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INTRODUCTION

FROM KERYGMA TO CATECHISM

Thought in order to be communicated must be expressed. Aside from the possibilities of extrasensory perception, it must be done in some sense-perceptible form, simply, for example, by a word, a gesture, a "look" or more complexly with highly developed formulae. Techniques of expression can, of course, be single or multi-sensory. Yet, whatever the method, ideas to be communicated successfully must be so formulated and directed as to be understood by the person[s] for whom they are intended. Certainly then, the form and content of a thought's expression must be greatly determined by the capacities of the "hearer" to receive it. This is frequently spoken of in educational literature, most particularly in the preparation of teachers, where "grading" material and providing for "individual differences" are greatly stressed. Even so, "communications" or more directly "getting-across-the-idea" remains a most vexing problem. We frequently hear "lack of communication," "cultural bias," and even "gobbledygook" charged against the most important and, presumably, carefully planned educational efforts. While the need to communicate successfully is vital to the transmission of ideas, not even the most strenuous and well-intentioned efforts are guaranteed of success.

All this is no less true of a religion's attempt to present its message. The literatures of the great world religions endeavor to communicate ideas in many different forms. Sometimes the message,
primitively expressed, comes through clearly even for the most simply furnished intelligence; in other instances, definitions, multiple commentaries, and forms of simplification are needed before some nuclear religious thought and/or its elaborations can be adequately grasped. Therefore, religious literature almost universally shows diversity and development. But, whatever genres are employed, religions have this in common: they offer a message for comprehension and acceptance. How this message can be effectively presented to achieve these desired outcomes, often in very diverse groupings, is the specific ongoing task of religious education.

This dissertation concerns itself with the catechetical effort of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States from 1784-1930. By the time the American Church undertook this work, Roman Catholic religious education had a long and varied history--one studded with accomplishments and failures. This Introduction attempts to give a detailed sweep of this catechetical history and its principal monuments. Its purpose, to show the continuity from which the American Church began.

Religious Education in Primitive Christianity

Primitive Christianity was immediately faced with the problem of how to preserve and communicate the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. The Christ had preached widely but, presumably, left no corpus of materials. Accordingly, the earliest Christians took up the task of expressing in varied forms their perceptions of what their Master had taught. Further, his seminal thought had to be expanded to meet the comprehensive
needs of those who followed his "new way" in the on-going, ever-changing life-experience. By initial necessity, then, the task of religious education was taken up by the apostolic community. One might say the most obvious result of this task is the corpus of the New Testament. Current biblical criticism generally agrees, however, that the New Testament scriptures represent a somewhat later development of even more primitive ideas and literary structures. Various efforts have been made to extract kerygma and other pre-existing forms from the text of the New Testament—where they are judged to have been subsumed. The recovery of such primitive elements is highly significant for the history of religious education because they represent the first monuments of Christian instruction.

1 The first Christians (and reportedly those who opposed them) spoke of faith and life in Jesus as the "way" or the "new way" (cf. Acts 9:2, 18:26; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22). One wonders if this was not related to the prior Jewish concept of halakah.

2 This is, of course, a primary tenet of those studies grouped under the category of form-criticism (formgeschichte), but many scholars who do not regard themselves as form-critics accept this proposition as well.

3 New Testament scholars, for some decades now, have preserved the distinction made in the scriptures themselves between the apostolic efforts "to preach" or "to proclaim" (keryssein) and "to teach" (didaskein). The "preaching," commonly referred to as kerygma, was the initial and essentially oral proclamation of the "Good News" (evangelion); simple and non-argumentative, it elicited faith in Jesus, repentance, and acceptance of Baptism. The "teaching," commonly referred to as didachē, gave further explanation and fuller development to the kerygma usually in written form. The written New Testament is largely didachē, but certain more primitive kerygmatic elements are apparent in it. The several Petrine discourses in Acts, for instance, are widely adduced as examples of the most primitive proclamation (cf. Acts 2:14-39; 3:12-26; 4:8-12; 5:30-32; 10:36-43). A similar kerygma has long been extracted from the Pauline epistles by C. H. Dodd (The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development, [New York: Harper and Brother Publisher, n.d. [1936], p. 17]). Cf. also C. H. Dodd, Gospel and Law (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), 24-45; John J. McKenzie, S.J., "'Proclamation' and 'Teaching' in the Primitive Church'," Living Light, I (No. 2, Summer, 1964), 118-36; also sources listed below in nn. 8 and 12.
It is clear that primitive Christianity first educated within the structures of Judaism. The Apostles taught in the porticos of the Temple where the Jews often gathered to discuss the Law. The first Christian missionaries, considering themselves to be the "Jews of the Jews," used the synagogue extensively in the Diaspora and almost certainly in the "Land" itself to explain the "new way" of Jesus in the light of the Torah and the Tradition of Judaism. For a time perhaps, there were synagogues in which the apostolic didache predominated. More often than not, however, the teaching of the "new way" in the synagogue became polemical and argumentative, frequently resulting in disorder and violence. This became particularly true after the wholesale reception of the "nations" (goyim) into the "way" by such as Paul and Barnabas and the shaking changes that this entailed. As the strain between "Church" and "Synagogue" increased--finally to the point of severance--Christians found it necessary to develop separate, although parallel, educational structures. For one thing, the "New Israel" entered the homes of its early adherents where the basic outline of the synagogue service was preserved in prayer, psalms,

and the reading of the Scriptures (Old and New) with the traditional explanation-application (homilia)--a structure yet maintained in Christian services. The New Testament preserves the text of early creedal formulations, narratives, and didactic hymns connected with primitive Christian liturgy and education.

As the number of those who accepted the "new way" constantly grew and the order and discipline of the Christian community increased, more formalized initiation or instruction preparatory to the reception of Baptism and Eucharist was established. This was the beginning of what has come to be called the Catechesis. The outlines of Christian religious

9Cf. rudimentary creeds in I Cor. 8:6; 12:3; 15:3-7; also Rom 1:3-4; 10:9; also I Tim. 3:16; Phil 2:6-11; Acts 2:36; II Cor. 13:14.

10There are a number of hymn texts incorporated in I and II Timothy, Philippians, Colossians, Revelations, and very possibly in the Prologue of St. John's Gospel. The New American Bible sets them forth in the text.

11In this dissertation the term "Catechesis" is used to refer to the total process of Roman Catholic religious education. The use of modifying adjectives limits its scope to time, place, or level. The term "catechesis[es]" is used to refer to a single instruction[s]. The Greek verb katechein (to instruct) is used several times actively and passively in the New Testament in connection with Christian instruction (Lk: 1-4; Acts 18:25; I Cor. 14:19; Gal 6:6; Rom 6:17; Heb 6:1-2). By the second century (ca. 150 A.D.), the noun form katēchēsis (instruction) had come to be used as the name of the increasingly formalized instruction given preparatory to the reception of Baptism and Holy Eucharist. In classical usage katechein carried with it the root-meaning "to sound down from above" (as from a stage or in a chorus). In the New Testament it clearly means "to instruct," but scholars are persuaded that it carries the connotation to instruct "aloud" which, of course, its root meaning would permit. This would fit the idea of oral kerygma. For a learned discussion of katēchein in its classical and scriptural usages, cf. H.W. Beyer, "Katēcheō" in Gerhard Kittel, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromley (6 vols.; Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans & Co., 1965), III, 638-40. The Latin verb catechizare is first found in the writings of Tertullian (ca. 200 A.D.). The noun catechismus, in the sense of catechesis, is not found until late in the next century and then in the works of St. Augustine. It is obvious that all our words with the stem "cate-" and referring to religious education come from katēchein, ultimately.
education in the first century are not yet well established, but a
number of studies have been made seeking to identify its structures
and materials.

The Catechesis of the Fathers

As Christianity grew stronger and stronger, coming in time
(even amid sporadic but severe persecution) to dominate the Graeco-
Roman ethos, its processes of instruction became fuller and yet more
formalized. During the era of the Church Fathers the Catechumenate
developed--one of the most significant developments in the total history
of religious education. This institution began its rise in the latter
second century, reached its high point in the fourth century, and suf-
fered rapid decline by the end of the fifth. While the Discipline of
the Secret (disciplina arcani) obscures our vision in the early part of
the era, the structure and materials of the Catechumenate are highly
visible. A large corpus of the patristic catecheses are readily

12 Cf. Carrington, Primitive Catechism, 31-93; idem, The Early
Christian Church (2 vols.; London: Cambridge University Press, 1958), I,
391-409, 481-501; Murphy, Moral Teaching in the Primitive Church, 8-30;
C. H. Dodd, "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus" in A. J.
(Manchester, England: University of Manchester Press, 1959), 106-18; E.
G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.,
1947), 363-466; Jan A. Muirhead, Education in the New Testament (New York:
Association Press, 1965); Sherill, Rise of Christian Education, 137-67;
Oscar Cullman, Early Christian Worship, trans. by A. Stewart Todd and

13 Cf. P. de Puniet, "Catéchuménat," Dictionnaire d'archéologie
chrétienne et de liturgie, ed. Fernand Cabrol, II (Paris: Letouzey et Ané,
1925), 2530-79. (Hereinafter cited as DACL.)

14 Cf. for instance, H. Leclercq, "Catéchêse-Catéchisme-Catéchumène,"
DACL II, 2530-2566; G. Bareille, "Catéchêse," Dictionnaire de théologie
available in English and with critical notes. Father Gerard S. Sloyan has written a most excellent essay on this period in religious education. In Sloyan's survey the catechetical writings of the Fathers, from beginning to end, are listed and instructional comments are given on many. One thing that is clearly evident in religious education as given by the Fathers is their comprehensive use of scripture and liturgy to explicate doctrine. This is especially obvious in the monumental classic of the Eastern Catechesis given by St. Cyril catholique, ed. A. Vacant et al., II (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1905), 1877-88 (hereinafter cited as DTC); M. Le Chanoine Hezard, Histoire du catéchisme depuis la naissance de l'église jusqu'à nos jours (Paris: Victor-Retaux, 1900), pp. 14-104 (hereinafter cited as Historie du catéchisme; also Jean Daniélou, SJ, La Catéchèse aux premiers siècles, rédigé par Regine du Charlot (Paris: Fayard-Mame, 1968).


of Jerusalem (ca. 350 A.D.). His catechetical lectures contain twenty-four substantial discourses given during the forty days of Lent and the week following Easter. The protocatechesis and first eighteen lectures were given in Lent to prepare the catechumens for the Sacraments they would receive in the Easter Vigil. Cyril calls for repentance and conversion; he warns of the need for "Rule of Secrecy" (disciplina arcani) and issues that timeless caveat of the teacher on the need for regular attendance. The lectures take up the dimension of Baptism (3) and Faith (4-5). In the next thirteen lectures (6-18) Cyril dwells strongly on the articles of the Palestinian Creed but nowhere gives the exact text. The five mystagogic lectures--of somewhat disputed authorship--given during Easter week explain the "Mysteries" that had been received in Baptism (19-20), Confirmation (21) and Eucharist (22-23). Continuing the earliest of traditions, strong emphasis is given the Lord's Prayer in the final discourse (24).

The writings of the Western Fathers, although filled with catecheses, contain nothing so original and extensive as the Jerusalem lectures. Rufinus of Aquileia provided what seems to be a skillful reduction of much of Cyril's material, in his Commentary on the Apostles' Creed (ca. 404 A.D.). It was widely used in the West. Similar

---

17 For the most recent translation and study, cf. The Works of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, trans. and ed. Leo P. McCauley, SJ, and Anthony A. Stephenson (2 vols.; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1969-70). (Volumes 61 and 64 in FC) It is generally held that the lectures, as extant, are transcriptions of St. Cyril's spoken word.

materials, exquisitely expressed, can be found in two works by St. Ambrose of Milan—Mysteries and Sacraments (ca. 390 A.D.)\textsuperscript{19} It remained, however, for the universal genius of St. Augustine to compose the classic on the pedagogy of religious education with his work Catechizing the Uninstructed (ca. 404 A.D.).\textsuperscript{20} The basic theme of all catechetical instruction for the Bishop of Hippo is the presentation (narratio) of God working in history for the salvation of men; for this reason his method is strongly biblical but he traces the divine interventions down to his own or "to the present time." He further outlines (expositio) the doctrine that can be found through the unfolding of history and emphasizes how this doctrine can have meaning (applicatio) in the life of the believer. The great theologian spends much time in the preparation of the catechist, discussing content, motivation, and method which are remarkably down-to-earth. After giving fifteen chapters on teacher-readiness, he offers two model instructions—a longer and very much shorter one. Augustine's catechetical theory greatly influenced religious


\textsuperscript{20} St. Augustine, The First Catechetical Instruction, trans. and ed. by Joseph P. Christopher, (Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop, 1946). (Volume 2 in ACW). This work is more often referred to by its Latin title De catechizandis rudibus. Father Christopher points out in his introductory notes that St. Augustine's treatise influenced the works of Cassiodorus and St. Isidore of Seville in the next century. Bede and Alcuin made extensive use of his text, while the De institutione clericorum of Alcuin's most distinguished pupil Rabanus Maurus (ca. 748-856) is a re-working of the Augustinian material. Christopher finds that Petrarch, Erasmus, and Vives were "steeped in Augustine's theory of education." The famous more modern catechisms of Claude Fleury (cf. below n. 84) and F. A. Pouget (cf. Chapter ii, n. 29) are strongly Augustinian. The same can be said of the Munich Method (cf. Chapter iv nn. 36-50). Cf. also Chapter ii, nn. 17-21.
education in the West down to the present. But in his celebrated treatise we find the end of the great catechumenal literature. The Book of Dialogues (ca. 593 A.D.) of Pope Gregory I was highly and long influential in Catechesis, but it featured miraculous tales and wonders of the saints rather than that biblical and liturgical emphasis so characteristic of the Fathers. In the very popular writings of St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636 A.D.), acknowledged to be the last of the Western Fathers, the specifically catechetical content is sparse.

The Catechization of the Nations

Concomitant with the decline of the formal Catechumenate, the enormous task of catechizing the Germanic and Slavic nations became increasingly incumbent on the Church. During this era, the conversion of whole tribes was common. A short preparation compressed into one


22 His large work De officiis has been referred to as the encyclopedia of the middle ages. For its catechetical sections, cf. J. B. Migne, ed., Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina (221 vols. + supplements; Paris: Garnier Fratres-J. P. Migne, 1844-1855), LXXXIV, 814-26. (Hereinafter cited, as conventionally, PL.) There is also a series graeca with 161 volumes. Migne's texts are often critically superseded in more modern sources, but for comprehensiveness and availability--his massive work is yet unsurpassed.

23 This study has been unable to find a specific work on the tribal catechization; information, however, can be found in Bareille, "Catéchêse," DTC, II 2, 1888-95; Leclerq, "Catechêse-Catéchisme-Catéchumène," DACL, II 2, 2566-70; and Hezard, Histoire du catéchisme, 105-36. Migne also contains several indices on the matter "praedicationis evangelii et conversationis gentium" (PL 219:527ff).
or two weeks was standard for these group baptisms. In the patristic epoch religious instruction had been largely pre-baptismal and often lasted for several years; but for some time now, even in the oldest parts of the empire, the emphasis in religious education had shifted to post-baptismal instruction, principally due to the rise of infant baptism. With the tribal migrations, however, this emphasis became fixed. During these times, a considerable number of directives came from bishops, synods, and the Holy See that the instruction of the baptized be continued even in such troubled times. The catecheses of the great missionaries are not extant but there are existing monumenta relative to the period, many of them of Anglo-Saxon origin or reference.


Cf. Raymond J. Jansen, Canonical Provisions for Catechetical Instructions (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1937), pp. 11-17. Some authors point to ecclesiastical legislation on catechizing as an indication that at that time instruction was not being given, etc. This may be true but not necessarily. Sometimes, the legislation merely canonizes regular procedure and does not institute it. As a case in point, the present author knows of several American dioceses where in the 1950's the most elaborate and compelling catechetical legislation was executed by synods. In each of these diocese, the lethargy of the human condition admitted, religious instruction was already strongly and regularly given.

Cf. Johann Schilter, "Monumenta catechetica theistica" in Thesaurus antiquitatum teutonicarum ecclesiasticarum civilium literarium, I (pars altera), (Ulm: Danielae Bartolomaei, 1727), 75-89; also George Hickes, Linguarum vett. septentronalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus (II t.; Oxford: e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1705). Schilter gives references to prior collections; the materials are scattered throughout Bishop Hickes' work. Cf. also Dorothy Whitelock, ed., English Historical Documents c. 500-1042, Vol. I in English Historical Documents, gen. ed.
With the forceful support of Charlemagne the catechization of the populace continued but with minimal content. The memorization of the Decalogue, the Creed, and the Pater were stressed but further instruction as to their meaning and content seems often to have been lacking due to the unsettled conditions of the times.

The Medieval Epoch

During the early medieval centuries emphasis was placed on lists of longer and shorter sins as an instructional technique for moral education. Along with the Decalogue, the mystical number seven became an increasingly popular teaching device, viz., the seven sacraments, the seven principal virtues and seven principal vices, the seven petitions of the Pater, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, etc. One of the most interesting examples of religious instruction found in the


27 In 811, for instance, the emperor circulated each archbishop or metropolitan, asking what ceremonies and instructions surrounded Baptism in their provinces (PL 98: 933, 938-40). His imperial visitors (missi dominici) stressed the necessity of catechizing and being catechized in each village they inspected; for an instructive account of this, cf. Joseph Lecler, The Two Sovereignties (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), 30-31. Cf. also the program of catechization in Rabanus Maurus, De ecclesiastica disciplina, PL 112:1214-22.


29 While there were many smaller manuals, the most sophisticated development of this theme is found in Hugh of St. Victor, De quinque septenis seu septenariis, PL 175: 406-14 and later in St. Edmund of Abington, Speculum ecclesiae (for the availability of this work of C. H. Lawrence, "Edmund of Abington, St.," NCE, IV, 109).
Carolingian era is the **Liber manualis (ca. 841-843)** written by Dhuoda to her son, a page at the court of Charles the Bald. At the end of the century and representative of the emerging theological method of the Schoolmen, the **Disputatio puerorum per interrogationes et responsiones (ca. 900 A.D.)** had widespread influence in future catechetics. Once attributed to Alcuin of York, the **Disputatio** is a vast work based on a question and answer technique directed to the hands of the catechist; the same pattern is fully used four centuries later in the prestigious **Elucidarium (ca. 1250)** attributed to Honorius of Autun. Another important monument of medieval religious education and one of special interest in the history of the English-language Catechesis is found in the enactments of John of Thoresby, Cardinal Archbishop of York. Thoresby caused catechetical legislation traditional to England to be restated with special force by the Convocation of York in 1357. The northern primate appended a required set of catecheses to the statutes. This had been done before, particularly by the Franciscan archbishop of Canterbury, John Peckham in 1281; but what makes Thoresby's instruction unusual is that he had it translated into English rude verse for wider use and comprehension. It may also have been used in the drama (Mysteries) of the York Minister. The Latin and

---


English texts are available in critical edition.

From the first decades of the thirteenth century, the Catechesis was widely implemented by the mendicant friars. Although such works as the Catechetical Instructions (1273) of St. Thomas Aquinas are preserved for us, they are not completely representative of the mendicant preaching. The bulk of the mendicant preaching more characteristically elaborated on a theological thrust provided by St. Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), one which greatly stressed the human element in the divine mysteries—a thrust which carried its own catechetical blessings and curses.

We know that in the latter middle ages, the perennial tension between the rational and affective in Christian theology became particularly exacerbated. The whole movement of the Devotio Moderna is witness to this. The struggle touched religious education as well. Perhaps a mediator, albeit a turbulent one, in this polarization of the late medieval Catechesis can be found in Jean le Charlier de Gerson (d. 1429). While chancellor of the University of Paris, he urged the theology faculties to publish little popular instructional works paralleling those issued by their

33 T. F. Simmons and H. E. Nolloth, The Lay-Folks Catechism or the English and Latin Versions of Archbishop Thoresby's Instruction for the People (London: Early English Text Society, 1902). This work also contains Wycliff's unlicensed revisions of de Thoresby's text and the Lambeth legislation (1281) of Archbishop John Peckham (cf. above in the text). Cf. also Dom Francis A. Gasquet, "Religious Instruction in England during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," Dublin Review, CXIII (October, 1893), 886-914 and idem, "How Our Fathers Were Taught in Catholic Days," Dublin Review, CXX (April, 1897), 245-65. These essays were reprinted a number of times. Cardinal Gasquet was a combination historian and apologist. Not all agreed with his findings and conclusions, but these essays are still the single most informative source on this subject.

medical colleagues during a recent outbreak of plague. He led the way with his Opusculum tripertium de praecptis decalogi de confessione et de arte moriendi composed for pastors but directed toward the use of people. In the work Gerson called for the use of tabulae where material reprinted from the Opusculum would be mounted as a kind of visual aid in public places. Many took his suggestion. When deposed from the chancellorship, he took up a more directly pastoral mission in catechizing the young of Lyons and produced in this last period of his life L'ABC des simples gens (ante 1420). Gerson had put forth his catechetical theory and apologia in an earlier work Tractatus de parvulis trahendis ad Christum (ca. 1415).

In fine, the medieval epoch in religious education cannot be spoken of without strong reference to the symbolization of doctrine in liturgy, drama, and cathedral. The marked catechetical influence of

---

35 Joannes Gerson, Opera omnia[etc.], ed. Ellies Du Pin (IV t.; Antwerp: Sumptibus Societatis, 1706), I, 426-50. This study examined the Opera on microfilm in "Manuscripta of rare and out-of-print books" (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana), Lista 39, 15, 15 A-D.


39 For a more contemporary work on this celebrated theme, cf. O. B. Hardison, Jr., Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama (Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins Press, 1965). The many so-called "coffee-table books," now so available, on the European cathedrals clearly illustrate the catechesis of art.
home and society must also be stressed.

**Reformation and Catechism**

With due regard to the impact of the catechesis of milieu in the Middle Ages, the closing of that era witnessed abundant religious ignorance in the populace. While this deplorable condition can be attributed to a complexity of factors, a lack of continuing formal instruction was surely a principal one. This can be admitted, all polemics aside. The situation hardly improved in the Renaissance even with the domination of the arts by religious themes. Jungmann judges this lack of formal catechesis left the bulk of the people "mentally immature" in theological knowledge and understanding; they were, for this reason, unable to distinguish the accidental from the essential in religion; further, their instructors very often lacked "the informing spirit" which could comprehend the essence of their authentic religious heritage "from unhealthy accretions." Whatever the background or its historical reasons, however, the various reformers gave strong emphasis to popular religious education. This was particularly true of Martin Luther who put a major

---

40 This idea is developed in its positive and negative aspects by Josef A. Jungmann, SJ, "Religious Education in Late Medieval Times, in Shaping the Christian Message, pp. 38-62. Jungmann concentrates on the catechesis of milieu in southern Germany.


42 Jungmann, "Religious Education in Late Medieval Times," pp. 61. He makes this same judgement in other of his writings.
catechetical thrust in his great Reform. He supplied strong motivation toward implementing religious education in both teacher and student. Editions of his works total many volumes; his output was varied and immense. Yet many would agree with Ulich that "besides his hymns, Luther's greatest contribution to Christian Education are his Catechisms of 1529." Large and small doctrinal summaries, little moral ascetical works and listings were common enough in medieval times; tabulae or catechetical charts were even more common. Circumstances of reduplication and the low level of popular reading ability, however, restricted their circulation and comprehension. The invention of the printing press had brought the opportunity of greater circulation and had given many people more practical reason to learn to read. The reformers took full advantages of these changes in distributing their confessional literature.

Luther judged the mass of the German people to be outrageously ignorant of religious rudiments. After a visitation of parishes (1527-28), made by commission of the Elector of Saxony, he wrote:

Merciful God, what wretched ignorance I beheld! The common people—especially in the villages—apparently have no knowledge whatever

---


45 Cf. above, nn. 29-37.
of Christian doctrine, and even many pastors are ignorant and incapable teachers.46

It was for this last reason, the education of pastors, that Luther published his doctrinal summary the **Deutsch Catechismus** in 1529 which with later additions and redactions came to be known as "The Large Catechism." Yet Luther's genius was practical enough to know that something shorter, more concise, and direct was needed as well--something that could be mastered. For some time the Reformer had been consumed by a desire to issue material "pro pueros et familia" which would be genuine "kinderlehrer." He had already published **tabulae** of basic catechetical material, in the late medieval style, to be used by the heads of households in giving Christian instruction. After the publication of Luther's celebrated "German Mass" in 1526, a number of evangelical enthusiasts wrote instructional texts for use in and outside the new liturgy--some thirty in all, in numerous editions. 49 But Luther's pastoral zeal, in this

46 John Nicholas Lenker, Luther's Catechetical Writings I (Minneapolis: Luther Press, 1907), 6. (Volume VI in his series Luther's Works)

47 For the text, cf. ibid., pp. 35-189. There are, of course, many other sources.


regard was satisfied only when he issued his own brief summary of Christian doctrine as a companion to his Deutscher Catechismus. Published in April, 1529, it soon gained the title by which it is best known, "The Small Catechism" (kleine Katechismus). Also called the "Enchiridion," it was designed for "the use of pastor and preacher" ("für die gemeine Pfaherr und Prediger"); but it soon became a book for the hands of the pupil, which in a sense made it "a first" in catechetical history. The original text of the kleine Katechismus is not extant but Reu assumes it consisted of: 1) the preface, 2) five parts treating the Commandments, Creed, Lord's Prayer, Baptism, and Lord's Supper, 3) basic prayers, 4) a table of duties and obligations for different classes, 5) the Marriage booklet. In later editions Luther added material on Confession and expanded the original materials. Nothing really new is presented in "The Small Catechism." Other than some statements in the Preface, it lacks all polemics and many would find it surprisingly "Catholic" in its materials. As with the other new catechisms, the accomplishment of the kleine was that it put together so many materials and explanations in a definite catechetical "package." With this little tool and the Large Catechism, Luther was able to put through a "crash program" of popular catechization. It became an integral part of the evangelical way and is yet regarded as a strong

---

50 Cf. Lenker, Luther's Catechetical Works, I, 16-34. Again, there are numberless sources.


52 He is very strict in the kleine preface in proposing physical and spiritual sanctions against those who will not study the catechism.
element in Luther's success.

Like most things that achieve great and sudden popularity, the catechismal format of question and answer had been used before. As we have seen, both the Disputatio and Elucidarium had been so structured. But both of these had been more learned works designed to be used in the academy; neither were instruments of popular religious education. The first use of the catechismal format in this last context is thought to have been made by the followers (ca. 1420/1436) of Jan Huss. In the first decades of the sixteenth century, the Bohemian Brethren (Unitas fratrum) used the technique extensively. One of their doctrinal works, first printed at Prague in 1521, was translated into German the following year under the title Die Schrift der Kinderfragen und Unterweiungen or simply Kinderfragen; it contained seventy-six question/answer units. It is not known to what extent this work influenced Luther to take up the catechismal format. It will be noted, however, that the work(s) of the Bohemian Brethren did not carry the title "catechism." The noun "catechismus" is first found in St. Augustine, but he uses it in the sense of "catechesis." The initial use of the term to name a small question/answer doctrinal summary is found in Catechismus[etc.] in frag und Antwort (Nuerenburg, 1528), the work of Andreas Althamer, one of Luther's followers.

---

53 Cf. above nn. 31-32. Hugh of St. Victor had also used the question/answer format (n. 29), so had St. Augustine in De magistro.


But whatever its proximate origins, the catechismal format caught on, first among Protestants and then among Catholics, as the way to catechize.

In his preface to the Enchiridion, Luther not only gives his own catechetical theory but sets forth the basis for the catechism-approach to instruction—an approach which for the next four hundred years dominated Christian religious education to the point where "catechism" and "catechesis" were convertible terms. The Reformer first emphasizes there what he finds to be the religiously illiterate condition of the people (cf. above) and explains that he now gives the pastors this catechism—something determined and definite for them to use in catechizing. He makes these further points:

I beseech you, then, in the name of God, my beloved brethren—pastors and preachers—to sincerely discharge the duties of your office, to have pity on the people entrusted to your care, and help us to acquaint them with the Catechism, especially the young. And if you have not the requisite knowledge of such things take these forms and read them to the people word for word . . . . .

First, let the preacher particularly beware of variations in the form, or wording of the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the sacraments. Let them adhere to one form year after year. For the young and the unlearned cannot be taught with success unless we keep to the same forms and expressions . . . . . that thus they may easily repeat and remember them . . . .

In the second place, when those you instruct know the text well teach them the meaning of the words. Take the explanation presented in these forms, or any other that is brief, and hold to it without altering a syllable. . . .

In the third place when you have finished with the Small Catechism begin the Large Catechism and give the words a more comprehensive explanation.56

56 Lenker, Luther's Catechetical Works, I, 17-18.
It is important to realize that in these exhortations, Luther was not demanding the questions and answers of the *kleine* be memorized—as we sometimes read even in scholarly writings—but only the text of the Commandments, Creed, and Lord's Prayer plus the names of the Sacraments. In the preface of the "Large Catechism" he writes that all must be "well drilled" in these. One can easily see, however, that zealous evangelical pastors and teachers would go Luther one better, as it were, and require the memorization of the explanatory questions and answers as well; his approach implicitly invites it. All in all, one can say that the *kleine,* and its counterparts, became a kind of *parva carta* of the Reformation.

**Counter-Reformation and Catechism**

The widespread distribution and use of the *kleine* and other Protestant catechisms greatly disturbed Roman Catholic authorities. An interesting example of this concern can be found in a decree issued at Vienna in 1554 by Ferdinand I, ruler of the Hapsburg Erblande, brother of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles, and soon to hold the imperial office himself (1556-64). In the expansive style of the times, the Latin

---

57 As we have seen (n. 49), there were a number of other evangelical catechisms used in Germany. Calvin authorized catechetical materials at Geneva in 1537 and 1542. The great reformed manual on the Continent, however, came to be the Heidelberg Catechism first published in the Palatinate early in 1563. In the British Isles, the Westminster Catechisms (Large and Small) were issued by the Calvinist Divines over eighty years later. The Church of England appended a catechism to the Book of Common Prayer in 1549 and added to it in 1604. This, with revisions, came to be called the "Shorter Catechism." King Edward VI's Catechism authored in 1553 and added to in 1579 was looked upon as the larger catechism.

edict makes these points: a) many continuing losses to the Catholic Church can be traced to the pernicious influence of the many small books (libelli) being circulated by her enemies, "those satellites and ministers of Satan;" b) among the most popular of these deadly libelli are what "they call catechisms;" c) these catechisms are now in great vogue "by reason of their terseness, method, and cleverness [elegantia] of words;" d) they are having an especially corruptive influence on "our good but inexperienced youth" (especially when they are used in schools) and on "simple, unwary people;" 3) for these reasons, there must be produced orthodox catechisms "completely faithful to the Catholic and Apostolic Religion." 59 Ferdinand's proclamation appeared in the first edition of one of the major catechisms of the Counter-Reformation, the Summa doctrinae christianae per quaestiones tradita published by Michael Zimmerman at Vienna in 1555. 60 It is only in subsequent editions that the volume carries the name of its distinguished author, Peter Canisius of the Society of Jesus. The great theologian was widely influential in the

59 The decree is said to have been written by Dr. Jacob Jona, vice-chancellor at the court of Ferdinand I (ibid., 751).

60 For a study of Canisius' catechisms, this author used Fridericus Streicher, SJ, ed., S. Petri Canisii doctoris ecclesiae catechismi latini et germanici (2 vols.; Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana; Munich: Officina Salesiana, 1933-36). Volume I is concerned with the various Latin editions; Volume II, with the German. Critical texts for each of the Canisian catechisms can be found in Streicher's work. Canisius asked a Jesuit conferee and fellow Hollander Peter de Buys (Busaeus) to provide the supporting texts from Scripture, the Fathers, the Councils, etc., which Canisius had cited in the margins of the Summa. The Dutch Jesuit provided four good size quartos (1569-70) in which the Summa text and the supporting materials were combined unit by unit. This latter work is not contained in Streicher but is generally available in the larger university libraries. Canisius long used in his own form was revised by Joseph Deharbe, SJ in the 1850's (cf. Chapter i, nn. 58-63).
renascence of the Catholic Church in Germany and adjacent lands. It is significant that he should have channeled his considerable talents into the production of catechisms. In addition to the Summa, Canisius authored what is referred to as his Catechismus minimus, published in 1556 as an appendix to a Latin grammar. His third catechetical work proved to be the most widely and long used of all his writings—Catechismus minor seu Catechismus Catholicorum. The same basic arrangement of catechetical material is followed in all three works and may be referred to as the "Canisian order." It is an order that greatly influenced future Catholic catechisms and for that reason is given here. The index to the Summa explains that all Christian doctrine revolves around the two virtues of Wisdom and Justice. Those parts which can be referred to Wisdom are:

I. The virtue of Faith and the Creed. II. The virtue of Hope, the Lord's Prayer with the Angelical Salutation [Hail Mary].
III. The virtue of Charity, the Commandments with the Precepts of the Church. IV. The Sacraments.

Those parts which can be referred to the prior part of Justice concern avoiding evil and are:

I. The seven capital sins. II. The sins of others in which we have in some way participated. III. Sins against the Holy Spirit. IV. Sins which cry to heaven.

Those parts which can be referred to the latter part of Justice concern doing and reaching for good and are:

I. The triple genera of good works [fasting, alms-giving or mercy, and prayer]. II. Works of Mercy. III. The cardinal virtues. IV. Gifts and fruits of the Holy Spirit. V. The eight beatitudes. VI. The evangelical counsels [Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience]. VII. The four last things of Man [death, judgement, heaven or hell].

While, as we have seen, the Canisian catechisms had a long and tremendous influence in their own form and later adaptations, it is
thought that Canisius' Summa also served as a model for the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Published in 1566 as a conciliar enactment, the Tridentine catechism was designed to serve as a source-book for the clergy in giving Sunday sermons and catecheses. It was used into the twentieth century for these purposes. The Roman Catechism, as it is also called, does not follow the question/answer format but is similar to Canisius in its ordering of material, except that it treats Sacraments before Commandments. The sequence of these last two major elements of Christian Doctrine has often been the subject of controversy in the Catechesis. The Catechism of the Council of Trent is surely one of the great landmarks of catechetical history.

The Counter-Reformation's use of catechisms reached another high point in the popular works of the great Jesuit theologian, later cardinal and saint, Robert Bellarmine. Bellarmine is said to have made it a regular practice early in his career to catechize the Jesuit lay brothers and had gained the reputation of being a great catechist. While he was an influential man with down-to-earth concerns, it is still significant that a person of his magnitude, as with Canisius, should produce catechisms. His first catechetical work was titled Dottrina cristiana breve perché si possa imparare a mente, published in 1597. It was


62 For the text of the Bellarmine catechetical works, this study used Justinus Fèvre, ed., Ven. cardinalis Roberti Bellarmini politiani S.J. opera omnia ex editione veneta pluribus tum additis tum correctis,
intended for the hand of the pupil and carries on a dialogue between teacher and pupil. It will be noted that the title itself invites memorization of the text. The Brève is divided into four basic sections (classi) in which the principal points of Catholic faith are listed and discussed (dichiarazione). These are followed by several "Acts" (Atti) or prayerful proclamations accepting and proposing to implement the chief Christian virtues. There are two final instructions (instruzioni) on the Sacred Chrism used in Baptism and Confirmation and on Penance and Eucharist. Prayers, litanies and hymns are added. The Brève follows this order:


Perhaps the two most famous units from Bellarmine's Brève are the opening ones:

M. Are you a Christian?
D. I am by the grace of God.
M. What does being a Christian mean?
D. One who professes the faith and law of Christ.

From here he goes on to explain the mysteries of Trinity and Incarnation through the Sign of the Cross. It is a section found in many catechisms. Bellarmine followed the Brève with a small catechist's manual in 1560, his Dichiarazione piu copiosa della dottrina cristiana. The Bellarmine

XII (Paris: Louis Fèvre, 1894), 259-82. This opera omnia has been republished (photoduplication) by Minerva G.M.B.H. (Frankfurt a. M. 1965).

Ibid., pp. 283-337. For material in English on Bellarmine's
catechisms, ordered by Pope Clement VIII, were recommended, as we shall see in the next chapters, again and again by the Holy See as universal models for the Catechesis. While the catechetical works of Canisius and Bellarmine were the most influential in the Counter-Reformation, there were a large number of other catechismal works authored in this general era for Catholic use.

THE ENGLISH CATECHISM

The first English-language catechism in the reformation sense--a work of the Edwardian Reform (1547-53)--was appended to the Book of Common Prayer in 1549. Surprisingly, during the reign of Queen Mary I (1553-58) no Catholic catechism of English origin, appeared to compete in the great religious turmoil of the times. The decisiveness of the catechisms. cf. James Brodrick, SJ, The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Bellarmine, S.J., 1542-1621 (2 vols.; New York: P.J. Kenedy and Sons, 1928), I,390-99; also Chapter ii, n. 5; also Bellarmine in Appendices C-D.

64 Cf. Chapter i, nn. 38, 52; Chapter iv, nn. 134-39.

65 Collections of other sixteenth century Catholic catechism have been made by Christoph Moufang (1881) and Paul Bahlmann (1894). In France, the catechism of Jesuit Edmond Auger (1563 and 1568) was the most widely used in this era. The summaries of the Spanish Jesuits Geronimo de Ripalda (1591) and Gaspar Astete (1599) were used among Spanish-speaking Catholics to the present; that of Jaime Ledesma (ca. 1570) had a more limited use. For a very comprehensive listing of Catholic catechisms in this and later eras, cf. E. Magenot, "Catéchisme," DTC, II 2, 1895-1968; also references in Chapter II, n. 21. For emphasis on French Catholic catechisms cf. Hazard Histoire du catéchisme, pp. 175ff, and Jean Claude DHotel, SJ, Les Origines du catéchisme moderne d'apres les premiers manuels imprimés en France (Paris: Théologie Aubier-Editions Montaigne, 1967).

66 In 1551, a catechetical summary in the Scots vernacular (in the old medieval style without questions and answers) was published by the Catholic authority in Scotland. Cf. The Catechism Set Forth by Archbishop Hamilton, Printed at St. Andrews, 1551; together with the Two-penny
Elizabethan Settlement, however, persuaded English Catholics that new times required new measures—the catechism among them. Not surprisingly, the first English catechisms of the Counter-Reform emerged from the Continent, where large numbers of Catholics had gone in and after 1559, "recusing" to take the religious oath prescribed by the Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. The first of these recusant catechisms was the work of Laurence Vaux, Warden of the Collegiate Church of Manchester during the reign of Queen Mary Tudor. Entitled *A Catechisme or a Christian Doctrine Necessarie for Children and Ignorante People*, it was first published at Louvain in 1567. In his quaint preface Vaux lists his sources, confesses his past negligences, and reflects a new


67, ed. by Thomas Graves Law (Manchester, England: Chetham Society, 1885). (Hereinafter cited as Catechisme.) Law's notes (pp. iii-xcix are very instructive. For more on Vaux, cf. Joseph Gillow, A Literary and Biographical History or Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics from the Breach With Rome in 1534 to the Present Time (5 vols.; London: Burns and Oates, 1885-1902), V, 565-66. (Hereinafter cited as Dictionary.) Cf. also A. F. Allison and D. M. Rogers, A Catalogue of Catholic Books in English Printed Abroad and Secretly in England 1558-1640 (reprint; London: William Dawson and Sons Ltd., 1964), 157-59. (hereinafter cited as Catalogue.) For further brief references to Vaux, cf. William R. Trimble, The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964). Vaux's Catechisme and other recusant catechisms mentioned here have been republished (photoduplication) by Scolar Press Limited (Menston Yorkshire, United Kingdom). For his Catechisme, especially certain editions, and other acts considered seditious by the Queen's officers, Vaux was arrested upon returning secretly to England (for a second time) in 1850. The "olde massigne priest," as the jailer's records describe him, is said to have died in "misery and want" at the Clink in Southwark ca. 1585. The name Vaux came to be spelled "Vause" or "Vose" and this is perhaps how his name should be pronounced.
catechetical surge among English Catholics. While the Lancashire priest follows the new catechismal method of question/answer units in his work, he takes little notice of the theological controversies then raging but is content to give and explain the fullness of the ancient faith in a tranquil way. One medieval facet in his Catechisme, not found in later English Catholic summaries, is an examination of conscience on the proper use of the five senses. Published nine times on the continent and secretly in England between 1567-1620, Vaux was the basic English catechism for those decades. Recusants, however, also regularly published "englished" editions of Canisius from 1578(9) and Bellarmine from about 1602. A translation of Jaime Ledesma’s catechism was also secretly printed in 1597. Other English catechisms were written in this era by M. George Douyle (pseudonymn of William Warford) in 1604, by the controversial Thomas White ("alias Blacklow") in 1637,

68 Vaux, Catechisme, pp. 5-7. Vaux lists his sources as Sts. Cyprian, Athanasius, Jerome, John Damascene, Bernard and the catechisms of Peter Canisius and Pedro De Soto. The Dominican DeSoto had been active in England during the Marian years in an attempt to reconcile the university faculties to the Holy See.

69 For data, cf. Allison and Rogers Catalogue, pp. 16-17; 35-36.

70 Ibid., p. 82.

71 For title, cf. ibid., 166-67. "William Warford, SJ" does not appear in Gillow as it is promised he will under the entry of "George Dowley." For biographical information as Warford, cf. Godfrey Anstruther, OP, The Seminary Priests: A Dictionary of the Secular Clergy of England and Wales 1558-1850. I. Elizabethan 1558-1603 (Ware, England: St. Edmund College; Durham: Ushaw College, 1968), p. 370, Warford's work was not available to this study.

72 For title and data, cf. Gillow, Dictionary, V, 578-81; also Allison and Rogers, Catalogue, p. 168. This author examined White's catechism at the Newberry Library in Chicago. (Hereinafter cited as Newberry.)
and by Anthony Errington in 1654. The English priests at Tournay (Tournai) College also produced a catechism in 1647.

The Doway Catechism and Its Redactions

For long range influence, however, none of these can equal the Doway Catechism. It can justly be called the parent catechism of the English-speaking Catechesis. Fully titled "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine with proofs of Scripture for points controverted. Catechistically explained by way of Question and Answer. By H. T.," it was first published at Douai (Douay, Doway) in 1649. The circumstances of its origin and authorship are not clear but "H.T." is generally conceded to be Henry Turbervill(e). Turberville, a Staffordshire man, was educated and ordained in the English College at Douai; he returned to England in 1640 when he was about thirty years old. When William Allen, later Cardinal, founded the English college near the University of Douai in 1568, he set forth to educate priests thoroughly prepared for the

73 For title and data, cf. Gillow, Dictionary, II, 176. This author examined Errington's catechism at Newberry.

74 A Declaration of Principall Pointes of Christian Doctrine Gathered Out of Diverse Catechismes and Set Forth by English Priests Dwelling in Tournay College (Paris: Sebastian Cramoisy, 1647)--examined on microfilm by courtesy of the British Museum (B.M. 3505 b. 46). There is no reference to this work in previous literature.

75 For Turberville, cf. Gillow, Dictionary, V, 560. How the work took the title Doway is not clear other than it was first printed at Douai by an alumnus of the College and was widely used by the Douai priests in England. Some think it was the basis of instruction at the English College at Douai but this opinion is uncertain and does not seem probable. While there is no evidence that the catechism listed above in n. 74 was called the "Tournay Catechism," it could have been. If this were so, it might be the key to why Turberville's work was so named.
demands of the "English mission."  The seminary priests, as they are called, first returned to England in 1574 to achieve the reconversion of the whole kingdom, no less, to the Catholic faith. Allen had seen to it that they were thoroughly grounded in "controversial divinity" and had given the greatest attention toward making them good catechists. They were drilled in the Catechism of the Council of Trent and it seems they were expected to learn Canisius by heart. 77 Grounded in this tradition and proving himself an enterprising kind of person, Turberville obviously felt the need for a new summa—one more native than Canisius and more contemporary than Vaux. The need was made all the more acute by the appearance at that same time of the Westminster [Reformed] Catechisms (1649). Turberville evidently composed his Abridgement in the field during his first years on the English mission. He is much more argumentative than Vaux and treats the controversies of the time vigorously but not bitterly. Locking into the times, the Doway takes on the Puritans of the Commonwealth with some zest. Turberville shows the influence of Canisius and Bellarmine but still much of his material is seemingly quite original. 78 In reading his units on the Church, Worship,


77 Ibid., III, 291-92; also The First and Second Diaries of the English College Douay and An Appendix of Unpublished Documents, ed. Fathers of the Congregation of the Oratory (London: David Nutt, 1887 p. 256 and passim. (This work has been reprinted at Fairnsborough, England: Gregory International, 1969.)

