

Church Historians in the Service of the Church

By JOHN W. O'MALLEY

You will note that my title speaks not of Church History but of Church Historians. That variation on our theme is deliberate. It enables me to speak about what I know most immediately and vividly, myself and my colleagues who practice the discipline. It also provides an opportunity to intimate my conviction, shared by many others, that all scholarship has a personal, even autobiographical, dimension to it and that this dimension is of the utmost importance in any discussion of the nature of Church History¹.

With your permission, therefore, I will begin with the Church Historian I know best, myself. I would like to describe for you two turning points in my own life. The first occurred after my ordination to the priesthood when I decided that I wanted to study Church History. As I now recall that decision, I see that it was not motivated simply by my desire to satisfy my curiosity about the Church or by an awareness that this discipline was particularly congenial to my talents. There was something more. I shall describe that "more" by saying that I wanted to put my talents and learning, however great or small they might be, at the service of the Church and its mission, as I then perceived them. Such a desire, I now know from experience, is often present in young people who make similar decisions.

Since I believed that I already had a good grounding in the Catholic tradition, I decided to study at a university where the only programs were in general history, not Church History². I believed that in such an atmosphere I would be better able to see the Church in a wide cultural context and thus be better able to address the interaction between culture and religion that seems to be the problem of central and perennial fascination for Catholic thinkers. We often express that problem in other terms: nature/grace, reason/revelation, Church/world.

I matriculated at Harvard University and found there a director who, though himself not a believer in any religion, was sympathetic to Catholicism and to my interest in it, while at Harvard and ever afterwards, I found colleagues who wanted to study many of the same problems I did and approached them with the same basic methodology, but who were Protestants, Jews, or agnostics. Our interaction has always been mutually beneficial. They brought background, questions, and a kind of objectivity that were different from mine, just as I brought an "insider's" viewpoint and skills that they lacked. I have never hesitated to designate their work Church History, and to my knowledge, their scholarship has never been re-

fused by journals of Church History because they lacked the proper faith-commitment. Lowly facts of life like these must be taken into account, it seems to me, even when we engage in our high speculation about the true nature of our enterprise.

The second turning point in my life occurred about three years ago. Up to that time I had taught in a university. Though my university was under Catholic auspices, its program of studies in the Department of History and the methodological assumptions that the members of the department employed did not differ from those found in other American universities. For all professional purposes, the discipline of History was practiced in the same secular way.

When I decided three years ago to leave my university, I had opportunities to move into similarly secular situations. Yet, somewhat in contrast to my earlier decision about where to study, such options at this time held no attraction for me. I wanted to be, as I often explained in vague fashion to friends, "in a more theological atmosphere". Hence I was gratified to receive the invitation to teach Church History at the Weston School of Theology, which is the Jesuit institution in Cambridge, Massachusetts, dedicated in the first instance to preparing young men for ordination to the Catholic priesthood. I have been at Weston for two years and have verified to my own satisfaction that this desire as an historian to integrate historical scholarship more fully with theology can be fruitful, in ways that I will explain later on.

This autobiographical prelude puts flesh and blood on some of the theoretical questions we have been discussing these days and underscores, once again, their complexity³. It also hints at how I would propose to deal with them, as we now move away from autobiography to more theoretical considerations. I want to say, in a word, that there can be no fruitful discussion of Church History apart from the *persona* of the Church Historian. All learning and all scholarship, I repeat, are conditioned by the person who engages in them. This conditioning operates on at least three levels that deserve our attention⁴. A description of these levels will be the burden of my presentation this evening.

