

Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology (DSPT)
Syllabus for STHS-4141 – 20th & 21st c. Roman Catholic Theologies
Fall Semester 2018 • Mondays, 12:40 pm to 3:30 pm • DSPT room TBD

Fr. Bryan Kromholtz, OP (DSPT), available at office, DSPT East room 120, during office hours (posted on door), or by appointment • 510-883-7151 • bkromholtz@dspt.edu

DESCRIPTION: This course is an introduction to currents in 20th-century and 21st-century Roman Catholic theology, including overviews of pre-conciliar neoscholasticism, the efforts labeled as “nouvelle theologie,” results from and reactions to Vatican-II, as well as more recent developments such as post-modern, personalistic, and analytic theologies, and recent Thomistic theology. A significant portion of the course content will be determined by the participants’ interests. Format: Lecture/discussion and student-led seminar. Requirements: presentations, and a research paper of 5000-7000 words. Intended Audience: Advanced MA Theology and doctoral students; advanced MDiv or other graduate students admitted with instructor’s permission.

COURSE GOALS AND OUTCOMES: The historical contexts of the debates over these issues will be an integral part of the course; nevertheless, the focus will be on the systematic conceptions of these issues and their relevance for today and for the future. Thus, the course will provide students with a means of evaluating their theological implications. Upon successful completion of this course, students will attain a deeper understanding of the theological currents discussed, they will be able to discuss them in oral and written form, to engage in dialogue about them, and to engage in independent academic research on them. Specifically, referring to the relevant Program Outcomes for DSPT’s MATH Program (namely, *foundations, specialization, writing, presenting, and integrating*, described at the end of this syllabus), through readings, class discussions, seminar presentations & discussion (*presenting*), and the research paper (*writing*), students will be better able:

- to describe certain key currents in 20th and 21st century RC theologies (*foundations, integrating*);
- to describe ways that philosophical outlooks are reflected in 20th and 21st century RC theologies (*specialization, integrating*);
- to describe and to analyze some positions and arguments on different sides of certain key controversies in 20th and 21st century RC theologies (*foundations, specialization, integrating*).

FORMAT: Lecture/discussion and student-led seminar; students will take turns presenting an evaluation of readings for each class, as well as leading discussions on their own work to other students in the class.

INTENDED AUDIENCE: Advanced MA Theology and doctoral students; advanced MDiv or other graduate students admitted with instructor’s permission. Doctoral students may upgrade the course to the 5000-level with SRC form.

REQUIREMENTS: (1) Attendance, (2) one to three Seminar Presentations/Discussions, and (3) a Research Proposal, Presentation, and Paper, as follows:

1. Attendance and active participation in class lecture and discussion. Any student who misses **three or more classes** cannot receive a grade for the course. (**10%** of grade)

2. Seminar Presentation(s) with Discussion. Each student, on **one to three occasions**, will offer a Seminar Presentation on a relevant topic and will lead a discussion about it with the class. (See “Guidelines for Participating in a Seminar,” below). The topic and the material concerning that topic are to be agreed upon by each presenter with me. The number of students taking the class will affect (a) how many times each student must prepare such a presentation, and (b) perhaps the assigned duration of the presentation and discussion (unless otherwise instructed, each presentation is to last 10 to 20 minutes, with discussion lasting an additional 20 to 40 minutes). The student may exercise considerable creativity in presenting material and leading discussions. If circumstances permit, a presenter may assign the other students brief texts in advance, either from class reading material or from other sources, in order to prepare the other students for his/her presentation. Each presentation is to be accompanied by a half-page written **outline** handed in to me beforehand (with a maximum length of 200 words, on one side of one page). (**20%** of grade)

3. A research Paper: This paper must be on a topic agreed upon by the professor and each student. The paper must be rather specific in what it demonstrates; however, it must also explain the relevance of the topic to broader themes in theology. The paper is to be completed according to the following sequence of tasks:

a. Possible Topics: The student proposes one or more topics to pursue. Each should be practicable and should advance the student’s own learning goals. They are to be discussed with me and with the class.

b. The Proposal: This is to be submitted to me electronically, with 200-600 words in main text, i.e., not counting notes, bibliography, etc. The filename should begin with your last name (e.g., SmithJ-Proposal). It is to include the topic title, a very brief **explanation**, including a **hypothesis** (a thesis statement, which may be changed as research progresses), a simple description of the **method** and **procedures** to be followed, the kinds of **sources** to be used, an **outline** (which can be as simple as a few “bullet points”), and a partial **bibliography** (no more than one page). No proposal will be accepted without a thesis statement. (**10%** of grade)

c. The Presentation: Near the end of the course, each student will present his or her paper’s conclusions (**10%** of grade).