78 This study examined the 1661 (Douai) edition and the 1702 (London) editions at the Memorial Library, University of Notre Dame (hereinafter cited as Notre Dame).
and the Eucharist, one feels that Turberville has reproduced the "controversial divinity" courses given at Douai. For that time when the public worship of the Catholic Church was severely curtailed, he also included a liturgical catechism. Shortened, rewritten, and then lengthened again, the Doway contains the core developed by the major catechisms of English-speaking Catholics for the next three hundred years.

Popular need for a small instructional aid caused the appearance of the greatly reduced *An Abstract of the Doway Catechism*. The Doway Abstract is better known in its revised editions (post 1686), but this study has encountered what is very probably the original edition printed at Douai in 1682 with some 375 question/answer units selected from the Doway Catechism. Later editions added about twenty-five more. The Abstract served English Catholics as a *catechismus minor* for a century or more. It cannot be said to have had an author but rather an editor(s). During the reign of James II (1685-88), more relaxed days for Catholics, Hills the King's printer advertised the very popular Bellarmine and a "revised and much amended" Abstract for sale. This

---

79 *An Abstract of the Doway Catechism* (Doway: n.p., 1682) -- examined at Newberry. This early edition is not listed in any of the standard indices of British bibliography governing this period. The London printer Hills (1686) advertised a "revised and much amended" *An Abstract of the Doway Catechism* for the use of children and ignorant people (J. S. Marron, OSB, "On the History of the Penny Catechism, "*Sower*, CXXV (October-December, 1937), 201. The earliest listed version this study has encountered is dated 1697 (Doway: M. Mariesse at the Salamander in the School Street, 1697) No. 1503 in Recusant Books at St. Mary's Oscott, (1518-1687) (Warwickshire, England; St. Mary's Seminary - New Oscott, 1964); also Part II (1641-1830) with Supplement to Part I to 1687 (Ibid., 1966). The 1697 edition has been examined by the present author by courtesy of the British Museum (BM3504a.26).

was in 1686. The Doway Catechism itself had been reprinted in London
two years before in the previous reign. 81 A few decades later London
printers were selling the Doway for one shilling, the Abstract at three-
pence, and Bellarmine's Short Christian Doctrine at twopence, but in
1726 a new catechism was offered, also at twopence, entitled A Short
Abridgement of Christian Doctrine. 82 A careful examination of this new
text 83 shows that it is taken from Turberville's An Abridgement of
Christian Doctrine; hence, its title, A Short Abridgement of Christian
Doctrine. It selected some 200 question/answer-units from the Doway
Catechism and its Abstract but rearranged them and largely rewrote them
in a more contemporary style. It also interspersed additional material. 84
This new catechism is especially important for the history of the English-
speaking Catechesis, as we shall see below. How these various catechisms
were used in the mid-eighteenth century (ca. 1753) in Catholic religious
instruction is shown by the Rules and Customs of Standon School, near

83 The Little Catechism or A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine
(London: n.p., 1728)--examined on microfilm by courtesy of the British Muse-
umum (B.M. 3504 aa 24). This is the earliest edition encountered.
84 A Short Abridgement seems to show the influence of Abbé Claude
Fleury, opening as it does on the theme of Creation and the questions "Who
made you?" and "Why did He make you?" Fleury published his famous
Catéchisme historique (Paris, 1683) in which he attempted to correl-
ate the dogmatic question and answer technique with the Augustinian idea
of biblical and historical narration. Fleury also made some attempt at
liturgical correlation as well. His Catéchisme was later placed on the
Roman Index most probably because of the overt Gallicanism found in sev-
eral of his other works. Cf. R. G. Bandas "La Catéchese de l'abbé Claude
Fleury," in Cinquante ans de catéchèse,[etc.]. trad. et red. Claude Cig-
nasse (Tours: Maison Mame, 1961), 113-26.
London. Before breakfast as the boys have their hair combed by the
women servants, they are to study their catechism. After daily Mass
and breakfast, the Rules continue:

5. Breakfast being ended, on Notice given by ye Bell, which it
were to be wish'd could always be at 8 o'clock, all repair to
School, on School days, to say their Lesson in some Catechism suit­
able to their Age & Capacity, as 1st ye Doway Abstract, with Mr.
Gother's Instructions for Children, 2ndly, Fleury's Historical
Catechism, 3rdly, Tuberville's &c., with the Chief Master's Appro­
bation. The short Abridgement of ye Christian Doctrine is indeed
ye Catechism in use for Children very young. 85

The Catechetical Works of Richard Challoner

The Standon School had been founded by Dr. Richard Challoner
historically the most prominent of all the recusant priests. 86 In 1704,
at age nineteen, Challoner was sent to Douai to study. Ordained twelve
years later, he returned to England in 1730. By 1741 he was consecrated
titular Bishop of Derbe and Coadjutor to the Vicar Apostolic of the London
District (Vicariate). 87 His literary output was very large; much of it

85 Bernard Ward, History of St. Edmund's College, (London: Kegan

86 The definitive work on Challoner is Canon Edwin Burton's The
Life and Times of Richard Challoner (2 vols.; London: Longmans, Green,
and Co., 1909). (Hereinafter cited as Challoner.) For a brief but help­
ful appreciation of Challoner's catechetical works cf. J. D. Crichton,
"Religious Education in England (1559-1778)." Shaping the Christian Mes­
 sage, 80-90. Father Crichton has written a beautiful essay on later re­
cusant authors.

87 From the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603), the Holy See
appointed no Roman Catholic Bishops in England until the restoration of
the English Hierarchy in 1850. In 1665 a vicariate apostolic was estab­
lished for all of England which is approximate to a missionary diocese.
In 1688 four vicariates or districts were established and in 1840, eight
vicariates. The respective vicars apostolic (as is customary) received
episcopal consecration and were designated titular bishops of ancient
but non-extant sees in Asia or Africa.
was revisions of the older recusant classics. His most original catechismal work was The Catholik Christian Instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies and Observances of the Church by Way of Question and Answer (1737). 88 Its apologetic (justificative) concern sometimes seems to distract from its liturgical instruction but the volume was widely used in England and America through the nineteenth century. Challoner's preservation and revisions of the above-mentioned A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, however, figure even more prominently in the development of the English-speaking Catechesis. The London vicar evidently thought the little work to be too short and so slightly enlarged it for use in the London district. Canon Edwin Burton, Challoner's principal biographer, lists its first edition as "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine revised and enlarged by R. C. (St. Omers: H. F. Boubers, 1772)." 89 Twiney, Marron, and Crichton agree with him; Gillow is silent on the date. This study, however, has encountered an earlier

88 (London, 1737)--this original edition was examined at Newberry. For the most critical list of Challoner's works, cf. Burton, Challoner, II, 323-39.

89 Burton, Challoner, II, 159.

90 William G. Twiney, "History of the Penny Catechism." Oscotian, II (3rd series), (Easter, 1902), 77-78. This is an extremely helpful essay on which later writers have heavily depended.

91 "On the History of the Penny Catechism," 209. Father Marron's excellent article enlarges on Twiney (n. 90). The only known copy of this edition is in the Oscott Library (No. 1517 in Recusant Books at St. Mary's Oscott, Part II (1641-1830).

92 Crichton, Shaping the Christian Message, p. 85.

93 Gillow, Dictionary, V, 454.
revision dated 1759, one year after he had become full vicar. It would seem that most of the scholars listed above regard the work in question to be Dr. Challoner's composition. An examination of the 1729 edition of *A Short Abridgement* and the later Challoner revisions, however, will show that the London vicar greatly preserved the original text. He made many stylistic changes, rewrote some units, and added new ones; he also added "The Christian's Rule of Life" and "The Christian's Daily Exercise" as additional chapters. The little catechism, however, is basically the work of someone else. Just who is the author of *A Short Abridgement* is not known and should be a point for further research. At any rate, Challoner did preserve the classic text and it became (with continued revisions) England's famous "Penny Catechism," used until quite recently in the religious education of English and Welsh Catholics. The same classic text passed to America, as we shall see in Chapter 1, where it had a long history under the name the "Carroll Catechism." In 1884 it was largely incorporated into the text of the Baltimore Catechism, until quite recently the principal material used in the religious education of American Catholics. The classic *A Short* 

---

94 *An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine revised and enlarged by R. C. and published for the use of the L---n District. (n.p., 1759).* This study examined a microfilm of this edition by courtesy of the British Museum (B.M. 1490 ḃb 17. [1]). It examined by the same courtesy the text of *An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine or the First Catechism. Published for the Use of the London District.* (London: Keating, Brown & Co., 1815)--(B.M. 3504 ḃg. 14 1).

95 Already revised by Challoner in 1759 and 1772, *An Abridgement* was again slightly revised in 1815. Further revisions occurred under the four vicars apostolic in 1836; under the restored hierarchy in 1855 (completed in 1859) under the Cardinal and Bishops of England and Wales in 1879, 1883, and finally in 1931. It came to be known as the "Penny Catechism" from its selling price. This study has examined all these revisions either at Newberry or on microfilm by courtesy of the British Museum.
Abridgement, then, preserved the Doway tradition and carried it in English and American catechisms up to the present era. It is a catechetical tradition that spans over 300 years among English-speaking Catholics.

It should be mentioned here that Challoner's revisions of the Rheims-Douai bible too were basic in the catechizing and instruction of English-speaking Catholics for close to two centuries.

Butler's Catechism

About the same time that Challoner was reworking the Short Abridgement, an immensely popular English-language catechism appeared in Ireland. It was the work of the Right Reverend Doctor James Butler II, Archbishop (1774-1791) of Cashel. The famous catechism was first published in or after 1775. Nothing has been written on Butler's

Butler taught in the seminary at St. Omer (1771-73). He was consecrated coadjutor to his cousin Archbishop James Butler I on July 4, 1773. His studies and sacred orders were all taken in France and Belgium. He was an active bishop and it is said he greatly developed education in his diocese. Cf. F. O'Brien, "Butler, James II," Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclésiastiques, ed. A. Baurillant et al. VI (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1924), 1441; also Michael Maher, The Archbishops of Cashel (Dublin: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1927), pp. 24-24; but most especially Laurence F. Renehan, Collections on Irish Church History, ed. by Daniel McCarthy, I (Dublin; C. M. Warren, 1861), 323-56.

The present author is indebted to Canon Michael Tynan of Croom, County Limerick, Ireland, for his several-paged mimeographed text "In Search of Butler's Catechism." Tynan judges that Butler published his catechism in 1777. Tynan calls this original text "Old Butler" and points out that no editions dating from Butler's lifetime are extant in English. The original text is extant in Gaelic editions and in other catechisms, not bearing Butler's name, that were used down in the 1950's in the Diocese of Meath and Ossory. The revised Butler (cf. Appendix C) called the "General" catechism appeared sometime after his death in 1791. The oldest extant edition of the "General" (4th ed.; Cork: J. Haly, 1806) was examined by the present author at Newberry. According to Canon Tynan, Butler referred to a revision and enlargement of his catechism made by himself, in 1789 correspondence. For references
authoring the work, even though a good deal is known of his activity in the ecclesiastical province of Munster. It is puzzling that it should have been issued so soon after his arrival, although he could have been working on it for some time. The Irish prelate is thought to be original in his development of the classic elements of catechism but he does show some signs of being influenced by Fleury and the Doway materials. Still most creators of catechisms were not all that original, and in the opinion of the present author, Archbishop Butler could well have selected his materials from pre-existing sources. As gifted as he undoubtedly was, he does not, after all, evince a great literary background. Considering his extensive continental experience, it is more than possible that he used some French source(s) in compiling his catechism. In fact, the present author has seen some later French catechisms which suggest parts of Butler but not his ordering of the material. What kind of interdependence there might be in such cases is not clear but is a subject for further research. We know that Butler spent some time in the Seminary of St. Sulpice (Paris) which was the great catechetical center of his day; we know too that from the seventeenth century it had been the custom of each French bishop to assign a specific catechism for use in his diocese. Perhaps these two factors shed some light on the authoring of the Butler Catechism. The origin of Butler's summary is of special interest because of its profound influence in the English-speaking Catechesis. His work

to other Irish catechisms, cf. Patrick Boyle CM, "Catechism (I)," in Catholic Mind, IV (No. 9, 1906), 17-73. A number of those mentioned are available at Newberry and the Elizabeth Cudahy Memorial Library at Loyola University of Chicago.

was used throughout Ireland and by the Irish clergy everywhere for over 150 years. Butler's text with some stylistic changes and few additions became (ca. 1882) the official "Maynooth Catechism" which was adopted "for General Use throughout the Irish Church." Butler was frequently reprinted in the United States and incorporated into other American catechisms until 1884. In that year, large sections of his work were obviously incorporated into the Baltimore Catechism. Butler's use in the United States is discussed several times in Chapter i. His catechism was also widely used in Canada and Australia. Aside from ancestral loyalties, many found Butler to give the fullest and most fluent summary of Christian Doctrine.

Butler was sprung from an aristocratic line. Unlike many other Irish bishops, he was controversially loyal to the British Crown. In troubled Ireland, the Archbishop of Cashel made a strong case for civil obedience and it shows in the Fourth Commandment units of his catechism.

Hay, Hornyhold, and Mannock

To the north in Scotland, Challoner's good friend Bishop George Hay, Vicar Apostolic of the Lowlands, developed a whole series of larger catechismal works widely read by English-speaking Catholics. After

---

99 Cf. Chapter i, n. 68.

1800 his smaller work titled *An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine* was published in the United States several times. It is an interesting summary in which each lesson is enriched by the assignment of collateral readings from the Bible and Hay's larger works.

The *Poor Man's Catechism* (1752) of John Mannock, OSB, and the catechetical works of Bishop John Hornyhold (1744-49), a younger contemporary of Challoner, held a prominent place too in the English-speaking Catechesis of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A word should be said here on the works of John Gother, Douai priest and principal Catholic controversialist in the reign of James II (1685-88). He produced a number of apologetical treatises and books that were highly influential in his day but was also the author of a number of spiritual works. Among the latter, he wrote many catechetical instructions using the catechismal format. The various British repositories list very few of the original editions of these instructions as extant. After his death in 1704, there was a resurgence of interest in his spiritual works and they were republished many times in the eighteenth century. Gother was not republished in the United States as often as Challoner, Hornyhold, or Mannock but his work does have the distinction of being the first material used in the preparation of American Catholics for the Sacrament

---

101 For the text of the Abridgement, cf. the end of Volume V of his Works as cited above in n. 100; cf. also Hay in Appendix C and Chapter i, n. 14.


103 For titles and data, cf. ibid., III, 400-03; also Crichton, "Religious Education in England in the Penal Days," pp. 78-80.

Some Conclusions

This Introduction has been titled "From Kerygma to Catechism." The title was chosen because it sets forth the development that took place in Christian religious education from its inception down into the sixteenth century. This preliminary essay has attempted to outline the principal epochs in that great sweep of time and indicate the surviving monuments of instruction and theory. It has also listed critical studies that have been made relative to each period. Major emphasis has been placed on the coming of the catechism, its nature, and its multiplicity. By the end of the sixteenth century, both Protestants and Catholics had accepted the catechismal format as the way to catechize. All in all, during the next 400 years catechesis and catechism were convertible terms in Christian religious education.

With special reference to the Catholic catechism, this essay has outlined its sixteenth century roots. The production of English-language catechisms for Catholic use from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth centuries has been particularly researched and explained. These were the religious education materials with which the American Catechesis began in 1784 and continued to use with modification down to 1930--the fifteen decade span of this dissertation.

---

105 Cf. Chapter i, n. 11.
CHAPTER I

THE AMERICAN CATECHISM (1784-1930)

The earliest monuments of the Catechesis in North America are understandably Spanish and French. In fact, what is thought to be the first book printed on this continent was a catechism—Breve y más compendiosa doctrina cristiana en lengua mexicana y catellana. Published in Mexico City in 1539 by Juan Pablos (agent of the Seville printer Juan Cromenberger), the text may have been the work of the eminent Bishop Juan de Zumarraga OFM who sponsored the edition.1 Other early Hispanic-American catechetical materials are also yet extant.2 Among French instructional texts, an Algonquin translation of Jaime Ledesma's catechism made by St. Jean de Brebouef and a French/Algonquin prayer-chart compiled by Père R. P. Massé are preserved.3 It was not uncommon

1 The first printing is no longer extant but cf. Doctrina Breve in facsimile published in the City of Terrocktillian, Mexico, June, 1544 (New York; United States Catholic Historical Society, 1928); also Doctrina Cristiana en lengua Española y mexicana por religiosos de la Orden de Santo Domingo obra impresa en México por Juan Pablos en 1548 y ahora editada en facsimil (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1944); and Pedro De Cordoba, Christian Doctrine for the Instruction and Information of the Indians [in the Manner of History], trans. and ed. by Sterling A. Stoudemire (Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1970). In the Spanish-American Catechesis, the manuals of Ripalda and Astete were used into the present century; cf. Appendices C-F. The reader is reminded that biographical sources on persons mentioned in this study can be found in Appendix B.


3 Cf. Les voyages de Nouvelle France occidental dicte Canada faits par le sr. de Champlain [etc.] (Paris: C. Collett, 1632), Appendices. Cf. also French catechisms in Appendix C.
for the early missionaries to compile brief catechisms and story-collections for the instruction of the Indians, but few are extant.  

Generally Catholic colonists used religious education materials authored and printed back in the mother-countries. This was certainly true of English-speaking Catholics in the New World. The Catholic Church entered the English colonies with Lord Baltimore in 1634; in that year, the London Jesuits established in Maryland what they called the "American Mission." One of those early Jesuits, perhaps Father Andrew White, reported in 1638 that as far as the colony's Catholics were concerned, "the more ignorant have been catechized and Catechetical Lectures have been delivered for the more advanced every Sunday." As far as instructional materials in English, the first Maryland Jesuits would have had Vaux and other early recusant catechisms. Undoubtedly, they would have made extensive use of those "Englished" editions of Canisius, Bellarmine, and Ledesma then available. After 1649, they would have had the Doway Catechism to use and after 1682, its Abstract; then by 1686 and beyond, the revised Abstract, John Gother's various Instructions, and the several editions of the Abridgement of Christian Doctrine. All these catechisms have been discussed in the Introduction.

---


5 Cf. Documents of American Catholic History (2 vols.; Henry Regnery Company, 1967), I, 109. The Society of Jesus was suppressed by The Holy See from 1773-1814. The papal decree took effect in America during these years.
In time, Catholics came to suffer grave legal disabilities in Maryland, but the Jesuits had opened a small school at Newtown (ca. 1640) and a somewhat larger one at Bohemia Manor (ca. 1745). Both came to be closed by the authorities, but not before a number of prominent American Catholics had taken their early training at Bohemia. Although nothing is known of the school's catechetical program, it must have been similar to the one we have seen used (ca. 1753) at Standon Lordship.

After a very confused situation regarding just who had canonical jurisdiction over Catholics in the English colonies and later in the thirteen United States, the Holy See appointed Father John Carroll in 1784 prefect apostolic and "head of the missions in the provinces of the new Republic of the United States of North America." In spite of the strong native American fear of "prelacy," he was consecrated first Roman Catholic Bishop of the United States five years later, choosing Baltimore as his see city. The subject of catechetical materials was one of the very first matters submitted to the judgement of the American Prefect.

In a series of letters (1784-86) to Carroll, Father Robert Molyneaux--pastor of St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia, organizer of the first parochial school in the United States and pioneer American

---

7 Cf. Introduction, n. 85.
Catholic publisher—reported on his printing activity. He explained that he had published (some years previously) Archbishop Butler's catechism and the little *A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine* for the use of American Catholics. He had just recently again reprinted this *Short Abridgement* but he asked Carroll if he should "reprint" Butler too, since it was almost out of stock. Molyneaux further reported that he would soon print the *Short Abridgement* (for the third time) as the appendix to a primer he was about to publish. The Philadelphia priest also expressed great concern in his letters that Carroll would help him sell his first edition of Challoner's (C) large catechisms, *Catholik Christian Instructed*, then going to press. He explained that in his experience Catholics did not buy religious works as they should, being content to borrow someone else's copy. In the last letter of the series Molyneaux alerted Carroll that he had sent him 500 copies of the "Instruction for Confirmation" which may indicate he had also reprinted material from the works of John Gother (C) or perhaps from the catechism of Archbishop Jean-Joseph Languet (cf. below) but more probably Gother. At any rate,

9 "Letters from Rev. Rob't Molyneaux to Rev. John Carroll, 1784-1805, from the Baltimore Archives," *American Catholic Historical Researches*, VII (N.S.), (July, 1912), 267-278. Pennsylvania laws had permitted the printing of Catholic books whereas those of other colonies had not. All the catechismal texts mentioned by Molyneaux in this correspondence have been discussed in the Introduction. Father Molyneaux was one of the suppressed Jesuits.

10 In this study, a letter designation, as here, indicates bibliographical data on the work mentioned can be found under the author's name in the so-lettered appendix.

11 Gother's (C) *Instruction upon the Sacrament of Confirmation*, revised by William Eyre, had recently been republished in England (Newcastle: F. Coates, 1783). As far as is known, Carroll would be the first to administer Confirmation in what had been the thirteen English colonies.
this is all the information we have on catechetical materials used in
the late colonial and early national periods. None of Molyneaux's im-
prints are known to be extant except his 1786 edition of Catholik
Christian Instructed; but Evans in his American Bibliography lists the
data of Molyneaux's primer-catechism:

The Roman Catholic Primer, to which is added with approbation, a
short abridgement of Christian Doctrine with a short daily exercise;
also further instructions, from the French Catechism of John Joseph
Languet, formerly Archbishop of Sens. Philadelphia: Printed and
sold by W. Spotwood, Frontstreet, between Market and Chestnut streets.
1786.12

Perhaps Molyneaux's edition of A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine
with his enlargements is preserved in extant catechisms bearing almost
the same title but characterized as the twelfth (1793), thirteenth (1795),
and fourteenth (1798) editions. These last editions further claim to
have been "newly revised for use in the United States" and as Molyneaux's
they also are printed "with approbation." Since Carroll was the proper
authority to give this imprimatur, the text of the American A Short

12 Cf. No. 19967 in Charles Evans, American Bibliography: A
Chronological Dictionary of All Books, Pamphlets and Periodical Publica-
tions Printed in the United States, from the Genesis of Printing in
1639 down to and Including the Year 1820 with Bibliographical and Bio-
ographical Notes (24 vols.; Chicago: Printed for the author by Blackley
Press et alii, 1903-1959), VII, 65. Evans does not give the source of
his entry, but it most probably was taken from a contemporary advertise-
ment.

(Baltimore: Michael Duffy) is available on microcard No. 34484 in the
reproductions based upon Evans, American Bibliography published by the
American Antiquarian Society (First Series; Worcester, Mass. 1955+)
John Gilmary Shea states that Bishop Carroll adopted a catechism from
England for use in America; cf. History of the Catholic Church in America
(4 volumes; Chicago: D. H. McBride, 1886-92), III, 95. This was very
probably a conjecture by Shea, although his statement is somewhat correct.
As we have seen above, it was Father Molyneaux who played the active role
in selecting and producing catechetical materials in the early National
Period.
Abridgement, came to be known as the "Carroll Catechism." Later on, some thought, erroneously, he had actually put it together. The fact of the matter is that Archbishop Carroll composed nothing in the way of a catechism; neither did he do any compiling nor abridging; nor any active selecting of catechetical materials. A unit by unit examination of the so-called Carroll Catechism will show it is nothing other than a reprint of the English An Abridgement of Christian as revised by Bishop Richard Challoner. There are only the most minute differences in the text. In "Carroll," Challoner's "Christian's Rule of Life" is omitted and his "Christian's Daily Exercise" is greatly edited and reduced. "Carroll" also includes a "fuller instruction on the Holy Eucharist and Communion from the French Catechism of John Joseph Languet, formerly Archbishop of Sens." The often repeated claim "newly revised for use in the United States," based on these three changes, seems to claim an originality for the American Abridgement that is as undue as it

14 Not all would agree with this last statement. Father Gerard S. Sloyan, and those who follow his opinion, maintains that Bishop Carroll was the author or at least the compiler of a catechetical work (cf. "The Relation of the Catechism to the Work of Religious Formation" in Gerard S. Sloyan, ed., Modern Catechetics [New York: Macmillan Company, 1964], 63-101; also "Catechisms," NCE, III, 229). Sloyan maintains that Carroll adapted the larger catechisms of Scots Bishop George Hay in a work known as An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine, published in the United States from 1800 in several editions (cf. Hay in Appendix C; also Evans Microcard No. 37599--as above in n. 13). Bishop Hay himself, however, authored the work in question (cf. Introduction, nn. 100-101).

15 On Challoner's works, cf. the Introduction, nn. 86-95.

16 This study examined the text of the 1772 revision as contained in An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine or the First Catechism Published for the use of the London District (London: Keating, Brown & Co., 1815) from a microfilm by courtesy of the British Museum (B.M. 3504 dg. 14 [1]). The final few pages are missing in the repository copy.
is confusing. The whole matter of the origin of the "Carroll" Catechism has been so nebulous, it is hoped that this explanation will at last straighten it out.

The inclusion of material from the catechism of the anti-Jansenist prelate Jean-Joseph Languet de Villeneuve de Gergy, Archbishop (1730-50) of Sens and formerly of Soisson, is significant, in that it contravenes the strictures of Jansenist piety against frequency of Communion. Its inclusion in the catechism by the Anglo-American Molyneaux reflects historic Jesuit reaction against Jansenism and further evidences that from the beginning of its organized life (and prior to it) the thrust in the American Catholic Church has been in the direction of frequent Holy Communion. The Languet material was absorbed into the text of later American catechisms but reworded; in the Baltimore Catechism, however, the original wording as found in the "Carroll" Catechism is largely restored. As mentioned above, Father Molyneaux may have also extracted a section on Confirmation from Languet for use in the American Catechesis but it is not extant or at least not cataloged. The use of the Languet material raises the question of who translated it. It is doubtful that Father Molyneaux did so. While other works of the French Archbishop had been translated


19 Cf. below at n. 44, also Chapter ii, n. 9.
and published in English, this study has not been able to find an English version of his catechism listed.

The "Carroll" Catechism in the American Catechesis.

When the First National Synod of the American Church met at Baltimore in 1791, no specific mention of a catechism-text was made. This is undoubtedly because the "Carroll" Catechism was generally accepted and available. The Statutes of 1791, however, do emphasize the need of concentrated religious instruction before First Communion with stress on Penance (No. 10) and before Marriage (No. 15). They also require that the Gospel be read in the vernacular and an instructional sermon be given on each Sunday and feast day (No. 17). After Mass, the principal prayers and Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity are to be recited aloud by the entire congregation (No. 18). After this, the children and the "unlearned" are to stay for "catechism," when they are to be "questioned and instructed" on the principal points of the Faith (Nos. 18), but in parishes with more than one priest, "catechistic instruction" may be given in the afternoon following Vespers. Bishop Carroll complemented this legislation in his first pastoral letter to American Catholics (1792) by strongly urging the regular Christian instruction of boys and girls, calling it "a primary object of pastoral solicitude." The Statutes of 1791 do set forth,

---

20 The Statutes of the First National Synod are contained in Concilia Provincialia Baltimori Habita ab Anno 1829 usque ad Annum 1840 (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1842) pp. 11-24. (Hereinafter cited as Concilia Provincialia).

however, the content of a minimal catechesis which must be accepted and understood by all who marry before the priest. Taken from the Council of Lima, Peru (ca. 1567), the essential points of instruction are these:

a) There is One God who is the maker (auctor) of all things. He rewards those who come to Him with eternal life and punishes the wicked and rebellious with eternal penalties in another world.

b) The One God has three Divine Persons--Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

c) The Son of God became Man of the Virgin Mary to bring about man's salvation.

d) He suffered and died for us and rose from the dead to reign forever in eternity.

e) Jesus Christ is our Lord and Savior.

f) No one can be saved unless he believes in Jesus Christ, is sorry for his sins, receives the Sacraments of Jesus, and finally keeps the Commandments of God and the Church--the greatest of which is to love God above all things and one's neighbor as oneself.22

This catechesis is in no sense original but, appearing as it does in the decrees of the First National Synod, it does provide a kind of basic American Catholic religious instruction.

In the first meeting of the American Hierarchy held at Baltimore in 1810 the catechesis again received attention when Challoner's revision of the Rheims-Douay Bible was made official for use in the United States

22 Concilia Provincialia,"Synodus Anno 1791," No. 15., p. 17. The reason given for this minimal catechesis is that "there are many African slaves (to say nothing of others) who for a variety of reasons are not able to be fully instructed." Theologians had long sought to identify the truths "necessary for salvation;" some were content with a) listed above in the text as the absolute minimum. The Third Council of Lima (1583) under St. Toribio (Turibius) de Mogrovego was very active catechetically. The legislation quoted in the text above is in the present author's translation.
in liturgy and instruction. The same decree (certainly reflecting Carroll) makes a strong plea for the use of the vernacular in Catholic rites and worship.

In the years that followed the 1791 Synod, the "Carroll" (C) Catechism was issued regularly in various editions, often with hymns and prayers added; sometimes it contained the brief scriptural catechism (more apologetic than "biblical") of Dr. John Milner (C), one of Bishop Challoner's younger contemporaries. Other European catechismal works also continued to be printed in the United States; Fleury (C), Hay (C), Challoner (C), Aimé (C), Mannock (C), Hornyhold (C), and the ever popular Butler (C), were all published here periodically. In 1822 Father Alban Butler's (C) Lives of the Saints—a perennial in the American Catechesis—was reprinted in Philadelphia; the first American printing of the Catechism of the Council of Trent (C) appeared at Baltimore in 1833. In that same year, the Doway Catechism, revised by Irish bishop James Doyle was reprinted in Philadelphia, while the Dublin edition of Turberville's (C) original work was reprinted at New York. This latter

23 Ibid., "Quidam Ex Articulis Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae (1810)," No. 3, p. 26; cf. also Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, Circular to the Clergy (1810), Nos. 8 and 9 reprinted in Guilday, Carroll, pp. 591-93, (The Baltimore Archives will be hereinafter cited as AAB).

24 All these authors are discussed in the Introduction. We know that Fleury's Catechismus historicus minor, with much specifically Catholic doctrine eliminated, was used at St. Mary's University, Baltimore (post 1806) where its use figured in a public controversy between the institution and a body of Protestant ministers; cf. Robert Gorman, Catholic Apologetical Literature in the United States 1784-1858 (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1939), p. 16.


26 For Turberville, cf. Introduction, nn. 75-78.
imprint appeared in the booksellers' lists for the next several decades. German (C) and French (C) catechisms, some authored or edited in this country, also received American printings. Indian (C) catechetical literature appeared, particularly the works of the saintly Frederic Baraga, first bishop of the Diocese, Marquette, Michigan.

Additional American Catechisms in the 1820's

The need for more current and native catechisms, however, is apparent in the catechetical activity of the 1820's. Father John Power (C) of St. Peter's Church, New York, authored a catechism on the New Testament in 1824. Following the French custom of having an official diocesan catechism, Bishop Joseph Benedict Flaget, SS, authorized the Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown in 1825; it was the work of his coadjutor, Bishop John Baptist David (C). This catechism, arranged in two parts, had a long history of devoted use in Kentucky and the surrounding states and influenced later American Catechisms. Its "First Catechism for Younger Children and Persons of Inferior Capacity" is a free adaptation of "Carroll," abbreviated in some parts and enlarged in others. Its "Second Catechism for Children who are preparing for their First Communion" is much more detailed and follows the classic format of French diocesan catechisms but may also show the influence of Butler. This is difficult to determine, however, since, as we have seen in the Introduction, Butler himself may have borrowed from French catechisms.

The "Second Catechism" has four parts: first: The Mysteries of Faith; second: Grace and Means of Obtaining It; third: Commandments; and fourth: Principal Feasts and Solemnities of the Church Year. David's catechism in many respects is similar to the French Catechisme ou Abrégé (C) which had been published in this country since 1796. Bishop Benedict Fenwick, SJ, authorized a catechism similar to David's for use in Boston in 1828. This was the first edition of the renowned Boston Catechism (C). All this catechismal activity, however, was not without its difficulties. In 1821, Father William Hogan, of the "Hogan Schism" fame, stirred a controversy with his version of Butler's (C) Catechism published in Philadelphia. Complaints were made about the "unauthorized" character of Hogan's catechism and Archbishop Ambrose Maréchal of Baltimore suppressed it. By the end of 1822, the unfortunate Hogan had been censured by Pope Pius VII. But Hogan was not alone in issuing a controversial catechism.

As Flaget and Fenwick had done, Bishop John England--one of the

---

28 The 1796 edition, as listed in Appendix C, can be had on Evans microcard No. 31117 (as above in n. 13). In regard to David's catechism, Shea records that its English was greatly criticized by Archbishop Maréchal and David's fellow Sulpician, the influential John Tessier (History of the Catholic Church in America, III, 96).

29 This author, after many inquiries, has been unable to uncover material on its origin or Bishop Benedict Fenwick's connection with it.

30 Raymond J. O'Brien, "The History of Our English Catechism," Ecclesiastical Review, XCI (December, 1934), 592. (Hereinafter cited as "English Catechism.") The late Msgr. O'Brien prepared this very informative article, on the history of the American Catechism and some of its English-language antecedents, while a student at St. Mary's Seminary (Baltimore) and the Sulpician Seminary (Catholic University of America) in 1919. It is a pioneering article and unique in many ways. He based his research on materials held at St. Mary's and the Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. His article, however, lacks bibliographical data and specific source references.
great figures in the concourse of the American Hierarchy—published a special catechism for his Charleston diocese. In his diurnal under March 2, 1821, the celebrated prelate wrote that he had spent much effort in compiling a new catechism for use in his diocese. One week later, he wrote in the same place that the catechism had been published in the last week of Lent. He noted that he had compiled it from various other catechisms but had also added "several parts which I considered necessary to be explicitly dwelt upon under the peculiar circumstances of my diocese." No copy of the 1821 catechism is known to be extant; in fact, all editions of the England text were long thought to be lost. Surprisingly, however, Shoemaker lists an 1826 edition by a New York publisher which was reprinted in Charleston in 1827 or later. It carries the title A Catechism of the Roman Catholic Faith published for the use of His Flock by the Right Reverend Father in God, John Bishop of Charleston.

This New York edition, probably because of its extra-diocesan circulation, caused Bishop David and Bishop Henry Conwell of Philadelphia to attack the England catechism to the Archbishop of Baltimore. Maréchal, to keep peace, asked England to withdraw his catechism.


The 1826 Charleston catechism is basically taken from Butler but contains a number of England's additions. These additions are not necessarily original although England himself had a literary background. He greatly expanded the opening chapters in his treatment of Divine Revelation (Lesson III and Lesson IV) and the various proofs or signs of credibility associated with its acceptance. He greatly vindicates the Pope's Authority (Lesson XII) but adds two pages "On Bishops and Infallibility" (Lesson XIII) which sets forth the episcopal function in the teaching authority (magisterium) of the Church. To use a current term, the Charleston bishop stresses the collegiality of the Bishops with the Pope. He consistently uses the phrase "The Pastors of the Church" and "the great body of Bishops with the Pope at their head." To this author, England's catechism seems very orthodox for his times but perhaps some of his fellow-bishops--not justly--saw a hint of Gallicanism in Lesson XIII; England was far too democratically inclined for many. As far as "religious toleration," (another of his concerns) there is nothing expresso stated on that then vexed question in the 1826 catechism. England was quite inflexible (with Butler) in his treatment of the errors of "heretics and infidels" but he does add two questions that touch on personal toleration at the end of Lesson XVII (On the First Commandment, continued"), viz.

Q. Who is my neighbour?

A. Every human being

Q. Am I to consider those persons who are opposed to the true religion as my neighbours?

A. Yes; undoubtedly; to punish for voluntary error is the prerogative of God; to shew mercy and kindness to his fellow mortals is the duty of man. Luke x, 87.
When Bishop Henry Conwell authorized a catechism for Philadelphia in that same year (1826) it was England's turn to query the Archbishop on Conwell's accuracy. 34 Marechal responded (1827) that there was so much trouble with these local catechisms, he favored a mutually agreed upon national catechism. That same year, the Baltimore archbishop wrote Rome and requested the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to require that the American bishops agree on a uniform catechism.

The First Provincial Council and the Catechism (1829)

When the First Provincial Council of Baltimore met in 1829 under the presidency of Archbishop James Whitfield, it upheld the deceased Marechal and forbade the use of unauthorized catechisms. 37 Rome too remembered what Marechal had written. When the Decreta of 1829 were examined and revised there before publication, the Propaganda added

34 Ibid., II, 98; also Shea, History of the Catholic Church in America, III, 96. Bishop Conwell had a highly troubled, if not disastrous, tenure in Philadelphia.

35 Guilday, England, II, 98. England strongly urged a provincial council to settle all these problems. Marechal was equally opposed to such a meeting of the American bishops preferring Rome to hand down this kind of decision.

36 AAB, Archbishop Ambrose Marechal to Cardinal Bartolomeo Capellari, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, Baltimore, Oct. 1, 1827; as cited in Shea, History of the Catholic Church in America, III, 96. Capellari became Pope Gregory XVI. The Archbishop of Baltimore acted as a quasi-primate in the affairs of the American Church until the formation of the National Catholic Welfare Conference after World War I. The American Church remained under the control of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to 1908 when by decree (Sapienti Concilio) it came under the general administration of the Holy See.

37 Concilia Provincialia, "Concilium Primum:" Decretum XXXIII, p. 83.
substantially to Decree No. 33. The revised Decree is made to promise that a uniform American catechism will be compiled—a text adapted to local needs but one which will "present Christian Doctrine according to the method of Cardinal Bellarmine's Catechism;" after the Holy See approves this uniform text, it will be published in the United States "for the common use of Catholics." The American version of the Bellarmine Catechism, however, never appeared. The failure of the national catechism to develop caused some bishops again to do something locally. Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick of Philadelphia, through the First Diocesan Synod (1832), continued to authorize the "Carroll" catechism until 1842; in that year the Second Synod authorized Butler and the recently published (1836) German Augsburg Catechism for the needs of the diocese. In 1839 Samuel Eccleston (C) fifth archbishop of Baltimore authorized the compilation of a ninety-six paged Catechism of Christian Doctrine.

A companion abridgement followed later. Eccleston's catechism contained a large number of scriptural references in the question/answer units. Perhaps some feeling had been expressed again in the Fourth Provincial Council of 1837 (there is nothing in the Concilia Provincialia) for the national catechism promised almost a decade before. Very probably

38 "Instructio circa decreta a synodo provinciali Baltimoreensi edita," Ibid., p. 70.

39 Statuta provincialia et diocesana (Philadelphia, 1897), pp. 16 cited in Hugh J. Nolan Most Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia 1830-1851 (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1948) pp. 144, 282. The Augsburg Catechism was a revision of Canisius. It was the work of the famed Canon Christoph von Schmid (C) whose work is discussed in the next chapter. A number of the Augsburg Catechism are listed in Philadelphia repositories (cf. NUC Pre-1956, 99:198). For the availability of Butler cf. Appendix C.

40 O'Brien, "English Catechism," 593.
Eccleston was promoting his catechism for national adoption. We get this idea from a letter written the Archbishop of Baltimore by Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, along with further proof on how difficult it was to get episcopal agreement on a text. Kenrick writes:

I have hastily marked some of the verbal imperfections of the new Catechism, as they presented themselves to me in the first part. You may find the criticisms morose and unjust, but in a spirit of candor I venture to submit them for consideration. I think it would be well to defer the edition for the Council, and to let the Prelates at their leisure prepare the amendments. It is a matter of no ordinary difficulty to write a good Catechism. The introduction of the present Catechism before its final adoption would be attended with some inconvenience, should amendments take place in a second edition, so that I should prefer leaving my proportion of the cost of this edition without claiming any of the copies.41

The Fifth Provincial (1840) gave no approval to the Eccleston text for national use. In 1839, the zealous Bishop Joseph Rosati, CM, selected Butler (C) and a new edition of the Catéchisme de St. Louis (C) for his bi-lingual diocese. European authors continued to be adapted, translated or simply reprinted in American editions; catechismal works were also imported directly and sold by Catholic book-sellers.

Fenwick's Boston Catechism (1825-42)

The most famous catechism in this era, however, came out of Boston. In 1835 and again in 1842, Bishop Benedict Fenwick republished the Boston Catechism (C) of 1824. In his approbation, the Boston Prelate complains of a number of unauthorized editions of the "small


42 Cf. above n. 29.
catechism" (i.e. "Carroll") used locally with inaccurate scriptural quotations. This authorized catechism, he hopes, will prove an antidote. Divided into three parts, with appendices, the Boston Catechism reprints "Carroll" or the American A Short Abridgement as Part I. Part II contains additional instruction on the Sacraments, especially Penance, Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. It shows substantial borrowing from previous catechisms but with many seemingly original additions. Just who the author of these additions might be is not clear although Fenwick had a literary background. One can see the author of Part II is greatly interested in promoting frequent Confession and Communion--an interesting commentary on the loose charges of Jansenist piety often popularly imputed to this era. One wonders to what this promotion is due--perhaps Fenwick's Jesuit background and/or the general élan of the American Church toward frequent reception of the Holy Eucharist. Part III contains a liturgical catechism suggested probably by David and Challoner but seemingly quite original in its composition. An appendix reproduces part of Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed, surprisingly indicating its source. Father Vaux in his recusant Catechisme is exceptional in listing his sources. Practically all other compilers of catechisms borrowed freely without mentioning the proximate origin of the materials used. It seems very likely that they did not always know the more remote sources of their much-borrowed borrowings.

43 Questions were taken directly and in an adapted form from David, Butler, Challoner, (Catholic Christian Instructed), and Languet (n. 17). Perhaps some are also taken indirectly from John Gother's Instructions for Confirmation.

44 Cf. above nn. 17 and 18.

45 For Vaux, cf. Introduction, n. 68.
The First and Second Plenary Councils of Baltimore (1852-66)

When the First Plenary Council of Baltimore convened in 1852, agitation for a national catechism was again strong. A committee of bishops was selected to arrange for an official English Catechism either by composing a new one or selecting one already in use. The same was to be done in regard to an official German catechism. In the original

46 Ignatius Reynolds (Charleston), John Timon (CM) (Buffalo), and Martin Spalding (Louisville formerly Bardstown). Cf. "Congregatio quinta privata, die eneris, 14 Maii, hora 11 A.M. habita," Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae Anno Salutis MDCCCLII as reproduced in Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum: Collectio Lacensis, III (Frieburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1875), 139. It was agreed that when the catechism was either written or selected by the committee it would be sent to the Archbishop of Baltimore who would forward it to the Holy See (Congregation of the Propaganda) for approval. The idea behind this is that the Acta et Decreta of national councils are always sent to the Holy See for review and approval before they have the force of ecclesiastical law nationally. Conciliar catechism being an Actum of the respective council must also be reviewed and approved by the Holy See before its national use can have the force of law. As far as this study has been able to determine neither the American conciliar catechism of 1852 nor the later conciliar (Baltimore) catechism of 1884 were submitted with the Acta et Decreta for approval of the Holy See—a factor which caused many to deny that they could be "enjoined" nationally. A survey of the pre-Code (1918) canon law on this matter would be an interesting point of research. (Cf. below n. 92). The Father of 1852 also voted in the same "Fifth Private Congregation" cited above to restrict the practice of printers and publishers to issue catechisms without ecclesiastical authorization. This had been a problem with Archbishop Marechal and others (cf. above). It is not clear, however, who must give this authorization, i.e. the bishop of the place of publishment, the Metropolitan, any bishop.