The first level we might call the level of historical scholarship pure and simple. It consists in the gathering and presenting of accurate information that will lead to the understanding of some specific problem. Note that understanding is the finality of this level and that the level is characterized by its determination to remain within circumscribed and verifiable limits established by the historical methodology of the discipline. This level can, nonetheless, range ever more broadly and propose hypotheses that challenge standard interpretations even of a whole era. In my own work, for instance, I have tried to establish that the Italian Renaissance was religiously and theologically significant⁵. I have thus challenged the ancient paradigm that the Counter Reformation in Italy and even in the Roman Curia was a mir-

acle of grace that marvellously restored a religious and theological fabric totally decayed. My work and its thesis invoke no faith-commitment for verification and are open for examination to all practitioners of the discipline, no matter what their religious backgrounds. We all practice Church History on this level, which is, indeed, what we conventionally mean, at least in the United States, when we use the term Church History. It is certainly the indispensable grounding of our work, even if it moves on to further levels.

This first level strives for rigor, objectivity, and methodologically verifiable conclusions. Give me a Church Historian, and he will know what I mean. Many scholars today, however, would affirm that this description of the scholarly enterprise, though correct as far as it goes, is misleading, for it omits an essential element. It omits the personality and personal commitment of the scholar and postulates a dispassion that is never verified in reality⁶. Some scholars put this point in its strongest possible terms by insisting that all scholarship is ideological in nature and that the healthiest strategy is to admit this fact openly and boldly. There is no doubt that this position was originally and most forcefully articulated in the Marxist tradition. Without passing judgment on any radical formulation of it, I surely would agree with a tempered version that learning often is, and in fact ought to be, in the service of some cause beyond the cause of learning merely for its own sake. This should be the case above all, it seems to me, for committed Christians.

In support of what I believe to be the pervasive psychological reality at the base of this position, I adduce "American Historians", i. e., my many colleagues in the USA who study the history of their own country. Most of these historians seem to pursue their speciality with the conviction that their study of it will help them or their students fashion a more authentic America of the future⁷. That, in fact, is why they study American history at all. In other words, they have a commitment to the present and future that influences their study of the past. This commitment may relate to political affiliation. In any case, it does not, necessarily and of itself, make their historical scholarship better or worse, in my viewpoint, than that of colleagues who conceivably might lack such a commitment. It might make it more penetrating for being more urgent and purposeful. It surely makes it more perilous, for it seems to endanger the objectivity that we still like to uphold as in some sense a characteristic of genuine historical scholarship. But whatever the perils of commitments like these, we must take such factors into account because they are omnipresent in historians of flesh and blood.

These considerations bring me finally to an analysis of a commitment to an institutionalized form of Christianity like Roman Catholicism. This commitment certainly has to influence the scholarship of the individual who professes it, but it does not, necessarily and of itself, make that person a better or worse historian of the Church on the level we have so far been

discussing. Moreover, I do not find that commitment to Roman Catholicism, viewed formally and in so far as it is a commitment to certain higher values, strange or idiosyncratic. Every practicing historian that I know has similar commitments that are "metahistorical". The very recognition of this fact puts us in a position to safeguard against abuses in our method into which such commitments might seduce us.

I understand a commitment to Catholicism to profess adherence in a public way to many values that are operative in all persons of good will, as *Gaudium et Spes* of Vatican Council II proclaims. Honesty is surely foremost among these values. The commitment says that the person also adheres to values that every believing Christian must support, as *Unitatis Redintegratio* similarly celebrates. Beyond these, there are relatively few values, associated for the most part with certain ecclesiological theses, that are distinctively Roman Catholic. It is on these few that the historian must especially cast his wary glances as he plies his historical trade on this first level.

I would further argue that a background in theology and a faith-commitment give the Catholic historian accessibility to some "inner" realities of the Catholic Church that our secular colleagues may miss. Under the proper circumstances, this accessibility should finally tip the scales in the Catholic historian's favor⁸. On the other hand, our colleagues have some psychological advantages over us that their different commitments help provide. Foreigners, as we all know, sometimes perceive things that natives fail to see. In both cases – natives and foreigners – there are ambivalences and dangers, and a variety of postures will assure the most comprehensive and solid results. This means that today Church History on this level is, like contemporary Biblical scholarship, "ecumenical" in its very method⁹. The ecumenical character of our discipline is a precious and remarkable achievement of the past several decades. We should make every effort to promote it, as well as to safeguard it against the neoconservatism that all bodies politic and ecclesiastical seem to be experiencing at the present time.