d. The Paper: This is to be sent to the professor in electronic form (.doc or .docx format preferred; pdf acceptable if necessary), with 5000-7000 words in main text (i.e., not counting notes, bibliography, etc.). Its format must correspond to the latest edition of “Turabian.”¹ The filename should begin with your last name (e.g., SmithJ-Paper). It must include a **thesis statement in its introduction**, and it must be **subdivided**, with a **descriptive heading** for each subdivision. It must include (usually, in the conclusions) some account of the possible implications, application, or relevance of the paper’s topic or conclusions, for today and for the future; normally, this includes some indication of the relevance of the results to broader themes in theology as discussed in class or in theology in general. The Paper must include a

¹ Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*, 7th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

Bibliography of works that are cited within the Paper; an additional, broader bibliography (including works not cited) may be added, though it is not necessary. (50% of grade)

INSTRUCTOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES: As the instructor for this course, my main responsibilities are: (1) to present lectures and to lead discussions that help students better understand the issues related to recent Roman Catholic theology and their importance for faith and life; (2) to communicate expectations to students clearly; (3) to provide individual help outside class, during office hours when possible and at other mutually agreeable times; (4) to provide constructive feedback to students; (5) to help students relate the course to their own learning goals; and (6) to evaluate students fairly (see “Explanation of Grades” and “Research Paper Grading Criteria,” below in the syllabus).

TEXTS FOR CLASS

The professor, in discussion with the students at the first class meeting, will evaluate the interests and language abilities of the class to determine the agreed selections from the following sets of readings. Additional texts, for these or other themes related to 20th c. and 21st c. R.C. theologies, are to be prepared for each class depending on the interests of the students. As the course progresses, we (professor and students) will consider what texts to read based on the questions and interests that emerge during the course of our reading; the professor will make the final determinations in each case.

Some primary texts on “nouvelle théologie”

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. “The Fathers, the Scholastics, and Ourselves.” *Communio* (English) 24 (1997): 347-396. [orig. German: 1939]

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Presence and Thought: An Essay on the Religious Philosophy of Gregory of Nyssa*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995. Foreword, pp. 9-13. [orig. French: 1988]

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Theology of Karl Barth*. Trans. by John Drury. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971, part four, section III, “The Concept of Nature in Catholic Theology,” pp. 217-247. [orig. German: 1951]

Blondel, Maurice. *The Letter on Apologetics & History and Dogma*. Texts presented and translated by Alexander Dru and Illyd Trethowan. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994. [French original texts, 1896 and 1904, respectively]

Chenu, Marie-Dominique. “What is Theology?” In *Faith and Theology*. Trans. by Denis Hickey, 15-35. New York: Macmillan, 1968. [French original: “Position de la théologie.” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 25 (1935): 232-257]

Chenu, Marie-Dominique. *Is Theology a Science?* Trans. by A. H. N. Green-Armytage. New York: Hawthorn, 1959.

Chenu, Marie-Dominique. *Une école de théologie: le Saulchoir*. Avec les études de Giuseppe Alberigo, Étienne Fouilloux, Jean Ladrière et Jean-Pierre Jossua. Paris: Cerf, 1985. [Chenu’s orig. work: 1937; excerpts only]

- Congar, Yves [M.-J. Congar]. Reviews of R. Draguet, “Méthodes théologiques d’hier et d’aujourd’hui”; J.-F. Bonnefoy, “La théologie comme science et l’explication de la foi selon saint Thomas d’Aquin”; Louis Charlier, *Essai sur le problème théologique*; and R. Gagnebet, “La nature de la théologie speculative”; in *Bulletin Thomiste* 5 (1937-39): 490-505.
- Congar, Yves. “Attitudes towards Reform in the Church.” Trans. by Bernard Gilligan. *Cross Currents* 1.4 (1951): 80-102. [excerpts from *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église*, 1950]
- Congar, Yves. “Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église.” Trans. by Lancelot C. Sheppard. *Cross Currents* 3.4 (1953): 358-365. [excerpts from *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église*, 1950]
- Congar, Yves. *A History of Theology*. Translated and edited by Hunter Guthrie. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1968.
- Congar, Yves. *Divided Christendom: A Catholic Study of the Problem of Reunion*. Trans. by M. A. Bousfield. London: G. Bles, 1939.
- Congar, Yves. *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of the Laity*. Trans. by Donald Attwater. Revised edition. London: Chapman, 1985. [orig. French, first ed.: 1953]
- Daniélou, Jean. “Les orientations présentes de la pensée religieuse.” *Études* vol. 79, no. 249 (1946): 5-21.
- de Lubac, Henri. *At the Service of the Church: Henri de Lubac Reflects on the Circumstances that Occasioned his Writings*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993. [pp. 340-51 – includes some reactions to post-Vatican-II developments.]
- de Lubac, Henri. *Augustinianism and Modern Theology*. Trans. by Lancelot C. Sheppard. Introd. by Louis Dupré. New York: Crossroad, 2000. [orig. pub.: 1965]
- de Lubac, Henri. *Catholicism: Christ and the Common Destiny of Man*. Trans. by Lancelot C. Sheppard and Elizabeth Englund. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989.
- de Lubac, Henri. *The Mystery of the Supernatural*. Trans. by Rosemary Sheed. Introd. by David L. Schindler. New York: Crossroad, 1998. [978-0824516994]
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Reginald. “La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?” *Angelicum* 23 (1946): 126-145.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Reginald. *Reality: A Synthesis of Thomistic Thought*. Trans. by Patrick Cummins. St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1950 [1958 reprint]. [Preface & “The Nature of Theological Work,” pp. 61-70.]
- Labourdette, M.-Michel. “La théologie et ses sources.” *Revue Thomiste* 46 (1946) 353-371.
- Oakes, Edward T. “The Surnaturel Controversy: A Survey and a Response.” *Nova et Vetera (English)* 9.3 (2011): 625-656.
- Rahner, Karl. “Concerning the Relationship Between Nature and Grace.” In *Theological Investigations, vol. 1, God, Christ, Mary, and Grace*. Trans. and introd. by Cornelius Ernst, 297-317. Baltimore, MD: Helicon, 1961. [orig. German: 1953]

