (2011) (2011) *Understanding Teaching and Learning Classic Texts on Education by Augustine, Aquinas, Newman and Mill.* Exeter: Imprint Academic

Mongoven, A. (2000) *The Prophetic Spirit of Catechesis.* New Jersey: Paulist Press

Mooney, T. and Nowacki, M (2011) (Eds.) *Understanding Teaching and Learning Classic Texts on Education by Augustine, Aquinas, Newman and Mill*. Exeter: Imprint Academic

Moran, G. (2008) Religious Education. In 'Curren, R. (Ed.) (2008) *A Companion to the Philosophy of Education.* Oxford: Blackwell

- (1974) The Intersection of Religion and Education. *Religious Education* 69 (5) pp. 531-541

- (1971) *Design for Religion.* London: Search Press

- (1967) *Theology of Revelation.* London: Burns and Oates

Morey, M. (2012) Education in a Catholic Framework. In Piderit, J. and Morey, M. (Eds.) (2012) *Teaching the Tradition: Academic Themes in Academic Disciplines.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 397-416

Mott-Thornton, K. (2003) Spirituality, Pluralism and the Limits of the Common School. In Carr, D. and Haldane, J. (Eds.) (2003) *Spirituality, Philosophy and Education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer pp. 200-212

Nebreda, A. (1983) East Asian Study Week on Mission Catechetics, 1962. In Warren, M. (Ed.) (1983) *Source Book for Modern Catechetics*. Minnesota: Saint Mary's Press

New Catholic Encyclopedia (1967) Vol XIII (Scu-Tex). London: McGraw Hill Book Company

Newman, John H. (1878: 2003) *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press

Nichols, A. (2002) *Discovering Aquinas.* London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.

- (1998) *Catholic Thought Since the Enlightenment-A Survey*. Leominster Gracewing

Nichols, K. (1978) *Guidelines for Religious Education*: *Cornerstones*. Slough: St. Paul

Nolan, L. (2007) Scaling the Heights of Heaven: Sister M. Rosalie Walsh and the Use of Story in the Adaptive Way. *Religious Education* 102 (3) pp. 314 – 327

O'Brien, T. and Guirney, D. (2004) *Differentiation in Teaching and Learning: Principles and Practice.* New York/London: Continuum

O'Collins, G. (2012) Ressourcement and Vatican II**.** In Flynn, G. and Murray, P. (Eds.) with the assistance of Kelly, P. (2012) *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

O'Donoghue, T. (2012) *Catholic Teaching Brothers –Their Life in the English-Speaking World 1891-1965*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

- (2004) *Come Follow Me and Forsake Temptation-Catholic Schooling and the Retention of Teachers for Religious Teaching Orders, 1922-1965.* Berne: Peter Lang

O'Grady, K. (2005) Professor Ninian Smart, Phenomenology and Religious Education. *British Journal of Religious Education* 27 (3) pp. 227-237

O'Hagan, F. and Davis, R. (2007) Forging the Compact of Church and State in the Development of Catholic Education in the late Nineteenth Century Scotland. *The Innes Review* 58 (1) pp. 72-94

O'Malley, J. (1993) *The First Jesuits.* USA: Harvard University Press

Ocariz, F. (2011) Adhesion to the Second Vatican Council. *L'Osservatore Romano.* December 5 2012

Orme, N. (2006) *Medieval Schools from Roman Britain to Renaissance England.* New York: Yale University Press

Orsy, L. (1987) *The Church: Learning and Teaching; Magisterium; Assent Dissent and Academic Freedom.* Delaware 1850: Michael Glazer Inc.