47 This was placed in the hands of Blessed John Nepomucene Neumann (C) then Bishop of Philadelphia, who had compiled German catechetical works some years previously for use in American parochial schools. Neumann was given the same options as the English catechism committee and was instructed to communicate the result of his choice to all the German-speaking bishops and to the Archbishop of Baltimore especially. No reference, however, is made to the approval of the Holy See. This study has been unable to locate any special German catechism emerging after the 1852 Council; it has located, however, German editions of the General Catechism (C) which emerged from the Council.
draft of the Decrees of 1852, it was proposed that the "Carroll" Catechism with some minor revisions should be submitted to the Holy See for approval as a uniform text for the American Church but for some unknown reason this was penciled out (marked *ommittendum*) in the final copy sent to Rome. Perhaps this is the reason the catechism committee was formed within the 1852 Council. Just how the final choice was made is not yet documented, but in 1853 the conciliar catechism was published locally by the authority of several bishops, carrying the title *A General Catechism of the Christian Doctrine - Prepared by order of the National Council for use of Catholics in the United States of America.* It dominated American Catholic religious instruction for the next thirty years.

The General Catechism is none other than the *Boston Catechism* with some few revisions. The question/answer units of Part I are verbally identical with the "Carroll" text, as preserved in the Boston, except for some few updatings of the language and the inclusion of several new items. The answers, however, are now made to repeat the questions in an obvious attempt to make them more internally intelligible. This, of course, would aid in the comprehension of the memorized material. Part II reproduces the Boston text but also adds a new chapter on the creation and fall of Man taken from Butler. In Part III, the Boston liturgical catechism and

---


49 Bishop John Timon (Buffalo) had taken an active interest in distributing catechetical literature while a missionary in the Southwest. He was thought by his contemporaries to have been the leading hand in compiling the catechism which emerged from the First Plenary Council; cf. n. 54.

the section acknowledged to be taken from Challoner are omitted; an appendix of two chapters is added "On the Mass" and "Sign of the Cross etc." which again are taken from Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed but this time with no acknowledgement as to the source. The existence and use of the General Catechism is not well understood in American Catholic historiography.

One interesting variation of the General Catechism of 1852 was produced by Bishop Augustin Verot, SS, in 1864 for the Diocese of Savannah. Verot's work carried an appendix of three specialized catechisms to be used in the preparation of converts from Protestantism, "Infidelity," and Judaism. A Short Catechism or abstract of this larger work was published in 1873. At the First Vatican Council (1868-1870) Verot debated the question of a universal catechism to which he gave only guarded approval; he was more truculent in the matter of Papal Infallibility which definition he strenuously opposed. Papal Infallibility, in the sense defined by the Council, is not mentioned in either of Verot's catechisms.

In 1860 an attempt to come up with a different kind of instructional text was made by the controversial New York pastor Jeremiah W. Cummings (C) with his rhyme catechism, but it had only very limited use.

51 Cf. under General Catechism in Appendix C.

52 Michael V. Gannon, Rebel Bishop, The Life and Era of Augustin Verot (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1964), p. 210, n. 57; and p. 210ff. French-born Verot was an ardent supporter of the Confederacy. Cf. also Dom Cuthbert Butler The Vatican Council 1869-1870 (reprint; The Neuman Press, 1962), pp. 197-200. Butler also gives reference to the documentary sources of Vatican I found in Mansi etc. The Universal Catechism was to be based on Bellarmine much to the distress of the German bishops who preferred Canisius. The final draft of the proposed catechism was never presented to the Council for final approval due to complexities within the Council and its sudden adjournment due to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War.
From 1858, the highly popular parish-missionary and author Father F. X. Weninger, SJ, (C) produced a number of German and English catechisms in the "Larger" and "Smaller" forms with a companion volume for catechists. What seems to be the first catechism authored west of the Mississippi was compiled by Father Alexander Hattenburg (D) in 1865 and came to be known as the "Dubuque Catechism." The conflict and stress of Civil War issues, however, do not appear in any of these catechisms.

The question of a national catechism was not dead, however, when the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore convened in 1866. The text of a catechism by Father John Henry McCaffrey (D), President of Mt. St. Mary College (Emmitsburg, Md.), had been sent to the American bishops and clergy for examination and comment. Archbishop Martin Spalding of

---

Weniger was very active in giving parish missions which were a strong moral, devotional, and instructional force in the American Catholic Church for more than a century (post 1850). Weniger's catechisms were adopted by some diocesan synods, especially where there was some German influence, but they seem to have had only a brief span of popularity. Unlike other American catechisms, parts of Weniger are quite polemical.

A study of McCaffrey's catechism shows it to be a reworking of the General Catechism of the First Plenary Council, with the "Carroll" text completely preserved; it contains further borrowings from Butler, some additions from David, and a considerable amount of seemingly original material. Among the things that stand out about the catechism are its strong treatment of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and its unusual arrangement of some of the materials. This last factor probably militated against its adoption as a national catechism along with other reasons mentioned below. Some twenty-five pieces of McCaffrey correspondence (1865-66) on the catechism were generously made available to this study by the very kind efforts of Msgr. Hugh J. Phillips, Archivist of Mt. St. Mary's College and Seminary, Emmitsburg, Maryland. An examination of the letters yields this information: 1) A number of bishops and clergy replied to McCaffrey after he had sent them the catechism for their study and comment; 2) some of those who replied expressed concern that the "venerable text of Bishop Carroll's catechism be preserved;" 3) several thought that since some bishops already had adopted Weninger for use in their dioceses (Weninger was alleged was active in securing this), they would be reluctant to vote for a new national catechism; 4) there was marked discussion on the
Baltimore, apostolic delegate to the Council, who had been on the catechism committee at the 1852 Council urged the adoption of McCaffrey's text. Bishops Verot and John Timon of Pittsburgh (the leading compiler of the General Catechism) strongly objected to the adoption of McCaffrey. It was said the bishops generally found it obscure in several passages, but this is surely a simplism. McCaffrey's text was rejected for a variety of reasons. The Fathers of 1866 still felt the need of a national catechism and so they repeated verbatim the Roman-revised Decree No. 33 of 1829 (cf. above). Again, nothing came of it. It should be noted suitability of including the questions in the answers since a number opposed doing this; 5) most, who mentioned it, regarded Bishop John Timon (Buffalo) as the principal compiler of the General Catechism; 6) McCaffrey mentioned that he had made extensive use of Butler and also of David; 7) McCaffrey had the active support of Archbishop Martin J. Spalding (his Ordinary, former pupil, and friend) who, as native Kentuckian and former bishop of Louisville (Bardstown), urged him to make use of David's catechism; 8) McCaffrey states he took the famous prayers of his catechism from old English prayerbooks (cf. below at n. 106); 9) the Emmitsburg priest circularized the entire clergy etc. May 24, 1866 advertising the public printing of his catechism; 10) McCaffrey had thoughts to put out a companion volume, containing devotions, a church history, and a liturgical catechism.

55 Sebastian G. Messmer, Spiragos's Method of Christian Doctrine (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1901), p. 557. On motions of Bishop James Wood (Philadelphia) and Timon the whole matter was dropped (ibid.) Messmer, later Archbishop of Milwaukee, was one of the secretaries and principal canonists of the Third Plenary Council (1884). The current popularity of Weniger's catechism worked against the adoption of McCaffrey's as a national catechism (cf. above n. 54). Both McCaffrey and Weniger were on the Catechism Deputation as consultants (theologi); cf. Concilii Plenarii Baltimoresensis II, Acta et Decreta (John Murphy, 1868), p. xlvii. Msgr. Phillips (cf. above, n. 54) recalls seeing correspondence indicating a lack of agreement on who would get the royalties. McCaffrey wanted them for Mt. St. Mary College but the bishops would not agree. Msgr. Phillips has not been able to locate this letter as yet in the Emmitsburg archives.


57 Concilii Plenarii Baltimoresensis II, Acta et Decreta, Titulus VII, Caput II, Decretum 387, p. 201. On the Decree of 1829, cf. above n. 38. Another significant catechetical outcome of the 1866 Council was its endorsement of the Catholic Publication Society then recently organ-
here that in both the First and Second Councils Archbishop Martin Spalding spoke for a national university and a national catechism but without success. These two goals were achieved in the Third Council (cf. below) largely through the efforts of his nephew Bishop John Lancaster Spalding. It was then that McCaffrey's catechism achieved its maximum influence; it was used as one of the principal sources of what came to be known as the Baltimore Catechism.

THE ERA OF DEHARBE (1847-1910)

If a vacuum was felt by religious instructors in the continued failure of a national catechism to appear, it was more than filled by the increasing popularity of Deharbe's catechisms which were published here in various translations and editions from the German. The Bavarian hierarchy had requested the Jesuit Joseph Deharbe (D) to produce a new Canisian catechism at the mid-century. The result was his *Katholischer Katechismus der Lehrbegriffe* also called the *Regensburger* (Ratisbon) Catechism (1847; rev. 1852). Archbishop John Purcell of Cincinnati had given the text its official introduction in the United States in 1850 when he made it the only German catechism to be used in the archdiocese. German editions of Deharbe's catechism and companion commentaries were printed in the United States past the turn of the century. An English


58 Scannell, "Doctrine, Christian," p. 82.
translation made by Rev. John Fander and printed in London (1862) soon made its way into this country where in time it received several American reprintings. Deharbe (D) was so popular in America that Bishop Patrick N. Lynch of Charleston authored his own revision of Fander's Deharbe. The Lynch revision offered Deharbe in the classic division of large, short and shorter catechisms. A few years later another new English translation appeared of the large catechism followed by other revisions of Fander's Deharbe. There were at least two Polish versions of Deharbe (D) printed in the United States for use in parochial schools --neither, however, uses his name. Deharbe's large catechism, in the three languages, was still widely used in the United States as a second or "larger" catechism for older children even after the "enjoinment" of the Baltimore Catechism in 1884-85. The widespread use of the Alsatian Jesuit's catechisms in all parts of the world prompted Scannell to speak of the second half of the nineteenth century and beyond as the "era of Deharbe." This vast popularity of Deharbe would seem to have been rooted in the fact that it was "traditional" but new, complete and yet concise. To use a modern phrase, it was thought "solid" as opposed to some more experimental approaches espoused by other German catechisms—for instance that of Johann Baptist von Hirscher's (post 1842) Frieberger Katechismus. Catechetically, German Catholics were very active in formulating different styles of catechesis from the early nineteenth century well into the

---

59 It is interesting to note that in the preface, Fander asserts the Large Catechism is not for school (pupil) use but for the catechist's use.

60 Cf. under Deharbe (D). While Lynch was an eloquent defender of the South's cause, his catechism, as Verot's, contains no echo of the civil strife.

61 Scannell, "Doctrine, Christian," p. 82.
Another factor in Deharbe's popularity was the "Application" to life which ended each of his chapters. In the early decades of this century, however, his use waned rapidly under the criticism that he had too many definitions, too many questions, and was too theological for children --unfortunately the constant criticism of catechisms. In all, however, it must be said that Deharbe's work had major influence in the religious education of several generations of American Catholics.

THE CATECHISM OF THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE (1884-85)

There were other catechisms published in the United States to complement Deharbe. Many bishops, however, were determined to have a national catechism. In the various diocesan meetings held preparatory to the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884) and in the correspondence of the bishops, the question of a national catechism appeared often. It was an era of theological standardization and definition. The assaults of liberalism and what has been aptly termed the "acids of modernity" had induced a traditional backlash within the Church. Among highly placed ecclesiastics from Pope Pius IX (d. 1879) on down, there was a strongly felt

64 Cf. Müller, Glennon, Fa' di Bruno in Appendix D.
65 The Metropolitan of Chicago (Archbishop Patrick Feehan) and his suffragan bishops (especially John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria) were forceful in calling for a conciliar and therefore national catechism; Bishop John J. Kain (Wheeling, West Va.) and Francis Janssens (Bishop of Natchez, Miss.) were also definite in calling for a catechism. For a discussion of these and other correspondence on the catechism, cf. John Tracy Ellis, The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons (2 vols.; Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1952), I, 235-36. (Hereinafter cited as Gibbons.)
need for integralism (to use a later term) and centralism. The decrees and definitions of the Vatican Council I (1869-70) shows this thrust very vividly. If the American Church did not have the theological sophistication at this time to feel all this as keenly as the Church in Europe, or even the need to feel it, the American bishops of 1884 had the great desire to pull together the vast burgeoning immigrant Church with more marked institutional uniformity and discipline. A national catechism would be of significant help in this. The matter had come before the American bishops at least four times previously (1829, 1837, 1852, 1866), as we have seen above. In this specific matter of the catechism, the bishops in 1884 had additional incentive from their brethren in Ireland who had recently produced the Maynooth Catechism (ca. 1882), designed for national use there. The English Hierarchy had authorized another revision of An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine in 1883 after an already extensive revision in 1879. Since its 1859 revision, the "Penny

66 Cf. above n. 52.

67 It has been often estimated that the Catholic population had doubled to 8,000,000 souls in the years between the Second (1866) and Third (1884) Plenary Councils with much institutional development as well. While the above figure is more approximate than exact, there can be no doubt that a dramatic increase had occurred, largely through immigration.

68 The Catechism Ordered by the National Synod of Maynooth and Approved of by the Cardinal and the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland for General Use throughout the Irish Church. This so-called Maynooth Catechism was essentially the Butler catechism with slight additions and redactions. The actual publication date of the Maynooth Catechism is uncertain (ca. 1882) but it appeared a number of years after the synod (1875) for which it was named. On Butler, cf. Introduction, nn. 96ff.

Catechism" had been prescribed for the "exclusive use" of the Church in England and Wales; the 1879 edition and that of 1884 were approved by the Cardinal and Bishops of England and Wales "directed to be used in all their diocese."  

The American Church now entering its majority could scarcely do less.

The Conciliar Decrees and the Baltimore Catechism

Because of the considerable interest expressed by the bishops,  

Archbishop James Gibbons of Baltimore, designated apostolic delegate to the approaching council by Rome, appointed a special committee of bishops to study the catechism question and make recommendations.  

The Second Provincial Synod held at Oscott in 1855 authorized a revision of the Abridgement of Christian Doctrine but it was not completed until the Third Synod held in 1859 (cf. Twiney "Penny Catechism," pp. 79-80 for details).  

Ellis, Gibbons, I, 236. John Cardinal Gibbons produced one of the great classics of American catechetical literature viz. Faith of Our Fathers, Being a Plain Exposition and Vindication of the Church Founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ (Baltimore: John Murphy and Co., 1876). Designed for the winning and instruction of converts and published while Gibbons was yet Bishop of Richmond (Va.), it is remarkably irenic in an era of fierce religious controversy--an early indication of the highly principled, reconciliatory and mediatorial role he was always to play; cf. ibid., 145-51.  

Joseph Alemany, OP (San Francisco); Louis De Goesbriand (Burlington, Vt.); Stephen Ryan, CM (Buffalo); Joseph Dwenger, CPPS (Fort Wayne), John Lancaster Spalding (Peoria), John J. Kain (Wheeling), Francis Janssens (Natchez, Miss.): cf. Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Tertii A.D. MDCCCCLXXXIV (Baltimore: John Murphy and Co., 1886), pp. xxv-vi. [The names have been supplied by this author.] The venerable Archbishop Alemany was titular head of the committee and representative of the Spanish population in the American Church. De Goesbriand, the French representative, had translated and published devotional works. Dwenger, unlike some other German bishops, spoke and wrote English fluently. Ryan had been an associate of Bishop John Timon (cf. above n. 49). Both Kain and Janssens had expressed great interest in a new national catechism (cf. above n. 65). The strongest interest in a new conciliar catechism had been expressed by John Lancaster Spalding. Born from old pioneering Anglo-American stock, he had been educated at Louvain and had studied in Rome and more briefly in Germany. He was fluent in German. His uncle, Martin J. Spalding, had been bishop in Louisville and Baltimore.
He also circularized the entire hierarchy for their various opinions which he would forward to the committee. The whole matter of the catechism's formulation is obscure (cf. below) but the printed decrees of the Third Plenary Council contain a very extensive section (Title VII) on "Christian Doctrine" (De Doctrina Christiana) in which Chapter II (De Catechismo) is devoted to catechetical instruction. The Latin text of the legislation (given here in English précis by this author) makes these requirements:

No. 217. The Church has a long history of giving instruction in the mysteries of God's Kingdom—using every means of communication. Pastors and their assistants, therefore, should regularly visit the Sunday School and all non-parochial Catholic schools as well. While religious and lay teachers of religion are invaluable, the priest has a special office to catechize.

No. 218. It is the special duty of pastors to instruct children especially at the time of First Holy Communion. For this reason pastors and/or their assistants should teach the catechism to the First Communion class three times a week for six weeks before the Sacrament is received (where conditions of distance make this possible). No one is to be admitted to Confirmation unless he has been thoroughly instructed in the nature and effects of the Sacrament. Before confirming, the bishop should examine the confirmands personally (or through another priest) on their knowledge of Christian Doctrine. After First Holy Communion, children

While inclining to the so-called americanizing party in the hierarchy, he adopted a middle stance in many of its controversies. While on leave from his native Diocese of Louisville in New York (1872-79) he collaborated with the Catholic Publication Society in producing a series of readers, Young Catholic Illustrated, for Catholic school use (cf. Fullman, "CPS," pp. 46-47). In a sense, he was the ideal man to promote the new conciliar catechism.

73 The text of the circular, as supplied by Archbishop Sebastian J. Messmer (cf. above n. 55), can be found in John K. Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," Ecclesiastical Review, LXXXI (December, 1929), 576-577. In the circular, Gibbons explains that the catechism committee will report, "at or before the Council," on these points: 1st. On the expedience of adopting a uniform catechism at the Council. 2nd. On naming the Catechism which they prefer to be sanctioned. 3rd. Whether the Germans, Sclavonians, Italians, Spaniards, French, etc., should have a translation of the catechism to be adopted, or whether another catechism should be approved for them.
should receive religious instruction for two years.

The bishops were not content with spelling out the quantitative dimension of catechetical obligation for pastors. There had to be a uniform and canonized instructional instrument as well. The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, therefore, further legislated:

No. 219. There is great need for a catechism fully developed and complete in all its parts. But many catechisms we use are incomplete; not at all suited to the intelligence of children; and, for one reason or another, are full of faults. Many of our people move from place to place and their children, as a result, go to several schools. Everyone sees the great inconvenience which results from the variety and number of catechisms used in the United States. After much thought we have set up a committee of bishops who

1) will select a catechism or if necessary improve one, or assemble a new one--whatever they think best

2) will submit their choice to the meeting (coetus) of the Archbishops who will give it a second examination and arrange for an accurate printing. When the catechism is officially published, all who have the care of souls as well as religious and lay teachers will be obliged to use it.

The final section of Decree No. 219 echoes the problems of the "melting-pot" within the American Church. Catholics had not been welcome.

74 Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Tertii, Titulus VII, Caput II, Nos. 217, 218, pp. 118-119. In the pre-council meeting held at Rome no mention is made of teaching Christian Doctrine or catechism (cf. "Minutes of the Roman Meeting Preparatory to the II Plenary Council of Baltimore," Jurist, XI [January to October, 1951] 121-32, 302-12, 417-24, 538-47; neither is "Catechetics" listed in the required curriculum of the major seminary as set forth in these sessions (Session, Nov. 13, 1883--p. 124) which curriculum is discussed extensively in Titulus V of the Acta et Decreta, but again there is no mention of preparation for the teaching of religion.

75 Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Tertii, Titulus VII, Caput II, No. 219, pp. 119-20. Notice the last sentence no. 219 making the use of the conciliar catechism obligatory: it became a highly controversial point. Note also the phrase "meeting of the Archbishops." The Latin coetus of the decree was translated by this writer as "meeting" since following the Third Plenary Council, the archbishops (Metropolitans) met annually. Coetus, however, also can mean the "body" or "group" of archbishops which would not necessarily imply a "meeting." The question, then, is this: was the catechism when finished to be submitted for a "second examination" to a "meeting" of the Archbishops or simply to the "body" of the Archbishops? Cf. n. 92.
in the English colonies nor in the United States in its inception. But by the early decades of the nineteenth century, they had come to be accepted, even though grudgingly, as a kind of cultured and stable minority. The picture changed substantially however, with the great migrations that began in the 1840's and continued well into the next century. Successive waves of Irish, German, Slavic, Italian and other Catholic immigrants drastically changed the previously existing religio-cultural homogeneity of America. The fear-filled reactions of American nativism against the illiterate "papists" and "foreigners" were strong and often took a violent form. Within the "household of the Faith" too there were various ethnic struggles culminating in the nationalist controversies of the 1890's. The energetic moving forces within the Third Plenary Council--James Gibbons (Baltimore), John Ireland (St. Paul), John Lancaster Spalding (Peoria), and John J. Keane (Richmond; later first Rector of the Catholic University)--were all "americanizers" to some degree. They were joined by other English-speaking bishops in being persuaded that the welfare of the Church would be best served by the rapid (here there differed) americanization of immigrant Catholics. Undoubtedly an Irish background permitted most of them to call so readily


78 Cf. Coleman Barry, OSB, The Catholic Church and the German Americans (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1952); also for its allied controversy, Daniel F. O'Reilly, OP, The School Controversy 1891-1893 (Washington: Catholic University Press 1943); cf. also below n. 80.
for immigrant acceptance of the English language and the "American ways."

By 1884 the Irish had integrated closely with American society and with increasing success. But if the "americanists" (as their critics called them) felt this way, such German bishops as Michael Heiss (Milwaukee), Joseph Dwenger, CPPS (Fort Wayne), Winand Wigger (Newark)—were much slower, again in differing degrees, to share this enthusiasm for "Americanization." They were joined in this reluctance by such bishops as the French Louis De Goesbriand (Burlington, Vt.). The thought contained in the dictum "lose the language—lose the Faith" was a great fear for these latter prelates.79 Nevertheless, the majority of the Council's Fathers voted for a step toward "Americanization" (in the sense mentioned) through the Catechesis. The last paragraph of Decree No. 219, therefore, concludes:

This new catechism, composed in English, is designed not only to promote uniformity and remove the problems mentioned above but is also sincerely meant to be made available in the other languages spoken by our people. Since children from German, French, and other national families in time often move to churches where Christian instruction [Doctrine] is given in English, we recommend that adolescents who speak both languages and who live among English-speaking be taught their catechism in English as well.


80 Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Tertii, Titulus VII, Caput II, No. 219; cf. also above n. 73. Shortly after the English catechism was published, editions in German, French and Italian appeared; a Polish edition was published later; this study encountered editions in Eskimo, Flathead, Hawaiian (cf. Baltimore Catechism, Appendix D). By the same token, German-Americans continued to use German-language editions of Deharbe (D) up to 1892 and somewhat beyond. When Gibbons circulated the hierarchy on the idea of a national catechism, Bishop John C. Nerza of
Such were the conciliar decrees on the proposed national catechism.

In the next year (1885) the promised text appeared under the title A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Prepared and Enjoined by Order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, popularly known as the "Baltimore Catechism."

The Compilation, Publication, and Enjoinment of the Catechism

It is not clear just who put the Baltimore Catechism together, but it does show a considerable amount of work. Some research into its origins was made from 1928-30 by Msgr. John K. Sharp, then at the Brooklyn diocesan normal school and a prominent figure in the American Catechesis. Msgr. Sharp published his findings in the Ecclesiastical

San Antonio wrote he favored such a catechism but not in Spanish translation. A new Spanish catechism, he pointed out, would be too confusing to parental catechists especially in isolated places and would result in retarding the "Mexican" Catechesis in the Southwest (AAB, 78-0-10, Neraz to Gibbons, San Antonio, September 9, 1884 cited in Ellis Gibbons, I, 236). For this reason, it is not surprising to find Ripalda being reprinted into the twentieth century (cf. Appendix F.) In an early twentieth century survey quoted by J. A. Burns it was found that the catechism was taught also in English in most Italian and German schools but not too widely in Polish schools, although increasingly so (The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States [New York: Benziger Brothers, 1912], pp. 309, 302, 324-25). A speaker at the Catholic Educational Association Convention in 1915 forcefully complained that large numbers of Catholic public school children were still not being taught catechism in English (CEA Bulletin [November, 1915], 245).

81 While all catechismshave a specific name, they are generally referred to by the name of their author (compiler) or the ecclesiastical jurisdiction from which they received authorization. For this reason the catechetical text of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore came to be known almost immediately as the "Baltimore Catechism." In this study frequent reference to the Baltimore Catechism requires some alternate forms; it is, therefore, often referred to as the "BC" or simply "the Catechism."
His most significant source was the scholarly Archbishop Sebastian G. Messmer of Milwaukee. The Swiss-born prelate, while professor of Theology and Canon Law at Seton Hall College and Seminary, had been loaned to the Third Plenary Council as one of its four secretaries and principal canonists. In response to Msgr. Sharp's inquiries, Messmer consulted his own notes on the Council's action regarding the Catechism but registered disappointment at not finding as much information as he had hoped for. He was, however, able to forward Archbishop Gibbons' circular letter sent out before the Council [cf. above n. 73]. He also found that in the Private Congregation of November 11, 1884, the Council Fathers discussed the catechism-question far in advance of its place on the printed agenda and this, at the request of the bishops who were working on that question [cf. above n. 72]. In the November 11 session, it was decided to increase the catechism committee with additional bishops and some priests selected at the discretion of Archbishop Gibbons. In the Private Congregation of November 1929, the catechism was again discussed and the conciliar decrees NN 217-219 [cf. above nn. 74-75, 80] were adopted. Messmer also interpreted his notes on the November 29 session to indicate that yet another committee of bishops was formed to settle the catechism-question. At the last private congregation, held on December 6, the Council Fathers were presented with galley sheets

---

Cf. Rev. John K. Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," Ecclesiastical Review, LXXXI (December, 1929), 573-86; "The Origin of the Baltimore Catechism," ibid. LXXXIII (December, 1950), 620-24. Msgr. Sharp, now retired, graciously answered several inquiries from the present author but was unable to add further to the material he had so diligently collected and published in the above articles.
of the proposed conciliar catechism for their examination and approval. After some discussion, it was decided that the individual bishop should forward their emendations of the text to Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria who, according to Messmer, would "make a full report to the next Conference of Archbishops [cf. above n. 75]." The data sent Msgr. Sharp by the venerable prelate came some forty-five years after the Council, but Messmer also had a "faint recollection" that the "actual making" of the proposed catechism was made the responsibility of Father, later Monsignor, Januario De Concilio, Pastor of St. Michael's Church, Jersey City.

83 One of Msgr. Sharp's correspondents quoted a fellow Redemptorist who had remembered that Bishop John A. Watterson (Columbus) stayed overnight at St. Philomena's Rectory in Pittsburgh and had "boasted of the fact that every Bishop had a printed copy of the new catechism on his desk at the end of the Council" (cf. Sharp, "The Origin of the Baltimore Catechism," p. 622).

84 For biographical sources on De Concilio, cf. Appendix B. The Neopolitan-born priest had twice taught at Seton Hall College operated by the Diocese of Newark, N.J., also contributed a number of essays on theological topics to the Catholic World and other periodicals. Some of these were collected and published as books by the Catholic Publication Society. All his published works are written in fluent English which does not support the unfair allegations made later that he did not handle English well (cf. Rev. Joseph A. Newman, "The So-Called Baltimore Catechism," Fortnightly Review XL [December, 1933], 280 and Journal of Religious Instruction, V [October, 1934], 125-29). De Concilio had been brought into the Council as "theologian" to the Vicar Apostolic of Nebraska and was appointed to the Committee on Christian Doctrine (cf. Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Tertii, pp. xxxi-xxxii). In Sharp's articles (cf. above n. 82), other correspondents support De Concilio's authorship, in addition to Archbishop Messmer, but their affirmations are largely based on tenuous hearsay. We know that Msgr. De Concilio translated the Baltimore Catechism into Italian in 1886 (cf. Appendix D--Baltimore Catechism). The Italian edition of the Catechism lists De Concilio as the holder of its copyright. Father F. A. Walsh reported that he had seen a copy of the Italian edition inscribed with the words "Humble respects of the author. De C." ("More about the Catechism of the Council of Baltimore." Ecclesiastical Review, XCV [September, 1934], 274-79). Just how De Concilio regarded himself as "the author", i.e. of the catechismal text itself or only of the translation, is, of course, not clear. The Jersey City priest, in addition to his literary prominence, by the time of the Council had been an advisor to the Bishop of Newark, had been responsible for the
Whatever the uncertainties of De Concilio's involvement with the Baltimore Catechism, it is certain that John Lancaster Spalding played the principal episcopal role in producing the famous summary of Christian Doctrine.

several buildings of St. Michael's Parish, and had directed the building of other institutions. We know that he was made a papal chamberlain in 1886 and a domestic prelate in 1887. One wonders if his inclusion among the monsignori was in some way a recognition of his work on the Catechism. Again, it is not clear. The most solid affirmation of De Concilio's authorship of the BC is actually Archbishop Messmer's "faint recollection." This, however, does not seem too solid. In 1884 both Messmer and De Concilio were fellow priests of the Diocese of Newark. They probably were not close; even so, since Messmer took such an active role in the Council (as one of its four secretaries and principal canonists), one would think that if De Concilio really did compile the BC, the archbishop would have more than a "faint recollection" of this. Although Messmer was eighty-two and soon to die when he wrote Msgr. Sharp, his responses seem very lucid. For more on De Concilio and the BC, cf. below n. 85.

85 Cf. above nn. 65 and 72 on Spalding. There was some connection between Spalding and De Concilio. While working in New York between 1872-75 (cf. above n. 72) Spalding had preached at the dedication of St. Michael's Church in Jersey City where De Concilio was pastor (David P. Sweeney, OFM, [cf. below n. 86], to Charles J. Carmody, St. Bonaventure, New York, October 21, 1971). Thomas McMillan, CSP, long active in the Catechesis, wrote Msgr. Sharp (cf. above n. 82) that Spalding remained as a guest of the Paulist Fathers in New York after the Council, i.e. from early December, 1884 until January 25, 1884. On the latter date he preached at the dedication of the Paulist Church of St. Paul the Apostle. McMillan was of the opinion that "during this period the Bishop and Mons. deConcilio worked on the Catechism." Correspondence dated January 15, 1885 (cf. below n. 89), however, shows Spalding to be working on the Catechism in Peoria with no mention of De Concilio. Father Mark Moesslein, CP, had a reminiscence which supported De Concilio's authorship of the Catechism (cf. "Origin of the Baltimore Catechism," Ecclesiastical Review, XCIII [December, 1935], 613-14). In 1888, he helped give a mission in St. Michael's Church. At that time, De Concilio told him "one of the Bishops appointed by the Plenary Council to prepare a Catechism" asked the Jersey City pastor, in 1884, to draw up a catechism for presentation to the Council Fathers. According to Moesslein, De Concilio did so but knowing the bishops "would dump it in the waste-basket anyhow" spent little time on it; he sent his hasty effort to the bishop who had requested it and heard no more about it; much to his surprise and chagrin, however, the catechism was published; De Concilio was offended that the bishops did not let him know "of the purpose to publish it and give him a chance to make it something really worth while." With all due regard to Father Moesslein, in the judgement of the present author, the story does not ring true. De Concilio would be clearly aware of the catechism deliberations before and during the Council. That the Catechism emerged after
About six months or so after the Council's close, the Catechism appeared with an 1885 copyright issued to "J. L. Spalding." From the correspondence of Spalding with Gibbons we learn that the Bishop of Peoria had examined various suggestions on the catechism forwarded to him by the American bishops during December (1884) and had incorporated them into a final provisional draft; by early January (1885) the Catholic Publication Society of New York had printed a pre-publication edition to be sent "for the final amendments of the archbishops" in accordance with the Third Council's Decree No. 219 which required this "second examination." The Bishop of Peoria was determined to have the catechism published but he was even more determined to get on to the arrangements necessary for the opening of the Catholic University of America. Spalding urged Gibbons to send out the private printing to the Archbishops immediately and ask for prompt answering, expressing his anxiety to get "the work off my hands." We know that Coadjutor-Archbishop Michael Augustine Corrigan of New York sent Spalding his "final amendments" within a

the Council could have in no way surprised him. The published Baltimore Catechism, however short the period of its compilation, shows a great deal of work if not originality and cannot be justly seen as a hasty effort. Moesslein's story, however, may well suggest the truth of the matter, viz. that Spalding had asked De Concilio for some help on the proposed catechism but in the end went ahead with the compilation on his own. The sources obviously used in compiling the BC (cf. below nn. 100-103) all point to Spalding.


87 Cf. above n. 75.

88 Sweeney, Spalding p. 175 ad n. 7. The Irish and English national catechisms (cf. above, nn. 68-70); had experienced considerable delays in being finally published. Evidently, Spalding was determined to avoid such a delay here.
week. By the end of February (1885), Spalding reported to Gibbons: 
"I have received suggestions from all the Abps. concerning the catechism 
and have made such changes as seem desirable." On March 2, 1885, 
Lawrence Kehoe (manager of the Catholic Publication Society) who was 
supervising the printing of the Catechism for Spalding wrote the Arch­ 
bishop of Baltimore: "Bishop Spalding sends me today the last of the 
corrections for the Catechism, and says it must have your Imprimatur." 
By April the copyright and ecclesiastical permissions had been secured. 
These details are important since it came to be alleged by some commen­ 
tators that the Catechism was never submitted to the Archbishops for 
their approval but had been pushed through in an irregular procedure by 
Gibbons and Spalding.

89 Archives of the Archdiocese of New York [AANY], C-3, Spalding 
to Corrigan, Peoria, January 15, 1885, as cited in Sweeney, Spalding, 
p. 175 ad n. 7. In a letter to the present author (cf. n. 85), Father 
Sweeney kindly answered that he could find nothing more substantial on 
Spalding and the Baltimore Catechism, other than what he included in 
Spalding, in the AAB, AANY, or the Archives of the Diocese of Peoria.

90 AAB 79-E-15, Spalding to Gibbons, Peoria, February 28, 1885 
as cited in Buetow, Of Singular Benefit, p. 198.

91 AAB 79-E-15, Kehoe to Gibbons, New York, March 2, 1885 as 
cited ibid.

92 Gibbons and Spalding seem to have truly submitted the Catech­ 
ishm to the archbishops (cf. nn. 90-91) for the required "second exam­ 
ination" (cf. n. 75), but it is not clear if their procedure of sending 
pre-publication proofs to the prelates for their individual "final 
amendments" (cf. n. 86) really fulfilled the provision of Decretum 219 
(2). Perhaps that conciliar decree required formal discussion and vote 
from the assembled metropolitans (cf. n. 75). This may have been the 
understanding of Archbishop William Elder (Cincinnati) who wrote Gibbons 
in early 1885, asking if Spalding would make the final revision of the 
Catechism on his own authority, and, if so, would his final draft then 
be obligatory on all (Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," 
p. 583). Still, the "enjoinment" of the Catechism seems to have been re­ 
garded generally as a fait accompli by the American archbishops who sev­ 
eral times discussed their responsibility to cause its revision. For 
more on this, cf. Chapter iii, n. 54 and Chapter v, nn. 29-30.
The earliest public edition of the Catechism was printed by the Catholic Publication Society of New York, followed quickly by such national publishers as Benziger Brothers and locally by institutional printing shops. German, French, and Italian editions of the catechism appeared in the next months; a Polish and other translated editions appeared later. In a letter to Gibbons, Lawrence Kehoe gives interesting details on the publishment of the Baltimore Catechism which touch the frequently vexed problem of providing suitable and "authorized" materials for the Catechesis. Written on March 5, 1885, he proceeds:

...I am now experimenting about type and paper so as to make the catechism in such a shape that it will be cheap and in large type. I do not think it right that our children should be compelled or allowed to ruin their eyes in studying small type catechism-printed on wretched paper. I proposed to better all this, but I need your authority and help.

Can you or will you copyright it? If you do, then the right to print could be withheld from all who would try to tinker [sic] it by adding a prayer book to it...or who would get it out in small type. It would be a caution that they must do right. I propose to sell it at $2.50 per 100 - that is cheap enough is it not?

I propose to sell plates to all the publishers that want to get it out and charge them 1/2 the cost of type setting and the cost of cast-sterotypes. If you and the Archbishops and Bishop Spalding should recommend this plan, we would have a uniform catechism all over the country, page for page, line for line, so that a child leaving New York and going to Chicago to live would find page 10, 10, 50 or any other page, agreed exactly with the one used in the Chicago school. I think this could be done, by writing a letter to me asking to get out uniform plates for all who wished it - or something to that effect. Murphy has already agreed to take them, - so will Benziger and others for they will save half the cost of type setting. It is the small towns that will create trouble in printing it, as has been done with the old National Council Catechism.

---

94 Cf. ibid; also above n. 80.
95 AAB - 79 - F - 8, Kehoe to Gibbons. New York, March 5, 1885, as reproduced in Fullman, "CPS," p. 66. Cf. above, n.50.
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+James Gibbons
Archbishop of Baltimore
Apostolic Delegate

Baltimore, April 6, 1885
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[Figure 1]
When it was reported to him that his fellow New York Catholic publisher Sadlier was coming out with an independent edition of the Catechism by-passing his arrangement, Kehoe complained that Sadlier would, therefore, be able to put out a cheaper edition than the CPS whose own expenses were higher because "... the bishops insists on good paper, good type." 96

All these matters were quickly settled and, as a result, the title page and its verso carried the data as found in Figure 1 of this chapter. Later editions, including translations, all carried the same title and credentials. The Third Plenary Council's Catechism of Christian Doctrine, therefore, became the one "enjoined" for use in the American Church. Although it had a few rivals, the Baltimore Catechism in its

96. Kehoe Papers in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame, Kehoe to John Hammond, New York, April 18, 1885 as cited in ibid. Evidently considerations such as these caused Bishop Spalding to take out a copyright on the BC. He could control its publishing in this way. According to Archbishop Messmer the Council Fathers had decided not to copyright the text of the conciliar catechism (Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," p. 575).

97. The principal rival was the catechism of Father W. [Friedrich Wilhelm] Faerber (1841-1905). Faerber was for many years editor of the St. Louis periodical Pastoralblatt in which he included much material on controversial issues being debated in the American Church (cf. below n. 113) and matters of social concern. Under his editorship, a series of articles appeared in the Pastoralblatt (1885-86) attacking the Baltimore Catechism (cf. below Chapter iii, n. 54) and setting forth the principles of what a good catechism for Catholic children should be. It is most probable that most of these articles were the work of Faerber himself. In 1895, Faerber (D) issued his own catechism in German; in the following year a German/English edition appeared followed by an abridgement of the same in 1897. Faerber (D) published several volumes of commentary (1899-1902) in German on his catechism for use of the catechist. Before and after his death in 1905, a number of Slavic/English editions of his catechism were published in the United States. An English-language reduction of his commentary appeared after 1900. Faerber's catechism was widely used in German and Slavic Catholic schools in this country into the late 1920's. The Faerber Catechism consists of four parts (Creed, Commandments, Sacraments, and Prayer), plus appendices on devotions, Confession, and the Liturgy of the Mass. He is more traditional than the Baltimore when he gives a lengthy explication of the Our Father and the Hail Mary, but less traditional
many editions and versions almost totally dominated the American Catechetism for over sixty years (ca. 1885-1950) and still has its staunch supporters.

Sources, Format, and Content of the Baltimore Catechism

Considerable interest has been shown as to what sources the compilers of the Catechism might have used. After an extensive analysis, this author has come to the conclusion that the Baltimore Catechism is an amalgam of those major catechisms hitherto used in the American Catechesis, plus materials originally composed for the Catechism by its makers. We have seen all these major catechisms in the development of this chapter. It is obvious that the BC's compilers used McCaffrey's Catechism as their most basic and immediate source. While they did not use all of McCaffrey, they used most of it. In McCaffrey they had the General Catechism of the First Plenary Council almost totally preserved, plus his further additions from Butler and David, plus his own

when he gives his answers in points rather than in full sentences. In the articles, presumably written by him, cited above, he criticizes the Baltimore for its lack of social content but he includes very little if any himself. For reviews of Faerber's catechism, cf. the various Catholic periodicals of the period; also Ecclesiastical Review, LXXVI (June, 1927), 651-52 and Catholic School Journal XX (March, 1921), 473-74. Cf. also Chapter iii, n. 54.

98 Cf. above nn. 82-85.

99 Cf. also Sister Mary Charles Bryce, OSB, "The Influence of the Catechism of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Widely Used Elementary Religion Text Books from Its Composition in 1885 to Its 1941 Revision" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1970--University Microfilms, No. 71-8975), 108-13; 238-43. The present author found Sister Mary Charles' findings very helpful in making his own analysis of this matter which he gives below in the text.

100 Cf. above n. 54.
original materials. As we have seen, Butler too in its own proper form has been used in the United States along with "Carroll" for almost as long a time; material from the Irish catechism had also been incorporated into David, the General, and especially into McCaffrey. In McCaffrey, therefore, the BC's compilers found "Carroll," David, and Butler already combined--almost the whole of the American catechetical tradition. This author's research showed that when McCaffrey did not have what the Baltimore's makers desired, they did several things: a) went back to the General or even to "Carroll," b) took yet even more material from Butler, c) seemingly went again to David for several ideas, and finally d) wrote their own material. While the BC does incorporate material directly from its sources, most of the question/answer units have been rewritten according to a uniform style. The Baltimore Catechism follows David's order of Creed, Sacraments, and Commandments but its ordering of catechetical material is distinctively

101 Cf. above.
102 Cf. above.
103 It is evident that the BC compilers in taking yet more material from Butler approached his text through the then recently (ca. 1882) published Maynooth Catechism (cf. above n. 68). It is important to point out here again, however, that all the Butler material in the Baltimore Catechism was not taken from the Maynooth Catechism but rather from previous American catechisms who had already borrowed from Butler.
104 Elements which appear to be originally composed for the Baltimore Catechism are these: its emphasis on three things necessary to make a sin mortal (grievous matter, sufficient reflection, full consent of the will); its controversial definition of a venial sin; its development of the "attributes of the Church" (authority, infallibility, and indefectibility); its distinction between sacraments of the living and of the dead with its development of sacramental graces and its treatment of the sacraments in general; its several questions on baptism of blood and desire (probably inspired by David or even by Doway) and those on godparents; its extensive treatment of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; plus another dozen or
its own.

The Third Plenary Council's text has 421 question/answer units arranged in thirty-seven lessons. It opens "On the End of Man" (Lesson First) and then proceeds through the Creed, frequently digressing into explanatory materials and allied topics. The Sacraments follow (Thirteenth-Twenty-sixth) with data on the Gifts and Fruits of the Holy Ghost following Confirmation. The Sacrifice of the Mass is treated in Lesson Twenty-fourth. The Sacramentals (Twenty-seventh) and Prayer (Twenty-eighth) follow the Sacraments. Unlike its sources, the Baltimore Catechism does not contain a phrase by phrase explanation of the Our Father and Hail Mary. Lessons Twenty-ninth through Thirty-fifth contain the Commandments of God and the Church. The "Last Things" are contained in the final lesson (Thirty-seventh) which treats "On the Last Judgement, and the Resurrection, Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven." The well-known prayers at the beginning of the Catechism--particularly the Baltimore Act of Contrition--are taken from McCaffrey with some very slight rewording.

The Catechism lacks the biblical approach of the ancient and contemporary Catechesis. Whenever the Bible is quoted (only very sparingly), it is usually as a proof-text; even then, the scriptural source

more question/answer units interspersed in the Catechism. This author again found Sister Mary Bryce's study very helpful in checking his own findings (cf. above n.99).

105 This was also the order of the Catechism of the Council of Trent (cf. Introduction). Many, however, were critical of this order in the BC, preferring the Commandments before the Sacraments.