Some secondary sources in English on “nouvelle théologie”

- Boersma, Hans. *Nouvelle Théologie and Sacramental Ontology: A Return to Mystery*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. [Contains an extensive **bibliography**]
- Coffey, David. “Some Resources for Students of *La nouvelle théologie*.” *Philosophy & Theology* 11 (1999): 367-402.
- D’Ambrosio, Marcellino. “Ressourcement Theology, Aggiornamento, and the Hermeneutics of Tradition.” *Communio* 18 (Wint 1991): 530-55.
- Daley, Brian E. “The Nouvelle Théologie and the Patristic Revival: Sources, Symbols and the Science of Theology.” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 7.4 (Oct 2005): 362-82.
- Donnelly, Philip J. “Current Theology: On the Development of Dogma and the Supernatural.” *Theological Studies* 8.3 (Sep 1947): 471-91.
- Donnelly, Philip J. “Current Theology: Theological Opinion on the Development of Dogma and the Supernatural.” *Theological Studies* 8.4 (Dec 1947): 668-99.
- Flynn, Gabriel, and Paul D. Murray, eds. *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. [includes extensive **bibliography**]
- Jossua, Jean-Pierre. *Yves Congar: Theology in the Service of God’s People*. Chicago: Priory, 1968.
- Kerr, Fergus. *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neo-Scholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.
- Mayeski, Marie Anne. “Quaestio Disputata: Catholic Theology and the History of Exegesis.” *Theological Studies* 62.1 (March 2001): 140-53.
- Mettepenningen, Jürgen. “The ‘Third Way’ of the Modernist Crisis, Precursor of Nouvelle Théologie: Ambroise Gardeil, O.P., and Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J.” *Theological Studies* 75.4 (Dec 2014): p774-94.
- Mettepenningen, Jürgen. “Yves Congar and the ‘Monster’ of Nouvelle Théologie.” *Horizons* 37.1 (Spr 2010): 52-71.
- Mettepenningen, Jürgen. *Nouvelle Théologie – New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II*. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2010. [includes extensive **bibliography**]
- Nichols, Aidan. *Yves Congar*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse/Barlow, 1989.
- Potworowski, Christophe. *Contemplation and Incarnation: The Theology of Marie-Dominique Chenu*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.
- Schindler, David L., ed. *Hans Urs von Balthasar: His Life and Work*. San Francisco: Communio/Ignatius Press, 1991.
- Voderholzer, Rudolf. *Meet Henri de Lubac: His Life and Work*. Trans. by Michael J. Miller. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008.
- Williams, A. N. “The Future of the Past: The Contemporary Significance of the *Nouvelle Théologie*.” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 7.4 (Oct 2005): 347-61.

Recent works by Thomistic scholars and others on de Lubac and the nature/grace relation