Padberg, J. (2000) Development of the *Ratio Studiorum.* In Duminuco, V. (Ed.) (2000) *The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum 40th Anniversary Perspectives.* Fordham University Press

Papadoyannakis, Y. (2006) Instruction by Question and Answer: The Case of Late Antique and Byzantine Erotapokriseis. In Fitzgerald Johnson, S (Ed.) (2006) *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism.* Aldershot: Ashgate

Paterson, L. (2012) Have We An Excellent Curriculum or Not? *The Scotsman.* March 23 2012

- (2003) *Scottish Education in the Twentieth Century.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Paul VI, Pope (1975) *Evangelii Nuntiandi.* Apostolic Exhortation. London: Catholic Truth Society

Piderit, J. and Morey, M. (Eds.) (2012) *Teaching the Tradition: Academic Themes in Academic Disciplines.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Piltz, A. (1981) *The World of Medieval Learning.* Oxford: Blackwell. (Translated by David Jones.)

Pius X, Pope St. (1908) *Catechism of Pope Pius X.*
Text available at *http://www.ewtn.com/library/catechsm/piusxcat.htm*
Last accessed: May 2013

- *(1907* a) *Lamentabili Sane.* Encyclical Letter
http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius10/p10lamen.htm
Last accessed: May 2013

- (1907 b) *Pascendi Dominici Gregis.* Encyclical Letter
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_x/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-x_enc_19070908_pascendi-dominici-gregis_en.html
Last accessed: May 2013

- (1905) *Acerbo Nimis.* Encyclical Letter

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_x/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-x_enc_15041905_acerbo-nimis_en.html
Last accessed: May 2013

- (1903) *Tra le Sollecitudini* Motu Proprio

http://www.adoremus.org/MotuProprio.html

Last accessed: May 2013

Pius XI, Pope (1929) *Divini Illius Magistri.* Encyclical Letter http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121929_divini-illius-magistri_en.html Last accessed: May 2013

Pius XII, Pope (1947) *Mediator Dei.* Encyclical Letter http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei_en.html Last accessed June 2013

- (1943) *Mystici Corporis Christi*. Encyclical Letter http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi_en.html Last accessed June 2013

Po-chia Hsia, R. (2005) *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540-1770.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Podgen, A. (2013) *The Enlightenment and Why It Still Matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polycarp, Letter to the Philippians. In Louth, A. & Staniforth, M. (Eds.) (1987) *Early Christian Writings.* London: Penguin

Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue (1991) *Dialogue and Proclamation Reflection and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/documents/rc_pc_interelg_doc_19051991_dialogue-and-proclamatio_en.htmlLast accessed: May 2013

Porter, R. (2001) *The Enlightenment.* Hampshire: Palgrave

Pottmeyer, H. (1998) *Towards a Papacy in Communion:Perspectives from Vatican Councils 1 and 2*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company

Power, E. (1991) *A Legacy of Learning A History of Western Education.* New York: State University of New York Press

Priestley, M. and Humes, W. (2010) The Development of Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence: Amnesia or Déjà Vu? *Oxford Review of Education* 36 (3) pp. 345-361

Priestley, M. and Minty, S. (2012) *Developing Curriculum for Excellence: Summary of Findings from Research Undertaken in a Scottish Local Authority.* University of Stirling: School of Education PDF
http://www.ioe.stir.ac.uk/research/projects/documents/StirlingCfEresearch-report_March2012.pdf Last accessed June 2013

Priestley, M. (2012 a) *Curriculum for Excellence and the Question of Knowledge* – blog post June 13 2012 http://mrpriestley.wordpress.com/
Last accessed June 2013

(2012 b) *Teacher Beliefs and Curricular Development* blog post
http://mrpriestley.wordpress.com/tag/curriculum-for-excellence/
Last accessed December 2013

Print, M. (1993) *Curriculum Design and Development.* Crows Nest NSW: Allen and Unwin

Rainey Harper, W. (1903) The Scope and Purpose of the New Organization. Originally published in: *The Religious Education Association: Proceedings of the*

First Convention, Chicago 1903: Chicago The Religious Education Association pp. 230-240

Rahner, K. (1966) *Theological Investigations Vol. V* (Later writings). London: Darton, Longman and Todd. (Translated by Karl –H Kruger.)