106 Cf. above n. 54.
of the quotation is never given. This last omission was undoubtedly made in the interest of fluent recitation but it had the effect of eliminating all reference to the biblical books themselves. This scriptural lacuna in the Catechism was generally thought to be met in the complementary study of bible history. Formal bible history had made its appearance into the American Catechesis in the first part of the nineteenth-century--a matter more fully discussed in Chapters ii and iii. There were some, however, who saw the complementary study of bible history to be lacking significant coordination with the Catechism. The text of the Third Plenary Council contains no liturgical catechism as do David, the Boston Catechism, and its chief rival Faerber (cf. n. 97) but then neither do "Carroll," Butler, nor McCaffrey. There were other liturgical texts available, however, such as Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed, but liturgical education did not begin to receive complementary status in the American Catechesis, such as bible history, until after 1915 with the rise of the liturgical movement here. Neither does the Baltimore Catechism contain a section on church history as Deharbe's larger catechism but again this was thought to be one of the functions of bible history.

The Pedagogical Character of the Baltimore Catechism

As the following chapters will show, the Baltimore Catechism received much diverse criticism from its inception. Perhaps the severest criticism most recently leveled against it comes from a distinguished

107 Cf. Bible History/Church History in Appendices C-F.
108 Cf. Liturgy/Ritual in Appendices C-F.
and knowledgeable critic, Father Gerard Sloyan, who finds the Catechism does not "...profess any pedagogical concern." While the authors of the Baltimore summary may not have been as pedagogically aware as their times would permit, they still did show definite pedagogical concern. The Catechism is no mere pastiche as is sometimes alleged. It is true that it borrowed most of its materials from previous sources, as we have seen, but its makers painstakingly rearranged these materials in an order they considered to be more highly logical. At the same time, they rewrote most of the borrowed materials to make for a more fluent reading and recitation. The Catechism does have a certain rhythm to its text. The Baltimore's compilers also carefully adhered to then current catechismal pedagogy: by breaking down older more complex questions and answers into several smaller ones, making each answer a complete statement, and especially repeating the question asked in the answer given to make a more comprehensible whole.

Neither the Baltimore Catechism nor its American predecessors in the Doway tradition number the questions as do the Penny Catechism, Deharbe and Faerber; this made references to its units a difficult procedure. Later, however, when changing catechetical method called for it, some editions of the Baltimore numbered the units.


110 It has been popularly alleged that this practice was adopted from the Penny Catechism of 1879. Twiney says it was done by the English Fathers at the strong urging of the remarkable Bishop William Ullathorne (Birmingham) ("Penny Catechism," p. 81). He also indicates later writers who scored the naive expectations attached to this reform. This technique however had already been employed by the General Catechism of the 1852 Council, apparently at the instigation of Bishop John Timon. This author finds indications of mutual interrelationships between the various editions of the American "Carroll" and the English "Challoner." It could be a point for further research.
We have seen how efforts were made by the Catholic Publication Society at the behest of the bishops to use "good paper, good type." Indeed most of the early editions of the Baltimore Catechism encountered by this study are a distinct improvement over what came before from the bookmaking standpoint. In addition to this good typography, the earliest editions of the Catechism carry a large number of artfully engraved illustrations in a highly competent attempt (for the times) to "pictorialize" the text. While we may still be amazed and discomforted by what the Catechism obviously expected children to memorize and understand, there is definite evidence that its compilers were making an attempt to put forth the traditional catechismal material in a more pedagogically suitable format. Of course, those who are opposed to the whole catechism-approach in teaching religion can see little good in the Baltimore.

It should be pointed out here, as well, that the responsibility for the American conciliar catechisms (1852, 1866, 1884) were put in the hands of bishops who had literary background. Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, chairman of the 1852 committee and active in the 1866 proposal, had authored a number of significant materials. Verot, who opposed the 1866 McCaffrey catechism, had also published. Clearly, Gibbons' choice of John Lancaster Spalding in 1884, all other considerations aside, was determined by the proven scholarly and literary abilities of that great churchman. DeGeesbriand who authored and translated several small theological works, is another case in point.

111 Cf. above nn. 95-96.

112 Pictorialized religious works had appeared and been co-published in this country from before the Civil War; cf. Chapter ii.
The Contemporary Order and the Catechism

The Baltimore Catechism is strictly traditional; it could not be otherwise if it was to gain "national" approval and the widespread acceptance desired for it. It is apologetic in terms of the Catholic-Protestant argument but in no way polemical. It contains no special pleadings relative to its compilers. There is nothing of emphasis to indicate the major controversies then being waged in the American Church regarding labor organization, secret societies, the temperance crusade, the single tax, or the parochial school controversy. Above all, there is nothing indicative of the "Americanism" condemned in the letter Testem Benevolentiae (In Testimony of Our Affection) sent by Pope Leo XIII (January 22, 1899) to the James Cardinal Gibbons. The postulates of what has been called a "phantom heresy" but as laid down by Pope Leo--stressing the "active" virtues over the "passive" ones, exalting the active over the contemplative life, the excellence of response to the "Spirit" as against obedience, a kind of latitudinarianism, and finally a compromised coming to terms with the "Age"--appear nowhere in the Catechism. There can be no doubt that the "americanist" bishops were consumed by the problems of adaption and frequently addressed themselves to the ramifications of their favorite theme "the Church and the Age," but there is no indication of it in the Catechism of 1884. We look in vain too for anything specific on

113 Learned works have been written on these controversies; cf. John Tracy Ellis, A Guide to American Catholic History (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1959)

"race" or other more modern understandings.

The Use of the Baltimore Catechism

As we have seen above and from a study of Appendices C-F, the "Carroll" Catechism and Butler were used as basic catechetical materials in this country into the 1840's when they were generally superseded by the Boston Catechism and the General Catechism of the First Plenary Council. In 1885, the Baltimore Catechism began its almost total dominance of the basic Catechesis, which it shared to some extent for a while with Faerber. This dominance of the BC lasted well after the years of World War II. It appeared in many editions and some adaptations but its basic text was the prime catechetical material in this country for over sixty years.

Some Conclusions

It can be clearly seen from this Chapter that the catechisms were the dominant instructional means in religious education in the United States

115 Although, as all catechisms, the Catechism stress the universality of justice and charity for all men, it does not spell out the specific obligations of racial justice--something perhaps that its compilers did not yet fully understand. The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council were strongly aware of the obligations of religious education and what we may call "welfare" among Indian and Negro Catholics. Chapter ii in Title VIII (On Zeal for Souls) is devoted to the establishment of the "Commission for Catholic Missions among the Colored People and the Indians." It also orders a special collection for this work to be taken up annually on the First Sunday of Lent (Acta et Decreta Concilii Baltimorensis Tertii, Titulus VIII, Caput II).

116 Cf. above n. 97.
to 1930 and beyond. Indeed, catechesis and catechism were convertible terms here as elsewhere. This was certainly true with the national and conciliar catechisms formulated in the last half of the nineteenth century; it had been true during the era of the diocesan catechisms that preceded. One can see the need for a theologically accurate summary, plus the need to put something definite in the hands of many thousands of teachers (very few of whom were capable of developing a syllabus), being met by the catechism. A number of manuals for catechists did develop however to help them explain and expand the catechismal text.\footnote{Cf. "For the Catechist" in Appendices D-F; cf. especially Perry and Kinkead.}

It should be noted here that nineteenth century American bibliography provides numerous examples of non-religious works using the catechismal format of question/answer. Presumably concomitant memorization was associated with many of these. Their titles suggest this. To this day the question/answer technique is still popular and appears from time to time as the format of best sellers--quite recently in fact. It is not considered a really literate way of presentation but it continues to have the advantage of not requiring extensive and uninterrupted concentration--which, of course, makes it a popular technique. Its segmented or short-unit-treatment of a subject part by part is its virtue and at the same time its vice.

The catechisms were generally lacking in originality: all stem back to some "original" source. The need to present "true doctrine" without variations as well as to present a Catholic consensus prevented them from introducing currently controversial materials. They contained
classical formulations which did not change greatly if at all from generation to generation. They did, however, oftentimes contain some editing which attempted to give special emphasis. We have seen, however, in this chapter from the experiences of David, England, Conwell, Eccleston, and McCaffrey, among others, just how difficult it was to get support for a new catechism--let alone agreement and approval. Even the "enjoined" and extensively used Baltimore Catechism was the object of constant criticism. In all the catechisms studied in connection with this chapter there are really no distinct echoes of what we now see to have been the theologically-connected social and political issues of those times. The static condition of the catechism, however, did contribute close continuity in the religious of one generation with the next--a condition which many today scorn as being unrealistic and unavoidably leading to "irrelevance" but which many others find highly desirable in leading to the stability of an "unchanging Faith."\textsuperscript{118}

In the formulation of American catechisms one can see the strength and persistence of the "Carroll" Catechism which calls to mind again that unacknowledged debt owed by the American Catechesis to Bishop Richard Challoner whose Abridgement of Christian Doctrine and Catholic Christian Instructed provided the American Church with much of its dominant instructional material for close to 175 years. This debt was almost equally shared with Archbishop James Butler II whose catechism was generally published here under his own name, but also frequently drawn upon with no acknowledgement. Both Challoner and Butler furnished most of the material for the Baltimore catechisms, cf. "Résumé and Conclusions."
Catechism but here again the double-debt is unacknowledged. Both Challoner and Butler, however, in their turn owe much to the tradition of the Doway Catechism. In fine, one can say that throughout its history, the American Catechesis (with the English and Irish) has been rooted firmly in the Doway tradition and its fontes--Canisius and Bellarmine.

This chapter has set forth the basic materials used in American Catholic religious education from its beginnings here to the middle decades of the present century. The remaining chapters will explore the reaction to these basic materials (and others) as well as catechetical concern generally expressed in the pages of American Catholic English-language periodicals from their beginning in 1830 to 1930.
CHAPTER II

EMERGING CATEchetical CONCERN
(1830-1864)

The bulk of American Catholic English-language periodicals (ACELP), published between 1830 and 1930, is the principal research-source used to chart the ongoing development of the American Catechesis

1The phrase "American Catholic English-language periodicals" is represented throughout this study by the abbreviation ACELP. The abbreviation, peculiar to this study, is used for purposes of brevity and exactness.

2The present author has based his researches largely on essay materials in the ACELP rather than on newspapers or archival sources. He has encountered difficulty in this since the ACELP do not really begin until 1830. Parsons gives "A List of Periodicals Edited or Published by Catholics in the United States, 1785-1830" (Americana, Appendix II, pp. 261-63). A number of these, as listed in Appendix A, were examined by the present author, but they yielded no significant data for this study.


ACELP examined in connection with this study are listed in Appendix A.
in this study. Catechetical concern, however, is fragmentary in the early ACELP. While devoted to learned exposition and Catholic "Intelligence" here and abroad, these magazines, understandably, have a strongly apologetic content; they existed in an era of exceedingly severe nativism and anti-Catholicism. Even the most literary of the early ACELP contain pieces defending various Catholic positions against the disapproval of the Protestant majority, then so forcefully articulated in the nation's press at large. Accordingly, the strident noises of the continuing public school controversy strongly registered in the pages of the middle nineteenth century ACELP. One often reads there of the need for Religion in Education; conversely, however, the need for Education in Religion is encountered much less frequently. Even so, the ACELP published between 1830 and 1864 do contain data on the theory, materials, and procedures of American Catholic religious education in that era.

The first specifically American Catholic periodical is generally acknowledged to be the Metropolitan or Catholic Monthly Magazine (1830), published and edited at Philadelphia by Father Charles Constantine Pise. It put forth only twelve monthly issues before ceasing publication and contained nothing of catechetical interest. That same year, Bishop

---


4 For biographical material on many persons named in this study, cf. the sources listed in Appendix B.
Joseph Benedict Fenwick of Boston founded and edited the *Expostulator or Young Catholic's Guide* (1830-1831); more a juvenile, it carried some general catechetical instruction but no essay material on religious education. In 1841 Father Pise made another attempt at a monthly when he and the Cuban refugee priest-publicist Felix Varela produced the *Catholic Expositor* (1841-44) at New York. The periodical showed very little catechetical concern until its last year of publication when it ran a translation of Bellarmine's two catechisms, *Dottrina breve* and *Dichiarazione*, made by a "Captain Douglas, U.S.M.C." It is the first translation of Bellarmine published in the United States that the present author has encountered. Unfortunately the work was only two-thirds printed when the periodical failed. Unlike other serial translations appearing in the ACELP of this period, the Bellarmine units were not subsequently published in book form. Although Douglas's work may very well have been used as filler material by Pise and Varela in the *Catholic Expositor*, its appearance there represents the initial effort of the ACELP to provide its readers with larger or fuller catechism -- a concept akin to what is called adult religious education today. About this same time, Bishop Peter Richard Kenrick of St. Louis published the *Catholic Cabinet and Chronicle of Religious Intelligence* but it had no catechetical content.

---

5 *Catholic Expositor*, V (November, 1843), 92-101; (December, 1843), 181-91; (January, 1844), 277-83; (February, 1844), 323-31; (March, 1844), 390-400. Throughout Volume V, Father Pise also published his own translation of "Père DeLigny's 'Life of Christ.'" For Bellarmine's catechisms, cf. the Introduction of this dissertation, nn. 62-64. For Bellarmine's catechism and the Councils of Baltimore, cf. Chapter i nn. 38, 52 and 57. For Bellarmine catechisms printed in the United States, cf. Appendix C.
Some interesting insights into the problems of American Catholic religious education in the mid-century can be found in the United States Catholic Magazine (1842-1848). Its first volume was published under the name Religious Cabinet. Founded by the Baltimore publisher John Murphy and edited by the two noted priests Charles Ignatius White and James Dolan, the USCM contained a goodly array of literary, historical, and apologetic pieces along with much Catholic "Intelligence" and regular book reviews. The USCM also expressed catechetical concern from the beginning. In Volume I, for instance, the editors included extracts on religious education from the writings of the English priest Rutter (Henry Banister), a catechetical instruction on the holy oils of the Church by "W" (probably Father White), and the religious novella "Wooden Cross" by the celebrated Bavarian teller of tales Canon Christoph Schmid. The extracts from Rutter are particularly interesting since they give insight into the English-speaking Catechesis of that time. The material is taken from his book A Help to Parents in the Religious Education of Their Children (Newcastle, 1821; London, 1832). As all the recusant clergy, Henry Banister received a continental education and, as many of them, he used a pseudonymn (Rutter) in writing. Most of Rutter's works are adapted from the French; there is indication his Help to Parents

also had a French base. At any rate, he maintains "the first object of Christian parents ought to be the religious education of their children" and then gives a number of reasons. Later he continues:

Parents are apt to imagine that the business of instruction belongs wholly to priests or pastors; but this is a great mistake. The parents themselves, as Bossuet observes, are the first, and, in some respects, even the principal catechists of their children. They are the first catechists, because, before their children come to the chapel, they ought to nourish them with the milk of sound doctrine which themselves have received from the Catholic church. They are the principal catechists, because it is their duty to teach them their catechism by heart, to make them daily repeat it, and to explain it to them in the best manner they are able. When parents neglect this part of their duty, the little which their children learn on Sundays is soon forgotten; whereas, by attending to it, they may render more essential service to their children than only in the chapel, on certain days, and for a short space of time, when they are extremely dissipated by the company and variety of strange objects which strike their senses. On the contrary, at home children are more recollected; their thoughts are more sedate, because they see nothing new to take off their attention; and parents have more frequent and better opportunities of instructing them: they know their capacity and inclinations, and can take advantage of those moments when their children are most docile and best disposed to receive instruction.

Rutter finds that parents should begin the religious education of their children when they see in their little ones "the first dawn of reason."

He proceeds in explaining how the "house catechism" should be implemented:

When children can repeat their catechism, their parents should begin to exercise their reason, and teach them to think, by little short questions, such as may help them to understand the meaning of words, and the sense of what they learn. For here lies the main difficulty of catechists--how to engage the attention of children, and impress on their tender minds a due sense of what is contained in the catechism. Boudon, in his excellent treatise on this subject, observes that the catechism is often of no use to children, because they learn it only by rote, without understanding it. He says that he had found children of twelve or fourteen years of age, who knew perfectly well how to answer the questions in the catechism, and who nevertheless had no knowledge of God. They would say, and repeat, that "there is one God and three persons,-- that the second person was made man, -- that one mortal sin was sufficient to damn a person," etc.; but they pronounced all this like parrots, without any meaning, and without having any proper ideas of religion.
One should note that while memorization of the catechismal text is taken for granted as a necessity by Rutter, he places great emphasis on the explanation and understanding of the memorized material. The USCM extracts from Help to Parents also contain material on teaching children to pray, correcting them, improving their habits, and inculcating the "leading principles of religion" into their lives. The Rutter units conclude with his extensive catechesis on sacred history.

The USCM continued to show catechetical concern in succeeding volumes but it reached a high point in an 1847 article entitled "Popular Theology." There the editors forcefully took up the religious education of the adolescent. The article was occasioned by the publication of the Abbé Jean-Joseph Gaume's (C) _Catéchisme de Persévérance_ first published that same year (1847) at Paris. The editors find Gaume's eight-volumed work "excellent" in most respects even if faulted by the author's "diffusiveness" and weak development of the "dogmatical part" of his catechism. In their opinion, Gaume offers a very suitable basis for implementing a widespread use of _Catéchisme de Persévérance_ in the United States. They explain that this concept, already widely established in France, concerns itself with offering a "fuller" or "more elevated" and less formal kind of religious education to young people (ca. 12-15

---

7 United States Catholic Magazines, VI (June, 1847), 285-301. (Hereinafter cited as USCM.) The cited article treats of the need for catechesis after First Holy Communion; its author promises another article on the pre-Communion Catechesis, but this, unfortunately, never appeared in the USCM.

8 In this study a letter designation (as here) indicates that the work discussed is listed in the so-lettered appendix under the author's name. USCM gave enthusiastic reviews to the larger catechisms of Mannock (C): (January, 1844), 67; Challoner (C): III (July, 1844), 474 and (December, 1844), 807; Curr (C): IV (September, 1845), 612.
years old and beyond), who "persevere" in religious instruction after the reception of their First Communion. The USCM article strongly

This later age for the reception of First Communion generally obtained in the American Church, as elsewhere in the West, until the apostolic decree Quam Singulari (1910) which had the effect of lowering the age of initial reception to about the seventh year (cf. Chapter iv, nn. 143-53). By the time the American Church was formally established (1784), the "age of reason" had been set for many centuries as the proper time for the reception of Confirmation and Holy Communion. The "age of reason," however, had never been defined. When the First Synod of 1791 (cf. Chapter i, nn. 20-22) was held in the United States, the Fathers set the conferral of Confirmation at "not before the age of reason had been reached" but required that the confirmed also receive the sacrament of Penance (Decretum IV); in fine, they added the observation that more often than not Confirmation would be conferred on youths (junioribus). The same synod ordered (Decretum X); that "youths" (juvenes) be not given First Communion until they a) had been well instructed in Christian Doctrine and b) had made a general confession of sins--after a thorough examination of conscience. The Fathers of 1791 admonished pastors not to delay the time of First Communion unduly but at the same time insisted that the "supreme excellence" of the Holy Eucharist required for its first reception "greater maturity of judgement" and a "more perfect age of reason." These various stipulations (which undoubtedly canonized previous practice) were often interpreted to be fulfilled around the age of thirteen. This, for instance, was the minimum age set in 1782 under Archbishop James Butler II (cf. Introduction, nn. 96ff.) for the dioceses of Cashel and Emily (cf. Renehan, Collections on Irish Church History, 1, 474). Before this in 1736, however, Challoner (C) in Catholic Christian Instructed (Section VII) indicates that some children may be ready for First Communion by the age of ten but seldom before. Both Butler and Challoner would reflect the opinion of segments in the early American Church. When Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick wrote his Theologia Moralis (3 vols.; Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1841-43) he set the proper age for first reception as generally occurring between ten and fourteen years, depending on the acumen and piety of the individual child. He does this in his discussion of the paschal precept and quotes Roman authors to support him. It is often said that where remnants of Jansenist piety were active (notably certain sectors of France) children did not receive First Communion much before the age of eighteen. While scattered, and oftentimes loose, allegations of Jansenism in the early American Church have been made, there is no evidence that such a late age for first reception was ever practiced here. On the contrary, the dominant thrust of American piety has always encouraged early and frequent reception. At any rate, this early legislation and theological opinion cited placed the bulk of catechetical preparation before First Communion and not Confirmation. As things worked out, however, only one major preparation was needed since both Sacraments were received in close proximity--often on the same day (cf. Metropolitan, IV [May, 1856], 262; ibid. [June, 1856] 328). In 1866 the decrees on First Communion (Nos. 260-61) of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (cf. Chapter i, n. 55) locate the limits of reception between ages ten and fourteen but acknowledge the possibility of exceptions. These decrees show very much the
affirms that the basic catechesis given in preparation for the "most
august Sacrament" cannot carry people through life: as important as this
basic catechesis is, it must be complemented by a more mature kind of
instruction, one that will be:

...at once, religious, historical, and controversial. The
exposition of the divine dogmas becomes more developed; the cate-
chizers show the different attacks to which each point of doctrine
has been exposed, laying great stress however on such parts as are
open to the aspersions of Protestants and Freethinkers. The reader
will easily understand the high interest which such a course of
instructions may have when handled by a zealous and well-informed
clergyman, delivered in a simple, easy flow of language that fre-
quently makes a deeper impression than the flowery oratory of the
pulpit.  

This statement and others that follow indicate by this time (1847) Ameri-
can Catholic religious education had to be concerned not only with the
intervention of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda (cf. Chapter
i, n. 38); it is said that in the latter half of the nineteenth century
the Holy See made such interventions in synodal prescriptions sent for
approval in an effort to reduce the age of First Communion (cf. Georges
Decluve SJ, "Confirmation at the Age of Reason," in Sloyan, ed., Shaping
the Christian Message, p. 300). It would seem, however, that age twelve
was the locus around which English-speaking Catholics made First Communion
in the United States until 1910. The Third Plenary Council added nothing
to previous legislation in this regard but a number of diocesan synods
held after the 1884 council canonized the traditional American praxis of
conferring Confirmation in close proximity to First Communion (cf. e.g.
No. 123, Synodus Dioecesana Chicagiensis Prima. [Chicago: Cameron, Amer-
berg, et sociorum, 1887]. A random examination of church records from
the last decades of the century show both sacraments were customarily
received ca. twelve years of age with Confirmation generally following
First Communion. Perhaps a small special catechesis of the effects of
the sacrament preceded Confirmation since synodal decrees often called
for it. This reception of Confirmation after First Communion is an inver-
sion of the proper sacramental order since Confirmation should follow
Baptism. For many centuries however, this proper sequence had not been
followed in the Latin church (cf. Decluve, Shaping the Christian Message,
pp. 289-303). For more on this cf. Chapter iv, nn. 143-53: also Chapter
iii n. 37; also Chapter i at nn. 18, 19, 44.

10USCM, VI (June, 1847), 288. Actually, the USCM is quoting from
the London Tablet. It may be noted here that the French usage of the noun
"catechisme" primarily indicates religious instruction and only secondarily
the method or the text of that instruction.
traditional Catholic-Protestant argument (then raging in the United States) but also with the increasing influence in the American ethos or what Christians commonly termed "infidelity" i.e. an atheism or at least agnosticism arising out of the nineteenth century conflict of science and religion. The editors of the USCM find this dual need not being met. They decry the lack of proper adolescent-oriented religious instruction in the American Church, observing:

It is certain, however, that young persons are generally supposed to have completed their course of religious training when they have completed their first Communion. From this period they are mostly left to themselves, as if fully equipped for the long and dangerous struggle that awaits them, the tactics of Christian warfare are no longer studied. The article charges that this lack of continuing instruction is very often the cause of the obvious "leakage" from the Catholic Church of young people both here and abroad--many of whom were given careful and regular preparation for First Communion. Youth cannot compete without "expanding instruction" to fit its "expanding need" against the blandishments of "sectarianism and infidelity." The need to establish this post-First Communion catechesis is the grave obligation of American parents, priests, catechists, and teachers. It is not that young people or Catholics in general are expected to study their religion in the same way that clergymen and theologians do, but tailored continuing education must be provided for them -- not only to meet their own individual needs but to create in them a well-educated Catholic laity which will act as

11 There are a large number of articles and book reviews in ACELP on the subject of Science and Religion in the latter decades of the nineteenth century.

12 USCM, VI (June, 1847), 287.
a leaven in a frequently hostile and religiously impoverished American society. But, the USCM warns, young people will not be drawn to a boring, childish or too formalized type of religious instruction. Catéchisme de Persévérance does not call for oratory etc. but rather for a well-informed, simple, perhaps conversational kind of teaching. The USCM does not use the phrase but this type of catechesis came to be called "familiar instruction" (following the French usage) in the United States after mid-century. Significantly, abridged English translations of the Abbé Gaume's (C) work became popular here after 1849 and were used in imparting "fuller catechism" along with the older works of Challoner (C) and Mannock (C) discussed in Chapter i.

Interesting enough, the "Popular Theology" article also comments that many see the need for adult education among American Catholics then being met by Catholic novels, a "class of publications that has rapidly increased within a few years and is intended to encourage a more enlarged study of religion among Catholics, while it aims also at the instruction of those who differ from us in faith." The article approves of this new instructional form generally since many people prefer it to the "heavier and more serious writings of a doctrinal and controversial character" but, at the same time every effort should be made to render these novels "unexceptionable." Unfortunately, this is not the case

13 Ibid., 289-91.

14 Comment on these Catholic "popular theology" novels is found ibid., 293-95. For an excellent and extensive essay on a large number of these novels cf. Willard Thorp "Catholic Novels in Defense of their Faith, 1829-1865," American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, LXXVIII, pt. 1, 25-117. The essay has also been separately published (n.p., n.d.). A number of these Catholic "teaching novels" also appeared after 1865.
with all of them. According to the USCM, "these Catholic explanatory or controversial novels" must demonstrate "sound doctrine, enlightened prudence, and charitable language." Many of them do so. Some, however, contain elements of "worldliness" that make them too distracting; so distracting in fact, that many young people "pass over the instructive parts, in order to feast upon the passages which detail the incidents of fashion, levity, and love-making." Others of this current class of "teaching novels," USCM finds, are too polemical and insulting to Protestants in explicating points of Catholic dogma -- particularly the doctrine "outside the church there is no salvation." The "Popular Theology" article, reflecting the "old Catholic" background of Anglo-American Father Charles Ignatius White, objects to the excesses of some apologists when he concludes:

Who can recall the Carrolls, the Chevrus', and the Dubourgs, the Englands, without associating with the recollection the charms of influential moderation. These men knew how to conciliate the most powerful defense of Catholicity with a tone of gentleness that never gave offense. In vain would we look into their popular writings or discourses, for the opprobrious appellation of heretic, or anything of the kind. When they addressed Protestants, they recognized them as 'separated brethren';...we may never fear to go astray, as long as we adhere to the path that has been traced by such enlightened and apostolic men.15

Other ACELP came to express this same criticism of these influential Catholic "teaching novels" in the mid-nineteenth century (cf. below).

This article "Popular Theology," the only one of its kind in the USCM, is a kind of mid-century guidepost in the American Catechesis. Rambling as it is, the article makes a strong plea in 1847 for religious instruction for adolescents of both sexes that will be continuing but

15 For references to these early American bishops, cf. Chapter i; also Appendix B.
changing, serious but not boresome, formally given but in a "familiar" way, controversial and apologetic to fit the period yet consciously positive and irenic, and finally, current i.e. "brought down to the present time." It was a plea made again and again throughout the remainder of the century by those seeking improvement in the American Catechesis.

Metropolitan (1853)

In 1849, the United States Catholic became a weekly and finally a newspaper. To provide another monthly periodical for the Catholic reading public, Father White helped to organize a second Metropolitan which was published in Baltimore by John Murphy from 1853-59. Edited by Martin J. Kerney, \(^{16}\) it showed a lively interest in the Catechesis in its brief reviews of catechetical literature and its articles. Kerney was especially appreciative of the works of Bishop Challoner (C) and vigorously hailed each American printing of his catechisms. He did the same for the General Catechism (C) of 1852 but gave no details of its making. For the purpose of the adult education, the Metropolitan published specially translated segments from Short and Familiar Answers by the celebrated Abbé Louis-Gaston de Segur (C) throughout its first volume (1830); the chapters were also published in book form as a larger catechism and had a wide circulation here. Material on the Sacraments

\(^{16}\) Kerney was a schoolmaster who compiled a number of Catholic school textbooks for use in the United States, among them a bible history (1858 -- cf. Appendix C: Mercy, Sisters of). During his editorship, the Metropolitan exhibited great interest in the young; its book reviews are often of school texts.
specially translated from *Le Génie de la Christianisme*, -- classic work of the French Catholic controversialist Francois René Vicomte de Chateaubriand (C) -- was printed through Volume II (1854). The segments were also published in book form. Reflecting the school interests of the editor, the Metropolitan came to express great concern over the need for illustrated textual material in the education of the young. Beginning with Volume III (1855) much space is given to a highly illustrated "Life of Our Lord" and "Acts of the Apostles" which appeared from month to month.

The extreme importance of such illustrated catechetical materials for all age groups but most especially for the young is taken up in a series of letters (1855) to the Metropolitan from Father Henry Formby then very active in England in producing illustrated religious texts. Formby's (C) American publisher was John Murphy & Co. of Baltimore, also publisher of the Metropolitan. The Formby letters are enclosed in a continuing article, imposingly entitled, "THE RESOURCES OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY FOR THE WORK OF CATHOLIC INSTRUCTION AND HOW TO PUT THEM IN ACTION." The English priest spends much time in explaining how the use of the graphic arts has a noble lineage in Catholic religious instruction. Formby charges, however, that religion has not kept pace with modern opportunity. The present time offers the resources of the zinc plate engraving process which in turn makes possible the relatively


18 Metropolitan, III (August, 1855), 414-19, 476-82; (December, 1855), 656-61, 722-29. Cf. also Formby's "Illustrated Books for the Young and Their Importance," Metropolitan, (March, 1858). 105-09.
inexpensive production of high quality illustrated religious texts--
texts characterized by "cheapness with excellence." It is very possible,
Formby points out, that the kind of illustrated religious texts he pro-
poses will ultimately surpass the currently popular \textit{Uncle Tom's Cabin}
[1852] in circulation. Formby dwells extensively on how to finance the
production of his illustrated materials in the United States and else-
where too since the engraved art work is "catholic" and can be used uni-
versally. But more than this, he insists that illustrated work in 1855
must be \textbf{authentic}. The use of "reductions from the celebrated cartoons
of Raphael, or the inferior designs of Dutch engravers are one and all
void of all quality of truth." Formby stresses that modern newspapers
take the public to all parts of the world in their news stories and on
the scene engravings. Witness the current coverage of the Crimean War!
Formerly, "it did not do great harm to depict Abraham as a Burgomaster
and his servants in the dress of Dutch boers; people were too uninformed
to cavil." Now, however, an illustrated religious text (and illustrated
it must be) will lose credibility and be reduced to a "fairy tale" if its
depictions are not seen to be accurate in detail by a sophisticated pub-
lic. The services of competent artists to create such authentic sketches
are, of course, what costs such great sums; but if their work be engraved
and these engravings be used by Catholics around the world, the overall
cost of initial production can be feasibly pro-rated. In his highly rep-
etitious exposition Formby comes to the point of how every Catholic child
(even if poor) can have his own illustrated text and how a \textbf{pictorialized-
religious text society} can be formed in the United States.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, III (December, 1855), 659-61.} Unfortunately,
Father Formby's plan seems to have been too ambitious to succeed on such a large scale in this country at that time.

Of equal importance to the English priest's strong call for authentically illustrated material is his plea for a *catechesis through sacred history*. From Abraham down to the present the history of God's dealing with men is capable of "truthful illustration." A study of sacred history is especially instructive, Father Formby affirms, because "the main drift, indeed, of the history as a whole, is to describe the progress of the work of the holy and ever Blessed Trinity, manifesting itself upon earth...." A history, then, "so deeply instructive, so touching, that speaks to the heart while it satisfies and improves the intellect, is quite of the nature to gain by a truthful and becoming pictorial illustration." Formby further explains:

The history of religion is no new discovery as applied to the purposes of education. It is as old as Abraham the patriarch, Moses the prophet, our Lord himself, his evangelists, his missionary apostles, the doctors of the Church, down to the teachers of our own times, - the history of the miracles of God has been in all ages the basis of instruction in the mysteries of divine faith. The creed of baptism is a short compendium of history. The only difference between our times and preceding times is, that the state of society in which our labors are cast, seems, in an especial sense, to speak for itself. How greatly it would be benefited, what an accession of strength faith would gain, and what a discomfiture of unbelief would ensue, if the history of religion could be given to the people in the beautiful unity of its divine drama, the patriarchs and prophets preceding the Divine Prophet of the nations, and the martyrs, doctors, confessors, and missionaries of the faith following in his train, the whole of this sacred story made a household possession to every family of the faith, by a truthful illustration embodying all the available resources of the art and skill of our century.20

---

20 Ibid., 729. Rutter, following Bossuet and especially Fleury (cf. Introduction, n. 84) had presented these ideas earlier (cf. above n. 6).
These are certainly Augustinian themes (cf. Introduction) and they greatly support the concept of teaching sacred truth through sacred history. In Formby's lengthy disquisition on the compelling value of illustrated sacred history, the accent is on "illustrated."

At the same time, even if less strenuously, he does bring St. Augustine's plan for the Catechesis to the attention of the American Catholic public in 1855. His emphasis on sacred history is not developed enough to identify its source, but at the time Formby wrote there was a great revival of the sacred history concept in Germany through the writings of Bernard Heinrich Overberg, Johann Baptist Hirscher, Gustav Mey and Archbishop Augustine Gruber. If Formby was not directly acquainted with their printed works, he was undoubtedly aware of the movement they helped to instigate. This author, then, judges Formby's articles to be the first thrust, however faint and indirect, of German catechetical influence in the ACELP. German catechetical influence in the nineteenth century

---

21 For a brief treatment with learned references on Catholic catechetical activity in Germany during the nineteenth century, cf. Josef Andreas Jungmann, Handing on the Faith: A Manual of Catechetics, trans. and rev. by A. N. Fuerst from the 2nd German edition of Katechetick (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959), 27-34; also A. N. Fuerst, The Systematic Teaching of Religion, I (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1939), 72-88. Fuerst based his study on the German works of Michael J. Gatterer (E) whose work had been already published here in 1912. In these works frequent reference is made to the learned articles of Bishop Friedrich Justus Knecht "Katechese, Katechet, Katechetik, Katechismus" Wetzer und Welte Kirchenlexikon, VII (Frieburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1891), 238-318. For biographical information on Overberg, Hirscher, Mey, Gruber, cf. Appendix B. Gruber (1763-1835), at length Archbishop of Salzburg, published his highly influential lectures on St. Augustine's De Catechizanids Rudibus (cf. the Introduction) in 1830 in which he gave modern application to the Augustinian concept of sacred truth taught through sacred history. In 1921, Gruber's lectures were revised and republished by Gatterer; these were translated into English by Rev. George Dennerle as Leading the Little Ones to Christ (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1932). Cf. below n. 23.
American Catechesis, already felt through the "Tales" of Canon Schmid (cf. below), would be intensified through the works of Deharbe (D) and Schuster (D) later in the century.

Formby's emphasis on authentic illustration in the mid-century also shows the effect that the rediscovery of the Ancient Near East was having upon religious instruction; scientific investigations had been going on for several decades by then in the "Bible Lands;" these greatly influenced biblical criticism which in turn came to influence the Catechesis. The English religious educator's articles indicate the momentum, then gathered, for illustrating or "pictorializing" catechetical material. Formby's (C-D) own works plus those of Gentelucci (C), Gilmour (D) and Businger-Brennan (D) are representative of the illustrated religious texts that were widely used in the American Church after 1855. Bible histories (cf. below) were especially valued for their numerous illustrations of the text. Catechisms on the other hand were almost without exception non-illustrated until the widespread use of Benziger's illustrated Baltimore Catechism after 1886.

Brownson Quarterly Review

When the Metropolitan failed in 1859, the Brownson Quarterly Review (1844-64; 1873-75) was the only Catholic periodical being published in the United States (except for several juveniles). The celebrated controversialist, philosopher, and journalist Orestes Brownson had been received into the Catholic Church at Boston in 1844. Although he wrote nothing ex professo on the Catechesis, Brownson did show great interest in catechetical literature as it appeared. While he had a reputation
for being sharp and controversial in his journalism, his reviews are
quite calm even in their faultfinding. Most of his comments welcome
the new publications as being helpful to religious instruction. There
is indication, however, that Brownson listed but did not review texts
he did not feel he could recommend. Whatever the reason, he had nothing
to say about the widely used General Catechism (C) of the First Plenary
Council. But the celebrated reviewer reserved high praise for the Tales
of Canon Schmid (C). For Brownson, Christoph von Schmid's stories are
"... Catholic and could have been written only by a Catholic"; comparing
them to the current Catholic "teaching" novels (cf. above), he observes
Schmid's Tales "are not controversial and have no conceivable resemblance
to the multitude of tales and novels intended to prove the Catholic Church
and Faith against Protestants." For Brownson, Schmid seems never to have
heard of heresy; the Canon, rather, writes positively for the "spiritual
inspiration of the young" to illustrate and enforce in them "the Christian
virtues and practical duties of every day life"; indeed, Schmid writes
with "remarkable truth and simplicity," with inimitable grace and delicacy,

22 Several Catholic publishing houses issued series of "tales" in
the middle nineteenth century. Individually bound and generally illus-
trated, they were advertised as being highly suitable as "gifts" for
various occasions and especially as "premiums" for Sunday school. The
most famous of these were published (after 1845) by the New York publish-
er Edward Dunigan and in "Dunigan's Home Library Series of Entertainment
and Instruction"; these titles were published by P. J. Kenedy under the
Dunigan name into the twentieth century. Cf. paracatechismal section in
Appendix C. For Brownson's comments on Schmid's Tales, cf. Brownson
Quarterly Review, III (July, 1846), 430 and II (N.S.), (July, 1848), 410-
11. (Hereinafter cited as BQR.) For other praise of Schmid's Tales, cf.
USCM, V (August, 1846), 590-91 and VII (June, 1848), 336; also Metropoli-
tan V (August, 1857), 443 and (November, 1857). Brownson and the other
reviewers were also impressed favorably with the illustrations of J. G.
Chapman which accompanied the works of Schmid. The "Tales" of Hendrik
Conscience [C] were also popular.
and above all "with an unction that comes only from the Holy Ghost."

Canon Schmid's Tales occupied a very popular place in the American Catechesis from 1843 until near the end of the century as paracatechetical literature. According to Lehner, Schmid (1768-1854) was greatly influenced by the ideas of the German pastoral theologian Johann Michael Sailer. Early in his career the venerable Canon of Augsburg (Bavaria) began to reassert the importance of fables and stories in the religious education of children. He is credited with authoring the first juvenile bible history (C) in 1801 in which he gives a simple account of salvation history illustrated with sketches and paintings. Historians of the German Catechesis regard him as having made a noteworthy contribution to modern catechetical method. Evidence of Canon Schmid's continued influence in the American Catechesis can be found in a popular appreciation of his life and work printed by Ave Maria in 1885.

As already noted, in connection with his review of Schmid's Tales, Brownson gives a slap to some of the current Catholic novels being published in the United States as "popular theology". In this, Brownson repeats an earlier complaint made by the editor of the United States Catholic Magazine in 1847 (cf. above). Both Brownson and the book reviewer in the Metropolitan were particularly distressed by the

23 Cf. F. C. Lehner, "Schmid, Christoph Von," NCE, XII, 1138 (Father Lehner has a number of articles on German catechetical figures, including J. M. Sailer in NCE). Cf. also B. Guldner, "Schmid, Christoph Von," CE, XIII, 545-46. Cf. also above no. 21.

24 Ave Maria, XXI (May 30, 1885), 434-39. Not all criticism of Schmid's Tales gave unqualified approval. The Metropolitan (II [June, 1854 303]) stated "that Schmidt's [sic] Tales leave something to be desired for the Catholic is undeniable" but had to add "there are respects in which they are models".

25 BQR, II (3rd s.), (April, 1854),269-70; Metropolitan, II (March, 1854), 120-21.
anti-Protestantism of a very popular "teaching novel," The Cross and the Shamrock. Both felt the Protestant clergy were very unfairly treated in the book. The booklists of the Catholic publishers and reviews of ACELP contain a great many of these novels or novellae. In the opinion of this author, these "teaching novels" must be considered paracatechismal and therefore significant to the American Catechesis.

If Brownson is favorable to Canon Schmid's Tales, he is not so favorable to E. G. Agnew's Tales of the Sacraments (C). He explains:

As for the stories, they are quite interesting, perhaps too interesting for the sacred purpose for which they are written. Personally, we are far from liking the plan of mixing up truth of doctrine with fictions of the imagination, but it is the fashion of the day.

Brownson also disapproved of A Dogmatic Catechism (Controversial) and the Catechism of Christian Doctrine (Montpellier) authored by Father Stephen Keenan (C). He comments:

We did not, in consequence of some opinion found in it, feel at liberty to recommend Mr. Keenan's Controversial Catechism; but in the present work, with the exception of the answers to the second question on p. 168, we have in the slight perusal we have

26 The Cross and the Shamrock, or How to Defend the Faith; An Irish-American Catholic Tale of Real Life, Descriptive of the Temptations, Sufferings, Trials and Triumphs of the Children of St. Patrick in the Great Republic of Washington. A Book of Entertainment and Special Instruction of the Catholic Male and Female Servants of the United States. Written by a Missionary Priest [Rev. Hugh Quigley], (Boston, Patrick Donahoe, 1853). Brownson and Quigley were constant Adversaries. Brownson wrote other essays on the novel in BQR (January, 1848; July, 1849; January, 1856). In his review of The Cross and the Shamrock, Brownson digresses (as he often did) to discuss the wider question of Irish nationalism in the American Church--cf. BQR, II (3rd. s.), (April, 1854), 269-70.

27 The United States Catholic Magazine looked upon the teaching novels as "our modern books of popular theology"; cf. USCM, IV (June, 1845), 408 and VI (June, 1847), 285-301. Cf. above n. 14.

given it discovered nothing to object to. The author is evidently a Gallican and inclined to give a very free interpretation to the dogma of exclusive salvation. 29

In later volumes, Brownson’s interest in catechetical literature is not as pronounced. 30

In 1862, Brownson made some comment on prevailing catechetical method in his famous essay "Catholic Schools and Education." Written in his characteristic style of intense personal opinion, it is well-worth reading. He shows himself to be the devoted Catholic that he was but still a Yankee as well. Brownson makes it clear that he is not opposed to Catholic schools per se. On the contrary, it is only the Catholic school that has the necessarily-comprehensive curriculum for the total education of man. Brownson declares that what he is opposed to, is the de facto situation in the United States where very many, if not most, Catholic schools are Catholic "in name only." They give a less than adequate education and a poor religious training. Many of their teachers, he goes on, are foreign-born or were trained according to a

29 Ibid., VI (n.s.), (July, 1852), 413. On the Catechism of Montpellier, cf. Hezard, Histoire du Catechisme, pp. 389-92. The edition used by Keenan may possibly still have contained elements from the Catechisme imperiale promulgated to be used throughout the empire by Napoleon I in 1806 (cf. A. Latreille, "Catechism Imperial," NCE, 1968, III, 231). On the other hand, the edition of 1701, written by the famous Oratorian F.A. Pouget, was condemned by Pope Clement XI for Gallican principles incorporated in its text. It may have been Pouget’s text that Keenan used. It would require further research to tell.

30 For other Brownson reviews of catechetical literature, cf. the following in BQR: Quadrupani (C): V (January, 1851), 134; De LaSalle (C), ibid.; First Communion (C), ibid. (April, 1851), 272; Youth Director (C) ibid., 269; River (C): VI (April. 1852), 284.

foreign pattern. They are undoubtedly worthy people but they teach for a different time and a different age; they constantly celebrate what is past and grossly fail to prepare their students to live "as Americans" and "in the modern age." The American Catholic schools are obtaining poor results because they "fail to impart the catholicity of truth."