- Bonino, Serge-Thomas, ed. *Surnaturel: A Controversy at the Heart of Twentieth-century Thomistic Thought*. Trans. by Robert Williams, trans. rev. by Matthew Levering. Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press, 2009. [original French version: 2001]
- Braine, David. "The Debate Between Henri de Lubac and His Critics," *Nova et Vetera* 6 (2008): 543–90.
- Feingold, Lawrence. "Man as Imago Dei and Capax Dei: Man's Specific Obediential Potency for Grace and Glory." In *Reason and the Rule of Faith: Conversations in the Tradition with John Paul II*, edited by Christopher J. Thompson and Steven A. Long, 197-215. Lanham, MD; Plymouth, UK: University Press of America, 2011.
- Feingold, Lawrence. *The Natural Desire to See God According to St. Thomas Aquinas and His Interpreters*. 2nd ed. Naples, FL: Sapientia Press, 2010.
- Forte, Bruno. "Nature and Grace in Henri de Lubac from *Surnaturel* to *Le mystère du Surnaturel*." *Communio* 23 (Wint 1996): 725-37.
- Healy, Nicholas. "Henri de Lubac on Nature and Grace: A Note on Some Recent Contributions to the Debate." *Communio* 35 (2008): 535-64.
- Hütter, Reinhard. "Aquinas on the Natural Desire for the Vision of God: A Relecture of Summa Contra Gentiles III, c. 25 après Henri de Lubac." *The Thomist* 73 (2009): 523-91.
- Hütter, Reinhard. "Desiderium Naturale Visionis Dei—Est autem duplex hominis beatitudo sive felicitas: Some Observations about Lawrence Feingold's and John Milbank's Recent Interventions in the Debate over the Natural Desire to See God." *Nova et Vetera* (English) 5.1 (2007): 81-131.
- Larsen, Sean. "The Politics of Desire: Two Readings of Henri de Lubac on Nature and Grace." *Modern Theology* 29.3 (Jul 2013): 279-310.
- Long, Steven A. "On the Loss, and the Recovery, of Nature as a Theonomic Principle: Reflections on the Nature/Grace Controversy," *Nova et Vetera* (English) 5 (2007): 133–83.
- Long, Steven A. *Natura Pura: On the Recovery of Nature in the Doctrine of Grace*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010.
- Malloy, Christopher J. "De Lubac on Natural Desire: Difficulties and Antitheses." *Nova et Vetera* (English) 9.3 (2011): 567-624.
- Mansini, Guy. "The Abiding Significance of De Lubac's *Surnaturel*." *The Thomist* 73 (2009): 593-619.
- McInerny, Ralph. *Praeambula fidei: Thomism and the God of the Philosophers*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006.
- Milbank, John. *The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate Concerning the Supernatural*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

- Moloney, Raymond. "De Lubac and Lonergan on the Supernatural." *Theological Studies* 69.3 (Sep 2008): 509-27.
- Mulcahy, Bernard. *Aquinas's Notion of Pure Nature and the Christian Integralism of Henri de Lubac: Not Everything is Grace*. American University Studies VII: Theology and Religion, vol. 314. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Nichols, Aidan. "Thomism and the *Nouvelle Théologie*." *The Thomist* 64 (2000), pp. 1-19.
- Oakes, Edward T. "The Paradox of Nature and Grace: On John Milbank's The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate Concerning the Supernatural." *Nova et Vetera* 4.3 (Sum 2006): 667-695.
- Torrell, Jean-Pierre. "Nature and Grace in Thomas Aquinas." In *Surnaturel: A Controversy at the Heart of Twentieth-century Thomistic Thought*, edited by Serge-Thomas Bonino, 155-90. Trans. by Robert Williams, trans. rev. by Matthew Levering. Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press, 2009. [original French version: 2001]
- White, Thomas Joseph. "Good Extrinsicism: Matthias Scheeben and the Ideal Paradigm of Nature-Grace Orthodoxy." *Nova et Vetera* 11.2 (Spr 2013): 537-563.

Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetics

- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*. Seven volumes. Edited by Joseph Fessio and John Riches. Translated by Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis, et. al. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982-89. Vol. 1, *Seeing the Form*. Trans. by Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis. [978-1586173210]
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*. Seven volumes. Edited by Joseph Fessio and John Riches. Translated by Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis, et. al. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982-89. [esp. Vol. 1, *Seeing the Form*. Trans. by Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis.]
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*. Five volumes. Translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988-98. [esp. Vol. 1, *Prolegomena*, 1988.]
- Bychkov, Oleg. *Aesthetic Revelation: Reading Ancient and Medieval Texts After Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- Bychkov, Oleg, and James Fodor, eds. *Theological Aesthetics after von Balthasar*. Ashgate Studies in Theology, Imagination and the Arts. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.
- Chia, Roland, "Theological Aesthetics or Aesthetic Theology: Some Reflections on the Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 49.1 (1996).
- García-Rivera, Alejandro. *The Community of the Beautiful: A Theological Aesthetics*. Collegetown, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

- Mongrain, Kevin. "Von Balthasar's Way from Doxology to Theology." *Theology Today* 64.1 (Apr 2007), 58-70.
- Mooney, Hilay A. *The Liberation of Consciousness: Bernard Lonergan's Theological Foundations in Dialogue with the Theological Aesthetics of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1992.
- Stoker, Wessel. "Beauty as a Theological Concept: A Critical Examination of the Aesthetics of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Gerhardus van der Leeuw." In *At the Crossroads of Art and Religion: Imagination, Commitment, Transcendence*. Edited by Hetty Zock. Leuven: Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2008.
- Takayanagi, Shun'ichi. "Hans Urs von Balthasar and Aesthetics." *Modern Schoolman* 81.2 (Jan 2004), 121-134.
- Van Erp, Stephan. *The Art of Theology: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetics and the Foundations of Faith*. Studies in Philosophical Theology 25. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2004.
- Viladesau, Richard. "The Beauty of the Cross." In *Theological Aesthetics After Hans Urs von Balthasar*, edited by Oleg Bychkov, 135-51. Oxford: Ashgate, 2008.