Rahner, K. and Schillebeeckx (1965) General Introduction. *Concilium* vol. 1 (1)

Ratio Studiorum. (16th century/1970) (Translated by Allan Farrell)
http://www.hist.umn.edu/shank/hist3281/RatioStudiorum.html
Last accessed June 2013

Rausch, T. (2012) Catholic Anthropology. In Piderit, J. and Morey, M. (Eds.) (2012) *Teaching the Tradition: Academic Themes in Academic Disciplines.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 31-45

Reinhard, W. (1989) Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: a Reassessment. *The Catholic Historical Review* 75 (3) pp. 383-404

Robinson, L. (2011) Contemporary Approaches to Religious Education. In Franchi, L. and McKinney, S. (Eds.)(2011) *A Companion to Catholic Education.* Leominster: Gracewing pp. 162-180

Rossiter, G. (2005) International Perspectives on Catholic Religious Education: An Interview with Dr. Gerard Rummery. *Journal of Religious Education* 53(2) pp. 19-23

- (1998) The Centrality of the Concept of Faith Development in Catholic School Religious Education. *Word in Life* 46 (1) pp. 20-27)

- (1988) Perspectives on Change in Catholic Religious Education Since the Second Vatican Council. *Religious Education* 83 (2) pp. 264-276

- (1982) The Need for a Creative Divorce between Catechesis and Religious Education in Catholic Schools. *Religious Education* 77 (1) pp. 21-40

- (1981) Stifling Union or Creative Disparity? The Future Relationship between Catechesis and Religious Education in Catholic Schools. *Word in Life* 29 (4) pp. 162-173

Royal Society of Edinburgh (2008) *Comments on Curriculum for Excellence draft experiences and outcomes for Literacy and English, for Expressive Arts and for Social Studies.*
http://www.royalsoced.org.uk/cms/files/advice-papers/2008/CFE_literacy.pdf
Last accessed December 2013

Ruddy, C. (2012) *Ressourcement* and the *Enduring Legacy* of Post-Tridentine Theology. In Flynn, G. and Murray, P. (Eds.) with the assistance of Kelly, P. (2012) *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ruff, D. (2002) From Kerygma to Catechesis –Josef Jungmann's 'Good News, Yesterday and Today'. *The Living Light* 39 (1) pp. 62-73

Rummell, E. (2004) *Erasmus.* London/New York Continuum Books

Rummery, G. (2001) *Catechesis and Religious Education in Pluralist Society: Revisited.* An address to `the Second National Symposium on Religious Education and Ministry, Sancta Sophia College, Sydney
http://203.10.46.30/ren/reflag/symp/rummery.pdf
Last accessed: June 2013

- (1975) *Catechesis and Religious Education in a Pluralist Society.* Sydney: EJ Dwyer

Ryan, M. (2008 a) Including Students who are not Catholic in Catholic Schools: Problems, Issues and Responses. In McKinney, S. (Ed.) (2008) *Faith Schools in the Twenty-first Century.* Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press Ltd.

Rymarz, R. (2012) Faithful Dissent and Religious Education in Canadian Catholic Schools: A Response to McDonough. *International Studies in Catholic Education* 4 (1) pp. 82-91

- (2011) Catechesis and Religious Education in Canadian Catholic Schools. *Religious Education* 106 (5) pp. 537-549

Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments (1910) *Quam Singulari* http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius10/p10quam.htm Last accessed: June 2013

Salmond, A. (2008) *Cardinal Winning Education Lecture*. University of Glasgow http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Speeches/Speeches/First-Minister/cardwinlecture Last accessed: June 2013

Scaglione, A (1986) *The Liberal Arts and the Jesuit College System.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Schall, J. (2008) *The Mind That Is Catholic: Philosophical and Political Essays.* Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press

Schmaus, M. (1968/1995) *Dogma 1 God in Revelation.* London: Sheed and Ward

Schonborn, C. (2008) By Whose Authority? In Willey, P., Cointet, P., and Morgan, B. (Eds.) (2008) *The Catechism of the Catholic Church and the Craft of Catechesis.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Schwab, A. (2012) From a Way of Reading to a Way of Life: Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazanius about Poetry in Christian Education. In Tanaseanu-

Dobler, I. and Dobler, M. (Eds.) (2012) *Religious Education in Pre Modern Europe.* Boston: Brill pp. 147-162