I have so far asserted three things. First, a theological background and personal commitment perforce affect one's historical scholarship; they help determine what the historian will be attracted to study and give him access to certain aspects of his subject that will be opaque for those who lack them. Secondly, persons who lack this specific training and a similar faith-commitment also can practice Church History in the fullest sense of the term. Thirdly, one's mettle as a Church Historian is tested, therefore, not by one's theology and faith, or by one's lack of them, but by one's ability to perceive and appropriate helpful insights into the life of the Church no matter what their origins or ideological base. In the sources the Catholic historian uses and in the research techniques he applies, he is no different from his colleagues who are not Roman Catholics. Moreover, the Church History he writes should yield the same kind of results as theirs do. Church History is vitiated, therefore, if it has to be correlated with "salvation histo-

ry", with "theological value judgments", with the course of divine providence, and with confessional ecclesiologies.

Is that the end of the matter? Are we thereby committed to purely "secular" assumptions in studying "religious" history? Have we thus so easily dispensed with the personal, even ideological, component found in scholarship? We have not. We must move to other levels. A commitment to the Christian religion in its Roman Catholic form implies much more than the possession of certain theological skills and a particular and intellectualized way of looking at the history of the Church. It implies the appropriation of a configuration of values and goals that pervade the historian's whole personality. True, this configuration supports and enhances an interest in the history of the Church, but it does much more than that. In a commitment to the Christian religion, after all, not the Christian's scholarship but his life is at stake. Hence, the commitment charges everything he does, including his academic profession, with an urgency and passion that it otherwise would lack. I believe in fact that any tendency to ignore or suppress this urgency and passion even as it relates to scholarship is abnormal and tends to neurosis.

This commitment does two things that take the historian beyond this first level of Church-historical scholarship. First of all, it raises questions beyond those that the Church Historian is capable of answering on the level we have so far been discussing. Secondly, the commitment cries out for further satisfaction and demands to be translated into practice, into action, into life. These are the two levels of our profession as Catholic Church Historians that I will treat in the rest of my presentation.

We thus come to the central issue of the "uses" to which the Catholic Church Historian can put his learning and the peculiar skills he has acquired in his discipline¹⁰. Though an understanding of some aspect of the history of the Church on the level so far discussed and a diffusion of that understanding among colleagues and students is the most immediate and obvious "use", the historian should be capable of more – in the service of authentic religion and in influence on Church policy.

I believe it is possible to apply to Church historians, therefore, the admonition that Karl Rahner addressed to systematic theologians: We cannot always be sharpening the knife; eventually we must cut¹¹. My own assessment of what Catholic Church Historians consistently do is sharpen knives that others then grasp and wield. These others – popularizers, polemicists, synthesizers, and even systematic theologians, not attuned to the delicacy of the instruments they have taken into their hands – often use them in ways we historians find abhorrent. They slash and gouge, where they should have made a fine incision. We then fume, criticize, and write nasty reviews in reaction, but surely part of the blame must be laid at our own door for not conceiving our vocation as Church Historians more broadly and boldly. We pay great attention to what and how we research. We are

remiss, however, in trying to imagine the service to which our research can legitimately be put – be put by us this time, not by others. I hope that a keener awareness of this aspect of our profession will be an outcome of our symposium.

Where and how do we “cut”? What does it mean to be of service to the Church as Church Historians? It seems to me that in a generic way this means to try to help the Church to an ever more authentic expression of itself today. “More authentic expression today” – this is a dense expression that I can only partially clarify in the few minutes that remain to me. But whatever the content packed into that expression, two tasks are clearly implied by it: discernment and action. By discussing these tasks I hope to clarify the content.