In regard to the teaching of religion in the schools, Brownson has this to say:

We do not mean, and must not be understood to say that the dogmas, that is, the mysteries, as defined in the infallible speech of the church, are not scrupulously taught in all our schools and colleges or that the words of catechism are not faithfully preserved and duly insisted upon. We concede this, and that this gives to our so-called Catholic schools a merit which no others have or can have. Without the external word, the life of the internal expires, and when it is lost or corrupted, there are no means, except by a new supernatural intervention of Almighty God, of renewing the interior Christian life. This fact is of the first importance, and must never be lost sight of or underrated. The man who has not lost his faith, although his faith in inoperative, or, as theologians say, a "dead faith," is always to be preferred to him who has no faith at all; because he has in him a recuperative principle, and it is more easy to quicken it into activity, than it is to beget faith in one who has it not. The education given in our schools, however defective it may be, must always be preferred to that given in schools in which the dogma is rejected or mutilated, and can never be justly censured, save when compared with its own ideal, or with what it should be and would be, were it truly and thoroughly Catholic.

He makes mention of continuous evolutionary change in man's existence and refers to certain passages in Cardinal John Henry Newman's celebrated essay "On the Development of Dogma"; then he goes on:

The fault we find with modern Catholic education is not that it does not faithfully preserve the symbol, that it does not retain all the dogmas or mysteries, so far as sound words go, but that it treats them as isolated or dead facts, not as living principles, and overlooks the fact that the life of the church consists in their continuous evolution and progressive development and actualization in the life of society and of individuals. They themselves, since they are principles and pertain to the ideal the church is evolving and actualizing, must be immutable, and the same for all times, places, and men. They are the principles of progress, but not themselves
progressive, for the truth was completely expressed and individuated in the Incarnation. The progress is not in them, but in their explication and actualization in the life of humanity. The truth contained in them is always the same, can neither be enlarged nor diminished; but our understanding of them may be more or less adequate, and their explication and application to our own life and to the life of society may be more or less complete.

Whatever limitations there are in the Catholic schools of the United States, however, Brownson concludes:

Schools under the control of Catholics will, at least, teach the catechism, and though they may in fact teach it as a dead letter, rather than as a quickening spirit, it is better it should be taught as a dead letter than not be taught at all. It is only by preserving the dogma intact that we do or can preserve the Christian ideal, or have the slightest chance of securing our final destiny. The hopes of the world for time and eternity are dependent on the preservation of the orthodox faith.

Brownson's stress on the need to "americanize" was, of course, his own but it also showed the influence of Father Isaac Hecker, among others, on the journalist. It is evident, too, that his ideas on the Catholic schools had been influenced by the controversial pastor of St. Stephen's Church (New York) Father Jeremiah W. Cummings. The Manhattan

---

32 Former Transcendentalist and convert to Catholicism, Hecker had become a Redemptorist priest (CSSR). It can be said that his anxious efforts to "americanize" certain Redemptorist procedures in the United States led to his separation from that order. At the same time, he received permission to found his own Missionary Society of St. Paul (Paulists). Hecker and his Paulist associates were determined to implement a specifically American apostolate. The so-called "americanizing" wing of the hierarchy (Archbishop John Ireland, Bishop John Keane, etc.) were all fervent admirers of Hecker. Much of his thought, his writings, and a French translation by the Abbé Felix Klein of one of his biographies (written by Father Walter Elliott, CSP) came to figure prominently in the Americanist controversy of the 1890's. For more on Hecker and Americanism in this study, cf. Chapter i, nn. 57 and 114; Chapter iii, nn. 10 and 67. In this essay, Brownson certainly enunciates Hecker's outlook on the need to "americanize" and to come to terms with the "age," but the present author has never encountered an attack on the inadequacies of the Catholic schools by Hecker. On the contrary, he gave them great public support.

33 The most informative article on Cummings is that of Thomas F. Meehan, "Cummings, Jeremiah William," CE, 567-68; cf. also F.D.
priest had written an essay on certain inadequacies of the foreign-born clergy in America and the capital need to raise a native clergy here which Brownson had printed in the BQR. The two pieces should be read together. Frequently enough, and especially in his Catholic school essay, Brownson made the point that the infallibility of the Church was not an attribute of the individual bishops and priests. It can be safely said that Brownson was not an anti-clerical but he was frequently at odds with the clergy, especially the Irish-born clergy whose militancy he frequently found more nationalistic than Catholic. Such material in his Review as his critique of Catholic Education caused the celebrated Archbishop of New York John Hughes to have deep misgivings about the Yankee publicist.

With the October, 1864 issue, Brownson suspended publication "his loyalty to the faith wrongly suspected, and grief stricken by the loss of two sons in the war . . ." This sad happening brought the first era of the ACELP to a close.

Cohalan, "Cummings, Rev. Jeremiah," NCE IV, 533. Cummings was followed at St. Stephen's by the equally controversial Father Thomas McGlynn. There has always been a small but continuous nucleus of American Catholic priests opposed to parochial schools for theoretical and/or practical reasons who have taken a public-schools-for-Catholics stand as opposed to the more dominant "every Catholic in a Catholic school" position. In the past two decades the nucleus has expanded dramatically.


35 Cf. above n. 26.

36 Comments unfavorable to the Church in Catholic periodicals had brought Hughes to write his famous essay "Reflections and Suggestions in regard to What is Called the Catholic Press." Metropolitan, IV (December, 1856), 649-61.

37 Lucey, NCE, III, 316.
Some Conclusions

The material uncovered in this chapter can lead to several conclusions regarding the Catechesis in the first half of the nineteenth century:

1. The relatively sparse comment on religious education in these early periodicals can be explained by one of two reasons: a) there was general satisfaction with the Catechesis as it worked in that era: there was no need felt for extensive comment; or b) the apologetic responsibility of the periodicals did not permit public comment on problems within the "household of the Faith," especially on something so integral to it as the Catechesis—Brownson excepted. Perhaps both reasons were operative. Subsequent events discussed in the next chapter, however, indicate that the first reason given here is closer to the truth.

2. Another point that emerges is the concern for better catechisms and teaching materials. It can be said that this concern dominated the nineteenth century American Catechesis and was based on the principle that better catechisms would make better catechesis. The result of this concern can be seen in the sweep of catechisms and materials listed in Appendix C of this study. As we have seen in Chapter I, the first half of the century was given to the production of diocesan and conciliar catechisms for basic religious instruction. Concern for improved materials, however, extended beyond this in the search for better larger or fuller catechisms, as they were called. Hence, the popularity of Chal-loner's Catholic Christian Instructed and the works of Mannock, Aime, and Gaume before 1865.

3. Allied with this concern for better larger catechisms was the strong desire to keep Catholic youth under instruction after First Communion until about age eighteen. They had to be given a larger or fuller catechesis that would prepare them for life against the assaults of "sectarianism" and "infidelity"; otherwise, there would be continuing "leakage" in the Church and "loss of Faith" among adults. This led to stressing the "Class of Perseverance" and providing it with suitable instructional materials. It also led to the continuing organization of Catholic academies and high school throughout the century.

4. In the middle decades of the century, many saw the need for adult-oriented religious education to be met in a body of Catholic "teaching novels" which they regarded as "popular theology"; others were less enthusiastic about this kind of teaching medium. Various "tales," particularly those of Canon Christoph Schmid became very popular in connection with religious instruction. Certainly the "tales," and the "teaching novels" as well, must be considered paracatechismal teaching materials.
5. The beginning of an increased concern for biblical education can be dated from the middle decades of the century; the slower rise of the use of illustrated materials within religious education also had its inception in this same period. Some attention was also given before 1865 here to the Augustinian concept of teaching sacred truth through sacred history.

And so like many other institutions in American life, the Catechesis would undergo change and expansion after 1865 largely on the basis of the concerns already discernible before the War.
CHAPTER III

THE SEARCH FOR BETTER CATECHISMS AND ORGANIZATION (1865-1899)

The war was not yet over when the ACELP revived at Chicago in the Monthly (1865). That same year, the Catholic World (1865+) began publication at New York under the auspices of the Paulist Fathers, and Ave Maria (1865-1959) was founded at Notre Dame by the Congregation of the Holy Cross. In the next year, the Jesuits initiated the Messenger of the Sacred Heart (1866-1967). Other religious orders followed suit in succeeding decades with De LaSalle Monthly later Manhattan Review (1869-77) associated with the Brothers of the Christian Schools; Rosary Magazine (1891-1968) published by the Dominican Fathers; Carmelite Review (1892-1906) an organ of that same order; and St. Anthony Messenger (1893+) still produced by the Franciscans. Following the pattern of the Messenger

1 The phrase "American Catholic English-Language Periodicals" is represented throughout this study by the abbreviation ACELP which is peculiar to this study. For sources used in selecting ACELP for this study, cf. Chapter ii, n.2; the reader's attention is particularly directed to Lucey's comprehensive essays cited there. For more information on the ACELP used in this study, cf. Appendix A.

2 Published by the faculty of St. Mary of the Lake University in Chicago, it produced only twelve issues and registered no concern for religious instruction. The same lack of catechetical content is found in the faculty/student literary magazine Salesianum (1873-78) published at St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee.

3 Since this study sought to base itself largely on essay materials, it generally restricted itself to the examination of monthlies and quarterlies. An exception was made, however, for the weekly Ave Maria because of the prestigious place it held for so many decades in the intellectual life of the American Church.
of the Sacred Heart, these magazines had a devotional aspect but they exhibited comprehensive interests as well. After 1875 a number of popular periodicals appeared too that were not associated with religious orders: for instance, the short lived Milwaukee Magazine (1875), Catholic Record (1871-78), McGee's Illustrated Weekly (1876-82), the parish-sponsored Sacred Heart Review (1888-1918), and the widely circulated Donahoe's Magazine (1879-1908). A more consciously intellectual approach was featured in the American Catholic Quarterly Review (1876-1924), and the academically oriented Catholic University Bulletin (1895-1928). The same can be said of the organs of personal journalism active in this period: the briefly revived Brownson Quarterly Review (1873-75), William Thorne's Globe (1889-1904), and Arthur Preuss' Review (1894-1935). Clerical studies were the specific concern of Pastor (1882-89) and the yet-living American Ecclesiastical Review (1889+). Elementary educational materials were stressed in the small-circulating Teacher and Organist (1890-1910), Catholic School and Home Magazine (1892-97), and the Catholic School Record (1875-80). Adult educational activities in the American Church were presented through the Catholic Reading Circle Review (1891-98) and Mosher's Magazine (1898-1903). Much of the Jesuit apostolate in the United States was reported in the

4 De LaSalle Monthly was not available to this study; Rosary Magazine, Carmelite Review and Sacred Heart Review were available only in broken series.

5 For biographical sources on many of the persons named in this study, cf. Appendix B.

6 Published at Milwaukee, Catholic School Record has no listed repository in the various indices used by this study (cf. Chapter ii, n. 2). Further inquiries yielded no additional information.

7 Cf. below, nn. 64-65.
semi-private Woodstock Letters (1872+). These more than twenty periodicals comprise the general sweep of the ACELP in the period under discussion (1865-1899) and form the basic research-source for this chapter. Many of them are discussed more in detail below.

Catholic World and Bible History

The catechetical content of the ACELP listed above varied greatly from magazine to magazine and from time to time in the same periodical. Ave Maria did not display much concern for religious education until the distinguished editorship (1875-1929) of Father Daniel Hudson CSC. The Messenger of the Sacred Heart, although it had comprehensive interests, made only passing references to catechetical instruction. Catholic World, on the other hand, took a lively interest in the Catechesis from the beginning under the dual editorship of Father Isaac Hecker and Augustine Hewitt. The Paulist periodical published several substantial essays on religious instruction before 1900 and carefully reviewed catechetical literature as it appeared. These essays and reviews very much show the pre-occupation of nineteenth century American Catholicism to produce better catechisms with the assurance that better catechisms would achieve better catechesis.

---

8 Ave Maria published no cumulative index; this created a problem for research, especially since it produced fifty-two issues a year. Fortunately, there is a very fine unpublished index available at Memorial Library of the University of Notre Dame; a goodly amount of volume by volume search is still necessary, however.

9 Discontent with the prevailing catechetical method is not clearly discernible in ACELP until after 1900 (cf. opening sections of Chapter iv). There are, however, earlier indications of this discontent which are discussed below under the Sunday school Catechesis.
Catholic World showed special interest too in the appearance of new bible histories and strongly advocated their use in American Catholic religious education. As we have seen in the preceding chapters and in the biblical section of Appendix C, Catholics in this country before 1865 had access to American printings of European bible histories as well as the American-compiled biblische geschichte of Blessed John Nepomucene Neuman (C). These works had considerable circulation before 1865 and, as an examination of Appendices D and E further shows, were reprinted again after the War and used up to 1900 and beyond. The first English-language bible history authored in the United States, however, was published in 1868 by the American branch of Benziger Brothers. The Swiss firm had opened a sales office in New York in 1853 but began to offer a line of books published here in 1860. Written by Father Richard Gilmour (D), later bishop of Cleveland, the textbook came to be widely used in the American Catechesis into the 1940's. Catholic World gave an enthusiastic welcome to Gilmour's

This marked interest in improving biblical education among American Catholics can be explained by several reasons: a) the Protestant and therefore bible-oriented background of many of the Paulists; b) the great thrust, energetically joined in by the Paulists, to "americanize" the Catholic Church in the United States by adapting in marked measure to the American ethos (cf. nn. 21 and 67); c) the general ferment in biblical studies taking place at large in that era; d) the Paulists' awareness of and sympathy for the great and continuing rise of biblical catechesis among the Catholics of Austria and Germany (cf. Chapter ii, n. 21). The Missionary Society of St. Paul (Paulists) was founded (1857) with the conversion of American non-Catholics as one of its primary objectives. Cf. also below, n. 12.

In this study, a letter-designation (as here in the text) indicates that the work discussed is listed in that appendix under the author's name.

Gilmour, born from a family of Scots Covenanters, became a Catholic in his late teens; presumably he was given a strong biblical
Bible History as a volume greatly needed by the catechist. Its development, paper, typography, and especially its numerous illustrations were all praised as excellent. Although neither the reviews nor the bibliographical data of the book indicate it, Archbishop Sebastian G. Messmer later expressed the opinion that Gilmour's work was based on the prior European publications of the Swiss seminary rector L. C. Businger. Messmer, however, found that Gilmour had produced practically a new work. This is an interesting point for further research. There background as a boy. For more on Gilmour, cf. Appendix B. In connection with Gilmour's text, the question of anti-semitic bias in American Catholic catechetical materials can be raised. It is safe to say that in the major catechisms there is no statement attributing special guilt or punishment to the Jews for the death of Christ. In the minor catechisms, Verot (D) has one question on "rich Jews" in a special appendix for converts from Judaism; actually the phrase as used there is more complimentary than deprecative. Groenings (E) contains an ambiguous reference to the power of "the Jews" over Jesus (Q. 88) in his intermediate catechism. The bible histories, however, present a greater problem. In setting forth the ongoing conflict between Jesus and those who opposed him, they consistently use the Johannine term "the Jews" to group all opposition to Jesus. Neither the author of the Fourth Gospel nor the bible histories make it clear that most of those who supported Jesus in his public ministry were also Jews. Gilmour, however, goes farther than his chief counterpart Schuster (cf. below), for instance, when he explains that after Pilate declared himself innocent of Jesus' blood and "the people cried out 'His blood be upon us, and upon our children'":

For eighteen hundred years has the blood of Christ been upon the Jews. Driven from Judea--without country, without home--strangers among strangers--hated yet feared--have they wandered from nation to nation, bearing with them the visible sign of God's curse. Like Cain, marked with a mysterious sign, they shall continue to wander to the end of the world.

Gilmour's statement, however, is singular in the major American Catholic catechetical materials between 1784 and 1930. For further comment on this matter, cf. Résumé and Conclusions.

13 Catholic World X (October, 1869), 143. (Hereinafter cited as CW in text and notes.)

15 Ibid.
can be no doubt that the famous illustrations in Gilmour's text came from Benziger's Swiss-connection. We have already seen in Chapter i the unacknowledged debt owed Challoner and Butler in the production of American catechetical materials. Considering the special place of Gilmour's Bible History in the American Catechesis, the question arises if there is a debt owed the Swiss author, as well, by generations of American Catholics. At any rate, more of Businger's (D) highly illustrated bible history appeared after 1876 in the American adaptations of the New York pastor Father Richard Brennan. In the book market, however, Gilmour's principal competition came from the bible history of the noted German Catholic religious educator Dr. Ignatz Schuster (D). Published in 1847 under the title Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testament und Neuen Testament by Herder at Freiburg im Breisgau, it proved a popular work among German-speaking Catholics. The work was given an extensive revision by the celebrated pastoral theologian Gustav Mey in 1875; it is very probable that this 1875 revision served as the basis for the American edition published by Herder at St. Louis in 1876. This American edition, however, indicates that it has been revised by that prolific Canadian-American religious writer Mrs. J. Sadlier; so, it may not have been based on Mey's revisions. The German Schuster-Mey was further revised in 1907 by the distinguished biblical educator Bishop Friedrich Justus Knecht (D). The Knecht revision appeared in this

16 The reader is reminded once again to consult Appendix B for biographical sources on the persons named in this study.

17 On Mey, cf. below n. 49 and Chapter iv, n. 32; on Knecht, cf. Chapter ii, n. 21 and Chapter iv, n. 36.
country under his own name, while the Schuster-Sadlier text (with several further revisions) continued to circulate here through the first several decades of the present century.

In its continued support of biblical catechesis among American Catholics, the Catholic World was also greatly pleased with Father James O'Leary's (D) Bible History published at New York by D. & J. Sadlier in 1873. The Paulist reviewer reveals some of the stress in theology in that era. He hails O'Leary's work as one which will meet the needs of older students and adults. He further pronounces it a learned work with fine illustrations and one which will surely be helpful in resolving the current stress between revealed religion and natural science. The reviewer explains:

The author has done well by taking into account those generally received facts and hypotheses of natural science which have a bearing on topics handled in their connection with the facts and truths of revelation by the sacred writers. His statement, however, that the surface of the earth bears on it the marks of perturbation caused by the Deluge, and are otherwise not capable of scientific explanation, is not one which geologists would admit and we very much doubt its correctness.

The CW lists several additional criticisms explaining that it does this only because the book is essentially an excellent text which a revision could improve "to the point of no criticism." The reviewer also expresses great satisfaction that the O'Leary has sought the imprimatur of ecclesiastical authority before publishing and hopes "that his good example will be generally followed, and moreover that the law of the church will be enforced in every diocese and in all cases, requiring this

---

18 CW, XVIII (December, 1873), 430-31.
19 The ACELP of the period (1865-1899) contain a number of essays and book reviews concerned with the religion-science argument.
approbation for all books treating de rebus sacris [sacred things]."  

At the other end of the educational spectrum, the texts of Madam Cather- 

ine White (D) are praised by the CW reviewer as being highly suitable for 

children.  

He lists his reasons: long a teacher in the Ladies (Madams) 

of the Sacred Heart, Madam White has brought her years of experience to 

the task of writing textbooks and it shows; they have a brevity, charm, 

and graphicness about them that will be appealing to the young audience 

(ten to fifteen years old); she has revised her works under the direct 

supervision of Cardinal John McCloskey of New York and they are therefore 

"unexceptionable".  

Since her books are for a younger audience, the 

reviewer also expresses satisfaction that the authoress has wisely avoid- 

ed the controversial material currently plaguing bible studies but simply 

presents the straight biblical narrative.  

More than this, the CW finds, 

This final point of the review reflects the continuing tension 

between the publication and the ecclesiastical authorization of cateche- 

tical texts already mentioned several times in Chapter i. The same point 

is made by the CW reviewer in regard to Madam White's work below (n. 21). 

CW, XXI (February, 1875), 715-16. Another favorable review was 
given by the Catholic Record, VIII, (February, 1875), 320. Cf. also BQR 
III (l.s.), (April, 1875), 290-91 in which Brownson states Catholics have 
long suffered from the "bibliolatry" of Protestants; this, he explains, 
have made many of his coreligionists chary of bible reading and study; 
books such as this Brownson thinks will help to correct such an unfortu- 
nate attitude among Catholics. From 1855, two Catholic publishers, Patrick 
Donahoe (Boston) and Murphy & Co. (Baltimore) listed a polemical piece with 
the most unlikely title viz. The Bible Weighed in the Balance and Found 
Wanting by James Blake M.D. The reviewer in the Metropolitan expresses 
great displeasure over the title if not the contents of Dr. Blake's book; 
cf. Metropolitan,III (December, 1855), 688. For more on this point of 
American Catholics and bible study, cf. nn. 10 and 67. 

Cf. above n. 20. 

The question of how much revised exegesis (especially in regard 
to Genesis 1-11) should be transfered from biblical studies into the Cat- 
echesis continued to be a problem into the twentieth century.
"the delicacy with which every narrative, where immoral and criminal acts are involved, shuns the danger of shocking the innocent mind of children by contact with evil of which it is ignorant, is exquisite."

The CW registers a strong protest at the "rude and disrespectful language" used by one (unnamed) Catholic newspaper in reviewing Madam White's last book.

As we have seen in Chapter i the authoring of catechetical literature could be a "thankless task," considering the minute scrutiny and strong criticism it oftentimes evoked. While the CW called for a courteous approach to Madam White's work, this did not mean it could not be extremely close in its own criticisms. A good case in point was the scrutiny it gave to what came to be called the "Springfield Catechism" (D). The Paulist reviewer is sympathetic with this attempt to provide a new "little catechism" but finds it does not come close in quality to the General Catechism (C) of the First Plenary Council. Hoping that the author will revise his work, the CW gives a number of criticisms. The several paragraphs of this critique are given here to show the close scrutiny generally given newly published catechisms as to their literary style and orthodoxy:

---

24 CW, XXX (May, 1879), 287-88. The CW reviewer is especially grieved at this rudeness since Madam White is reported to be dying at this time.

25 CW, XXIII (May, 1876), 280-81.

26 Cf. Chapter i for a discussion of the General Catechism; also Appendices C and D. The term "little" as used above by the CW reviewer is synonymous with primary and or basal and is in no way deprecative, although some contemporary authors interpret it so. The "little" catechism was so called vis-à-vis the "large" catechism.
In the 'Act of Hope,' p. 4, we come upon the following ungrammatical sentence: 'O my God! who has promised every blessing.' 'What is God?' is asked at the very outset, and the answer given is: 'God is a spirit.' This is no more a definition of God than it is of an angel or a soul. 'What was the Garden of Paradise? Answer--A place of pleasure.' This is poor, not to say false, rendering of the Scriptural phrase. 'Who is the devil? Answer--One of the fallen angels.' Is he not the prince of fallen angels? 'Who are the angels? Answer--Pure spirits without a body.' Is it then, possible for pure spirits to have a body? Hell, we are informed, is 'a place of eternal torments, where there is all evil and no good.' This is theologically inaccurate. It is impossible that a place where there is not good should exist, since existence itself is a good.

'What are the chief things we must believe? Answer--The chief things we must believe are contained in the Apostles' Creed.' Question and answer do not agree. The one is what, and the other is where. 'Why did he establish but one church? Answer--Because God being one, he could have but one church.' To affirm that God's nature renders more than one church impossible is, we think, unwarranted.

'Can the church err? Answer--She cannot.' The catechism approved by the First Plenary Council says: 'She cannot err in matters of faith.' The priest of the Diocese of Springfield fails to give the four marks of the church; and this is certainly a very grave omission. He, moreover, says not a word about the infallibility of the pope, which is equally inexcusable.

'How many kinds of sin are there? Answer--Two kinds: original sin and actual sin.' We were under the impression that the kinds of sin were very numerous.

'What sins are mortal? Answer--Grievous sins.' And what sins, then, are grievous? Mortal sins, we suppose.

'Is tale-bearing a great sin? Answer--Yes: supported by a text of Scripture.' Now, we cannot think that tale-bearing is necessarily a great sin, or even that it is generally so.

'What is the Eucharist made from? Answer--From wheaten bread and the wine of the grape.' This, in our eyes, as a matter of taste, if for no other reason, is very objectionable. 27

---

27 CW, XXIII (May, 1876), 281. On the other hand, CW favorably reviewed the adult and intermediate catechisms of Father Michael Müller (D) in XXVI (October, 1877), 137-38. For other reviews of Müller, cf. Catholic Record, XI (May, 1876), 63-64 and n. 32 below. For additional reviews of catechetical literature in the Catholic World in this general era, cf. the following list: Formby (D): XIII (September, 1871), 854; Bagshawe (D): XIII (September, 1871), 854; Perry (D): XXII (December, 1875), 432; Deharbe (D): XXI (July, 1875), 576; New Catholic Sunday School Manual (D): XXXII (November, 1880), 288; Wenham (D): XXXV (May, 1882), 283-84; Gibson (D): XXXV (May, 1882), 284; Faa di Bruno (D): XLII (March, 1885), 856-57. The CW agrees with the general judgement that Deharbe (1875) is the "most celebrated catechism of the century." It is significant that the reviewer speaks of Perry's commentary on the "Penny Catechism" as being valuable to those who use the "Boston Catechism." He does not
It should be noted that this kind of close criticism was for the most part designed to improve a catechism in future editions, but it also must have greatly injured sales, thus preventing a revised edition. It took a "brave soul" to write a new catechism; it is small wonder that a number were published anonymously.

American Catholic Quarterly Review

While the Ave Maria and Catholic World were gaining momentum, the Catholic Record (1871-78) was founded in Philadelphia by the publishers Charles A. Hardy and D.H. Mahoney. It is an interesting journal but contains no catechetical references except for an occasional review. It was at length supplanted by its sister publication the American Catholic Quarterly Review (1876-1924). The ACQR can be said to be the queen of the nineteenth century ACELP. It was the organ of expression for many of the Catholic intelligentia of that era. Its pages are a real thesaurus of Catholic Americana, and yet it contains not a single essay on the Catechesis. There are many articles on Catholic Education and the need of "religion in education" but nothing on the subject of

mention the General Catechism of 1852 which had the same common text as the Penny and the Boston and was supposed to be the official American catechism (cf. Chapter i). The Boston text can be found in the New Sunday School Manual. Booklists around this time (1875-1880) offer hymnals and Sunday school manuals with a choice of the General, Boston, or Butler catechisms included. As we have seen the General Catechism was adapted from the Boston Catechism and was essentially similar to it except for Part II and the Appendices. Apparently, many still preferred the Boston.

While the ACQR has a cumulative index to 1900, this author examined the periodical volume by volume because of its importance in Catholic Americana.
religious education itself. The same can be said of the briefly re-
vived Brownson's Quarterly Review (1873-75) and William Thorne's Globe 
(1889-1904) in spite of both journalists' penchant for controversial 
themes. This catechetical void is found more understandably in many 
of the popular-type ACELP listed at the opening of this chapter, even 
though they showed interest in just about everything. The silence on 
the Catechesis in the ACQR and later even in the Catholic University 
Bulletin (1895-1928) can only lead to this conclusion: there was gen-
eral satisfaction with the prevailing catechetical method, even among 
Catholic intellectuals in this period. Dissatisfaction with the method 
does not clearly emerge in ACELP until after 1900. Such satisfaction, 
however, did not extend to catechetical materials. Chapter i, Appendices 
C and D, plus the reviews in ACELP cited in this study, all show the con-
stant search for better instructional materials in religious education. 
This was indeed the quest of the nineteenth century Catechesis.

In line with this quest, the ACQR showed special interest in 
adult-oriented catechisms through its extensive book reviews. Many 
paragraphs of enthusiastic criticism are given the larger catechetical 
works of Weninger, Müller, Jouin, Dausch, White, Brennan, Lambert, and

29 For some of Brownson's reviews in this era, cf. the following 
list in the BQR: Pellico (D): I (l.s.), (July, 1873), 415; Formby (D), 
ibid., 424; White (D) II (l.s.), (April, 1875), 290; Dupanloup, The Child 
(D), (July, 1875), 436-38.

30 There is considerable material in CUB after 1908 on catechetical 
materials and theory, the work of Father Thomas Edward Shields; cf. Chapter 
iv, nn. 75ff.

31 Cf. above n. 9.
Faa di Bruno. It should be noted that all these authors are American (some foreign-born) except Faa di Bruno. Since the great mass of nineteenth-century catechetical material used in the American Church was of European origin, the ACQR was seemingly quick to celebrate American authorship in the field of religious education.

**Donahoe's Magazine**

One of the most popular offerings in the history of ACELP has been Donahoe's Magazine (1879-1908). Founded by the renowned Irish-American publisher Patrick Donahoe at Boston, it found the formula of success in giving the public what it wanted. Lucey informs us that by 1897 its circulation had reached 42,475 compared to 20,000 for the Messenger of the Sacred Heart, 22,000 for Ave Maria, 2,250 for the Catholic World, and 1,000 for ACQR. The comprehensively popular nature of Donahoe's plus its Irish nationalism account for its larger circulation. Aside from its book reviews, it contains no articles on religious

---

32 For ACQR reviews of these books, cf. the following list:
Weninger (D): I (February, 1876), 183-84, Müller (D): IX (January, 1884) 187-88, also II (October, 1877) 758-59; Jouin (D): II (October, 1877), 759-61; Dausch (D): IV (February, 1879), 192; Businger-Brennan (D): IV (October, 1879), 770-71; Madam White (D): IV (October, 1879), 722; Lambert (D): IX (October, 1884), 572-73; Faa di Bruno (D): X (April, 1885).

33 The reader is reminded that biographical sources for many names mentioned in this study are listed in Appendix B.

34 Cf. Sister Mary Alphonsine Frawley, SSJ, Patrick Donahoe (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1946); also Appendix B.

instruction, but it does have scattered pieces that graphically inform us of the religious milieu and customs surrounding the American Catechesis. One correspondent, for instance, from the Basilica parish of Our Lady of Perpetual Help in Boston (popularly called the "Mission Church") wrote of First Holy Communion given there at the hands of the Redemptorist Fathers in 1887. M. Reynolds first recounts the preparations made the night before in the homes of the children for the "guest of tomorrow," and then continues:

When the happy "morrow" came the organ played a grand march, and there appeared in slow, measured procession down the Mission's centre aisle a line of boys and girls,—the boys in black, the girls in white,—heads bowed, hands clasped, and Father Licking, their steadfast Instructor, at their head. They were the first communicants of 1887. They filed into place according to the manner of thoroughly drilled soldiers. Father Licking then ascended to the pulpit, and addressed them.

...Father Licking's language was so true to the child-nature and understanding, so valorously winning and appealing, that it could have been no other than inspired. There were moistened eyes and awe-stricken hearts among the parents, as they harkened to this young shepherd guiding his flock....

The first Communion Mass had Rev. Father Joseph Henning as celebrant, with Reverend John Hicky and Rev. Father Kantz as assistants. I knew one of the little communicants whose card to his friends on this great occasion was a rose bud. He was twelve years of age and wore a bouquet on his breast of twelve buds, a bud for every year. These he sent to particular friends. To his best friend he sent one of his white gloves, with date red lettered in silk, on its index finger, the other, spotless, was laid aside as a relic to be looked in upon in hours of temptation. 37

36 Donahoe's Magazine, XVIII, (August, 1877), 190. (Hereinafter cited as DM.) Cf. also Chapter ii n. 9.

37 Very probably as a survival of the medieval white anointing bands, many Catholic churches before and after 1900 gave a white rosette, arm-band, tie, glove, etc. in the reception of First Holy Communion. Such souvenirs are still, if rarely, available through church goods houses. It was said by some older priests whom the present author knew that in some parishes the children were instructed to burn or cast away this souvenir of First Communion at the commission of a first grave sin. The present author has not been able to document the accuracy of this report, but such a custom, if indeed it did exist, would have been regarded as misguided piety by most.
Donahoe's is also surprisingly distinguished in that it was the only one of the ACELP to announce the publishing of the Baltimore Catechism. Neither the Catholic World, Ave Maria, American Catholic Quarterly Review, Pastor, nor Messenger of the Sacred Heart announced it—let alone reviewed it. Donahoe's also quotes several paragraphs from the New York newspaper Catholic Review which affirms the BC publishing arrangements described by Lawrence Kehoe; it also makes a reference to Kehoe's trouble with Sadlier. In the same issue presumably Donahoe himself announces that he has obtained the services of the author Father Louis A. Lambert to write an "Explanation" of the BC along the lines of Dr. Jacob Schmitt's Erklärung of Deharbe (D). Such a necessary volume has already been suggested to Donahoe by a number of the clergy. On the previous page, he has told us that Lambert's edition of Faa di Bruno (D) has sold beyond 20,000 copies in less than two years. Items of information on the Catechesis such as these are not uncommon in Donahoe's.

---

38 DM, XIII (January, 1885), 572. There is no mention of a catechism in ACELP in articles discussing the coming Third Plenary Council. This is true of John Gilmary Shea's classic essays anterior to the council: cf. ACQR, IX (April, 1884), 340-47 and (July, 1884), 471-97.

39 In this study the Baltimore Catechism is frequently referred to as the "BC" or simply "the Catechism."

40 Cf. Chapter i, n. 96.

41 DM, XIII (January, 1885), 573.

42 Lambert was a prominent author and editor in American Catholic publishing between 1860-1910; cf. Appendices C, D, E. He did not publish the promised "Explanation"; instead, this became the work of Father Thomas F. Kinkead (D), published by Benziger Brothers in 1891; cf. below n. 66.

43 DM, XIII (January, 1885), 572.

44 Items of information such as this illustrate the quest of the nineteenth century American Catechesis for better catechisms, especially better "larger" catechisms.
This silence on the BC in ACELP is indeed strange. It seems to indicate the Catechism was not well received by editors and reviewers. Perhaps they followed Brownson's custom to spare themselves and the BC's makers embarrassment. This author finds it difficult to explain the silence in any other way. However it may be, the BC was dutifully adopted and used on a very wide scale in the United States. Of this there can be no doubt but subsequent reference to the BC in ACELP (cf. below) show considerable unhappiness with it; but, as we have seen several times in this study, this was not unusual with a catechism--especially with an enjoined one.

The Assault on the Baltimore Catechism in ACELP

The first extensive critique of the Baltimore Catechism in ACELP surprisingly appeared in the Catholic World (1885) in an essay titled "The Requirements of a Catholic Catechism." Its author was Rev. A. B. Schwenniger presumably, the same New York priest whose German translation of the Catechism was published in the following year (1886). Schwenniger finds

45 Apparently, Brownson did not review catechetical works he felt he could not recommend; cf. Brownson in Chapter ii.


47 CW, LXI (September, 1885), 827-32. Schwenniger's piece is really only the third extensive essay on religious education to appear in ACELP by 1885 that this study has encountered; cf. Chapter ii, nn. 7 and 18. Cf. also Schwenniger below in n. 54.

48 Cf. Appendix D: Baltimore Catechism.
the BC "wanting" in many respects. He begins his essay by affirming the absolute need of "catechism" (i.e. distinct formulae) for elementary religious instruction; for him it cannot be done through bible history alone. According to Schwenniger, great religious educators of the past who at first favored teaching sacred truth through sacred history--Gruber, Hirscher, Mey, Fleury and Fenelon--came to realize the deficiency of this concept in practice. Consequently, "catechism" needs good catechisms which give the "elementary" truths of faith succinct formulation in language "intelligible to children." St. Augustine's dictum "Doctrina Christiana ita doceatur ut pateat, placeat et moveat" is the measuring-rod of a catechism. Therefore:

**Ut pateat:** only terms that can be "readily understood and easily memorized for the recitation" should be used; recitation should be "'something more than a pat sing-song of parrot-like answering'"; indeed the recitation must be proof that the child has learned the questions and answers and not merely performed a feat of memory; finally such words as "hypostatic union, transubstantiation, indestructibility," should be excluded.

**Ut placeat:** the questions and answers should be "plain, brief, rhythmical."

---

49 This statement reflects the conflict within the German/Austrian Catechesis between the exponents of religious instruction by doctrinal statements, e.g. Canisius (cf. the Introduction), Deharbe (cf. Chapter i) those who sought to give religious education through sacred history, e.g. Fleury, Fenelon (cf. Chapter i), Mey, Hirscher, Gruber (cf. Chapter ii, n. 21). All these men were the subject of controversy in their own times in regard to their catechetical theories; cf. Appendix B. Not all historians of religious education would agree with Schwenniger's broad statement cited above.

50 "Christian Doctrine must be so taught that it is clear, pleasing, and moving." On St. Augustine's catechetical theory, cf. the Introduction, n. 20.
Ut moveat: the material, especially an "application" at the end of the chapter should "breathe a certain warmth that may move the heart of the child"; indeed, "a language frigid and indifferent does not touch and inspire the young heart"; ultimately all "catechism" must "stimulate the zeal of the child to serve God; indeed "videant catechistae ut doctrina moveat." 51 Another characteristic of a good catechism, accordingly to Schwenniger, is that its language "should be as near as possible the language of the Bible," not only because of the theological richness of biblical language but "short striking quotations from the Bible fortify the child against attacks from non-Catholics, who make the Bible the only source of faith."

In the second half of the article, Schwenniger applies the measuring -rod of St. Augustine's dictum to the Baltimore Catechism. He first notes:

This catechism has been greeted and welcomed with great joy in our Sunday and parochial schools. It has been tried and, without belittling its good qualities, we are bound to say it has been found wanting.

He gives many examples but the following points summarize the New York priest's quarrel with the BC and are greatly representative of the criticisms consistently leveled against the Catechism:

1) It is not easy to write a good catechism; in fact, it is a crux autorum [sic]--the "cross of authors." Therefore, anyone who attempts to compose

51 CW, LXI (September, 1885), 828-30. The Latin phrase, again from St. Augustine, means "Let catechists see that their teaching is moving."

It may be noted here, once again, that the Baltimore Catechism's lessons, in the original form, have no "application" to life as do the classical catechisms of the German tradition.

52 Ibid., 830-32. The reader is reminded that in this dissertation the Baltimore Catechism is often referred to as the "BC" or simply "the Catechism."
one "deserves praise even if his efforts should not be crowned with perfect success."

2) Many explanations and comments are needed to make the Baltimore Catechism intelligible. This is a clear indication of its deficiency. For instance, a recent edition by Father James P. Turner contains sixty-eight pages of catechism and forty-three pages of explanatory vocabulary. Indeed, the BC's terms and language lacks conciseness, briefness, and simplicity." [Particular notice is directed to pp. 9, 10, 13, 16, 22, 34; all early editions of the catechism were made from the same stereotyped plates.]

3) The arrangement of material is not always feasible (Sacraments treated before Commandments) and several of its statements seem to lack theological accuracy e.g. the difference between the natural and supernatural order, definitions of Grace, Contrition, and the Holy Eucharist.

4) Biblical quotations find no place in the Catechism.

5) It is generally acknowledged that "yes and no" questions should be avoided in a catechism and yet the BC has a great many (e.g. six on page 7 alone).

After listing his objections to the conciliar catechism, Schwenniger abruptly ends the essay by observing:

- There seems to be a general desire for a really good catechism. For the advanced classes it should be an explanatory catechism which would serve to instruct a Catholic for life and fortify his faith. An abridged catechism should be compiled to prepare children for

---

Cf. Appendix D: Baltimore Catechism--Turner. Turner was secretary of Archbishop Patrick John Ryan of Philadelphia and associated with him in the management of the American Catholic Quarterly Review; cf. Turner in Appendix B.
confession and first Holy Communion.

There is some kind of a story behind the Schwenniger article. It is the first of a series of "assaults" on the BC, albeit a mild one, to appear in ACELP. Surprisingly, however, it appears in the Catholic World--publication of the Paulists Fathers whose Catholic Publication Society first published the BC and whose whole élan was favorable to Spalding, Gibbons, and other supporters of the Catechism in the hierarchy. Schwenniger's reproof surely reflects German-American Catholic piqe. 

German-American Catholics were overwhelmingly devoted to the catechisms of Deharbe (and Canisius). Many of them resented an "enjoined" catechism that was basically Anglo/Irish in source (i.e. "Carroll" and Butler) and was theirs only as a translation; (for more on Deharbe, "Carroll" and Butler, cf. Chapter i). In September of 1885 a formidable assault was made on the Baltimore Catechism in the German-American monthly Pastoralblatt (1886-1925) published at St. Louis. Because it is a German-language periodical it does not fall into the scope of ACELP but note is made of it here because of its very extensive criticisms of the BC--undoubtedly the most detailed and extensive ever printed. The assault began with an article "Kritik des neuen Concils-Katechismus," signed by "X" (XX [September, 1885], 97-102). It is a very detailed and mostly negative critique of the BC. Certain remarks of "X" and comparative features in his article make one wonder if "X" is not Schwenniger (cf. above nn. 47-53). This initial article was followed by an additional two essays on general catechetical theory by "BL," (XX [January, 1886], 4-6 [February, 1886], 16-19). All three articles show a knowledge of the historic and current development of the Catechesis in Germany. The really heavy barrage on the BC, however, comes in a series of articles "Ein bescheidener Beitrag zur Kritik des neuen (Concils-) Katechismus" in 1886 (XXI [July] 76-80; [August], 88-91; [September], 100-06; [October], 113-16). The author is again "BL" and he manages to give a chapter by chapter criticism of the BC. He is astounded at its small size which he finds more the size of a "Temperance Tract," which comment could also be a slap at the temperance proclivities of the Irish supporters of the BC. The parentheses around "Concils" in the polemic's title is no accident. "BL" rejects the claim of the BC to be a conciliar catechism: its authorization is faulty since it did not follow the Council's rules for its approval and adoption (cf. Chapter i, n. 75). This was the first time this often-repeated accusation was made against the BC's conciliar authorization. "BL" also find the treatment of the Creed in the BC unusual and very "baroque" in its attempt to work everything into its explanation of the credal affirmations. He finds a large number of "doctrinal misstatements" in the BC which he claims to correct. Finally, he points out certain lacunae in the BC which he judges to match lacunae in the American ethos. Neither expresses any concern for the duty of the child to show
over the Catechism but why in the Catholic World? Could this small enigma offer some evidence of a freedom of the Church press even in the loyalist camp? At any rate, this dissatisfaction with the BC soon showed in the pages of the American Ecclesiastical Review as well.