Analytic Theology

- Abraham, William J. *Analytic Theology: A Bibliography*. Dallas, TX: Highland Loch Press, 2012. [978-0985310264]
- Bitar, Ray Paul. "The Wisdom of Clarity and Coherence in Analytic Theology." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81.3 (Sept 2013): 578-585.
- Chignell, Andrew. "The Two (or Three) Cultures of Analytic Theology: A Roundtable." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81.3 (Sept 2013): 569-572.
- Coakley, Sarah. "On Why Analytic Theology Is Not a Club." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81.3 (Sept 2013): 601-608.
- Crisp, Oliver D. "Reason, Style, and Wisdom: More on Analytic Theology." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81.3 (Sept 2013): 609-613.
- Cross, Richard. "Analytic Theology." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 12.4 (Oct 2010): 452-463.
- Gasser, Georg. "Toward Analytic Theology: An Itinerary." *Scientia et Fides* 3.2 (2015): 23-55.
- Macdonald, Paul A., Jr. "Analytic Theology: A Summary, Evaluation, and Defense." *Modern Theology* 30.1 (Jan 2014): 32-65.
- McCall, Thomas H. *An Invitation to Analytic Theology*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015.
- Oliver, Simon. "Analytic Theology." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 12.4 (Oct 2010): 464-475.

- Rea, Michael C. "Analytic Theology: Précis." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81.3 (Sept 2013): 573-577.
- Rea, Michael C. "Analytic Theology Roundtable: Replies to Bitar, Couenhoven, and Wood." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81.3 (Sept 2013): 614-619.
- Rea, Michael C., Oliver Crisp, eds. *Analytic Theology: New Essays in the Philosophy of Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2009. [978-0-19-920356-7].
- Stump, Eleonore (Interviewee), Agustín Echavarría (Interviewer). "Analytic Theology and the Richness of Classical Theism: An Interview with Eleonore Stump." *Scripta Theologica*, 49.1 (Apr 2017): 85-95.
- Timpe, Kevin. "On Analytic Theology." *Scientia et Fides* 3.2 (2015): 9-21.

Postmodern Theology

- Boeve, Lieven. "Beyond the Modern-Anti-Modern Dilemma: *Gaudium et Spes* and Theological Method in a Postmodern Context." *Horizons* 34.2 (Fall 2007): 292-305.
- Boeve, Lieven. *Interrupting Tradition: An Essay on Christian Faith in a Postmodern Context*. Louvain; Dudley, MA: Peeters Press, 2003.
- Bonsor, Jack A. "History, Dogma, and Nature: Further Reflections on Postmodernism and Theology." *Theological Studies* 55.2 (June 1994): 295-313.
- Cahill, Lisa Sowle. "Renegotiating Aquinas: Catholic Feminist Ethics, Postmodernism, Realism, and Faith." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 43.2 (June 2015): 193-217.
- Doak, Mary. "The Politics of Radical Orthodoxy: A Catholic Critique." *Theological Studies* 68.2 (June 2007): 368-393.
- Godzieba, Anthony J. "Incarnation and Imagination: Catholic Theology of God between Heidegger and Postmodernity." In *Sacramental Presence in a Postmodern Context*, ed. Lieven Boeve and Lambert Leijssen, 279-298. Louvain: Peeters, 2001.
- Godzieba, Anthony J. "Incarnation, Theory, and Catholic Bodies: What Should Post-Postmodern Catholic Theology Look Like?" *Louvain Studies* 28.3 (Fall 2003): 217-231.
- Godzieba, Anthony J., Lieven Boeve, Michele Saracino. "Resurrection—Interruption—Transformation: Incarnation as Hermeneutical Strategy." *Theological Studies* 67.4 (Dec 2006): 777-783.
- Grenz, Stanley J., and John R. Franke. *Beyond Foundationalism: Shaping Theology in a Postmodern Context*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Hart, Kevin. *Postmodernism: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2004.
- Hemming, Laurence Paul. "What Catholic Theologians Have to Learn from Radical Orthodoxy: What Radical Orthodoxy Has to Learn from Catholic Theology." *Louvain Studies* 28.3 (Fall 2003): 232-239.
- Lowe, Walter James. "Postmodern Theology." In *Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*, ed. J. B. Webster, Kathryn Tanner, Iain R. Torrance, 617-33. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Murphy, Nancey and James Wm. McClendon, Jr. "Distinguishing Modern and Postmodern Theologies." *Modern Theology* 5.3 (Apr 1989): 191-212.
- Murray, Paul D. "On Valuing Truth in Practice: Rome's Postmodern Challenge." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 8.2 (2006): 163-83.
- Penner, Myron B. *Christianity and the Postmodern Turn: Six Views*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2005.
- Riggs, John W. *Postmodern Christianity*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Siniscalchi, Glenn B. "Postmodernism and the Need for Rational Apologetics in a Post-Conciliar Church." *Heythrop Journal* 52.5 (Sept 2011) 751-771.
- Stanley J. Grenz and John R. Franke, *Beyond Foundationalism: Shaping Theology in a Postmodern Context*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ward, Graham. *The Blackwell Companion to Postmodern Theology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Ward, Graham. *The Postmodern God: A Theological Reader*. Oxford; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.