Discernment, as it is currently used in theology, denotes a subtle process of testing and choosing among a variety of goods. It thus relates to my expression, “more authentic today”. To speak of “more authentic” implies the possibility of “less authentic”. There are “more” and “less” because Church History is about human beings, who are capable of both “more” and “less”. To speak of “today” implies yesterday and tomorrow. All these terms imply change. Change is, then, the key issue whenever we speak of “more authentic expression today”.

When applied to the Church, however, “change” seems to be a word still abhorrent to many Catholics, and they prefer softer words like “development”, “updating”, and “renewal”. My students readily – perhaps all too readily – admit that the Church has sinned. They do not like to say that it has changed.

Even Catholic Church Historians sometimes have a similar nervousness about change, despite the fact that change is precisely the phenomenon that our profession teaches us to chart and that makes our work interesting. The preoccupation of Catholic Historians with continuity in the Church has often been singled out as a distinctive, and not necessarily admirable, trait. The “classic Catholic stratagem” is how one generally fair historian once described it¹².

Viewed in the broad perspective of the whole historical profession, our Catholic preoccupation with continuity may be a healthy corrective to the preoccupation, even obsession, of most of our fellow historians with change, diversity and discontinuity. I personally am inclined to hypothesize in any given instance that the continuities of traditions and institutions run deeper and are mightier than the perhaps more easily perceptible discontinuities. “*La longue durée*”, of which M. Dupront spoke yesterday, can in my opinion hardly be overemphasized. For all the radical changes that the French Revolution and its aftermath introduced into French life, for instance, certain fundamental realities that we associate with France somehow survived them. France was still France.

Still, I submit that our service within the Church as historians is closely

related to that preoccupation with change that has become the conventional hallmark of our discipline. If so, I suggest this requires a self-conscious resolution on our part to change our ways, for the Catholic tradition of historiography at least since Baronius (if not since Eusebius and Orosius) has not favored a study of discontinuities. I have expounded on this subject at some length elsewhere, and it has recently been treated from a different perspective by Klaus Schatz¹³. Nonetheless, a few words on it are in order here. To put it bluntly: we as historians must be the scholars who above all others in the Church take the historicity or changing nature of the Church seriously.

It is a changing Church, in other words, that we are dealing with when we study the past. It is a changing Church that we are living in – a Church that must make a number of contingent choices that thereby indicate what it in fact is and determine what it will become in the immediate future. The Church is what it does. I assume that you accept that premise. If you do not, there can be no discussion of our service except according to the pattern of our predecessors who put their learning at the service of apologetics for the divine and unchanging nature of the Church – as betrayed so tellingly by Pastor's famous, dramatic, and obtrusive exclamation about divine providence shining through the sinfulness of Pope Alexander VI. To do this again today accords neither with good history nor with good theology.

We must, then, wrestle with this problem of a changing Church, and we must with our colleagues in other theological disciplines work out its implications for theology and for the way the Church today addresses the problems and choices that it faces here and now. Yes, you correctly detect a change in my terminology. I now speak of our colleagues not in other areas of history but our colleagues in theology. It is at this level that the "more" in our commitment to being of service to the Church becomes practical and affects the way we go about "using" or applying the fruits of our historical methodology for the service of the Church.

As I said earlier, what we want to do is to help the Church to an ever greater authenticity today, to an ever greater authenticity in its understanding of itself and in the actions it takes because of that understanding. It is only in this context that the healthy instincts operative in programs that require Church Historians to have a good grounding in Scripture, Canon Law, Systematic Theology, and other related subjects make resoundingly good sense. Without them, the historian can arrive at valid insights into what every historian wants to know: what happened. With them, it is true, the Christian historian has tools for an insider's grasp of what happened that an outsider lacks. To stop there, however, is to deprive these skills of their fullest potential in the hands of the Church Historian. The Church Historian who is a committed Christian will put questions to history that historical method alone cannot answer, but that he – and perhaps he alone – can legitimately approach with help from these other sources.