The AER and the Catechesis

The New York-Cincinnati firm of Fr. Pustet began publishing the American Ecclesiastical Review in 1889 under the distinguished editorship of Father Herman Joseph Heuser, professor of Sacred Scripture at the Philadelphia Archdiocesan Seminary (St. Charles Borromeo) in Overbrook. The new journal showed more catechetical concern than its predecessor, Pustet's The Pastor: A Monthly Journal for Priests (1882-89) which in fact had registered none. Since the clergy were pivotal in the Catechesis, Heuser was careful to keep his readers informed on religious respect for his elders nor responsibility for his aged or infirm parents (probably, he adds, because the American State fumbles to do this). In some misguided patriotism, the Baltimore Catechism and the American ethos also fail to stress the duty of man to obey God rather than men. Neither do they condemn the "lynch law" so prevalent in the United States. Finally the BC slavishly follows the ethos in failing to state the obligation of parents to send their children to parochial schools. This last statement reflects the emerging parochial school controversy among American Catholics (cf. Chapter i, n. 78). The editor of the Pastoralblatt at this time Father Wilhelm Faerber (D) was probably the author of these essays. If so, he had good opportunity to put his theories into practice when he published his own catechism and commentary some years later in German and many bilingual editions (cf. Faerber in Chapter i, n. 97). The present author wishes to express his thanks to his colleague Father Wayne Fehr SJ for his extensive help with the German texts cited above. This author first encountered reference to these articles in John K. Sharp, "The Origin of the Baltimore Catechism," [American] Ecclesiastical Review, LXXXIII (December, 1930), 622-24.

education as part of the "clerical studies" the journal promoted. In 1891, the American Ecclesiastical Review printed an article occasioned by an American edition of Msgr. Felix A. P. Dupanloup's (D) *Ministry of Catechizing* [L'Oeuvre par excellence," Paris, 1868] in which the anonymous author praises the late, great Bishop of Orleans and eminent catechist; he sets forth some basic points made in Dupanloup's explication of the Sulpician Method. 56 Dupanloup was very popular with the

56 *American Ecclesiastical Review*, V, (October, 1891), 256-63. (Hereinafter cited as AER.) Monseigneur Dupanloup had been chief catechist in his days at the Seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris. His classic work on catechetics was *Méthode Générale de Catechisme* (3 vols.; Paris: Charles Duniol, 1862). In 1642, M. Jacques Olier became pastor of the Church of St. Sulpice in Paris (Faubourg St. Antoine). As a result of his efforts the Society of St. Sulpice (Sulpicians) was formed which devotes itself to educating students for the priesthood through teaching and example. In time, the Sulpicians and their students became distinguished in the parochial catechetical effort which zealously took in every segment of age and class in that very comprehensive parish. From this well organized and developed catechetical tradition, the Sulpician Method emerged. The method was built on the necessity of well-trained, devoted, and pious catechists who would give regular, well-prepared, and interesting instruction designed to persuade the intellect and move the heart. The method was prepared to adapt itself to all levels and groups. Certain characteristics were classical to the Method of St. Sulpice, viz., a) recitation of the catechism with verbal perfection, b) explanation of the catechismal text memorized, c) reading the Gospel of the Sunday or the feast, d) explanation and application of the Gospel by a brief sermon (homily), e) further small exhortations and the singing of hymns to "move the heart," f) emphasis on interesting stories to illustrate the catechismal lesson, graphic displays, playlets, celebrations, etc. to add "condiment" to the classes, g) "games for points" toward the winning of holy cards and other "premiaus." h) written homework, written testing, report cards, i) strong emphasis on attendance with written reports to parents, j) finally, weekday classes and special First Communion classes in addition to the regular Sunday school. Many American priests by the end of the nineteenth century had been educated by the Sulpician Fathers in the seminaries which the Society staffed for the dioceses in Baltimore, New York, Boston, San Francisco, Montreal, Quebec, and the Sulpician Seminary at the Catholic University of America. Many Sulpician-trained priests were appointed to teach in seminaries staffed by diocesan priests. The influence of the Method of St. Sulpice had already appeared in ACELP with the article "Popular Theology" in 1847, (cf. Chapter ii, n. 7); its probable author, Father Charles Ignatius White,
American party (insofar as there was a party) in the Catholic Church in this country because of what they considered his democratic and progressive stances as well as his willingness to come to terms with the "Age." His catechetical works were often quoted by those seeking to improve Catholic religious education in the United States and proved influential in promoting the Method of St. Sulpice in the American Catechesis.

In 1893 the AER presented a series titled "Rambles in the Pastoral Fields"—an informative and often amusing piece in a format suggested by the ancient catechetical classic the "Shepherd" or "Pastor" (Poimēn) by Hermas (ca. 140 A.D.). Subtitled "Dialogue between Hermas Pastor and Tyro Sacerdos about Internal Administration," it represents the thinking of the Irish immigrant clergy then so very numerous in the American Church—even if "Hermas Pastor" seems to have been a bit more permissive than some. The following excerpt treats of the priest and religious instruction and is indeed a piece of primary source material. The young "curate" has already been admonished to keep at hand the Catechism of the Council of Trent.57


57 For information on the Tridentine Catechism, cf. the Introduction, n. 61.
TYRO.--I do not expect to make much of an orator of myself for a while, but I would like to be able to talk, to instruct, especially children.

HERMAS.--That means catechise. You have struck the most important and the hardest to master of all the arts of the spoken word. Much show of learning is not so much a help as, practically, a hindrance. Neither will eloquence or brilliancy avail. The catechist must bring to the class a teacher's training—and that none but Jesuit priests scarcely ever get—a father's wisdom, a mother's patience. Above all is absolutely imperative that sympathy with the child, consisting in the simple direct intuitiveness which can see all its difficulties, know all its fears, and feels its lack of expressing, even what it knows. Lastly, an intimate acquaintance with the clear distinction between a boy's and girl's mind and heart, at a given age, will lessen mistakes, aye, and save souls!

But excuse me. I did not propose to preach to you. Your question refers to hints of tact necessary for a skillful instructor.

1.--Mingle good boys among bad or unruly ones. I learned that trick from Max O'Rell(?)—you comprehend?

2.--As to behavior, if you expect American boys, or girls either, to conduct themselves as staidly as they generally do in Europe, you reckon without your host. Our children will use a certain freedom of posture, and you may as well wink at what you cannot prevent.

3.--Intersperse facts of history or bits of apposite stories. Be graphic and—in spite of what you may read of set rules—fear not from time to time, when the little ones get restless or flag in attention, to introduce a word or illustration that will make them smile. It is like a ray of sunshine on frosty ground.

4.--Do not ask a child what he cannot be expected to answer. Dullness is not criminal in se.

5.--If you cannot teach the whole catechism in propria persona [by yourself personally], never leave the Sacraments to be explained by another, whether that one be brother, nun, or laic.

6.--Be uniformly kind—but do not leave unpunished these five faults: lying, theft, quarreling, irreverence in church, or sins contra sextum [against the Sixth Commandment].

7.--Invariably keep lists of the children and take note of what lesson they have on hand.

8.—Explain the prayers—particularly the Acts, for instance: 'what, how, why, do you believe, hope? How does an act of faith give glory to God? Because by it God's veracity is acknowledged.' Finally, I need scarcely say that a zealous priest will not only teach catechism in his own parochial school, but that he will be vigilant in watching over the instruction of his children who go to public schools—even getting Catholic teachers, where he safely can, to instruct Catholic pupils outside of school hours in the text of the catechism. Pay special attention to this latter class in Sunday schools and on feast-days of obligation.58

58 AER, IX (August, 1893), 113-14.
By 1895, the struggles over the Baltimore Catechism broke in the AER where one correspondent asks for a discussion in the journal's "Conferences" of his query: "Is a pastor at liberty to introduce into his parish school a catechism different from the one published by the authority of the last Baltimore Council?" The editor replies that the principal concern of the Council was to provide a uniform catechism. For this reason as well as its official character the BC must be used even though "as everybody knows" it is "criticized for being faulty in many respects." The BC presents true doctrine in a sound manner in spite of what some hypercritical minds find as "heresy" in the incompleteness of some of its answers. While it is the official national catechism, a local bishop can authorize other catechisms to be used in his diocese to complement the BC but not to supplant it. This would leave the door open for the legal use of some of the older catechisms (Boston, General, Butler, etc.) which many hold as superior to the BC. The AER then goes into some fine canonical points on the possibility of establishing a "custom contrary to law" but concludes that the best thing to do for those dissatisfied with the BC is to continue to use it and at the same time present their requests to the Archbishops for a revision. Several years later (1899) the AER printed a similar communication which affirmed that the unsuitableness of the BC is proved

59 Anonymous, "Introducing a New catechism," AER, XIII (November, 1895), 383-85. The "Conferences" in the AER contained discussion or interchange of views on some specific point; they usually were several pages long; sometimes the same conference continued through several issues of the AER. The catechisms mentioned by "Anonymous" are discussed in Chapter i.
by all vocabulary-added and explanatory editions that are being published. The correspondent points out:

It is a well-known fact that nearly every priest in the United States has found fault with the Baltimore Catechism; but we all, in the spirit of obedience, cast aside our Butler's and our Boston, and our other excellent catechisms, to make our little ones learn incomprehensible definitions of venial sin, etc.

The AER responds that it is not possible to provide a single uniform text that will suit every age and group. There is currently too much controversy over the suitableness of the Catechism. After all, it is finally up to the teacher who can make the best or the worst out of any text. Father M. J. Considine, superintendent of the New York parish schools, made this same point for the readers of the Catholic Reading Circle Review, about the same time. He admitted that the III Council's text has "evolved much adverse criticism" and that critics dislike "its arrangement of material and the repetition of the question in the answer" etc. but he points out the Baltimore Catechism yet survives (1897) as the dominant catechism nonetheless. To the devotees of other allegedly superior catechisms, Considine contends:

For the writer's part, after several years of experience with all kinds of children, he must say that the children who had the

60 "New Catechisms," AER, XXI (July, 1899), 86-88. For vocabulary-added and explanatory editions of the Baltimore Catechism, cf. Appendix D: Baltimore Catechism. For many years, communications and conference contributions in the AER were generally (not always) signed by descriptive Latin titles rather than by surnames; other significant materials appear unsigned. The AER generally gave no biographical information on its authors. Various anniversary issues of the journal are of no help in this regard.

Baltimore Catechism as their textbook are not less thoroughly grounded in Christian Doctrine than the children who have studied other catechisms.

The assault on the Catechism continued and, as we shall see, gathered momentum after 1900. Yet it had many defenders and remained the dominant text of the American Catechesis, at least until after World War II.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL CATECHESIS

A special concern for the Sunday school Catechesis is found in a number of articles (post 1892) appearing in ACELP, most of them seemingly the result of the then currently instituted Catholic Summer School (1892). By the fin de siècle, whatever organization there was in the Catechesis existed largely within the Catholic schools. The parochial Sunday school had no organized resources that could compare with those available to Protestant Sunday schools. A vast interdenominational program offering materials, publications, and teacher-training opportunities for the Sunday school arose within American Protestantism after the Civil War, increasing in pace with the ongoing secularization of the public schools. The famous Chautauqua Institution in upper

---

62 By this time many teaching orders had developed organized grade by grade programs for teaching Religion in the parochial schools e.g. School Manual for Use of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet (St. Louis: E. Carreras, Printer, Binder, and Publisher, 1883-84). The creation of the office of diocesan school superintendent by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore had done much to organize and formalize syllabi in Christian Doctrine and Bible History. For one of the earliest of these diocesan programs of study, cf. "New York Catholic Teachers' Manual," CW, LXIX (September, 1899), 832-35. After 1900 diocesan curricular organization became quite common.

63 For material on the Protestant Sunday school movement, cf.
New York State resulted from a very successful effort to provide summer training for Protestant Sunday school teachers. The Chautauqua-like Catholic Summer School not surprisingly shared this Sunday school


John T. Driscoll, "Summer Schools, Catholic," CE, XIV, 334-35. This article is very informative about the organization and development of the Catholic Summer School and the antecedent Catholic Reading Circle etc. It gives a number of references to essays in ACELP on the two movements. Cf. also W. C. Sullivan, "National Union, Catholic Young Men's," CE, X, 712. The Union, founded in 1875, came to be an association of 100 separate organizations. One of its many active objectives was to foster the interest of young men in teaching Sunday school. The name of the young layman Warren E. Mosher is most prominent in the three united Catholic endeavors listed above. Cf. also Rev. Thomas McMillan CSP, "The Catholic Summer School - Silver Jubilee 1892-1916," CW, CII (February, 1916), 597-608. Catholic summer schools and winter schools developed in other sectors of the nation.

In 1892, the American Archbishops in their annual meeting called for a reintensification of effort to implement the legislation of the Third Plenary Council regarding parochial schools. They also resolved:

"...as to children who at present do not attend Catholic schools, we direct, in addition, that provision be made for them by Sunday Schools and also by instruction on some other day or days of the week, and by urging parents to teach their children the Christian doctrine in their homes. These Sunday and week-day schools should be under the direct supervision of the clergy, aided by intelligent lay-teachers, and, when possible, members of religious teaching orders" (Catholic School and Home Magazine, [January, 1893], 276).

In the various announcements about the Catholic Summer School that appear in the CRCR (n. 65 below) and its successor publications and in the Catholic School and Home Magazine (n. 66 below) references are made to receptions for Sunday school teachers and special sessions on the organization of Sunday school but nothing appears on methodology. In the various "normal courses" for Catholic school teachers instituted by the Summer School there are none offered on "Christian Doctrine" per se. The Germans were long using the term "Katechetic" but the term "Catechetics" does not appear in ACELP before 1900 (cf. Chapter iv, n. 8.)
concern as a very definite part of its wider effort to produce a better educated Catholic laity. In time, over 10,000 people from many different states attended the eleven week summer school on Lake Champlain (Cliffs Haven) near Plattsburg, New York. Many of them were already Sunday school teachers, and it was hoped that many more would become such. A definite concern for the Catechesis, especially in the Sunday school situation, can be found in two periodicals closely associated with the Catholic Summer School. The Catholic Reading Circle Review was the organ of the Summer School and its older cousin the Catholic Reading Circle. The Catholic School and Home Magazine (1892-97) was published by one of the Summer School's founders Father Thomas Conaty, later rector of the Catholic University and then Bishop of Monterey and Los Angeles. CSHM grew out of Conaty's personal catechetical efforts as pastor of Sacred Heart Parish in Worcester, Massachusetts and did not survive his going to Washington. Never large in circulation (ca. 5000), with most of its subscribers in New England, the little publication still offers insight into late nineteenth century Catechesis--particularly the parochial Sunday school. One of its monthly features was the one or two paged "In the Sunday School" which generally contained such segments as "The Meaning of Words in the Baltimore Catechism," (about six words each

65 Surprisingly, there are only a few essays on religious education in Catholic Reading Circle Review (1891-98) and its successor Mosher's Magazine (1898-1903); but in reading both magazines, one can see that the Reading Circle and Summer School had as one of their greatest objectives the further education of Sunday school teachers--especially those who would teach the post-Confirmation class (Banner, Advanced, Perseverance etc.). Cf. Julia C. Lynch, "The Sunday School," Mosher's Magazine, XIII (December, 1898), 176-78; also Rev. John T. Mullen, "Bible Study and the Sunday School," CRCR, XII (March, 1898), 384-96; Father Considine's article cited above in n. 61; and Klauder cited in Chapter iv, n. 59.
issue—obviously considered a necessity); "Bible History," a short biblical narrative from the Old Testament with questions drawn from the material (answered in the next issue); a gospel text to be memorized for each Sunday; a short exhortation or suggestion on Sunday school teaching for the catechist and often some correspondence from Sunday school teachers active in New England. One of the very warm features of the Sunday school pages was the monthly listing of the "little gleaners" who had sent in the correct answers to the previous month's bible questions—a

---

66 Cf. Catholic School and Home Magazine (hereinafter cited as CSHM):

P. J. Buckley [Philadelphia], I (April, 1892), 50--(August, 1892), 154--(January, 1893), 282-83; Father F. J. Butler [East Cambridge, Mass.], I (May, 1892), 76--(June, 1892), 102--(December, 1892), 255-56; A.C.C. [Worcester], I (February, 1893), 509-310; B.E.B. [Taunton, Mass.] II (March, 1893), 22; P.F.D. [Worcester] II, (March, 1893), 22; Teacher [Worcester] II (April, 1893), 48; K.A.W. [Worcester] II (August, 1893), 150; Francis P. McKeon [Worcester] II (August, 1893), 151; Father F. J. Butler [East Cambridge], II (September, 1893), 176-77. Cf. also [Brother] Edmund Francis [FSC], "Catechism," II (November, 1893), 223-25; in which he pleads for better class preparation by the catechist, appealing to Msgr. Felix Dupanloup's writings for support (cf. above, n. 56). Cf. also a number of short essays I (July, 1892), 128--(August, 1892), 206--(December, 1892), 258--(January, 1893), 282; II (March, 1893), 22--(December, 1893), 257--(January, 1894), 283. Many of the above communications and brief articles in the CSHM touched attendance, the need for parental cooperation (greatly stressed) but only a few short references toward improving method in the class. There are one or two brief condemnations of "parrot-like recitation." The appearance of Father Thomas L. Kinkead's Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism (D) in 1891 was helpful to many in enriching the class. As McKeon (cf. listing above) puts it:

"This book the teachers are exhorted to study, so as to be able to reproduce the explanation for the benefit of their class; or, so that the excuse, 'No time for study,' may not be permitted to interfere too frequently with the pupil's instruction, to read at least to the class, as time allotted to Sunday school may allow."

Father Conaty was also very active in the Catholic Total Abstinence movement (cf. below n. 67) and the Summer School (cf. above, n. 64). There was always news of both endeavors in the CSHM.
host of Annies, Nellies, Patricks, and Jimmies--most now dead but perhaps some still living in their mid-eighties. In May, 1894 (partly in response to Leo XIII's encyclical letter on biblical studies Providentissimus Deus issued in 1893), Conaty instituted special New Testament bible lessons in the CSHM designed for students "fifteen years of age or older."
The lessons were Conaty's much needed contribution to material for the "Advanced" or "Perseverance" class. The New Testament lesson treated the gospel of next Sunday's Mass through a short instruction and further explanatory material developed through the standard question/answer technique. The illustrated lessons could also be purchased separately in leaflet form. In 1898, Conaty published the completed series in book form under the title New Testament Studies (D). The CSHM also carried other materials for the Advanced Class or parish sodalities, e.g. "Chats for Young Men," "Studies in Church History," etc.

Others prominent in the Lake Champlain movement wrote articles on the Sunday school question in other ACELP. Although they make no

---

67 Conaty's great stress on bible study is interesting. There can be no doubt that there was in his time (and for many decades later) an historical reluctance toward popular bible reading in the American Catholic ethos (cf. above n. 21). Bible reading and quoting to these Catholics was a Protestant phenomenon. This would certainly be true of the Irish-American Catholics. As we have seen, German-American Catholics were greatly influenced by the rise of the bible-oriented catechesis in Germany; a number of Anglo-American Catholics being converts from a Protestant background were also very amenable to bible study (cf. above n. 10), in the Catechesis. Irish priests like Conaty were influenced by a general thrust within the Catholic Church at that time toward restored popular study of the bible. In the opinion of the present author, interest in promoting the biblical catechesis was intensified by their close cooperation with Protestants in the national temperance crusade and other social movements plus their readiness to integrate with the dominant American ethos. The above comments should not be taken to mean that Catholics did not own bibles in the United States; the family bible was a widespread thing. From the time of Bishop John Carroll, the Rheims-Douay Bible in its various English (Challoner, also Haycock) and American (Kenrick) revisions was continuously produced by American Catholic publishers in "cheap" and expensive editions.
mention of it by name, these authors show unmistakable signs of being influenced by the Method of St. Sulpice (n. 56). Of all these articles, surely the most widely read appeared in Ave Maria (1898) where Father John Talbot Smith, prominent turn-of-the-century ecclesiastic, author, and one of the founders of the Catholic Summer School, contributed "Progress in the Sunday School."

John Talbot Smith and the Catechesis

In his Sunday school article, Father Smith expresses much agitation over the declining strength of religion in American life and finds "a comparison of the present with the past of thirty years ago is apt to depress the hopeful." In proof for his assertion, Father Smith offers a) the millions of unchurched and religionless Americans or the "nothingarians," as he calls them; b) the increase of "vicious knowledge" in every strata of life; c) Ingersoll's "mistakes of Moses" are the topic

68 Ave Maria, XLVI (April 23, 1898), 513-18; (April 29, 1898), 554-58. (Hereinafter cited as AM.) Smith had contributed a stinging critique on seminary education in the United States, viz., The Training of the Priest (1896) which many viewed as a reckless attack. It was republished in 1906 and 1908. For biographical sources on Smith, cf. Appendix B. Cf. also Chapter ii, n.34.

69 Colonel Robert Green Ingersoll (1822-99), articulate speaker and self-educated man, was by profession a lawyer. His greatest fame on the American scene, however, was as a popular lecturer who was much in demand. He developed about 100 lectures. One of the most attention-getting was "Some Mistakes of Moses" first given in 1879 in which he attacked the Mosaic cosmogony, chronology etc. Styled "the great agnostic," it is said that one of Col. Bob's (as he was called) techniques was to take out his pocket-watch on the lecture platform and invite God, if there was a God, to strike him dead within one minute. Col. Bob still lived - ergo. It is interesting to note that Ingersoll died at Dobb's Ferry, New York in 1899 where Smith was Pastor of Sacred Heart Church. Father A. A. Lambing (cf. below n. 80) wrote a popular critique of Ingersoll.
of conversation in factory, street-corner, and saloon; and finally d) the working classes are abandoning the Protestant churches. Far from taking comfort in this last development, Catholics should realize the same losses await them (even if just now most Catholics "hotly defend their faith") unless the young be better prepared for the changes of modern life. Such a preparation is the responsibility of religious instruction but religious instruction needs to be strengthened and expanded. At present, most children leave the Christian Doctrine class at Confirmation or soon after [ca. 14 years of age] largely because there is nothing further provided for them to do. They should be kept in the Sunday school until age eighteen and be given special classes. As it is, the sigh of relief that most young boys and girls breathe at being released from Sunday school at fourteen is only exceeded by the sigh of relief breathed by their teachers at getting rid of them. Smith is convinced from his experience that "catechism is torture to the average child and the teaching of it a heartbreaking task to the average teacher." Indeed the failure of religious instruction in the Sunday school is comprehensive; he explains:

A little inquiry among the young men and women of one's acquaintance, whether rich or poor, intellectual or commonplace, does not impress one with the excellence of the instruction communicated to them in the average school of Christian doctrine. It is not accurate and does not stick. It leaves no impulse with the pupils to inquire further, for it has never excited any interest in its own subjects. The cleverest child can recite the catechism well at

---

70 Cf. Chapter ii, n. 7 for the 1847 article in the United States Catholic Magazine calling for the same thing. This keeping Catholic youth under instruction between 15-18 was a key objective of the Catechesis during the last six decades of the nineteenth century; it surely gave impetus to the continuous development of Catholic high schools in that period.
graduation, and the dullest can do nearly as much. The difference of knowledge between them is imperceptible. In five years their understanding of the catechism has become equal: both have forgotten all. 71

As far as the mass of American Catholics is concerned, Smith affirms, the aim and achievement of the Sunday school have been the same, viz. to prepare children for Penance, Eucharist, and Confirmation and beyond that to give them (when they will stand still for it) instruction in one of the "larger catechisms." Well, this is simply not enough to build an adult life on. This unfortunate situation must be attributed to the indifference of parents and pastors according to Smith. The trouble is not with the catechisms; the BC and Deharbe series are good and useful; it is the way in which they are used that is wrong. They offer a "rich modicum of truth" but they are, after all, only a skeleton; the teacher must put the flesh and blood into it. Indeed, "the experience of men has taught us that it is not sufficient to put a truth into a book; the living man must teach the truth to others and induce them to practice it." A catechism contains the outline, "yet, what an amount of filling out has to be done before the child of fifteen can understand the relation of that outline to his own life!" If religious instruction leaves a void, the "vicious" doubts of the modern era regarding God's existence, the divinity of Christ, the immortality of the soul, the destiny of man, etc. will seep in. These errors are discussed presently by the least educated so that children catch the echo of the argument and repeat it among themselves. Whether parents and clergy like it or not children are being exposed to religious problems before their time.

71 AM, XLVI (April 23, 1898), 516.
They must, therefore, be prepared to understand the error of such phrases as "the necessity of nature" when used to excuse sins of the flesh or "they all do it" when used to justify the "great trusts, rapacious landlords, and unjust employers" or the "stress of poverty" when used to excuse sins against "the family and unborn children."

In preparing young people, Father Smith admonishes, "very little interest attaches to a straight course through the smaller and larger catechisms." Indeed, "those in authority must be totally naïve if they do not find it ridiculous to think of a child solemnly marching for years to Sunday school for the sole purpose of mastering those dry outlines." Modern pedagogy is demonstrating what common sense has long known--the student must be "entertained" in the best sense of the word. It is not enough "to stick him to a bench with a book in his hand and a teacher in front of him." There must be in religious instruction "a little meat and much entertaining milk" so that "digestion be not overstrained." So then, the catechism must be enriched with more expanded and explanatory materials from other textbooks. Smith lists such helpful sources as Faa di Bruno's Catholic Belief (D), Cardinal Gibbons' Faith of Our Fathers, Spalding's (D) History of the Church, The Ten Commandments Explained, Gaume's Catechism of Perseverance (C) and the Deharbe series (D). About another twenty volumes are needed, however,

---

72 Cf. Chapter i, n. 71; also Appendix D.

73 He probably speaks of Devine (Appendix D) which the Catholic World finds "eminently up to date and practical that it quotes as authorities the latest instructions to the bishops and discusses such modern questions as hypnotism and the many difficult problems of justice created by our modern life"; cf. CW, LXVI (November 1897), 274-75.
to do the job of explaining religion in terms of the "times in which we live." The reason these needed books are not on the market, especially a better Life of Christ, is that there is no demand for them by catechists and pastors.

In closing his article, Smith states one of the greatest outcomes of religious instruction should be an eagerness in the children to read good religious books. This can only be done if each parish has a good circulating library in connection with the Sunday school. Smith laments, however, that the parish library, so common in first-class parishes twenty-five years ago, is now becoming increasingly rare at a time when it is needed most. One can certainly see that Smith is calling for an enrichment of the catechism—a theme that would be greatly stressed after 1900. Smith's essay is the first strong assertion of this idea encountered by this study in ACELP. He can be said to be the first of the "progressive traditionalists" who came to dominate the American Catechesis in the next few decades.

The Ideas of Msgr. Lavelle.

Another group of articles and comments expressing Sunday school concern, but prior to Smith's, appeared in the American Ecclesiastical Review. Two were authored by Father Michael J. Lavelle, another founder

74 In 1864, Father Isaac Hecker founded a circulating library in connection with the Sunday school of the Paulist church (St. Paul's) in New York. He arranged that the reading and discussion of a book should be part of the "Advanced Catechism Class." Driscoll (cf. above n. 64) sees in this the beginning of the Catholic reading movement that followed. Cf. also below, n. 88.
of the Catholic Summer School, Rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and prominent New York Catholic educator. Although directed to a clerical audience, his thoughts have much in common with those of Father John Talbot Smith. His articles contain a number of interesting points that shed light on the Sunday school in the late 1800's. It is clear that his catechetical thinking was greatly (if not totally) influenced by the Sulpician Method (n. 56).

First of all, he points out that in seeking better Sunday school training, he is not discussing "the relative necessity and value of Catholic day schools"--a disclaimer that has been customarily made by those seeking to improve the extra-school catechesis in the United States. Lavelle finds that grouping the children into grades is absolutely essential. He suggests therefore, five grades:

Grade I: for those who are learning the basic prayers (not to be learned in a sing-song fashion), viz., Sign of the Cross, Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Apostle's Creed, the Acts of Contrition, Faith, Hope, and Charity, the Confiteor, and the Hail Holy Queen;

Grade II: for the First Confession group: no suitable printed material has been devised for this group as yet--a four to five page abridgement is needed containing material on Creation, Man, God, the Soul, the Mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation and Redemption (plus a clear idea that Christ is our Saviour). Original and Actual Sin, Rewards and Punishment, the Sacraments in general and in particular, Contrition and Confession, the Commandments of God and the Church, and finally the Holy Days;

75For Lavelle's first article, cf. "The Scope and Organization of Sunday Schools," AER, XV (October, 1896), 374-86. Father Lavelle, born in New York City of Irish parents, spent his whole priesthood (1879-1939) at St. Patrick's Cathedral there, first as assistant priest and later as rector. He served as Vicar General of the Archdiocese of New York and was very active in educational affairs. He served several times as president of the Catholic Summer School. Msgr. Lavelle in his sixty years of priesthood bridged a great era in the American Catechesis. For biographical sources, cf. Appendix B. Cf. also Chapter iv, n. 83.
Grade III: the First Communion group using the Baltimore Catechism (Abridged) No. 1—the vocabulary-added edition is preferred;

Grade IV: the Confirmation group using the Baltimore Catechism (original) No. 2—again the vocabulary-added edition is preferred;

Grade V: the Perseverance group (which may be subdivided into several internal groups depending on age, number, etc.) using a larger catechism such as Deharbe and other materials for the study of Church History, Bible History Liturgy, and the proofs of Religions "gleaned from books like the two excellent works of Cardinal Gibbons, De Segur's 'Answers' and 'The True Religion' by Father Russo" (375-79).76

Lavelle explains he lists the Baltimore Catechism Nos. 1 and 2 in particular "because they are supposed to be the official manuals of religious instruction for the United States." There are, of course, other catechisms containing similar material which would serve the purpose just as well but "apart from the questions of whether or not a departure from the recognized text is to be recommended," Lavelle will not go into the question of their use over against the BC. Still, he would like to know why there cannot be a variety of catechisms just as there are a variety of Catholic readers.

In regard to class organization, Father Lavelle makes several other points: since more often than not the whole Sunday school attendance meets in one or two large rooms, each class should be divided into groups of not more than ten children, each with its own teacher: if there are a large number of rooms available, then up to forty children can be cared for in a group. The New York priest is convinced there should be

76 Gibbons (D), Ségur (C), Russo (D). Lavelle gives no age-groups to correspond to these grades but for comment on this, cf. Chapter ii, n. 9.
a superintendent for the boys and one for the girls and yet another for the Confirmation class. The Sunday school should have a spiritual director--ideally the pastor or another priest deputed by him. At any rate, the pastor (as obliged by the Third Plenary Council) should visit the classes frequently and take a lively interest in the school but there is no need for him "holding entire and absolute control." Neither should the spiritual director "interfere with the work of the teachers in their classes," although he should be there "every minute of every session."

The same lesson should be given to all the classes of the same grade, and to all the children in each class. Lavelle deplores "a very pernicious practice" which "obtains in some Sunday Schools of never allowing a child to go forward if he misses a lesson, until that lesson be recited." As a result, "one sometimes sees a class of ten children, each responsible for a different lesson and not one of the ten knowing the lesson assigned him"; all this is "terribly wearing on the teacher"; "it destroys attention in the pupils at the same time"; this undesirable custom is to be reprobated. One, of course, can see from Lavelle's protest that the demand for verbal perfection in reciting the catechism was yet dominant in the catechesis.

The selection and training of teachers consumes the balance of the Lavelle article. The spiritual director must find people "who have considerable experience not only in teaching but in management"; if he cannot find such people "he must make them." There must be monthly meetings between spiritual director, superintendents, and teachers which are held on convenient days and do not last too long. They must be encouraged to read constantly not only the smaller catechisms but such works
as "the Catechism of the Council Trent, Gibson's 'Catechism Made Easy'
the [Chisholm] Catechism in Examples, 'Power's Catechism,' and Father
Kinkead's 'Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism'." In the selection
of teachers, Lavelle warns his readers that "ladies are more valuable
as Sunday School teachers than gentlemen"; after "everything is in per-
fect running order" and after the program has produced its own graduates
"whose hearts are in the work," then and only then the spiritual director
"can gradually introduce the men to teach the boys." If this advise is
heeded, the spiritual director will save himself "many days, weeks, months,
and even years of worry and comparative failure." 78

77 These authors are listed in Appendices D to E, except Rev.
Patrick Power, A Catechism Doctrinal, Moral, Historical, and Liturgical.
With Answers to Objections of Science against Religion. (3 vols.; Dublin:
James Duffy, 1880) which does not seem to have received an American im-
printing but is often found in older United States Catholic libraries.
In response to Lavelle's article, J. L. wrote to the AER (XVI [February,
1897], 186-86) that using materials from the books listed by Lavelle
(and he adds Deharbe [D], Jouin [D], Schouppe [D], Gaume [C]) is fine but
what is really needed is a set of graded Religion books comparable to
the several sets of Catholic readers then being used in the parochial
schools. J. L. points out most pastors and teachers need something
already put together for their use. He is certain that several Catholic
authors in Boston and New York would be capable and willing to do such
a series if some responsible publisher would invite them to do so. Cf.
Chapter iv, nn. 55ff.

78 Women predominated in the nineteenth century Sunday schools,
both Protestant and Catholic, as they did in the public and parochial
schools. One facet of Protestant Sunday school education, however, which
did not exist in its Catholic counterpart was the use of men prominent in
business and public life to conduct the higher classes. One of the many
cases in point was John Wanamaker, Philadelphia merchant-prince and Post-
master-General of the United States in the Arthur administration. Accord-
ing to Catholic Sunday school enthusiast P. J. Buckley (CSHM, I [January,
1893], 283) Wanamaker came from Washington each Sunday to Philadelphia
to meet with his bible class of 175 men at the [Mother] Bethel Sunday
school. Buckley goes on to ask:

"How many John Wanamakers can be found in our Catholic S.-Schools or
men of like standing? Where are all the talented Catholics who figure
conspicuously in elections, Catholic Congress and serve other Catholic
unions. Certainly our Catholic professional and mercantile men should
Once all the arrangements are made, the Sunday school can open. Classes should meet on Sunday morning since boys object to coming in the afternoon. The whole session should last exactly one hour or at most one hour and a quarter. It must begin and end exactly on the assigned minute. Father Lavelle gives the execution of a typical session:

The Spiritual Director should have a bell, a single sound of which will immediately call every one to order. Nothing is more important than to train both the teachers and the pupils to prompt obedience. A second stroke of the bell should never be required to bring everybody to immediate attention. The following will make a good order of exercises for each session.

1st. Spiritual Director calls attention with one stroke of bell.
2nd. He salutes—'Good morning children'; they answer—'Good morning Father.'
3rd. Short prayer.
4th. Hymn.
5th. Director addresses the school for three or four minutes.
6th. Teachers explain the lesson for the next day.
7th. Teachers hear lesson of present day.
8th. Teachers read the epistle and gospel. It is well to circulate Bibles through the classes that the children and teachers may get used to handling them.
9th. Teachers mark books.
10th. Spiritual Director makes another short address.
11th. Hymn.
12th. Closing prayers.

The Spiritual Director will find it very conducive to the progress of the children, if he have a blackboard, on an elevated platform, and if upon it he write every Sunday, or has written at his own dictation, the lesson for each grade for the next session. And he must always insist that the lessons there inscribed be learned for that particular day.

There should be three examinations a year in writing for the upper grades feel ashamed when they look at the zeal displayed by our separated brethren and think of their own apathy and indifference in Sunday-school work."

This contrast of views (Lavelle/Buckley) is not totally in conflict but it does raise the greater question of lay participation in the catechesis and its historical problems. For material on the above mentioned "Catholic Congress" of the American Laity cf. "Conferences, Catholic: United States," CE, IV, 250-51.
(about twenty questions) and orally for the lower. A full report of marks (including the number of lessons known and missed in the term), attendance, and conduct should be sent to each child's parents. Rewards and prizes for student-performance are also valuable. Again one can see in all these suggestions, the classical facets of the Sulpician Method.

Finally, Lavelle strongly affirms the Sunday schools in any diocese would improve, if similar to the parochial schools, they were subject to the control of a Diocesan Sunday School Board which would have "the right and duty to examine the teachers and the classes, to report upon them, and to make public the exact, absolute, and relative condition of each Sunday School."

In his second article in the AER, Father Lavelle focuses upon "The Relations of the Pastor to the Sunday School." Admonishing the pastor to see to the proper physical accommodations of the Sunday school, Lavelle also maintains "the pastor should be willing to spend a reasonable amount of money for the Sunday School." Perhaps people do not value what they are given for nothing, but in America education is "as cheap as air or water." Since "the books in the Public Schools are free, and also those in our best Catholic day schools," it is almost essential that "the catechisms and other books be given free." He brings up another question:

Should teachers be paid? The answer to this question is that everything should be done that is necessary to secure efficient work. In cases where there is a Spiritual Director who is a thorough pedagogue, and who has at his command superintendents capable and energetic, there seems no good reason for paying anyone. But if these be not at hand, it seems foolish to hesitate about paying a small salary when there is question of getting good talent. What can be

79 AER, XVI (August, 1897), 179-83.
important? Keeping shingles on the roof? Even this is not as essential as keeping the faith alive among Catholics. And religious instruction is the most fruitful of all means to this end.

He closes his discussion with advice to the pastor on keeping himself up to date on what is going on in the Sunday school (by insisting on regular detailed reports) and what is going on in the world of education (by reading current literature).

Msgr. Lavelle was popular with the clergy and his position added prestige to his ideas. Most of all, however, his status as a "working pastor" would make his remarks all the more authoritative to those who held the pastoral rank. In the opinion of the present author, Lavelle's insistence that the pastor be not afraid to spend money on the Sunday school is particularly revealing.

A. A. Lambing on the Sunday School

The final article "How Should We Conduct Our Sunday Schools" appeared in the AER. Written by Father A. A. Lambing, noted editor and author of catechetical materials, it parallels the other articles already examined but makes specific points of its own. After reviewing the statutes of the Councils of Baltimore on the catechetical obligation of the pastor, Father Lambing lists the further duties of providing adequate facilities for the classes and seeking the cooperation of the parents. The Sunday school teachers should not be left on their own.

---

80 AER, XVII (October, 1897), 393-409. Father Lambing had written a manual for Sunday schools in 1875 (Appendix D). For a review of Lambing's manual, cf. Ave Maria, XIV (January 26, 1878), 60-61. The AER article gives highlights from his book.
in this apostolate. The pastor's responsibility also extends to securing good teachers which is paramount since "it may be said with perfect truth that a large number of Sunday school teachers are not worth their room; and even some of the religious teachers are susceptible of very considerable and necessary improvement." It must be made clear to teachers that they are involved in both "education and instruction"; "education" is drawing out what is already implanted in the mind by God [idealism?] while "instruction" is concerned with putting into the mind what is not yet there. In this dual operation kindness is absolutely essential; the author spends much time on this point quoting many authorities. The teacher must also have flexibility with children not forgetting they have "feelings" and characters too. They have to be physically comfortable and be interested before any results can be honestly expected from them. Some Sunday school practices are not consonant with this principle and should be changed. After all, he writes:

The teacher cannot reasonably expect children, especially if they are small, to cross their little arms, and sit motionless for half an hour or more; it is impossible for them to do so; he [note the pronoun] could not do it himself. The restlessness which we often complain of in children is not a fault; it is a constitutional necessity.

The teacher should also encourage the children to ask questions, being careful not to make light of faulty or irrelevant questions; questions increase and reinforce knowledge "imprinting it more indelibly on the memory." "'Almost all catechists are great talkers''" is the opinion of one authority he quotes; Lambing agrees and finds this a great abuse. "Premiums" (he gives reasons pro and con) and picnics make things go more smoothly. Many make a big thing over the need for Sunday school libraries, but Lambing [unlike John Talbot Smith] thinks collateral
reading (especially stories) only distract from the "proper work of the school" i.e. the teaching, understanding, and memorizing of the catechism. Lambing ends the article by firmly endorsing the drastic importance of the "Class of Perseverance". It is important for the further education of "those who have completed or imagine they have completed, their course in common catechisms" and serves as the primary source of teacher recruitment for the Sunday school at large. As Smith and Lavelle, Lambing's ideas too show the influence of the Method of St. Sulpice (n. 56).

The Sunday School in Practice

One Sunday school operation that implemented many of the ideas of Smith, Lavelle, and Lambing was that of Sacred Heart Parish in East Cambridge, Massachusetts. In fact, the Advanced Class of catechism there edited a parish weekly, the Sacred Heart Review (1888-1918) which by 1897 had developed into a national Catholic weekly with a circulation of 400,000. While the East Cambridge weekly expanded to include diversified comment and assorted features, it continued to report the news of the parish Sunday school through the "Sunday School Notes." More often than not in the earlier issues, at least, the rules and procedures of the Sacred Heart Sunday School and Advanced Class appear in the Review. It seems proper to reproduce them at length in this study as an example of what a well organized catechetical program (Sulpician style) was thought to be in the late nineteenth century. Certainly, the pride of

---

the parish was its Advanced Class. The SHR consistently reported:

The Advanced Class, composed of about 400 pupils from 14 to 18 years of age, provides religious instruction for many children, who, after Confirmation, would consider their religious knowledge complete if an additional opportunity for study were not furnished.

The Class, under the supervision of Rev. Francis Butler, meets Sunday afternoons and Wednesday evenings. The textbooks are Schuster's Bible history and Deharbe's large Catechism. Essays are written and read, book premiums and gold crosses are awarded to those who successfully pass the annual examination, and at the end of the Sunday School year the graduation exercises take place, diplomas being given to all who have finished the prescribed four years' course of study.

RULES OF THE CLASS
1. All girls and boys from fourteen to eighteen years of age are members of this class and are, in conscience, bound to attend.
2. Children from fourteen to sixteen years of age attend class on Sunday afternoons at 2 o'clock; those over sixteen attend Wednesday evenings at 7:30 o'clock.
3. All are expected to study the lesson appointed, and all must bring their catechisms with them to the class.
4. All must go to Communion on the first Sunday of January, April, July and October.

From the various items in the SHR, the Advanced Class--consisting of four progressive years or levels--followed the standard question/answer method, with concomitant memorization. The premium of a special gold cross was given those who could recite the Deharbe (D) Large Catechism by heart. At the same time the director of the Sunday school and the Advanced Class, Father Francis J. Butler stated on numerous occasions, he was opposed to "parrot-like recitation." To complement Deharbe and Schuster (D), the parish boasted of a circulation library of over 1,000 volumes for its students.

The general Sunday school in East Cambridge ordinarily enrolled over 1,200 children under the care and instruction of "fourteen officers

and 200 teachers." The school was divided into the "Banner, Confirmation, First Communion, and Prayer Classes," in descending order of age and accomplishment. The various rules again are informative:

RULES OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

1. The Class begins at 9 o'clock promptly. No one will be admitted after that time without seeing the Spiritual Director or Superintendent.
2. All should have a Sunday School Manual, containing the Catechism, hymn book and prayers for Mass.
3. The lesson appointed for the following Sunday should be studied at home.
4. When children are obliged to be absent, parents should inform the Spiritual Director or Superintendent.
5. Children should confess every two months. Every child over nine years is provided with an attendance card, the object of which is: 1st.--To keep an exact record of the confession. 2nd.--To enable parents to discover any unnecessary absence of the child.

Parents are earnestly requested to urge their children to observe the foregoing rules. They should frequently examine the card and note the attendance. The attendance each Sunday is shown by the numbers punched out.

If any cards are lost, a new one should be obtained immediately.

Children are provided with an absentee slip on which parents are requested to state the reason of the child's absence from Sunday School.

RULES OF THE CONFIRMATION CLASS

1. All children who are twelve years of age, and have not been confirmed, must attend this class.
2. Children who attend school will meet for this class at 4 o'clock, Wednesday afternoon. For those who cannot attend on Wednesday, class will be held Sunday at 6 P.M.
3. Always bring your card and have your attendance marked on the card.
4. Go to confession every month and have it marked on the card.
5. Children will not be confirmed unless they attend this class, confess regularly and pass the examination on the catechism.

As one can see, strong emphasis is placed on regular attendance and preparation of the catechism lesson through regular parental
co-operation. Regular reception of the Sacrament of Penance was also required, as the rules show. In the Advanced Class, premiums of "gold medals" were given for perfect recitation of the "little Catechism." The children in the Sunday school also had access to the circulating library. The teachers met monthly "to report the standing of the school, suggest improvements, and give an account of the visits made the parents." Even the Sacred Heart Sunday School, however, reported

The matter of parental cooperation in preparing the lesson or more commonly "hearing the catechism" was greatly stressed by those associated with the Catechesis. In 1892, the Archbishops had urged it (cf. n. 64 above); the same point is constantly made in the pages of the CSHM. It had its effect. The present author knows that one of the familiar phrases in a practicing Catholic home some decades ago was "Go tell your Father (or sister etc.) to hear your catechism!" The goal of verbal perfection in memorizing the fixed and familiar text made the job of parental monitoring within the securely-felt competency of most parents. They after all, whatever their additional education or lack of it, had passed through the same training. One of this author's most interesting personal experiences in this regard took place in the mid-1930's when he and his father would visit a neighborhood "fire barn." Among the very friendly group, there was one fireman who knew the whole Baltimore Catechism by heart (or so it seemed). He could give the answer to every question asked and with verbal perfection. He was then of an age that would put his sacramental preparation in this turn-of-the-century period. He, of course, had an extraordinary memory, but his accomplishment was the result of his mother "hearing the catechism." Family custom dictated that whoever was "up for Confirmation" that year would help mother with the dishes. She stood at the sink with the catechism propped up before her and (with this son at least) would toss the plate to him as she fired the question; as he caught the plate and dried it, he would shoot back the answer. He spoke of the "catechism-game" with great nostalgia and love. The Sulpician Method stressed "games" in catechismal recitation (cf. above n. 56). For more on parental cooperation in teaching the catechism, cf. Chapter iv, n. 18.