Postliberal Theology

- DeHart, Paul J. *The Trial of the Witnesses: The Rise and Decline of Postliberal Theology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2006.
- Erikson, Stefan. "Refining the Distinction between Modern and Postmodern Theologies: The Case of Lindbeck." *Studia Theologica* 56 (2002): 152-63. [downloadable through GTU Library ATLA search]
- Lindbeck, George A. *The Church in a Postliberal Age*. Edited by James J. Buckley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003.
- Lindbeck, George A. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*. 25th anniversary ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.
- Pecknold, C. C. *Transforming Postliberal Theology: George Lindbeck, Pragmatism and Scripture*. London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2005.
- Ramelow, Tilman Anselm. *Beyond Modernism?: George Lindbeck and the Linguistic Turn in Theology*. Neuried: Ars Una, 2005.
- Vidu, Adonis. *Postliberal Theological Method: A Critical Study*. Milton Keynes (U.K.); Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2005.
- Webster, John, and George P. Schner, eds. *Theology after Liberalism: A Reader*. Oxford, UK ; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

SCHEDULE FOR THE SEMESTER

<u>Date</u>	<u>Session topic</u>	<u>Assignments due</u>
Sept 10	Course introduction (Students should arrive at class having a copy of this syllabus available for reference.)	
Sept 17	Class	
Sept 24	Class	
Oct 01	Class	Paper Topics discussed
Oct 08	Class	
Oct 15	Class	Proposal due
Oct 22	<i>No Class – Reading Week</i>	
Oct 29	Class	
Nov 05	Class	
Nov 12	Class	
Nov 19	Class	
Nov 26	Class	
Dec 03	Student Paper Presentations	
Dec 10	<i>No Class – Finals Week</i>	
Dec 21	<i>No Class – Friday, 1pm, Papers due (electronically)</i>	Papers due, 1pm

EXPLANATION OF GRADES

Grades for papers are assigned according to my “Research Paper Grading Criteria” listed on the following two pages, which are based in part on DSPT’s *Research Readiness Paper (RRP) Review Form*, as well as DSPT’s *Rubric for Life-long Learning* and *Rubric for Effective Leadership* (see the DSPT website for these Assessment forms, found among the Student Forms). The following table describes how grades are applied to students’ papers (applying analogously to presentations and other work):

<u>Grade</u>	<u>General Description</u>	<u>R.P. Grading Criteria</u>
A	Deep understanding and insights are expressed in a clear, penetrating, and engaging manner, with virtually no errors.	mostly “E”s & no “U”s
B	Content, structure, and expression are all adequate, free of significant faults.	no “U”s – or mostly “E”s with 1 or 2 “U”s
C	Significant errors or shortcomings are present, although many basic elements of the assignment are done adequately.	a few “U”s, few or no “E”s
D	Many serious deficiencies in content, structure, and expression are present, although at least a few basic elements of the assignment are done adequately.	several “U”s, few or no “E”s
F	There is a failure to execute the most basic elements of the assignment.	mostly “U”s (or no work submitted)

A summary of grade composition is given in the following table:

1. Attendance:	10%
2. Seminar Presentation(s):	20%
3b. Paper Proposal:	10%
3c. Paper Presentation:	10%
3d. Paper:	50%
<hr/>	
Total:	100%

Grading Scale: A=100, A-=97, B+=93, B=90, B-=87, C+=83, C=80, C-=77, D+=73, D=70, F=0. No late work of any kind will be accepted (except, at my discretion, for very serious reasons).