To all these academic aids must be added another, if we are to take seriously the central teaching of *Lumen Gentium* about the Church: to them must be added the historian's striving for personal holiness and his struggle against sin in his own life. *Lumen Gentium* emphatically stated that the call to holiness was constitutive of the very nature of the Church. What the Church is about, in other words, is holiness, grace, salvation, and the overcoming of sin and death. To understand the Church means to understand these things. By their very nature these things can be understood only through some experience of them. The experience and recognition of both sin and grace in his own life should create in the Christian a *connaturalitas*, a sensitivity, for a new depth of understanding of the Church in its central definition. There must be, that is to say, a religious dimension in one's approach to a religious problem, if one is to understand that problem on its own terms.

With all these aids the historian is launched on the process of discernment. He can legitimately ask of past and present the questions that gnaw at every Christian: in the light of Christian teaching and experience was such-and-such a phenomenon good or bad, right or wrong, more or less authentically in accord with the Lord's Word; above all, what does the past mean for us Christians today? The historian is surely limited in his attempts to answer these questions by all the limits of his own culture, training, and personality, but he does have helps in addressing them that others do not have and that enable him to make judgments about Christian authenticity. This process of discerning the authentic – or the more authentic – is frightfully difficult. Yet, somebody must engage in it. Christians, after all, must understand themselves and then must act upon that understanding. This understanding is not a monolithic given, rigidly immobile for all times, places, and cultures. It is my conviction that Church Historians, through the process just described, are the best (or among the best) to undertake such service in and for the Church. The responsibility is awesome, but we should not dodge it. Henri de Lubac's *Meditation sur l'Eglise* is a familiar example of this kind of discernment from an earlier era.

When I say that we attempt to discern in the past and for the present what is more authentically Christian for the Church, I do not mean to imply that the Church has been ascending through the ages on a path of ever-increasing perfection. In fact, in so far as that pattern is applied to the development of doctrine, I believe that Church Historians have a special obligation to make systematic theologians face squarely all the difficulties inherent in it. I, for one, have never been quite satisfied with the thought that dogma can overcome history. Still less do I mean that the historian now possesses the power to map the course of God's providence in the vagaries of human behavior. These vagaries, not God's providence, are the subject of our investigation.

All that I mean by more authentic is that at any given moment in history

there is room in the Church for more honesty, more courage, more charity, more prophecy – for less hypocrisy, less bigotry, less self-concern. Further, these “mores” and “lesses” do not follow the same pattern from generation to generation or from culture to culture. We are dealing with a changing authenticity. What was a more authentically Christian option for Pope Gregory VII may no longer be so for Pope John Paul II. This is what makes our discernment or meditation such a delicate task.

Put in another way: we should conceive of our discipline as a liberating study. It frees us from the limitations of the past at the same time that it enhances our appreciation for that same past. We cannot improve on Bernard of Chartres’ phrase: dwarfs on the shoulders of giants. Our discipline, as I understand it, studies the contingencies of human existence in the past. Its task is to render past expressions of our tradition intelligible precisely as they are located in limited, unique, culturally conditioned, never-to-be-repeated situations. Its task is not, on the other hand, to render any of these contingencies sacrosanct and to insulate them from critical revision.

I propose, therefore, that we take a more aggressive stance vis-à-vis dogmatic or systematic theology. In the 1950’s and 1960’s historical considerations began to play an important role in such theology in Catholic circles. I have the disappointing impression that in the past ten years that role has considerably diminished. It surely can be argued, however, that certain tracts can be at least as competently developed by persons whose training has been primarily in historical studies as by those whose training has been primarily “philosophical”.

For instance, I myself have been teaching at Weston the basic course in ecclesiology, the tract most obviously related to Church History. I have had to have frequent recourse to my colleagues in systematics and Scripture to give the course the dimensions they most adequately provide. But I find this pattern of exchange no less satisfactory than the traditional one of their coming to us to supply weapons for their arsenal.

One obvious advantage that this pattern supplies is its ability to integrate the history of doctrine with the history of the institution. Again, the Church is what it does. We cannot allow the very life of the Church to be treated as contingencies that lap up against the so-called substance of the Church without affecting it.