Manuals of moral theology used in this period (and later) questioned the morality of Confession cards and Easter duty cards as invading the right of privacy guaranteed to the individual by the seal of the Confessional; the custom of Easter duty cards persisted in some few places.

from time to time in the SHR that there were a "few vacancies on the teaching staff," but, even then, those interested "could apply" for acceptance. The whole catechetical operation in East Cambridge shows not only religious dedication but the vast amount of social control exercised by its pastor, Father John O'Brien. Indeed, the celebrated Curé of Ars (St. Jean-Marie Vianney) is said to have set out to control his problem-parish in Ars à l'irlandais. The influence of St. Sulpice (n. 56) is clearly visible in the East Cambridge operation.

Undoubtedly, there were other highly organized Sulpician-styled Sunday schools such as the Paulist Sunday School in New York (under

86 Father O'Brien came to the United States from Ireland at the age of twelve and settled with his parents near Springfield, Massachusetts. In time he worked in the mills. Seeing that many children were not studying the catechism, he asked the superintendent for a company room in which to open a Sunday school. Later, he decided to study for the priesthood and was ordained at the age of thirty. He was appointed pastor of Sacred Heart Parish in East Cambridge, Massachusetts five years later (1873). He founded the Sacred Heart Review with the help of the Advanced Class in 1888. He remained pastor of Sacred Heart for over forty years; for biographical sources, cf. Appendix B.

87 This author strongly suspects that further research into the organization and strength of the Sunday school in this era would disclose that "ideal" Sunday schools were in parishes without parochial schools. Sacred Heart parishes in East Cambridge and Worcester are exemplificative of this. Where parochial schools existed the full thrust of the parish's educational resources would be placed there. The Sunday school might very well be a kind of "tired" effort to give some religious instruction preparatory to the Sacraments for children not in the parochial school. In a parish where the parochial school existed, the Sunday school population would be very often (not always) from religiously marginal families --which would make a difference in the overall operation. In a large parish without a parochial school (very often yet in New England ca. 1900), the full educational thrust would be put into the Sunday school. In this case, the Sunday school population would also be very different, containing the children of the religiously devout and religiously concerned families --again, this would make for a very different operation. The one great exception to this would be large parishes staffed by religious orders. These "religious" parishes would tend to have large parochial schools and "ideal" Sunday schools as well since they ordinarily had the staff necessary to provide enthusiastic efforts toward both works.
Father Thomas McMillan CSP), 88 at Worcester (cf. above) under Father Conaty, 89 and at the Holy Family Church in Chicago under the Jesuit Fathers. Indeed there must have been many, but less perfect situations are described by one correspondent in the AER who wrote in response to Father Lavelle's first article discussed above (n. 75).

Fr. Lavelle's article on "Sunday Schools," published in one of your recent issues, must read like a big reproach to many among us who are responsible for the management of our Sunday Schools. What is generally done there? The school opens with a short prayer; each teacher begins at the head of his class, and examines each child in the lesson; meanwhile, the rest of the class are disengaged, some idling and chatting, some perhaps studying their catechism, if they care to do so. By the time the last child is examined, the signal for dismissal is given. The children get little or no explanation of the lesson, and Bible History is often entirely ignored. There is time for more work, and more could be done, but we lose much of our opportunity from want of proper organization. There are, I know, schools which approach Fr. Lavelle's standard; but I venture to think they are few in number, and to be found chiefly in the large cities. 91

---

88Father Thomas McMillan CSP was director of the Sunday school at St. Paul's Church in New York. He was active in the New York Catholic educational effort and highly influential in the Catholic Summer School. It is safe to say he provided the principal Sunday school thrust at Cliffs Haven. The arrangement of the Paulist Sunday School (much like East Cambridge's Sacred Heart) is given in CSHM, I (December, 1892), 258. In 1908, McMillan collaborated in editing a very popular revision of Fander's Deharbe (Appendix E). For more on the Paulist Sunday school cf. Montgomery Forbes "Work of the Laity in a Sunday School." Catholic World, LXVI, (December, 1897), 355-63. Cf. above n. 74.

89Rules for the Worcester Sunday school and comments on its operation can be found in CSHM, I (October, 1892), 206; II, (July, 1893), 126; (August, 1893), 150-51. Rules for parental cooperation can be found in CSHM, II (October, 1893), 203.

90The Holy Family Church Association published at Chicago the Sunday School Messenger (1868-1887). It does not contain Catechetical data such as found in Conaty's Catholic School and Home Magazine (cf. above nn. 66, 78, 89). Cf. also Chapter v, n. 122.

91AER, XVI (February, 1897), 186.
In addition to the unsettled conditions cited in the above quotation, an 1899 review in the CW welcoming Spirago's (D) catechetical compendium made this charge:

It sometimes happens the teachers in our Sunday schools know little more of their faith than the children they teach. Again some think they fulfill their duty by exacting a mere parrot-like recitation from their children.92

There are a sufficient number of allegations like this in ACELP to indicate rising dissatisfaction not only with catechetical organization, and as before with the materials, but also, now for the first time, with the method. We do not always find these reforming sentiments, however, where we might expect. As the American Catholic Quarterly Review, the Catholic University Bulletin (1895-1928) registered no concern before 1900 for the Catechesis (except in its book reviews). Once again, the absence of essay material on the Catechesis in these two major intellectual journals of American Catholicism can only lead to the conclusion that the Catholic intelligentsia generally did not look on religious education as containing major problems in the nineteenth century.

92 Ibid., LXX (March, 1899), 278.

93 Catholic University Bulletin (hereinafter cited as CUB) was founded by a group of professors at the Catholic University of America. It served as a collective journal for several faculties until they developed learned journals of their own. CUB ceased in 1928.

94 For CUB reviews of catechetical literature in this period, cf. CUB:

Bold (D): II (January, 1896), 390; Cochem (D): II (April, 1896), 552; Brennan (D): IV (July, 1898), 261-62; Conaty (D) IV (April, 1899), 508; Rodez (D) V (July, 1899), 276.

The CUB also contained a number of favorable reviews and comments on the scriptural works of Father Francis Ernest Gigot (D), Franco-American seminary professor.
Some Conclusions:

Several further conclusions can be drawn from the material presented in this chapter:

1. There was, as before the War, continued concern for better catechisms. This led to the formulation of the national catechism of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. It also led to the production and acceptance of the larger or fuller works discussed in this chapter and listed in Appendix D. The theory behind this activity, as before, was that better catechisms would make better catechesis.

2. The rise of bible history in the American Catechesis can be traced to a complex of reasons. After mid-century it became even more entrenched as a formal part of religious education. While catechisms were generally not illustrated (except the Benziger BC), bible histories were. These illustrations were thought to make a great contribution toward imagination and comprehension and were highly valued. There was a variety of bible histories, basic and enlarged, for use in school and home. After 1865 the Catechesis faced the increasing problem of how much biblical revisionism to include in the school texts.

3. The ACelp before 1900 does not contain much information on the "elementary" catechesis and its materials. It is strangely silent on the appearance of the Baltimore Catechism. There is considerable evidence that while the BC was dominant in the American Catechesis after 1886 there was much dissatisfaction with it from the beginning but, as we have seen, this was not at all unusual with a catechism--especially an "enjoined one."

4. A number of parishes had organized Sunday schools along the lines of the Method of St. Sulpice but these were probably more the exception than the rule. There is evidence that not enough attention was paid to produce an adequate Sunday school catechesis by the clergy. For reasons unexplored by this study, it seems the laity did not always cooperate in the Sunday school program as teachers, but this is not surprising.

5. Explanation of the catechismal text and "familiar" instruction were always favored in the American Catechesis if not always widely implemented. By the 1890's, however, there was strong stress upon "explanatory catechism" and the need for teachers to prepare themselves for this task. A number of teacher manuals appeared to meet this development--especially Kinkead's Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism (D) which came to be used widely.
6. While some dissatisfaction was expressed by the end of the century with the prevailing catechetical method of memorization of the catechismal text with verbal perfection, the major learned journals of American Catholic opinion made no mention of problems in the Catechesis. The term and concept of "Catechetics" as a separate discipline, already understood in Europe, had not taken hold in the United States before 1900.

The preceding two chapters show an ongoing development throughout the nineteenth century in American Catholic religious education, largely in terms of better materials and organization. After 1900, however, it would be the method of the Catechesis that would be questioned and questioned strongly.
American Catholic English-language periodicals (ACELP) strongly reflected the development of the Catechesis during the period of 1900-15. Such older periodicals as the *American Ecclesiastical Review* (1889+), *Catholic World* (1865+), and the widely circulated *Ave Maria* (1865-1959) published, as before, essays of major catechetical import. By 1908, the *Catholic University Bulletin* (1895-1928) began to express great interest in religious education, but the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* (1876-1924) generally maintained its characteristic silence in this regard. Minor materials relative to the Catechesis also continued to appear in such specialized journals as *Teacher and Organist* (1890-1910), *Salesianum* (1906+), and *Mosher's Magazine* (1898-1903) as well as its successor *Champlain Educator* (1903-06). The same was true of the more popular periodicals such as *Donahoe's Magazine* (1879-1908), *Benziger's Magazine* (1898-1921), *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (1866-1965), *Rosary Magazine* (1891-1964), *Carmelite Review* (1893-1906), *St. Anthony Messenger* (1893+) and *Extension Magazine* (1907+). These last periodicals gave catechetical comment largely through their book reviews. Among the organs of personal journalism, Arthur Preuss frequently expressed his views on the teaching of religion in his variously titled *Fortnightly Review* (1894-1935); while William Thorne, although given to controversial themes, had nothing to say on the subject in his *Globe* (1889-1904).
Among the ACELP founded in the new century, considerable concern for the Catechesis was registered in the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist (1900+), Catholic School Journal (1901-64), Catholic Educational Association Bulletin (1903+), and Catholic Educational Review (1911-69). The same is true of Rev. Dr. Thomas E. Judge's Review of Catholic Pedagogy (1903-04)—titled Catholic Review of Reviews in its final volume—but it did not survive long enough to develop its concern. Magnificat (1907-68), published by the Sisters of Mercy, contained little on the Catechesis, but the Catholic Mind (1902+), specializing in reprinted material, contained a number of erudite essays of interest to the religious educator. The very scholarly New York Review (1905-08), published out of the New York archdiocesan seminary (St. Joseph) at Dunwoodie, made no mention of the Catechesis in any form; neither did the Messenger (1907-09) which developed out of Messenger of the Sacred Heart (1866-1965) and was forerunner to America. On the other hand, America (1909+) expressed a fairly consistent if not lively interest in religious education. Father Herman Joseph Heuser, editor of the American Ecclesiastical Review, that distinguished journal for the clergy, put out a counterpart for the educated laity entitled the Dolphin (1901, 1902-05); unlike its literary cousin, however, it surprisingly contained no material on religious education except for books reviews. With one important exception, cited in Chapter i (n. 9), the American Catholic Historical Researches (1884-1912) published practically nothing on the history of religious education in the United States. The same is regretfully true of the venerable Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia (1884+), the Historical Records and Studies (1899-1964) of
the New York based United States Catholic Historical Society, and the Catholic Historical Review (1915+). Perhaps some insight into the Catechesis of the period would have been given by such local diocesan journals as New York's Catholic School Work (1909-10) and Erie's announced but unlisted Christian Home and School, if they had survived. Finally, some information on changing method appeared in the teacher-oriented Helper (1905-13) which was published to go with the popular eastern juvenile Sunday Companion (1900-27).

All in all, the ACELP of the 1900-15 span published a number of essays, comments, and reviews which shows the period to have been a very prolific one for the development of religious education within the American Catholic Church.

CONTROVERSIES OVER CATECHETICAL METHODS AND MATERIALS

As we have seen in the last two chapters, continuing interest was registered in the nineteenth century ACELP for better catechisms with the expectation that such would lead to better instruction. Concern for vigorous catechesis after First Communion and the organizational problems of the Sunday school in general appeared there, as well. No dissatisfaction, however, was expressed with what was then the traditional or classical method of catechizing until quite late in the century. Again as we have seen, the traditional or classical method consisted of teaching segments of the catechism question by question with the requirement that the student (of whatever age) memorize the answers and recite them with verbal perfection (at least for determined intervals). There was, of
course, continuous concern that the student would understand the memorized material and some explanation was, therefore, always called for. At the same time, there was greater concern that the young Christians, living in a frequently religiously hostile milieu, would memorize the authentic and uniform formulations of their "ancient faith." If children did not always understand the catechismal text, the proponents of the classical method consoled themselves with the assurance that the children would retain the memorized material and come to understand it when they would achieve greater maturity of mind. Not all catechists saw it this way, but most did. But by the end of the nineteenth century there was growing if yet faintly registered discontent with this method; greater explanation of the text was called for; it was understood that this could only be achieved by better and more fully trained teachers. This sentiment gained support; after 1900 there was marked ferment within the American Catechesis with many urgently seeking a more "explanatory" and enriched teaching of the catechism; soon too, voices were heard calling for a lessening of comprehensive memorization in catechetical method. These positions came to be facets of a developing catechetical stance, termed by the present author, "progressive traditionalism." Religious educators that can be grouped under this term were traditionalists in that they clung to a catechism as the necessary base of catechetical instruction but were progressive in that they greatly stressed the need to enrich the catechismal text with various other materials and graphic illustrations. While progressive traditionalism rose to dominance in the 1900-1915 period, there were others who radically called for setting aside the catechism entirely, especially in the first years of religious
instruction. In the first decades of this century, then, the forces of the American Catechesis were largely aligned in various pro or anti-catechismal positions. Indeed, the assault on the catechism had well begun.

Bishop Bellord's Manifesto on Religious Education

Undoubtedly, the most vigorous criticism of the classical catechetical method in this era appeared in Ave Maria in 1901. Written anonymously by Bishop James Bellord, Vicar Apostolic of Gibraltar, the

1A Catholic Bishop, "Memory and Religious Education," Ave Maria LII (January 19, 1901), 65-70; "Our Failures in Religious Instruction," ibid. (March 16, 1901), 321-24; "Our Failures in Religious Education II," ibid. (May 25, 1901), 641-46; "Errors in Our Catechetical System," ibid., LIII (August 3, 1901), 129-36. These essays were Ave Maria's great thrust in regard to religious education during the 1900-15 period. Ave Maria always carried brief articles on the importance of religious instruction at the opening of the school year and in this period reprinted catechetical statements made by the English Catholic hierarchy.

2Rt. Rev. James Bellord (d. 1905), titular bishop of Milevis, retired from the Vicariate Apostolic of Gibraltar in 1901. He took residence at Southend-on-Sea, Essex [at the mouth of the Thames, England], where he continued to write on theological subjects of current interest. He died while publishing a series of essays on eucharistic theory in the American Ecclesiastical Review (cf. AER, XXXIII [1905] for the essays and controversial reactions, including those of the distinguished Jesuit theologian Lemmkuhl). Bellord was already well known and respected by the clergy in 1901 for his two-volumed Meditations on Christian Dogma, first published in the United States through Herder (St. Louis, 1898). The Meditations based on a classic French work by Louis Bail (d. 1669) was last published by the Newman Press (Westminster, Md., 1948). Homiletic and Pastoral Review (1905-13) continued to publish his sermons and essays long after his death. Bellord also wrote on social topics. Before his appointment to Gibraltar, the English prelate had served as a military chaplain in Her Majesty's armed forces. His writings were not highly original but always proved provocative. There is indication that he was considered somewhat of a l'enfant terrible by more conservative churchmen.

The reader is reminded that a letter in parentheses following an author's name (as below with Bellord's) signifies that works of that author with bibliographical data are to be found in the so-lettered appendix, under his name.
the series of four articles had a bombshell effect on the American Catechesis. No one had yet been so outspoken in criticizing traditional religious instruction. Ave Maria reprinted the essays that same year under Bellord's (E) name in a separate brochure titled Religious Education and Its Failures which had wide circulation in the United States. There can be no doubt that Bellord's essays are a landmark of early twentieth century catechetical thinking. By present day standards his work would be considered quite unscholarly: his allegations and especially his stinging examples are undocumented: his material is highly repetitious (in the style of the time) and contain large blocks of quotations from other sources. Bellord's personal comments form a relatively small part of his development, but what he says of himself is forceful and attention-getting. Clearly the strength of his essays resulted from his own incisive comments plus his gathering of supportive quotations in one package. It becomes clear that many were seeking a drastic change and Bellord provided them with a needed manifesto.

The Vicar of Gibraltar opens his attack on the prevailing method of Catholic religious instruction by denouncing its preoccupation with "cramming the memory." To him, this accepted practice of demanding verbal perfection in memorizing the formulae of the catechism is horrendous; such a method in any subject can be made to prevail with students only "by the threat of exceedingly painful alternatives." In some places that Bellord knows of, just a minor slip of the tongue (e.g. a "though" for an "although") is enough to bar a child from Confirmation or First Holy Communion. The bishop is sympathetic to these children and to all who have difficulty in memorizing because he had the same problem himself.
He recalls:

For some years, in a college too, I was taught catechism by a conscientious and holy priest, who has since risen to high position in the Church. Every Sunday we devoted an hour and a quarter to learning the words of the catechism, and half an hour to the repetition of it. The most minute care was bestowed on the small syllables, and the least slip was a grave fault to be visited with punishment. I knew my religion well, practised it well, was well-read in devotional and controversial literature; but my physical memory for sounds was weak, and I had to suffer as one who was negligent and ignorant of his most important duty.

But what of those, the bishop asks, who do achieve the required verbal perfection in learning the catechism? In answer, he gives a number of examples (some calculated to be humorous) of pupils who could recite large parts of the catechism perfectly but who would show upon further questioning that they obviously did not understand what they had so perfectly recited. Bellord points out that in such cases, education has been largely one of "sound and tongue-motions" and not intellectual development. He insists that the total psychology of the child--with due attention to his differences as an individual--must be involved in catechization:

There are several stages to be gone through in the course of the religious education of children. First, of course, the sense-memory has to be stored with impressions of sounds and sights and actions; much must be learned by rote as an aid to the action of the understanding. The second stage, more important than the first, is to store the intelligence with ideas, with a knowledge of truths. But this is far from being sufficient. It is worse than useless to have sound knowledge without a perception of our duties arising from it, and without the inclination to do that duty. The conscience must be formed by means of the proper impressions. Next, the will must be impressed so that it may reproduce, as from its memory, these impressions in the form of a fixed determination to do that which intelligence and conscience dictate. The imagination, emotions and affections have to be submitted to training as important subsidiaries.

3 Bellord, "Memory and Religious Education," p. 68.

4 Ibid., p. 67.
If catechists do not reach the intellects of many of their students, they do not reach the hearts of many others according to Bellord. What other explanation can there be for the constant phenomenon of "leakage" from the Church, i.e. the continuing loss of practicing Catholics.

He explains:

I do not intend to dwell on the rapid decay of faith in certain countries where the duty of religious education has been totally neglected: I would speak only of the losses in those countries where the Church is vigorous, and her children, on the whole, enlightened; where every effort is made to impart full religious instruction; where the machinery of parish schools and Sunday-schools, of catechism and sermons, of inspections and examinations, is in full activity. Wherever circumstances seem most favorable, wherever the Church has full freedom of hand and no particular obstacles to her influence, there we hear of thousands who disappear from the Church when they leave the school; who, even if they retain the name of Catholic, disregard every precept of their Church; who have carried away only the most superficial and fleeting religious impressions, and who are without even the common natural sense of religion and moral conscience.

How to explain these "failures" when they seem to have been taught their religion so zealously? Bishop Bellord finds the unfortunate answer largely in poor materials and poorer methods.

According to the Gibraltar Vicar, since catechisms are the basis of contemporary religious instruction much of the blame for the widespread lack of comprehension and leakage must be placed on them. What Bellord calls the "original sin" of catechisms is that most of them are the work of theologians and not the teachers of children; as manuals of theology they are satisfactory but as textbooks for children they are impossible.

He charges:

I have examined many catechisms. In point of true doctrine they are unexceptionable. As handbooks for children not one seems

---

to me to come near the mark. They have from internal evidence, been drawn up by persons deeply read in theology, possessing little elasticity of mind, incapable of putting themselves in the place of others, without much experience of actual teaching of young children. .... ...in every catechism I find simple things made obscure; words multiplied excessively; stilted and technical language instead of natural and colloquial speech; much that is quite unnecessary is to be learned word for word, and much omitted that is very necessary to know at the present day.6

Thus Bellord finds the materials of religious instruction to be generally unsatisfactory and often incomprehensible, but what is even worse--these unsuitable materials must be memorized. Here is the real curse for him--total memorization. He points out that due to the influence of such great educators as Rosmini, Pestalozzi and Froebel great innovations have been made in modern education and "parrot-learning by rote has been reduced to narrow limits; and words are not used as being valuable in themselves and identical with knowledge, but as a subsidiary to ideas, and only as a vehicle for conveying them."7 Bellord is convinced that English-speaking Catholics have not kept pace with improvements commonly found in secular instruction when it comes to teaching religion. He finds that "education in religion is carried on in the obsolete, wearisome manner of a century ago" and "antiquated methods are looked upon as sacred" but worst of all a mistaken psychology of learning has been "naturalized into a method." German Catholics, on the other hand, have made great progress; they have formulated a new science viz. "Catechetics" which makes full use of the laws of learning in teaching Christian Doctrine; the Catholic world must look to them for

leadership. At the same time, however, the bishop affirms that he does not stand alone unsatisfied among English-speaking Catholics; he quotes extensively from several authors who agree with him on need for catechetical revolution. He begins with American Father John Talbot Smith's essay which had appeared several years previously in Ave Maria. Bellord finds the ideas of English Father Michael P. Glancey and Provost Wenham especially supportive. He retains his highest praise, however, for the catechetical writings of the English Redemptorist Father Furniss. The Gibraltar vicar quotes too from a number of letters

8 Ibid. This is the first use of the term "catechetics" that this study has encountered in CELP.


10 Cf. Chapter iii, n. 68. For biographical data on many persons named in this dissertation, cf. Appendix B.

11 Glancey was at one time inspector of schools for the Diocese of Birmingham (England). A special function of the diocesan inspector was to supervise religious education. Glancey had written a foreword to the English translation of Bishop Friedrich Justus Knecht's (Appendix E) bible history. Knecht was an outstanding figure in the German Catholic Catechesis (cf. Chapter ii, n. 21). Glancey's preface was widely quoted in American catechetical writings after 1901. It is difficult to know, however, whether he was quoted directly or through Bellord.

12 The Very Rev. Provost John G. Wenham (D), author of popular catechetical works, was at one time inspector of schools for the Diocese of Southwark (England). Wenham was also widely quoted in American catechetical writings after 1901.

13 Father John Furniss, CSSR, (1809-65) was the author of a number of catechetical writings regarded progressive for his time by most Catholics; some of his works were republished in the United States. Furniss, however, was subjected to scathing criticism from sources outside the Catholic Church for his scare tactics with children. One does notice this occasionally in his works. For biographical data, cf. Appendix B. For his works cf. Appendices C-E.
he has received from American Catholic educators and Sunday-school teachers applauding the sentiments of his first essay (cf. below).

If, then, there is such agreed-upon need for a new method of catechization, what will it be? Bellord has the answer: minor emphasis on memorization--major emphasis on comprehension. For him, there is always need for some minor memorization--such as prayers and several essential definitions. For this reason, there must always be some kind of catechism but there is no need for the kind of "encyclopediac" catechisms so commonly used. Bellord feels that he has put together the right kind of catechism based on his experience and promises it will soon be published (cf. below). In the main, however, Christian Doctrine should be taught by the catechist in his own words as clearly and as graphically as he can; the students in turn should be asked to answer in their own words as they demonstrate their understanding of what they were taught. Bishop Bellord promises success where this method of free exchange is conscientiously used:

... seek to impress the mind; give the children ideas, and they will find the words for themselves, they will learn the art of free and accurate expression, and they will not find themselves inarticulate, when they are taken outside the range of one set of phrases. Tell children something interesting and see how well they will remember facts and details and lessons drawn from them, and how quickly they will pick up new words and employ them judiciously. Religious instruction would rather be modelled on the object lessons of modern schools than made an exercise in repetition of sounds. Information must be first given and then elicited with living speech, with illustrations, comparisons, exhortations, and practical personal applications.14

In fine, then, the thrust of Bellord's essays on religious education can be summarized in five points: a) reduce memory work to an absolute minimum; b) involve the total psychology of the child in the learning process viz. intellect, will, memory, emotions etc.; c) de-emphasize

the catechism as the sole teaching material; d) encourage the teacher and student to exchange their understandings of the great ideas of Faith in their own words; e) above all, teach toward understanding.

Reaction to the Bellord Manifesto

Bellord's articles were widely read, discussed and quoted. **Ave Maria**, as noted above, received a number of comments on the first article which Bishop Bellord quotes in his third essay. He gives some indication earlier in the same essay that not all react favorably to his ideas; the comments he does quote, however, are supportive of his position. This study reproduces Bellord's summary of the letters he received since it is representative of the intense feeling shared by a rising number of American Catholic religious educators after 1900. The bishop explains:

I venture now to transcribe a few expressions of opinion that have been called forth by these articles. A bishop writes: 'That article on Memory is excellent....His criticism of our catechisms and catechetical methods I find not even strong enough.' A lady engaged in teaching says: 'I can not forbear thanking you.... After a lifetime spent in the daily classroom, and every Sunday in what seems to be vain effort to inculcate Christian doctrine by the ponderous, well-nigh unintelligible words of the catechism, one feels so utterly discouraged that one can not but be thankful for such an article from a theologian. Oh, such little results from such hard, constant labor!' A Sister of Mercy writes a hurried line or two on a post-card: 'The article in the **Ave Maria** read with the greatest interest. I can indeed feel the truth of the remarks about the various things objected to. Eighteen years of drudgery, trying, and often in vain, to cram a specified amount into a child's mind, has taught it to me. A catechism in one hand of the child, and a paper with meanings of words in the other - or else good-bye to good results on the day of exams!! A dean uses the following forcible language: 'I can not forego expressing to you the pleasure I had in reading the article on "Memory and Religious Education." If it were possible for it to be forwarded to every priest in these United States to every Sister
and Brother, to every teacher charged with teaching catechism to children, and to ask every one of them to put in practice the lessons learned from it, the soul-killing business of the everlasting memorizing of the dead letter of catechism would cease; and I venture to say that in less than ten years we should see the most wonderful effects in our schools and churches. Experience for the last twenty years has taught me the lesson that the constant memorizing of the letter of the catechism without a thorough explanation of the same is killing religion in the souls of our young rising generation."

I have before me a letter from another priest. He speaks of the organization of a system of Sunday-schools with permanent and efficient staffs of volunteer teachers; he speaks of places where there are no parochial schools, and bemoans the laissez faire and negligence of Catholics in regard to catechetical instruction. My message does not include these aspects of the question. Ne sutor ultra crepidam [Let the cobbler stick to his last: Pliny]. I must leave these points to those possessing full qualifications, which I do not: I extract some sentences from the letter which bear on my special point:

'We simply have no catechism that comes up to the requirements. It is a hopeful sign that many new ones are appearing, which shows at least our discontent; but they are still either too difficult for all except those who have studied philosophy and theology in Latin, or they are too simple, and there is no natural progression from the simpler truths for the little tots to the more enlarged mental view of adults.... What is needed is: A catechism that at least approaches perfection; a higher catechism that will give the dogmas to the children's intellect, not merely to their memory; a greater stress laid upon the virtues of life, and not so much hairsplitting;...more prominence given to the beauty of Catholic worship.'

Another immediate (1902) reaction to Bishop Bellord's essays appeared in the Catholic World in an article entitled "The Successful Catechist" by Ella M. Baird, then prominent in normal school teaching and administration. It is difficult to understand her reaction to Bellord's arguments since she seems to have misread him in part. At any rate, she goes along with him on the causes of "leakage" in the
Church and expresses great delight with his announcement of "a new science of Catechetics" but she wants to know where are the "new scientists" or at least who will produce them. Mrs. Baird agrees strongly with Bellord on the need for more skillful religious instruction but she finds the bishop makes it all sound too easy. In her experience, pastors have very little time for the catechism class except for "a few minutes each week" or "save during the special time of preparation for First Communion and Confirmation." As for the curates (religious orders excepted) they are at best "raw material whose devotion is their only recommendation and who, at best, can but teach as they themselves were taught, by asking questions from a catechism and insisting on answers learned by rote." Yes, she sadly concludes:

... many children receive only the teaching of amateurs during their entire Sunday-school life; by Sunday-school we mean the religious school, the school where Christian Doctrine is taught, whether it be for one day or seven days in a week.\[17\]

The poor children, according to Mrs. Baird, have asked for bread and are being given a stone. The trained catechist before the learning child is every bit as necessary, she insists, as the trained nurse is now understood to be necessary at the bed-side of the sick child. Something has to be done to give children trained catechists! When this is done, she concludes:

Countless boys and girls with tender hearts and willing minds will receive with joy this product of the new science, this

\[17\]

Ibid., 589. The inadequate training of catechists, sometimes described in the most belittling terms, appears a number of times in articles on the Sunday school catechesis during the 1900-15 period.
last gift of the Holy Ghost--the successful Catechist.

There were other more favorable reactions to Bellord's essays. The Ave Maria, not surprisingly, found them stimulating and progressive while the Catholic World appraised them to be well worth reading.

Both periodicals agreed that the bishop's catechetical ideas would surely benefit the religious educators who would study them; the CW, however judged the Gibraltar Vicar's estimates of "leakage" in the Church to be much exaggerated. The Catholic School Journal found Bellord's material to be invigorating and frequently published extracts from it.

---

18 Ibid., 592. Mrs. Baird, reflecting the increasing thrust of the times, makes a strong plea for catechism illustrated by pictures, poems, stories, selections from the epistles and gospels etc.--all facets of the Sulpician Method (cf. Chapter iii, n. 56). She also brings up the point that all these materials, the catechisms and bibles etc. should be paid for out of the church funds--a plea made by other writers on the subject before her (cf. Chapter iii, n. 79). She likewise takes up a controverted question, viz., should the next lesson be prepared by the children before the class? She answers, no! The new lesson should be gone over, explained, illustrated, and memorized in the class before it becomes the responsibility of the student. The first part of the next class should be concerned whether or not the student, with the help of home, has retained the previous lesson; after this, the class goes on to the new lesson etc. This last point was apparently much disputed among catechists in this era since it appears a number of times in catechetical writings. While some catechists, as we have seen, expected the parents to help the child prepare "the next lesson" of the catechism, others, sensing the objection of parents to "homework in catechism," agreed with Mrs. Baird. Cf. Chapter iii, n. 83. For more on Sunday school catechesis, cf. below n. 122.

19 AM, LIII (November 2, 1901) 575; CW, LXXV (May, 1902), 250-51.

20 The Catholic School Journal (hereinafter cited as CSJ) specialized in printing extracts from catechetical works (then on the market or out of print) along with materials originally written for the magazine, although the editor does not always make clear which kind of material is being featured. The quarto-size monthly contained material on all the elementary curriculum but had a strong interest in religious instruction. Catechetically speaking, it was an organ of (what the present author terms) progressive traditionalism in the 1900-15 period. The CSJ printed extracts from Bellord, Father Furniss, Spirago-Baxter, Spirago-Messmer, Mother Loyola, Nolle, Schuech-Lubbermann and the catechetical works of the Christian
Following its customary aloofness from discussing questions of catechetical theory, the American Catholic Quarterly Review did not comment on the bishop's essays. The American Ecclesiastical Review too was at first silent. In 1902, however, when Bellord's promised catechism (E) was published in the United States, the AER took him to task; its critique contains a very representative statement of the classical method of religious education as it was then evolving in this country to the point of progressive traditionalism. There is good reason to believe the AER review was the work of that periodical's distinguished editor Father Herman Joseph Heuser whose work we have already seen in Chapter iii. He had considerable catechetical concern as the contents of the AER demonstrate. About the time the AER critique of Bellord appeared, Heuser was also collaborating with the Sisters of St. Joseph (Chestnut Hill) in Philadelphia in the Course of Christian Doctrine: A Handbook for Teachers. Grades I - VIII—a well respected effort to bring about enrichment of the catechism. At any rate, the AER review, whoever its author, states

Brothers as well as from the works of A. A. Lambing, Bishop Stang, Bishop Conaty, Feeney, Sloan, A. Urban, etc. (cf. Appendices D-F). The CSJ was directed to the classroom teacher who, more often than not, was also catechist in the Sunday school. The CSJ was not thought to be a great educational journal and unfavorable comparisons were made between it and the more literate but short-lived Review of Catholic Pedagogy. Apparently librarians did not find it worthy to include among the bound periodicals because its first twenty-nine or so volumes are very rare. It does, however, give an excellent view of the moving currents in the Catechesis and is a valuable research-source.

21 AER, XXVII (August, 1902), 222-25. For another favorable review, cf. CSJ, II (September, 1902), 222-225. In 1921 Father Michael V. Kelly, CSB, affirmed what an excellent catechism Bellord had written but gives evidence of how little it had been used (cf. CSJ XXI [April, 1921], 42).

22 This work is a remarkable effort for the times not only for catechetical enrichment but also for the correlation of catechism, bible history, and liturgy; it is well laid out, beautifully printed and bound;
that it had no quarrel with Bellord's catechism; in fact, it is a good one with no need for a glossary; it avoids technical language and refined distinctions but still maintains objective accuracy. Helpfully too, each set of questions and answers is followed by an explanation, a group of scriptural quotations and a brief application. The AER warns the teachers who use the catechism, however, to disregard Bellord's directions on minimizing memorization. The bishop's principal fallacy, according to the reviewer, is "the assumption that the truths of faith can or ought to be made intelligible to the child's mind from the first."

A catechism, the AER agrees, should not contain long, strange, or ambiguous words but this cannot be done to such an extent as "to render every statement clear, or to eliminate every word or phrase which is beyond the comprehension of the child." It is all well and good to appeal to a child's experience but, after all, this can only carry you so far.

The reviewer explains:

The fact that in matters of religion the unformed mind has no experience of certain impressions, and that we have no synonym which would convey to it a familiar equivalent of the thing to be taught, obliges us for a time to confine certain impressions to the memory alone. These impressions, at first purely physical images which the sensitive tissues of the brain cells receive and retain mechanically, are in course of time illumined by the experience which the child gets from other impressions, and as the circle of its cognitions grows and widens, its understanding of the motives and facts of faith grows likewise.

it covers work for the eight grades with appendices full of supplementary materials. It received very favorable reviews in ACELP and was frequently referred to with great approval by progressive traditionalists for the next decade or more. The CSJ (cf. above n. 20) printed a number of extracts from the Handbook in IV (September, 1904), 110-11 and (October, 1904), 141-42. For some comment on the Handbook, cf. Messenger of the Sacred Heart V (5th s.), (October, 1904), 495-96; CEAB, XI (November, 1914), 277-87; AER, XLIV (January, 1911), 94. For a listing of the Handbook, cf. St. Joseph, Sisters of in Materials for the Catechist, Appendix E.
No, the AER insists, the child needs to take a number of things on the authority of his parents, the Church, etc. without necessarily understanding these things at the time; what at first may be only mechanical acts or the obedient practices of childhood will become more rational as the child gains experience in support of them; indeed, many of the good habits we have in later life are due to good mechanical training given us in the early years. Considering this, then, "insistence upon the rational development of the truths of religion so as to make them acceptable to the understanding of the child may be carried too far; and the process is decidedly dangerous when it entails systematic neglect of rigid memory lessons." While the AER will not surrender the memorization of the catechism, it readily concedes the need of explanatory catechism. More than this, however, the reviewer in this same critique shows himself very friendly toward growing efforts to enrich the catechism lesson by use of stories, pictures, and other imaginative techniques which he finds consonant with the catechetical tradition of the Church. Still, he maintains:

But all these things should be used only to confirm, to make palatable the lessons to be committed to memory; they should never dispense us from insisting upon the accurate, mechanical repetition of the truths contained in the small catechism.

In another part of the critique, he again registers his approval of adding "illustrations" to the teaching of the catechism but again not as ends in themselves. Their function is to "thus render interesting the truth which is best retained in the form of unalterable principles, maxims, and tenets, like the mathematical theorems of Euclid." If the catechismal texts are memorized by the average Catholic, the AER promises "we will avoid superficial knowledge, confusion of doctrinal principles,
and false interpretation of the facts of faith." In 1902, the AER affirms the real problem is not with the catechisms but, unfortunately, with the teachers. Catholics must organize normal schools to train catechists and not continue to rely on "those sodality boys and girls who happen to be available, without reference to any particular aptitude or training for the work of catechizing . . . ." Until this is done, the Catechesis will hobble.

References to Bellord's essays and catechism, more often pro than con, appeared in the ACELP into the 1930's. Generally, those who agreed with him quoted from his works extensively; those in opposition dismissed him with a broadside. A middle group found his criticism "iconoclastic" but demanding of attention. In 1908 the great American religious educator Father Thomas Edward Shields (cf. below), then struggling to advance his own catechetical theory, wrote of Bellord's Religious Education and Its Failures:

This little work of Bishop Bellord's is doing a good service to our people in bringing home to teachers the need of a radical change in the method of teaching religion.23 Shields used Bellord several times to bolster his own attack on the catechism. In 1911, Father John J. McCahill, then president of the New York Archdiocesan Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, attributed great influence to Bellord's essays, when he concluded:

The day of rote memory in its worst form has gone by and for this blessing much credit is due to Rt. Rev. James Bellord. In some respects the good Bishop's little fifteen-cent booklet

----

23 "Notes on Education: The Teaching of Religion," Catholic University Bulletin, XIV (March, 1908), 292. (Hereinafter cited as CUB.)
Pro-catechism forces in the United States, however, were critical of Bellord. The distinguished Father Peter C. Yorke (cf. below), although agreeing with him in part, still wrote with irony:

Bishop Bellord went so far as to speak of our failure in religious instruction and ascribed it to the imperfect manner in which our catechisms in common use are constructed. He might have got away with it, as they say, if Satan had not tempted him to write a catechism of his own, and Job's wish was gratified 'Oh, that mine enemy would write a book.' In my humble opinion Bellord's catechism is about as bad as a catechism could be.25

Father Thomas Crumley CSC, vice president of Notre Dame University, was certain that many agreed with him in finding Bellord much too negative, reckless and censorious. Crumley judged that "if there is room for a pamphlet entitled Religious Education and Its Failures, there is also room for a larger work entitled Religious Education and Its Successes."26

Clearly, then, Bellord's manifesto had great influence and must be considered one of the primary documents of the American Catechesis.

24 ER, XLIV (January, 1911), 93. The AER dropped "American" from its title with the July issue of 1905 but resumed it again in January, 1944. It was hoped that the Review would be co-published in the United States and Ireland but this really never developed. The periodical is cited here as ER when so titled.


26 "Christian Doctrine in the Primary Grades," CW, XLIX (September, 1914), 800-01. The essay is interesting and, while taking a progressive traditionalist stance, is more positive than many in setting forth the accomplishments of the Catechesis in the 1900-15 period. Perhaps because of its more positive approach, the essay was reprinted in whole and in part in several of the other ACELP in this period.
The Influence of the German Catechesis in the United States

A type of catechesis akin to what Bishop Bellord called for had been quietly made available to the clergy and catechists of the United States from 1900. In October of that year, catechetical concern in this country received a new ally in the arrival of the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist. Published by Joseph F. Wagner at New York and edited by the Father John Francis Brady of the New York archdiocesan seminary (St. Joseph) at Dunwoodie, it was faithful to its name—each month providing for its subscribers a set of weekly sermons and catechetical lessons. Very probably the new periodical was inspired, in part at least, by the older catechetical journals published at Munich and Vienna; in its early volumes it very much shows the influence of the German Catechesis. The appearance of the HM&C gives additional evidence of rising interest at that time in the American Church for a new type of religious instruction. Indeed, the catechetical part of the journal was so well received that it was also published separately under the title Practical Catechist for a number of years.

In its first four volumes the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist featured a narrative-question type of instruction long used on the Continent among German-speaking Catholics. "First Instruction for Little Ones"—a translation of the manual of Rev. Albert Schaffler—was published throughout Volume I (1900-01). Schaffler's work consists of simple, 

27 Katechetische Blätter published at Munich since 1875 and Cristlich Pädagogische Blätter at Vienna since 1877.

28 Schaffler's work was also published in book form; cf. Appendix E. It should be remembered here that Schaffler wrote at a time when little children were still several years away from making First Holy Communion; cf. below n. 143.
vivid stories about God, His love for His creatures, Our Lord, the Blessed Mother, prayer, charity and other virtues, etc. Each story is followed by four or five brief but probing questions on the narrative for the children to answer. The Schaffler catechesis calls for no memorization nor does it make any reference to the catechism. He adds a few words by way of answer to each of his questions but only as a guide to the catechist. While Schaffler's lessons follow a sequence, each is a separate teaching unit in itself, concerned with a special topic. The same kind of narrative-question instruction appeared in the next three volumes (1902-05) under the general title "An Explanation of the Catechism for Middle and Upper Classes of Parochial and Sunday Schools."

The work of Rev. A. Urban, it follows the same narrative-question development as Schaffler. Urban uses a much heavier approach in the narrative, however, and appends up to seventy-five questions (again, with very brief suggested answers) to each unit. He also includes a short résumé and application at the end of the lesson.

Both Schaffler and Urban were handbooks for the catechist rather than textbooks for the pupil. Neither uses nor refers to a catechismal text. Indeed, this type of catechesis was directed toward replacing the textbook catechism. Father Josef Andreas Jungmann gives brief but incisive background to this catechetical development in Germany and Austria.

29 Urban's catecheses were also published in book form (Appendix E). This author is persuaded that "Urban" was a pseudonym since the name does not appear in any of the United States clergy directories of the time. Neither does the work appear to be a translation. A later edition of the CSJ (January, 1910) refers to Rev. A. Urban as being from Wisconsin but does not identify him. For more on Urban, cf. below nn. 36 and 39.

30 Handing on the Faith, pp. 27-34. For more on German catechetical theologians mentioned here, cf. Chapter ii, n. 21.
when he makes these points: a) during the Aufklärung the catechesis was greatly affected by a "Socratism" which sought to draw the elements of Faith out of the child's own concepts and experiences through a heavy reliance on questioning; b) later catechetical theologians (Overberg, Hirscher, Gruber, Mey etc.) rejected the rationalistic theory behind this "Socratism" but saw great good in its appeal to experience and its use of the "Socratic method" since these factors made the child an active rather than passive participant in the instruction; consequently, they added these two features to their own Augustinian emphasis on narrative in catechesis; c) even though the classical method of catechization (cf. above) was dominant in Germany/Austria in the greater part of the nineteenth century as evidenced by the immense popularity of Deharbe's catechism, an ever increasing minority supported the narrative-question type of catechesis; d) by the last decades of the century, there was a strong surge away from the "text-explanatory" method (cf. above), which featured the catechism, to the "text developing" method which minimized the catechism and sought rather to have the student make his own verbalizations of what he had learned from the material presented. Along these same lines Lehner points out the German catechetical theologian Gustav Mey introduced "learning pieces" into religious education about 1871, which were "organically structured teaching units" separate in themselves but arranged in progressive order. Various catecheses in the early volumes of the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist were very much the end

31 For Deharbe, cf. Chapter i, nn. 58-63; also Appendix D-F.
products of these historic developments, but there is no indication that they had major impact on the American Catechesis.

Neither Schaffler nor Urban offered theoretical justification for his narrative-question catecheses, cited above, but other articles did appear in the HM&C which gave them support if only indirectly. One unsigned article in two parts, "The Method of Teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ," points to the experience-oriented parable [narrative] type of instruction characteristically used by Jesus. The essay is significant since American catechetical revisionists such as Shields and Pace (cf. below) came to stress strongly the theme that religion should be taught as Jesus taught i.e. by ideas, concretely and graphically expressed, and not by stereotyped formulae--however dogmatically correct and orthodox. The value of questioning in religious instruction was further developed in a series of articles under the notable name of Father Thomas L. Kinkead. Kinkead (D), who had authored the widely used An Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism, expresses his conviction that some catechists over-emphasize memorization while others underemphasize it. For him, the

33 Homiletic Monthly and Catechist II (November, 1901), 207-12 and (December, 1901), 305-09. (Hereinafter cited as HMC.)

34 "The Art of Questioning," ibid., IV (February, 1904), 462-65; (March, 1904), 539-42; (April, 1904), 643-46. A previous version of these articles had appeared in the Catholic School Journal, II (January, 1903), 229-30; ibid., (February, 1903), 261-62; ibid., (March, 1903), 301; ibid., III (April, 1903), 30-31. These articles show the influence of Bishop Bellord's essays (n. 1), as well. Other essays by Kinkead also appeared in the CSJ viz., "Important Considerations in Teaching Christian Doctrine," IV (May-June, 1904), 41-42, 86-88; "The Religious Training of Small Children," VII (December, 1908), 207-08 and (January, 1909), 259. Kinkead, priest of the New York archdiocese at Peekskill, was a progressive traditionalist and great exponent of "explanatory catechism."
correct method is somewhere in between, with skillful questioning providing the balance (he gives many examples); it activates the student, keeps the teacher alert, and helps both to understand the catechismal material. Other essays, theoretical and practical, continued to appear in the *HM&C* for a decade, in an effort to meet the needs of the catechist.