RESEARCH PAPER GRADING CRITERIA

<u>I. Style</u>	U – scholarly standards achieved <u>Unsatisfactorily</u>	S – scholarly standards achieved <u>Satisfactorily</u>	E – scholarly standards achieved w/ <u>Excellence</u>
I.a. Grammar, Spelling, Capitalization, & Punctuation	Student makes many errors in grammar, spelling, capitalization, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.	Student makes few errors in grammar, spelling, capitalization, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.	Student makes no errors in grammar, spelling, capitalization, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.
I.b. Sentence Structure	Many sentences have awkward structure or unclear content; or there is too little variation in sentence structure.	Sentences are adequately clear, but they may lack variation, or a few may be awkward.	Sentences are very clear and varied in pattern, from simple to complex.
I.c. Formatting	Student makes many errors in formatting in paper, footnotes, or documentation, and/or important information is lacking.	Student makes only a few errors in formatting in paper, footnotes, or documentation; no important information is lacking.	Student makes no errors in formatting in paper, footnotes, or documentation; all pertinent information is present.
<u>II. Use of Sources</u>	U – scholarly standards achieved <u>Unsatisfactorily</u>	S – scholarly standards achieved <u>Satisfactorily</u>	E – scholarly standards achieved w/ <u>Excellence</u>
II.a. Primary Sources	Student lacks primary sources where needed as evidence for key points.	Student uses primary sources adequately where needed for key points & for other argumentation.	Student always uses primary sources for key points & for other argumentation, very well (e.g., by extensive use).
II.b. Secondary Sources	Available secondary sources to support exposition or argumentation are lacking where needed.	Secondary sources adequately support exposition or argumentation (e.g., explaining context, background, or implications).	Secondary sources often support exposition or argumentation (e.g., explaining context, background, or implications), with distinction (e.g., by extensive use).
II.c. Accuracy	Important facts or quotations, or a significant number of them, are inaccurately reported.	Supportive facts & quotations are reported accurately, with only minor exceptions.	All supportive facts & quotations are reported accurately.
<u>III. Parts & Framework</u>	U – scholarly standards achieved <u>Unsatisfactorily</u>	S – scholarly standards achieved <u>Satisfactorily</u>	E – scholarly standards achieved w/ <u>Excellence</u>
III.a. Introduction	The Introduction does not present the essay's theme or structure, or does not preview what will be discussed.	The Introduction presents the essay's theme & structure adequately.	Introduction clearly explains the essay's theme & structure, and outlines the main points to be discussed.
III.b. Thesis Statement	A thesis statement does not appear & is not even discernible.	A thesis statement can be discerned, expressing the conclusion the paper demonstrates.	A thesis statement clearly states what conclusion the paper demonstrates.
III.c. Sequencing	Some of the arguments or support are not in an expected or logical order, making it difficult to follow the student's train of thought.	Arguments & support are provided in an order that makes it possible to follow the student's train of thought.	Arguments & support are provided in a logical order that makes it easy & interesting to follow the student's train of thought.

III.d. Headings & Divisions	Headings & divisions are absent where needed, or poorly chosen.	Headings & divisions are adequate.	Headings & divisions are well-chosen.
III.e. Conclusion	There is no true conclusion; the conclusion is either non-existent or contains mere generalities or irrelevant content.	Student's position is restated, with some consideration either of implications or areas for further exploration.	The conclusion clearly restates the student's position & important implications of that position; areas for further exploration are also noted.
IV. Content	U – scholarly standards achieved Unsatisfactorily	S – scholarly standards achieved Satisfactorily	E – scholarly standards achieved w/ Excellence
IV.a. Audience	Content or vocabulary do not fit potential readers' background.	Content & vocabulary fit potential readers' background, with minor exceptions.	Content & vocabulary fit potential readers' background.
IV.b. Analysis	Student does not adequately explain concepts, principles, or elements underlying the matter studied.	Student adequately explains concepts, principles, or elements underlying the matter studied.	Student explains well the important concepts, principles, or elements underlying the matter studied.
IV.c. Reasoning	Student's reasoning is flawed in at least one essential point, or contains several errors.	Student's reasoning is free of major errors.	Student's reasoning is free of error, & penetrating.
IV.d. Insight	Student does not adequately offer concepts or explanations that shed light on the subject matter.	Student adequately offers concepts or explanations that shed light on the subject matter.	Student offers concepts or explanations that shed light on the subject matter in a particularly creative or incisive way.
IV.e. Relevance	Student fails to point out any direct relations of the paper's ideas to the issues or concerns of contemporary Church, society, or academy.	Student briefly refers to some direct relations between the paper's ideas & the issues or concerns of contemporary Church, society, or academy.	Student explains direct relations between the paper's ideas & the issues or concerns of contemporary Church, society, or academy; or offers creative proposals showing such relations.
IV.f. Fairness	Opposing views are given inadequate or tendentious treatment (whether favorable or unfavorable).	Opposing views are stated reasonably accurately & evenhandedly.	Opposing views are stated accurately, evenhandedly, & thoroughly; or criticism of the student's chosen position is significantly addressed.

GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPATING IN A SEMINAR

Normally some specific text, or set of texts, or topic forms the basis of the discussion. The purpose of the discussion is to elicit insights, to develop a deeper understanding, to clarify the issues at stake, and to suggest areas for further exploration. Below are some guidelines, first for all Seminar Members (attendees), then for its Leader/Presenter.

For Seminar Members (non-presenters)

Preparation: Read **all** material, taking notes upon it, preparing **questions** and **comments**. Look up references to any **relevant outside material** that may interest the class.

In Class: Listen actively to the presenter, taking **notes** for questions or issues for discussion. Does the presentation capture the **key arguments** of each text? Are there **implications** of the argument that the presenter is not mentioning? Be prepared to ask the presenter about these matters – in a constructive way. Bring **relevant outside material** to the attention of the class, when appropriate.