Equally important, the pattern I propose can integrate both of these histories with the history of piety and religious experience. The Church is infinitely more than institution and doctrine. It is a life-related reality that is meant to touch our yearnings, our hopes, our desires, our loves, and to satisfy our mysterious hunger for God. After the centrality that *Lumen Gentium* accorded to the call to holiness in the Church, no ecclesiology (no Church History!) is adequate until it gives full recognition to that reality. The common practice, however, is to treat doctrine, institution, and religious experience as three distinct phenomena, with only casual reference to

one another. If positive, speculative, and spiritual theology are ever again to be reintegrated (according to the healthy pattern of the Fathers), the Church Historian may be the best person to effect it.

Such integration may be the most telling aspect of our role in discerning the authentic in the Christian past. Discernment here means judging the past against a "holistic" grasp of Scripture, history, and the Christian experience of sin and grace. A further problem, however, is thereby implied. *Cui bono?* Discerning for whom? The obvious answer is for ourselves – for you, for me, for our own generation. This is the third and final level of our scholarship. It is the level at which manipulation becomes easiest. It is also the moment at which our service to the Church most clearly emerges – here we see a conjoining of the tasks of interpreting the past and of deciding what we are going to do with it.

To perform this task effectively and "authentically" means that we must be as in touch with our own culture as with the past. Is this not what we hope for in all leaders in the Church, especially priests and bishops: that they be both enriched by tradition and at the same time so faithful to it that they can mediate it to the present in ways that are new? They thus help shape the future. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The discovery of truth, furthermore, is inseparable from a passion to persuade others of it. This means speaking out on issues, not letting our insights sleep in learned tomes and seminar rooms, not waiting for the fruits of our research to be exploited by others. Much has been written lately about the "public nature" of theology in the Church¹⁴. If we as Church Historians wish to participate in the theological enterprise, therefore, our practice must have a public component to it too.

This "public component" of learning is not peculiar to theology. It is, today at least, a dimension of all serious learning. The late C. P. Snow, the distinguished English physicist and author, best known for his book on *The Two Cultures*, argued strenuously for it as a responsibility of scientists in the contemporary world¹⁵. If scientists have such a responsibility (and it is difficult to see how they do not), a more pressing responsibility would seem to devolve upon theologians, whose professed function is to aid men and women to deal with ultimate concerns in the complexity of the world in which they actually live.

Perhaps in some ways I am echoing in part the message of Pope John Paul II. The English title of one of his books is *The Acting Person*¹⁶. Should not the motto on our escutcheon read: "The Acting Historian – in the Church and for the Church"? Almost a century and a half ago, Karl Marx observed that until this moment philosophers had tried to understand the world; now they must labor to change it. There are instincts within us that recoil at applying his observation to Church History and to ourselves, yet we should not dismiss them out of hand. Catholic theology has always insisted that Christian doctrine is intimately related in the theologian to

Christian practice. Orthodoxy and orthopraxis are for the Christian correlative terms. Our colleagues in "Liberation Theology" pose this truth in ways that may upset and annoy some of us. But they at least should disturb our complacency and make us ask what validity their challenge has for us as Church Historians, just as other theologians have been forced to take it into account.

In conclusion: the Church has changed and is changing, whether we like it or not. That is what we mean when we say that it is an historical reality. That change is part of the "scandal" of Christianity. Our task as historians is to interpret that change and to help mediate it so that it be as authentic as possible today. Our training and our life experience as Catholics, as Christians, uniquely fit us for this task, for change is, ultimately, what we study. We neglect the task at great peril to the Church and even to ourselves. At peril to the Church, for the Church is again at a crucial point in its history, as the past twenty years eloquently testify. At peril to ourselves, because we are human beings first, historians second. It is inhuman to be disengaged from something we love. To stand on the sidelines to cheer or jeer when we could actually be in the fray is both neurotic and cowardly.