Scott, K. (1984) Three Traditions of Religious Education. *Religious Education* 79 (3) pp. 323-339

- (1982) Religious Education and Professional Religious Education: A Conflict of Interest? *Religious Education* 77(6) pp. 587-603

Scottish Catholic Education Service (SCES (2011a) *This is Our Faith …*

- (2011b) *Having Faith in the Curriculum* http://www.sces.uk.com/curriculum-guidance.html Last accessed: June 2013

- (2009) *Shining the Light of Christ* http://www.sces.uk.com/shining-the-light-of-christ.html Last accessed: June 2013

- (2008) *Curriculum for Excellence: Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools Cover Paper This is Our Faith: Guidance on the Teaching of `Religious Education in Catholic Schools*

Scottish Education Department (1972) *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools* (Millar Report). Edinburgh: HMSO

Scottish Office Education Department/Scottish Catholic Education Commission (1994) *Religious Education 5-14 Roman Catholic Schools.*

Seasoltz, K. (2005) *A Sense of the Sacred* New York/London: Continuum

Second Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC II) (1991) *The Church as Communion.*

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/angl-comm-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19900906_church-communion_en.htmlLast accessed May 2013

Second Vatican Council – The following documents are in Flannery, A. (Ed.) (1987*) Vatican Council II The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents Study Edition*. New York: Costello Publishing Company

- (1965) *Nostra Aetate* – Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions

- (1965) *Apostolicam Actuositatem* –Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity

- (1965) *Christus Dominus* – Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church

- (1965) *Gaudium et Spes* – Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World

- (1965) *Perfectae Caritatis* - Decree on the Adaptation and Renewal of Religious Life

- (1965) *Gravissimum Educationis* –Declaration on Christian Education

- (1965) *Dei Verbum* – Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation

- (1964) *Lumen Gentium* – Dogmatic Constitution on the Church

- (1963) *Sacrosanctum Concilium* - The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy

Shank, G. and Brown, L. (2007) *Exploring Educational Research Literacy*. London: Routledge

Shannon, C. (2008) A Catholic Approach to History. *The Catholic Social Science Review* 13 pp. 9-25

Sheldrake, P. (2007) *A Brief History of Spirituality.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Skeie, G. (1995) Plurality and Pluralism: A Challenge for Religious Education. *British Journal of Religious Education* 17(2) pp. 84-91

Sloyan, G. (1958) Religious Education from Early Christianity to Medieval Times. In Sloyan, G. (Ed.) (1958) *Shaping the Christian Message-Essays in Religious Education*. New York: MacMillan. pp 3-37

Smart, N. (1987) *Religion and the Western Mind*. London: MacMillan

- (1973) *The Phenomenon of Religion.* London and Oxford: Mowbrays

- (1968) *Secular Education and the Logic of Religion.* London: Faber and Faber

Standish, P. (1998) Learning by Heart. In Blake, E., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., Standish, P. (1998) *Thinking Again Education After Postmodernism.* Westport: Bergin and Garvey

Stern, J. (2006) *Teaching Religious Education.* London: Continuum

Strange, W. (2006) *Children in the Early Church.* Milton Keynes: Paternoster

Strhan, A. (2010) A Religious Education Otherwise? An Examination and Proposed Interruption of Current British Practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 44 (1) pp. 23-44

Stroik, D. (2009) Domus Dei et Domus Ecclesiae: The Church Building As a Sacred Place. In Whitehead, K. (Ed.) (2009) *Sacrosanctum Concilium and the Reform of the Liturgy.* Chicago: Fellowship of Catholic Scholarsr

Stortz, M. (2001) When Was Your Servant Innocent? Augustine on Childhood. In Bunge, J. (Ed.) (2001) *The Child in Christian Thought.* Cambridge: Eermans Publishing Company

Sullivan, F. (1985) *Magisterium - Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church.* Dublin: Gill and MacMillan