For the Seminar Leader/Presenter

Preparation: Your presentation need not be “slick,” but it must be **organized** and **coherent**. For any passages or quotations that you want to use in your presentation, have them **marked** and **ready** for your use. Prepare in advance any **handouts** that will be needed for the discussion. Please use only what will aid discussion, limiting it to **one side of one sheet of paper** if possible: outlines, bullet-point lists, brief quotations, graphs, or diagrams can be helpful, while long texts usually are **not** helpful. If you are using any technology, prepare it, arrive early, and test it. Have a backup plan in case the technology fails (technology failure will not excuse you from presenting.) Stay within the established time limits.

The following is a **suggested outline** for leading a discussion. Your presentation may proceed differently.

I. Introduction: Usually, you **must** mention **all** of the following **four items**:

A. Tell us very briefly the outline (structure, parts) of your discussion. Announce the **time** limitations (for presentation and discussion), in line with those given by the instructor. State any conceptual **limits**, or other limits, that you may have chosen for your presentation.

B. **Who** wrote the piece or pieces under discussion, and in what year(s)? Give the relevant elements of their background or current status (give authors’ birth and death years, places active, etc.); do not repeat material if it has been included in a previous presentation.

C. What is the **context** for each text to be discussed? Is it part of a larger work? Are there any particular circumstances we need to know in order to interpret any of the texts? Mention any material beyond the readings that can help the discussion.

D. In a general way, what is the **relevance** of the issues discussed in the text(s)? How do they relate to broader issues, and to the goals of the class?

II. Contents of Texts, or Outline of the Topic: Identify the central issues at stake in the topic, and the various positions people might take on the topic. Identifying groups, people, or well-known writings that hold a particular position is also helpful. (This is a **suggested outline**; **do NOT try to cover ALL these points!**)

A. If there is a **single** reading, give a brief overview of the argument of the reading, and the author's main conclusions or positions. If there are **multiple** assigned readings, then try to connect them in addition to giving an overview of the arguments and conclusions. Do **not** simply **summarize** the reading(s)! Keep summarizing to a minimum.

B. Whether there is one text/author or many, **draw together** whatever variety is present, either in a **synthesis** (**not** a **summary**) or in a **contrast** of the various elements with one another. **One or more** of the following may help you to do this:

1. describe the **theory, system, or view of reality** presented by the author(s); or
2. describe a central **idea**, recurring theme, or "leitmotif" in a given author; or
3. offer **your own explanation**, suggesting an underlying unity or key differences; or
4. **compare & contrast** the different views that are presented, according to theories, systems, themes, or central ideas of the texts/authors.

C. If possible, go **deeper** into the issues. Any of the following may be pertinent:

1. What **sources** is a given author drawing upon? Is he or she part of a school or group with a shared outlook? Did anyone else's work strongly influence this author?
2. What is each author's **purpose**? How does the material discussed here fit within the broader goals of the author(s)?
3. Is there any particular person, group, or idea that the author is **opposing** (one or more)? Is there a **debate** that can shed light on the issues involved?
4. What has been the **reception** of the ideas of the author(s) in the academy, the church, or society? What **effect** or impact have they had?

III. Conclusions, Implications, and Remaining Difficulties

A. Recall the **main points** of the reading(s). Explain what is most important.

B. Give your **own view** on the reading(s), author(s), or topic, giving your **reasons** for it. If you are unable to come to an opinion, state briefly **why** this is difficult.

C. Indicate any important **implications** of the position(s) taken by the author(s), and of your own position if it is different from that of the author(s).

D. Note any areas that bear **further research** or thought. Refer to other material if needed.

IV. Questions or issues for discussion

Pose a few **questions**, or give some examples for **application** of the ideas you covered, that will **spark discussion**; or try to stimulate discussion in some other way.

"Guidelines" adapted from <http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~janzb/courses/seminarleading.html>, accessed 16 Feb 2012, and from syllabus, HSSP-5474 by A. Thompson, OP, 2012, DSPT.

DSPT MATH PROGRAM OUTCOMES

In the Master of Arts in Theology Program, for either the Thesis or Exam Option (here, the goals are taken from the Thesis Option, since they include within them the Exam Option Outcomes), in addition to the stated institutional goals, students develop:

MAThO-1 (***foundations***): a foundational knowledge of the fundamental areas of theological inquiry in the Roman Catholic tradition (Biblical Studies, historical theology, dogmatic theology, and moral theology);

MAThO-2 (***specialization***): a specialized knowledge of one area of theological inquiry (area of concentration) chosen by the student;

MAThO-3 (***writing***): the ability to communicate this knowledge effectively through scholarly writing;

MAThO-4 (***presenting***): the ability to communicate this knowledge effectively through oral presentations and discussions;

MAThO-5 (***integrating***): the ability to integrate contemporary theological issues with the tradition of the Catholic Church, and where possible with the theological tradition of St. Thomas Aquinas.