My remarks today are not meant to be arrogant or to attribute more to our professional and spiritual capabilities than they can in fact yield. Even if we become more active and aggressive than we have been in the past, we will always be a very small part of a very big Church. We Church Historians are marginal in the life and theology of the Church today. Perhaps it will always be so. In any case, all Catholics must work together in the immense task we face. But we historians must certainly do our duty, play our part — as best we can.

¹ This viewpoint is argued at length, e.g., by *M. Polanyi*, *Personal Knowledge*, in: *Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (New York 1964) and *H. White*, *Metahistory*, in: *The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore 1973) esp. 1–42. See also *H. G. Gadamer*, *Le problème de la conscience historique* (Louvain 1963).

² See the discussion by *J. F. Wilson*, *Recent Historical Studies of Western Religion*, in: *Bulletin The Council on the Study of Religion* 10 (1979) 105–7.

³ The most thorough, recent analysis of the issues is by *K. Schatz*, *Ist Kirchengeschichte Theologie?*, in: *Theologie und Philosophie* 55 (1980) 481–513. In the course of the article Schatz also reviews the rather abundant literature on the problem that has been published in German in the last decade. The most recent treatment in the United States is by *R. M. Kingdon*, with further bibliographical indications of works in English, *The Church, Ideology or Institution*, in: *Church History* 50 (1981) 81–97. To these must certainly be added *E. Cochrane*, *What is Catholic Historiography?*, in: *The Catholic Historical Review* 61 (1975) 169–90, which contains even further bibliography for works especially in English and Italian.

⁴ These "levels" are my own, but are suggested in a general way by a number of others, e.g., *D. Sturm*, *The Learned Society and Scholarly Research, Models of Interaction*, in: *Bulletin The Council on the Study of Religion* 12 (1981) 37–41; *K. J. Winkler*, *Historians Urged to Act as "Moral Philosophers"*, in: *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (1981) 7.

⁵ See esp. my *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome* (Durham NC 1979), and *Rome and the Renaissance* (London 1981).

⁶ See, e.g., *White* (Note 1) and *Kingdon* (Note 3).

⁷ See, e.g., *F. Fitzgerald*, *America Revised*, *History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston 1979).

⁸ See, e.g., *Gadamer* (Note 1) 65–87.

⁹ See, e.g., *D. J. Harrington*, *The Ecumenical Importance of New Testament Research*, in: *Religious Book Review* 11 (1981).

¹⁰ The “uses” of history is a subject of long-standing debate. See, e.g., *P. Geyl*, *The Uses and Abuses of History* (New Haven 1955); *H. J. Muller*, *The Uses of the Past* (New York 1954); *A. L. Rowse*, *The Use of History* (London 1946).

¹¹ Quoted by *D. Tracy*, *Defending the Public Character of Theology*, in: *The Christian Century* 98 (1981) 354.

¹² *F. Oakley*, *Council over Pope* (New York 1969) 134. See also *L. Vischer*, *The Question of Contradiction and Continuity*, in: *Dialog* 5 (1966) 201–8; *M. Hoffman*, *Church History in Vatican II's Constitution on the Church, A Protestant Perspective*, in: *ThSt* 29 (1968) 191–214; *G. Maron*, *Das Schicksal der katholischen Reform im 16. Jahrhundert*, in: *ZKG* 88 (1977) 218–29.

¹³ *Schatz* (Note 3); *O'Malley*, *Reform, Historical Consciousness, and Vatican II's Agiornamento*, in: *ThSt* 32 (1971) 573–601, and *How to Get Rid of History*, in: *Woodstock Letters* 97 (1968) 394–412.

¹⁴ See *Tracy* (Note 11), and *M. E. Marty*, *The Public Church, Mainline-Evangelical-Catholic* (New York 1981).

¹⁵ *Risk of Disaster or a Certainty: The New York Times* (Monday Aug. 17 1981) A15.

¹⁶ (Boston 1979). See now also his *Towards a Philosophy of Praxis*, ed. *A. Bloch* and *G. T. Czuczka* (New York 1981).