Sullivan, J. (2007) Dismembering and Remembering Religious Education. In Felderhof, M., Thomson, P., Torevell, D. (Eds.) (2007) *Inspiring Faith in School:Studies in Religious Education.* Aldershot: Ashgate

- (2001) *Catholic Education Distinctive and Inclusive.* London: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Synod of Bishops XIII Ordinary General Assembly (2012 a) *Instrumentum Laboris for the Synod on the New Evangelisation*
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20120619_instrumentum-xiii_en.html Last accessed: June 2013

- *(2012 b) Post-Synodal Propositions from the Synod of the New Evangelisation.* http://www.zenit.org/article-35831?l=english
  Last accessed: June 2013

- (2011) *The New Evangelisation for the Transmission of the Christian Faith.*
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20110202_lineamenta-xiii-assembly_en.html Last accessed: June 2013

- (1985) Second Extraordinary Synod *The Church, in the Word of God, Celebrates the Mysteries of Christ.*

http://www.saint-mike.org/library/synod_bishops/final_report1985.html
Last accessed: June 2013

Tamir, Y. (2008) Education and the Politics of Identity. In Curren, R. (2008) (Ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of Education.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Tartaglia, P. (2011) Christology. In Franchi, L. and McKinney, S. (2011) (Eds.) *A Companion to Catholic Education.* Leominster: Gracewing

Tartaglia, P. (2008) *Address to Teacher-Catechists.*
http://www.paisleydiocese.org.uk/081030%20Talk%20p4%20Teachers.htm
Last accessed: June 2013

Tertullian (on-line) *De Spectaculis (On the Shows).*

http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0303.htm Last accessed June 2013

Tjorhom, O. (2010) The Ecclesiology Of Communion: On The Church As A Vertically Grounded, Socially Directed And Ecumenically Committed Fellowship. *The Heythrop Journal* 51 (5) pp. 893-900

Topping, R. (2012) *Happiness and Wisdom: Augustine's Early Theology of Education*. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Traina, C. (2001) A Person in the Making: Thomas Aquinas on Children and Childhood. In Bunge, J. (Ed.) (2001) *The Child in Christian Thought.* Cambridge: Eermans Publishing Company. pp 103-133

Tertullian (on-line) *On Baptism.*
http://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/fathers/view.cfm?recnum=1675 Last accessed: June 2013

Tillich, I. (2000) *Deschooling Society.* London: Calder and Boyars

Vitz, E. (2005) Liturgy as Education in the Middle Ages. In Begley, R. and Koterski, J. (Eds.) (2005) *Medieval Education.* New York: Fordham University Press

Vogt, H. (1980) Liturgy, Care of Souls, Piety. In Jedin, H. Dolan, J. (Eds.) (1980) *History of the Church Vol. II and of the Church Between Nicaea and Chalcedon.* London: Burns and Oates, pp. 658-689. (Translated by Anselm Biggs.)
Walsh, M. (2012) The Myth of Rerum Novarum. *New Blackfriars* 93 (1044) pp. 155-162

Warren, M. (1981) Catechesis, An Enriching Category for Religious Education. *Religious Education* 76 (2) pp.115-127

Whaling, F. (1980) Religious Education in Scotland: A Critical Review of the SCCORE Report. *British Journal of Religious Education* 3(1) pp. 17-23

Willey, P. (2009) *Introductory Paper to the Catechetical Conference on the Pedagogy of God* – unpublished

Willey, P. de Cointet, P. Morgan, B. (2008) *The Catechism of the Catholic Church and the Craft of Catechesis.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Williams, H. (2010) *Emperor of the West: Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire.* London: Quercus

Winch, C. (1996) Constructing Worthwhile Curricula. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 30 (1)

Wrenn, M. (1991) *Catechisms and Controversies Religious Education in the post-Conciliar Years.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Wrenn, M. and Whitehead, K. (1997) *Flawed Expectations the Reception of the Catechism of the Catholic Church.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Wright, A, (2007) *Critical Religious Education, Multiculturalism and the Pursuit of Truth.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press

- (2000) *Spirituality and Education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer

Yarnold, E. (2000) *Cyril of Jerusalem*. London: Routledge