**The Munich Method**

The *Homiletic Monthly and Catechist* also continued to feature the latest developments in German Catholic religious instruction when throughout Volume V (1904-05) it published bible history lessons by Father A. Urban which he presented according to the Munich Method.

---

35 In addition to the catechetical material cited elsewhere in this chapter, the following essays also appeared in *HM&C*: Volume II: "At What Age Should Religious Instruction Begin?" (March, 1902), 621-24; "Weakminded Children and Their Religious Training," (June, 1902), 906-7. Volume III: "Series on Preparing Children for Their First Confession," (October, 1902 to January, 1903), 79-82; 184-85; 260-61; 330-32. Volume IV contained a series of twelve essays on "Sunday School Topics" by Father P. C. Halpin (E) which were published separately. Volume V contained a second series on the same topic by the same author also published separately. Volume VI contained twelve essays on "Christian Pedagogy" by the same author, and published separately; also "The Main Object of Religious Instruction," (May, 1906), 656-59, and (August, 1906), 939-42. The specifically catechetical material, oriented to the classroom, dwindled by Volume XI (1910-11) but was replaced by various sermons on the catechism for adults and for children; "Conferences" on catechetical themes and current topics touching religious education appeared regularly in Volume XI and for many years afterwards and were designed to be given before parish organizations of young people and adults, such as the Holy Name Society, Children of Mary, Young Men's Society, Boys' Sodality, etc. On *HM&C*, cf. Chapter v, n. 8.

36 Urban's Munich catecheses were also published in book form (Appendix E). It is significant that in the book form the Munich catecheses are coordinated with the Baltimore Catechism—an obvious attempt to make the book more acceptable to the majority of catechists who were committed to the use of the BC. In reviewing Urban's biblical lessons, the *Catholic World* (LXX-VII [July, 1903], 535) approves of his work.
Again, however, neither the periodical nor Urban offer an explanation of the theory behind the lessons. Strangely enough the first formal explanation of the Munich Method did not appear in the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist until 1929. The Munich Method, however, was explained throughout 1908 by Father Francis L. Kerze of Cleveland in the pages generally but takes him to task for failing to incorporate the newer perspectives of biblical studies especially on the Mosaic account of creation, the flood, etc. The same complaint is made more fully by Arthur Preuss in his Catholic Fortnightly Review (XIII [No. 6, 1906], 183-84) but in regard to Ignatz Schuster's Illustrated Bible History (Appendix D). B. Herder, its American publisher, announced in issuing a new edition that "since the sole aim and object of this text-book is to give children an accurate knowledge of the main content or facts recorded in the Bible, the treatment of historical or scientific questions raised by modern criticism lies altogether outside its scope." Preuss judges the biblical catechesis must pay some attention to these questions and suggests teachers to consult Bishop Knecht's Practical Commentary (Appendix D). About this same time Brother John A. Waldron SM spoke on this problem before the Catholic Educational Association where he distinguished between the use of "broad and narrow interpretation" in teaching bible history (Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, III [November, 1906], 184-85). The CELP of the period contain a number of articles on the difficulties of biblical interpretation with regard to science and religion, new findings in archeology and linguistics, etc. There are also reviews of books published on the same difficulties. None of these latter articles or reviews, however, speak of the Catechesis directly.

37 Rev. Rudolph G. Bandas, "The Psychological and Munich Method," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XXIX (April, 1929), 703-13. Msgr. Bandas did much to popularize the Method in this country through his years as professor of catechetics in The Saint Paul Seminary (Minnesota) and director of the Archdiocesan Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The St. Paul Confraternity trained many teachers in the Method and published a number of texts using the Munich-style catechesis. Cf. also Bandas' explanation of the Method in his Catechetical Methods: Standard Methods of Teaching Religion (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1929), pp. 176-210. Here, following Michael Gatterer SJ, Bandas adds the principle of Arbeitssprinzip i.e. learning by doing. This latter principle introduced demonstration by the students, playlets, use of arts and crafts into the Method.

38 Francis Lawrence Kerze, born August 10, 1875 at Laibach (Ljubljana), in Carniola (Krain), was educated there and in the seminaries of the Archdiocese of St. Paul here. Ordained June 4, 1898, he served on the faculty of St. Thomas College (St. Paul) until 1900 when he served two rural parishes. In 1901, the Slovene priest entered the Diocese of Cleveland where he became
The Ohio priest was a great admirer of catechetical accomplishment on the Continent—in Germany and Austria-Hungary especially. His articles are replete with references to past and current catechetical theologians in those lands; he reports on various catechetical congresses held there and lists the latest continental catechisms and bible histories.

Father Kerze is especially enthusiastic with the work of the Society of Catechists at Munich (Münchener Katechetenverein) and the pastor of the short-lived parish of St. Lawrence where he wrote these articles. In 1909, Kerze became pastor at Marblehead, Ohio. A year later, Marblehead and its pastor passed to the newly formed Diocese of Toledo. After 1911, he is listed by Toledo as unassigned. After 1913 his name no longer appears in the directories nor is he listed in the necrologies. The present author is indebted to Msgr. Ambrose V. Hayden, Episcopal Vicar of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis for data on Kerze's early life and ordination. The diocesan archivists of Cleveland and Toledo kindly consulted their files and made additional inquiries but were unable to find anything on Father Kerze. For more on Kerze and his work, cf. below n. 39.

All but the first article listed here are unsigned. The style and topic continuity as well as the series-like quality of the articles cause the present author to conclude they are all the work of Father Kerze. They all appeared in ER: Francis L. Kerze, "A Catechetical Movement," XXXVII (February, 1908), 202-08; "Catechetics," (March, 1908), 340-47; "Catechetics: The Psychological (or Munich) Method of Catechetics," (April, 1908), 460-76; "Catechetics: 1. Reform of the Catechism etc.," (May, 1908), 576-82; "Catechetics: The Hardest Duty of the Catechist," (June, 1908), 690-97; "Catechetics: The Failure of Naturalistic Pedagogy," XXIX (September, 1908), 316-20; "Catechetics: Dr. Shield's Catechetical Method," (December, 1908), 705-11. For other signed articles, cf. Francis L. Kerze, "Didactic Materialism and the Teaching of Religion," CUB, XIV (June, 1908), 552-62; "Some Points of Attention," CSJ VIII (March, 1908), 299; "Our School Children," CSJ (January, 1908), 265-66. Other unsigned articles appeared that follow his style and interests, viz., "The Warfare of the School against Alcoholism," Homiletic Monthly and Catechist II, (January, 1902) 408-10; (February, 1902) 534-36; also "The Moral Preservation of Youth and Sexual Enlightenment (adapted from the German of Dr. Hoffman of Munich)" ibid., V (June, 1906) 721-24. There is a good possibility that Kerze and Rev. A. Urban (cf. above n. 29) are one and the same person.
method of religious instruction they had developed; this newly formulated catechetical method was based on the "formal steps" of education (cf. below) first formulated by Johann Friedrich Herbart and later adapted by his disciple Tuiskon Ziller. Kerze is convinced that Bishop Bellord (cf. above), whom he quotes in detail, has demolished the validity of the straight classical method in religious education for many American catechists; the Cleveland priest now offers the Munich or, as he prefers to call it, the Psychological Method to fill the void. It is true, he concedes, that the Method is based on the "formal steps" of Herbart-Ziller but there is nothing "rationalistic or modernistic" about it. The Psychological Method is nothing other than the ancient mode of the Christian Catechesis in modern dress. In fact, Kerze explains:

Its beginnings can easily be detected, if you will in the method of Christ Himself, in the works of Church Fathers, such as St. Augustine, of great catechists, like Archbishop Gruber, Archbishop Milde, Bishop Sailer, Overberg, and others. Moreover, bowing to tradition absolutely, the Psychological Method freely accepts the concrete results of Pedagogical Psychology, much the same as St. Thomas grounded his philosophy, as best he could, on Aristotle.

For Kerze, the American Catechesis has for too long permitted itself to be deceived by what he calls (following Doerpfeld) "didactic materialism"--a theory of education which works to communicate material to the memory with little or no direct concern as to how the same

---

Kerze is quick to disassociate himself from the theological "Modernism" condemned the year before by the reigning pontiff Pius X in his syllabus Lamentabili sane (July 3, 1907) and his encyclical Pascendi Domini gregis (September 8, 1907). In the minds of some (if not many) anything moderne in theology was associated with Modernism, especially if it made rapport with "rationalistic" thought. Such a disassociation was made by others proposing reform in religious education, and for the same reason, in the 1900-15 period. The modernist controversy, it can be safely asserted, complicated catechetical reform.
material affects the higher faculties. It is nothing but a "dermo-plastic skill" applied to the teaching of religion when the "true problem of the educative process in Christian Doctrine is the question of how religion should become a power in the mind, heart, and will." The catechist must seek "changed behavior" as the result of his teaching; this can be done only if the child is approached through his "total psychology"; herein lies the excellence of the Psychological Method which does precisely this. While the Cleveland priest is convinced the catechism has been much misused by the classical method, he does not propose to abandon it; in fact, it should be used with the Psychological Method but there must be some adjustments. Since the Method pursues only a single topic (or at most, two) in each lesson; the catechism cannot be generally used according to its present order. He explains:

It is apparent at a glance that we are presupposing strict methodical objective units. We shall therefore not treat together catechism questions which do not essentially belong together. Hence it may be necessary to take catechism questions out of their order in the catechism before us and join them appropriately. This constitutes today an accepted result of catechetical research, studies, experience. Do not blame the method; reject rather the faulty arrangement of questions in so many catechisms.  

Father Kerze explains the Method's "formal steps" four times, in his series of articles, in greater and lesser detail. For this early American protagonist of the Munich catechesis, they are to be used in this way:

---


42 He digresses several times on this last point to affirm that Father W. Faerber's (D-F), in its many bi-lingual editions, is easily the best catechism published in the United States and is well respected in Europe as well. On Faerber and his work, cf. Chapter i, n. 97.
Preparation: The essential task of the first step is to situate the child psychologically or to bring him to the point of new learning by reviewing with him what he may already know about the topic or proximate to the topic. It is, of course, essential to explain the unknown in terms of the known. So then, on this note of familiarity and with the child at ease, the catechist now declares the Aim of the lesson. The student will then know where he is going. The success of the lesson in terms of understanding depends on a good implementation of the first step. Perhaps the catechism question(s) to be used in conjunction with the lesson could be glanced at here.

Presentation: The Psychological Method appeals directly to the imagination and senses here. Ordinarily this step features a story—one, from experience, the Life of Christ or some other biblical source, church history, the lives of the saints, etc. While the Method is strong on narrative, a point of liturgy could also be used, or a large vivid picture, or even some objects that can be seen or better yet seen and handled. It is essential that the material of the Presentation be vivid to the imagination and senses; it cannot be sketchy but must be rich in detail and drawn out; it must be attention-getting and attention-keeping. Above all, it must contain implicitly the ultimate Aim of the lesson.

Explanation: This step is also called concept-formation and appeals directly to the intellect. Here the implications of the Presentation are drawn out, explained, and put together. From the specifics of the prior step, the catechist now attempts to help the pupil form general concepts. Through the Explanation and all that preceded it, the child should now have achieved some real insight into the basic
Christian Doctrine topic chosen for the lesson.

**Combination:** The various ideas gained from the lesson are now gathered together and related to appropriate catechismal texts. It is a question here of making a synthesis. By this time, the ideas expressed in the catechism question/answer are not "foreign" to the child as they often were in the "classical" method. In fact, this correlation of the material treated in the prior "formal steps" with the catechism is rather like "gathering ripe fruit."

**Application:** The Christian truth now developed in the lesson and combined with the catechism--now understood much more clearly by the child--is in this last step applied to his life. It is all made practical to him. Everyday examples are given; resolutions are suggested or made. In the Application a thrust is made to "train the child in judging his own moral conduct." Finally an appropriate, theme-related hymn, prayer, saying, poem etc. is learned as a reminder or carry-over mechanism.

To illustrate the Method, Kerze included, in his articles, lesson-pieces taken from the Munich masters: one on Creation translated from Karl Bühlmayer's _Ausgeführte Katechesen für das erste Schuljahr der katholischen Volksschule_ and one on the general concept of sin taken from H. Stieglitz's _Ausgeführte Katechesen über die katholische Sittenlehre_. But the Cleveland pastor also included a shorter lesson piece that he had composed himself on the sixth commandment for use in the second grade. While this latter catechesis does not illustrate the Method

---

as fully and as technically as the former ones, it does show how an ordinary teacher can adapt the Method to classroom instruction; for this reason, it is reproduced below in its entirety. In a previous article Father Kerze had taken up the idea of sexual instruction; there he showed himself to be very traditional in his approach—forcefully eschewing the current surge of "materialists" (he names them) for the "sexual enlightenment of youth"—but he also maintained that as much harm can result from saying "too little" as in saying "too much." In introducing his own lesson piece, Kerze explains that positive reverent attitudes toward the body as "temple of the Holy Ghost" must be given young children from the beginning; too, they must be taught "self-discipline" by foregoing harmless and innocent pleasures from time to time in order to "strengthen the will" against the day when they will be faced with the "seductions of the forbidden fruit." He further explains that he intends to use the innocence of the holy youth St. Stanislaus Kostka to develop the lesson; happily (for the needs of the Method) there is a very large Polish church nearby dedicated to this patron saint of youth which will help to begin the lesson in the children's collective experience. Having set this ground-work, Father Kerze then presents his second-grade catechesis:

Aim. -- To-day, my little ones, we shall hear of a holy little child, St. Stanislaus. Such as he you must become and remain.

Preparation. -- (Short review of the Fifth Commandment). What Commandment did we speak of last? To-day we come to the Sixth Commandment, therefore. What does the Sixth Commandment say? I shall tell you what it means. How many of you have seen that big Polish church down there? (All raise their hands; attention secured.)

How many of you have been inside? (Only two or three.) You know what we call our church? Do you know the name we give to that big Polish Church? St. Stanislaus. Now you will hear who that Saint was.

Presentation. -- St. Stanislaus was a noble Polish boy. He was a bright, pious, and sweet-tempered child. I must tell you more, he was not only pious, he was a holy child. Most of all he liked to pray; his greatest delight was to be in church. He obeyed his parents promptly; he never caused them any grief. Toward other children he was exceedingly amiable and kind; he used to teach them beautiful prayers. But when other children did anything evil, if they called one another names, or even struck each other, then Stanislaus became sad and even ran away. Above all he would not hear nasty, impure things. If anyone said anything impure at meals, little Stanislaus could not eat any more. He could not bear immodest words; he became ill, if he heard them. Indeed, he was a holy child.

Explanation and Application combined. We saw, then, that Stanislaus was a modest child, pure in thought, word, and action;

(a) in thought. He would not even listen to immodest words, but fled. He would not let them enter into his heart. Just so, a good child thinks only of good, pious, proper, modest things, and must immediately turn his heart away from any thought that might be impure. It is always a mortal sin. You have seen wasps. You do not let them sting you. Just so, you must at once drive away an immodest thought, should you notice it.

(b) in words. What will a modest child do, if he hears nasty words or songs? He will get away at once. He will never say anything like that, for he would bring tears to his good Guardian Angel.

(c) in action. St. Stanislaus died—seventeen years old in angelic purity, as an angel. You children must remain such as he. Do you know what happened at the time of Noah? (All remembered. The writer drew forth Herder's picture.) Why were these men all drowned? Because they were impure. God could not look at them longer, so bad were they.

Now, little ones, I shall yet better show you how a modest child behaves.

In the morning he gets up quickly and dresses at once. He says his morning prayers, comes out of his bedroom fully dressed. We dress our body to keep away cold, or the burning rays of the sun, and we never let others look at us when we are partly dressed. And we do not let them touch us either.

In the evening a good child goes to his bedroom, says his prayers, undresses and goes to bed at once, nicely folds his hands over the bedcover, and falls asleep thinking of God and his Guardian Angel. God sees him then and everywhere. God sees into his very heart, sees even what he is thinking about. God knows what happens even in the darkest room.

Now then, children, stand up and let us all pray to the Guardian Angel that we may remain pure as St. Stanislaus did.

Angel of God, my guardian dear,
To whom His love commits me here,
Ever this day be at my side,
To light and guard, to rule and guide. Amen. 45

Kerze must really be looked upon as the pioneer of the Munich Method in the United States. The abrupt disappearance of his writings from ACELP after 1908 probably did much to retard the widespread acceptance that the Method later received in this country. Thomas Edward Shields (cf. below) was friendly to the psychological approach of the Method but did not adopt it preferring rather to develop his own methodology in the teaching of religion. It was not until 1914 that the formal steps of Herbart-Ziller applied to religion-teaching were again explained in ACELP—that time by Dom Lambert Nolle, OSB. The greatest impact of the Munich Method nationally in this country came after 1919 through the widely used catechist manuals of Father J. J. Baierl (F). Baierl of the diocesan seminary (St. Bernard) at Rochester, New York cast


46 Cf. above n. 38. Another brief but fervent approval of the Munich Method was given by E. W., "Munchenen Method," America, I (October 9, 1909), 695. After Kerze ceased to write, no one in ACELP gave such copious information on European catechetical activity as he had. Exceptions were an enthusiastic report on the First Catechetical Congress for German-speaking countries (1912) by Lambert Nolle, OSB, (Catholic Educational Review, VI [September, 1913], 133-4) and a report of some European studies made on the teaching of religion by Joseph Husslein, SJ, (America, VII [August 31, 1912], 489-91).


49 For Baierl's works, cf. Appendix E-F. In 1911 Benziger Brothers published an American edition of Munich catecheses in German authored by Celestin Muff OSB (Appendix E); for a review of Muff, cf. America, VI (November 18, 1911), 139.
the whole elementary course of Christian Doctrine in the form of the
Method. It is said that he brought the Method to this country, but in view of Kerze's initial promotion and Urban's Munich biblical cate-
cheses, discussed above, this statement needs qualifying.

While the Munich Method achieved a significant place in the American Catechesis, it cannot be said to have gained substantial pop-
ularity. Although the Method as used in this country was integrated with the catechism, it did not by its very nature have place for the comprehensive memorization of the catechismal text which continued to be a principal goal in religious instruction here. Like all methods too, its constant use very probably proved monotonous to student and teacher. The stress of the Method on the use of graphic materials and narratives, along with intelligibility, gave added impetus in the American Catechesis to that general movement toward explanatory and enriched cate-
chism. The influence of the Munich Method added considerably to the de-
velopment of progressive traditionalism in the United States.

It seems proper to mention here that in addition to the materials discussed above, the influence of the German Catechesis was also felt in the United States during the 1900-15 period through the still popular catechisms of Deharbe (D-E), discussed in Chapter i. Linden's (E-F) re-
visions of Deharbe were also used in this country after 1900. The translated works of the Austrian seminary professor Franz Spirago (D-E) as the ACELP show, were widely read and quoted in this country. The same is

true of the Practical Commentary of Bishop Knecht (D-E). The bible history of Dr. Ignatz Schuster (D-F) had continued use in American parochial schools.

Klauder and the Language of the Catechism

As we have seen, there was considerable dissatisfaction with the Baltimore Catechism from the beginning, even though it was generally used. While some had specific complaints against the Catechism, most of the criticisms leveled against it were shared with catechisms generally, viz.: too theological, too academic, too abstract, too difficult in its wording and terminology, etc. This latter type of criticism was particularly anguished in connection with the Baltimore text, however, because its use had been nationally "enjoined." Actually, response to these criticisms was not long in coming. Abstracts or abbreviated editions of the Catechism were available from the start. Turner authored a vocabulary-added edition of the BC in 1895. Phillips followed soon afterward with an edition "simplified with explanation." In 1891 Father Thomas L. Kinkead (D) had authored his teacher-handbook, An Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism; ten years later his "Kinkead series" of five graded catechisms was published with the question/answer units numbered to match the paragraphs of his Explanation.

\[51\text{ Cf. Appendices D-F; Baltimore Catechism.}\]

\[52\text{ Cf. Appendix D: Baltimore Catechism; also Chapter iii, n. 53; also Appendix B.}\]

\[53\text{ Cf. Phillips, Appendix E.}\]

\[54\text{ Cf. Appendix E. For more on Kinkead, cf. above n. 34.}\]
When the movement to enrich the catechism was gaining momentum in the closing years of the last century, a correspondent in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* (1897) pointed out that most catechists would need the catechismal text and the enriching materials put together for them. He called, therefore, for *religion books*, that is: manuals for student use in which the catechism, illustrations, stories, etc. would be combined—something, he wrote, like the various Catholic readers that were on the market. Apparently unknown to the AER correspondent, the renowned Father Peter C. Yorke, of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, began to publish his enriched catechisms entitled *Textbooks of Religion for Parochial Schools and Sunday Schools after 1896*. In 1900, Father Thomas J. O'Brien, Brooklyn superintendent of parish schools, put together a very popular advanced catechism for higher grades (containing much added material) that had long use. Father Francis J. Butler, director of the famed Sacred Heart Sunday School at East Cambridge discussed in Chapter iii, published his *Holy Family Series* of catechisms after 1902. All these aforementioned works attempted to clarify, explain, and enrich the Baltimore Catechism in varying ways. Some rearranged its order and slightly altered its text here and there, but none attempted to rewrite it.

---

55 Cf. Chapter iii, n. 77.

56 Cf. Appendices D-F. For more on Yorke, cf. below nn. 86-92, 98.

57 Cf. Appendix E-F. It was said several times in the ACELP that O'Brien had put together his enlarged catechism at the request of parochial and Sunday school teachers gathered at the Catholic Summer School (cf. Chapter iii, n. 64-65) on Lake Champlain.

58 For Butler, cf. Chapter iii, n. 82; for the Sacred Heart Sunday School, cf. *ibid.*, nn. 81-86; for his catechisms, cf. Appendix E.
In 1901 Father Alexander L. A. Klauder did just that but with much resultant controversy.

Klauder, priest of the Ogdensburg (New York) Diocese, introduced his series of catechisms in 1901 with a preliminary article in Mosher's Magazine, where he begins with a lament over the way the Baltimore Catechism is being displaced in the American Catechesis. One bishop is quoted as having told him: "there are as many different manuals employed in this diocese as there are nationalities and religious orders."

Klauder finds this exceedingly regrettable for several reasons: first of all, the BC is the official catechism of the American Church; secondly, unless the "enjoined" catechism is used by all, that "uniformity of instruction" called for by the Fathers of 1884 cannot be realized; finally, the Catechism, whatever its faults, is a fine piece of work--far better catechetically than its allegedly superior competitors. Klauder is strongly of the opinion that "He who placed the Bishops to rule over the Church of God, undoubtedly breathed in them the proper spirit for the work, even if rudely begun." This last phrase--"even if rudely begun"--is particularly significant, since the Ogdensburg priest announces that he has undertaken to perfect the Catechism or at least to carry it to a new stage of development. Klauder points out that he has kept two hundred question/answer units of the BC "in their integrity," but


60 Cf. Chapter i, n. 75.
has added to and/or rewritten the remaining two hundred and forty-one. He stresses that in adding to the Catechism he found it particularly necessary to include materials "relating to American life and morals."

While the basic order of the Catechism has been preserved in the revised text (especially its much-criticized inversion of sacraments before commandments), the priest explains that he has reverted to a more classical Canisian order (cf. the Introduction) in the other parts. Father Klauder feels that his greatest improvement in the BC text has been his changes in its language. Statistics will show, he points out, that most American Catholic children are receiving their religious instruction from untrained Sunday School teachers or (in rural areas especially) at home from their parents; this condition creates an essential need for a national catechism which can be easily understood by all--especially those catechists and parents who labor under difficulty with the refinements of the English language. Consequently, in the rewritten parts of the Catechism, Klauder explains, "... a deference is even exhibited to foreign idiom, commonplace expression, and the popular language of children generally." At the same time, however, care has been taken to preserve the "sacred terminology of the catechism," but equal care has been expended to explain the "Latinic terms" in "every day language." In fine, the author affirms that his revised and graded catechismal series is in truth a series; one number builds on the other. Number 1, designed for "the primary grades," is basic; it is totally included in the expanded Number 2 which is designed for use in "the lower grammar-grades ... until the time of first Communion or Confirmation." Number 3 contains all of the previous two numbers with added material for use in "the upper grammar-grades." The
progressive addition of new materials changes in the series: there is no mutation in the material carried over from the previous number. Thus, the student is not confused by changes in elements already studied. Klauder promises a Number 4 for use in high schools and academies if the first three "meet with sufficient favor." This was not to be the case, however.

The Klauder catechisms received good, if qualified, notices in the American Ecclesiastical Review and its related publication the Dolphin, but it received an extraordinarily strong blast of negative criticism from the Supplement of the Messenger of the Sacred Heart. The latter publication was generally mild and acceptant in its reviews, but its critique of Klauder's work was an exception. The reviewer (possibly the editor himself Father John Wynne SJ) can find no good in this revised version of the Baltimore Catechism; in fact, he opens with a plea for its withdrawal:

With all due deference to the reverend compiler of the Catechism, we not only cannot commend it but feel compelled to condemn it most emphatically and to advise the publisher [Benziger] to withdraw it from the market.

The Supplement reviewer is particularly distressed by what Klauder thought was his principal accomplishment, viz., the translation of the Catechism's

---

61. AER, XXV (July, 1901), 66.

62. Dolphin: Book Review Supplement of the American Ecclesiastical Review (June, 1901), p. 139. The Dolphin (1901-05) was designed to be a counterpart of the AER for the educated laity. From March-December, 1901 it was issued as a book review supplement. From 1902-05 Dolphin appeared as a periodical in its own right. Cf. also below 71.

63. The Supplement of the Messenger of the Sacred Heart V (June, 1901), 197-98. The Supplement was a transitional publication.
"Latinic terms" into "every day language." Klauder's English is found to be "prehistoric, almost paleolithic"; some of his expressions are "startlingly tautological"; there is frequently a "strange confusion of cause and effect"; what is to be "most considered" is that "the information imparted is at times alarmingly inexact." The Jesuit reviewer, after giving a detailed critique very much like that given the Springfield catechism in 1876 by the Catholic World, concludes:

These are a few of the reprehensible things to be found in this new Catechism. It is inconceivable though the author asserts it in his preface that 'the book has been submitted to all the bishops of the country.' If this be so then our condition is alarming. But we are led to conclude that this pronouncement of the preface is as incorrect as a multitude of other utterances in the body of the book. Can we not have an end to this Catechism-making? It is one of the most difficult things to do, and one which, if at all ill-done, is fraught with most serious consequences. The author will do a service to the Church by stopping the sale.

The negative ardor of the Supplement surprised many and astounded Klauder (cf. below) but it was not alone in its condemnation of the revised Catechism; rather, it was joined in this by other segments of the Catholic Press. Klauder had his defenders, however, especially the American Ecclesiastical Review or more properly Father Herman Joseph Heuser (cf. above) its editor. Heuser views the quarrel with Klauder's

---

64 Cf. Chapter iii, n. 26.
65 Supplement of the Messenger of the Sacred Heart, V (June, 1901), 198.
66 In a later publication (cf. below n. 70), Klauder bitterly complains that his work has been unfairly reviewed by a number of "sixth-rate" Catholic weeklies (he names them) and by that "freak of educational journalism" Teacher and Organist. He is most hurt, however, by a borrowed review that appeared in the well-respected journal of Arthur Preuss, the Review. For these anti-Klauder reviews, cf. Review, VIII (No. 16, 1901), 346-7; also Teacher and Organist (June, 1901).
67 "Teachers of Catechism and Their Critics," AER, XXV (July, 1901), 66-69.
language to be very much overdone. After all, the AER maintains, catechism does need explanation in a way that it did not need formerly:

There is, of course, also the old method of simply memorizing the exact terms of the Catechism, and allowing the mind by a gradual appreciation of their value, attain to the true meaning of the mysteries and facts of faith that lie beyond the child's comprehension. Of late years, however, more stress has been laid upon the development of the reasoning faculty than upon mere memory records, and thus explanations of catechisms for children have become a necessity of which our parents did not dream.

However lacking in refinements Klauder's English may be, Heuser finds him totally correct in seeking to meet the child on familiar ground; even if he must use the "imperfect word images which the child has already acquired" in order to do this. Klauder's appeal to the child's experience is excellent. What if many of his definitions are not philosophically exact? After all, the revised Catechism is only a transitional medium and even the most exalted analogies invented by the greatest intellects limp. As to the "prehistoric" language, it must be remembered that "the English most sensible and educated Mothers speak to their little ones, with a view of gradual and future improvement, is of necessity more or less 'prehistoric' . . . ." Heuser ends repeating his conviction that too much has been made over Klauder's grammar by his critics.

The Catholic World also proved friendly to Klauder by opening its pages to a lengthy exposition of his catechetical ideas. The essay is much like his article in Mosher's Magazine except that it is fuller, more literate and carries a mild defence against his emerging critics. Responding to criticisms against his catechetical changes in the Catechism, he quotes Hirscher, Gruber, and Spirago in his defence. Pointing out that he

had been criticized for including "such matters as the payment of
taxes, voting, bribery," he affirms:

We feel convinced that security for the government of this country,
for the political rights of Catholics, lies in the proper training
of our Catholic children. 69

As to those who are so fiercely opposed to his grammar, he snorts:
"
. . .
the eternal welfare of the majority must be preferred to the
literary tastes of the few." Klauder executed his real vendetta, how-
ever, in a privately published polemic entitled  A Recent Catechism and
Some of Its Critics. The Science of Catechetics and Catechetical Criti-
cism: Some Startling Revelations. 70 Upon receiving his copy of the pri-

tate publication, Heuser judged that now Klauder was overdoing it what-
ever the provocation.

The Klauder controversy arose quickly and spent its vehemence

69 Here Klauder reflects Catholic participation in the American

crusade for "social purity" in common with Protestant and humanitarian
groups. Archbishop John Ireland and other prelates, priests and laymen
of the so-called "americanist camp" of the American Catholic Church at
this time were especially active along these lines. Material on citizen
duty was included in the official 1941 revision of the Baltimore Catechism.
(cf. below n. 72).

70 Printed by the Swanton Courier, 1901 it is a very interesting
example of unbridled theological polemic, traditionally referred to as
the odium theologicum. The unresolved nationalist controversy in the
American Church is greatly brought out as well. Klauder accuses the
Messenger particularly of anti-German animus against him even though he
is definitely not a German nationalist himself.

71 Dolphin: an ecclesiastical review for educated Catholics issued
monthly in connection with the Ecclesiastical Review designed to supply
systematic information regarding the religious life, the ecclesiastical
arts and sciences, and practical church work, I (January, 1902), 108.
In spite of his own interest in the Catechesis (clearly shown in the AER)
Father Herman Joseph Heuser included no comment on religious education in
the Dolphin, apparently not considering it of concern for the educated
laity. Cf. above n. 62.
just as quickly, but it apparently left a lasting lesson—the text of the Baltimore Catechism must not be tampered with. Some might desire another catechism but most did not desire a revised Baltimore for whatever their assorted reasons. In the years that ensued a number of authors followed the example of Kinkead and Yorke in supplementing, explaining, and enriching the Catechism, but no significant catechetical work sought to alter its text until its official revision sponsored in 1941 by the American Bishops. The Catechism stood, but the murmurings continued.

72 For another extensive re-arrangement of the Catechism, cf. Appendix E: Baltimore Catechism: Mullett.


74 There were other efforts to add to or revise the Catechism in this 1900-15 period, cf. for example James J. Dunne, "Some Suggestions For Improvement in Our Catechism," ER, XLI (December, 1909) 750-54; Henry Beauclerk SJ, "Catechisms," ibid., XXXVIII (June, 1908), 684-85. There was also discussion on abandoning the question/answer method in catechetical instruction, cf. Teacher, "Catechisms," ibid., (November, 1907), 531-32; Scholasticus, "The Form of Our Catechisms," ibid., (January, 1908), 70-73; Teacher, "The Form of Our Catechisms," ibid., (February, 1908), 215-16. New catechisms such as that of the Jesuit Father Boarman were subjected to the usual meticulous criticism, cf. Scrutator, "Father Boarman's Catechism," ibid. XLI (November, 1909), 632-33; Marshall I. Boarman SJ, "Father Boarman's Answer to the Critics of His Catechism," ibid., XLII (February, 1910), 211-13; Scrutator," The Merits of Father Boarman's Catechism Once More," ibid., (May, 1910), 589-92. The subject of catechismal revision was also discussed several times in Arthur Preuss's Review; cf. "Is there Need for a New Catechism?" Review, X (No. 28, 1905), 439-41; "Little Notes on a Great Subject," Fortnightly Review, XIX (No. 11, 1912), 326-27; "A New Catechism," Fortnightly Review, XX (No. 9, 1913), 272-74. A more theoretical approach was given by Rev. Aloysius Kemper, SJ, "On Teaching Catechism," ER, XLVI (June, 1912), 651-58.
Shields, Pace and Yorke: Divergent Champions

About the time that Klauder was anxiously revising the text of the Baltimore Catechism and Yorke, Butler, and Kinkead were enriching it, another American Catholic educator was coming to the conclusion that the BC, or any catechism for that matter, should be abandoned especially in the primary grades. This radical position was forcefully enunciated by Father Thomas Edward Shields of the Catholic University of America. In the opinion of this author, Shields must be regarded as the first American Catholic catechetical theologian. He was this in the sense that he put his entire zeal, understanding, and ability into formulating a theory of primary religious instruction and composed the instructional texts to actualize it. There were others before him, as we have seen in the preceding chapter and some with him--particularly Father Peter C. Yorke (cf. below)--who directed their talents and energies to religious education but none so comprehensively and exclusively as he. Shields' work in religious education has been studied by McMahon, Bandas, Ward and recently by Murphy. Consequently, his efforts are not as obscure as those of others discussed in the present study but for the sake of completeness a short résumé of Shields' work must be given here

---

75 Cf. Appendix F: Shields.
Thomas Edward Shields had come to the Catholic University in 1902 (then solely a graduate school) to teach physiological psychology in the Department of Philosophy under the chairmanship of Father Edward Pace, himself a Roman graduate and student of Wilhelm Wundt at Leipzig. Shields had taught courses in biology at the Saint Paul (Minnesota) Seminary and held a prestigious doctorate (1895) from Johns Hopkins University. Early in his career he had made some contribution to physiological research but his interest turned more and more to education and particularly to religious education. It is not surprising, then, that his psychology students at the Catholic University heard increasingly more of that science's application to pedagogy. Indeed, in a short time, many of his students came fully expecting this. It is most probable that he was supported in this emphasis by his chairman, Pace; the two like-minded men were close collaborators in the beginning. The "bootlegged" education course was given a proper stage of its own in 1908 when the University, after much wrangling, set up its own Department of Education with Shields as chairman. The new department was largely organized to train superintendents and supervisors of the growing parochial school systems in the United

---

Pace and Shields, priests with a common background in psychology, both sought methodological change in religious education. Differences in temperament and professional modus operandi, however, were the apparent causes of a gradual estrangement. Both Ward and Murphy (cf. nn. 76-77) agree on this; as do certain contemporaries of both priests whom this author has spoken with informally. Pace, however, preached at Shields' funeral in 1921. It is unfortunate for the American Catechesis that the two scholars did not maintain a more fruitful relationship. It seems certain that Shields especially was no "team man" in any of his relationships. In various parts of his study Murphy leads us to conclude that Shields could use "assistance" but not "collaboration." On Pace, cf. below n. 96.
States. But Shields was not satisfied with this development alone: he sought the Catholic classroom-teacher as his audience. At this time the higher education of the religious sisterhoods was being greatly stressed by the bishops and several state departments of certification. The semi-cloistered character of practically all the teaching orders at that time and their own community-centeredness made higher education difficult for most of them. Attendance at the state universities was, of course, greatly discouraged and most of the larger Catholic colleges were for men only. The larger religious communities and some dioceses had normal schools and the Catholic Summer School, as we have seen, had tried to aid in this matter. In time, Shields was able to bring about the foundation of a separate Sisters College (after 1911) at the Catholic University but he began his efforts to contact the teaching nuns by instituting the Catholic Correspondence School (1904-09). Five courses were made available with Shields handling the "Psychology" and "Teaching Religion" offerings. He constructed the two courses and wrote accompanying texts. As far as this author can determine, Shields' correspondence course, "Teaching Religion" and its same-named text is the first formal course in Catechetics constructed and published in the United States. To reduce his theory to practice he authored, in succeeding years, a series of unusual

79 The Catholic University of America, for instance, did not admit women until its 1929-30 school year.

textbooks for use in the primary grades (cf. below) and went about the country for many years explaining their use in summer institutes to thousands of teachers.

Shields began a more public exposition of his work in 1908 in his "Notes on Education" in the Catholic University Bulletin. His style is expansive and loose and he constantly repeats himself, but in his first article on "Teaching Religion" he sets forth the basic ideas that he will repeat and expand in later essays and pronouncements. He opens by pointing out that there is much discussion and regret over the then current secularization of religious schools in France by its government but indicates a more important consideration for American Catholics is the quasi-secular character of most of their own parochial schools. For Shields a secular school is one in which religion is not the centrum in which all learning is integrated. With this criterion in hand, he finds much of Catholic education wanting. In fact, even the teaching of religion itself (isolated as it generally is in the curriculum) is much less than satisfactory. While the great ferment in teaching methodology, caused by the findings of psychology, have touched many of the subjects taught in the parochial schools, "catechism" remains largely untouched. This is particularly distressing to Shields since for him "psychology is

---

81 Thomas Edward Shields, "Notes on Education: The Teaching of Religion," CUB, XIV (March, 1908), 287-98. In this article Shields quotes supportive materials from reports issued by Rev. Thomas Devlin (1906) Superintendent of Parish Schools for the Diocese of Pittsburgh and Rev. James F. Nolan (1907), Superintendent of Parish Schools for the Archdiocese of Baltimore. He also quotes material from Father Francis Kerze (cf. n. 39) and Bishop Bellord (cf. nn. 1-2). He approves of Father Peter C. Yorke's Textbooks of Religion (cf. nn. 86-87), Sloan's The Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success (Appendix E), and especially Mother Mary Loyola's Jesus of Nazareth (Appendix E)--finding all these in the spirit of the new catechetics.
just beginning to study the mental laws which the Church from her earli-
est days has observed." In her "organic activity" the Church fully
uses a "psychological method of teaching." It is tragic, he concludes,
that in a very real sense Catholics are strangers to their own tradition
when it comes to teaching Christian Doctrine.

Shields' next and perhaps most comprehensive single statement of
his theory and method appeared in the November (1908) issue of the Catho-
lic Educational Association Bulletin. In 1904, previously existing
conferences joined together in the Catholic Educational Association. Each
year thereafter the CEA has met in convention and later in the year pub-
lished the various papers and discussions in its bulletin. The CEAB in
its ongoing series gives evidence of currents active in the American Cate-
chesis in any given period. Shields had given a précis of the lengthy

---

82 "The Method of Teaching Religion," Catholic Educational Asso-
ciation Bulletin, V (November, 1908), 287-98. (Hereinafter cited as
CEAB.) Shields had spoken before the convention already in 1905 on "The

83 A paper on religious education by the Very Rev. Patrick S. Mc-
Hale, CM, President of Niagara (New York) University, "Religious Education
in College," had been given in 1900; cf. Second Annual Conference. Asso-
ciation of Catholic Colleges of the United States (Washington: Catholic
University Press, 1900), pp. 88-100. The article is somewhat informative
but not substantial. For comment occasioned by McHale's address, cf.
Review, VIII (No. 22, 1901), 346-47. In the early years of the Catholic
Educational Association these papers on religious education were published
in the CEAB: Rev. Walter J. Shanley, "The Teaching of Catechism and Bible
History." I (November, 1904), 122-29; Rev. M. J. Considine, "The Catholic
View of Moral and Religious Teaching in Elementary Schools," II (November,
1905), 155-64; Msgr. M. J. Lavelle, "The Relationship of the Pastor or
Priest to the Catholic School especially as regards Religious Instruction,
Secular Instruction, and Discipline," III (November, 1906), 149-60;
Brother Baldwin, FSC, "The Teaching of Catechism," ibid., 161-75; Brother
John A. Waldron, SM, "The Teaching of Bible History," ibid., 175-87. On
Msgr. Lavelle, cf. Chapter iii, nn. 75-79.
article published in the CEAB cited above at the fifth annual convention of the Association held the previous July in Cincinnati. It represented Shields' most public appeal for acceptance of his method and the accompanying texts. As always, his style is diffusive and repetitive; he begins by repeating much of the material contained in the prior CUB article noted above but now especially stresses the obligation of religion teachers to follow "our Lord's method of teaching religion." This is most appropriate in teaching the same religious truths that the "Master Teacher" taught and also is consonant (nor surprisingly, he affirms) with the latest findings of educational psychology. Such concrete and meaningful teaching will achieve the desired goal of all— that religion be the most attractive and best taught subject in the Catholic grammar school. More than this, such teaching will make clear that religion is the basis of correlation for all subjects in the curriculum. Christ's method does not feature "memory load" or "memory cram"; the Master "refrained from presenting to His followers the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven in abstract formulations." Indeed, nowhere in the Gospels "is it recorded that He required His disciples to commit to memory the exact words of any of His lessons. Rather, Christ taught the "highest truths" primarily to change behavior. In one particularly specific paragraph on the rationale of Christ's teaching Shields finds:

In teaching the sublime truths of religion, He always appealed directly to the instincts, to the experiences, and to the imagination of His disciples, and through these means He sought to lead them into an understanding of the saving truths which He announced to them. Moreover, Christ did not come among men to deliver to them a body of recondite truths to be carried as a memory load by the multitude who were unable to grasp their significance. He proclaimed indeed the highest truths in both the intellectual and the moral orders, but these truths were always eminently practical. They were intended to modify the conduct of all who received them.
All the above assertions were key themes with Shields and he repeated them over and over again. They very much show his devotion to the person and witness of Jesus Christ and the influence of his training and reading in contemporary psychology.

After the forceful presentation of this preliminary material, the professor from the Catholic University then sought to inform his hearers of the developmental needs of children as they pertain to teaching. He makes the point very clearly that different phases of the child's growth require different teaching approaches; to illustrate his principle he uses a number of complex examples from botany and biology that surely must have been lost on those for whom they were intended. In one of his more easily comprehensible statements, however, he points out:

The conscious life of the infant begins in a phase that is wholly under the control of instinct. This rapidly passes over into a phase that is dominated by imitation. Out of this imitative phase, in the child's ninth and tenth years, there develops a well-defined phase of mental life which is characterized by comparison of authorities, by the recognition of superficial analogies and above all by delight in symbolic representation. This is followed by a fourth phase in which the mind seeks more exact definition of the truths which are presented as well as internal evidence, more subtle analogies. Finally, the maturer mind seeks out the history of the things in which it is interested and finds their meaning in the processes of becoming.

It is here that Shields announces a series of religion books being prepared in which material and method are directed to these corresponding phases of mental development in the child. He explains:

The first book contains five chapters, the second book will contain fifteen or sixteen chapters. In each of these the child is brought to observe the familiar phenomena of surrounding nature and to discover the meaning of the instincts which govern the lower forms of life. From this he is led to a contemplation of home life and human impulse and to trace their government to natural law. From this he is brought to the contemplation of Our Lord's example and to a realization of the supernatural law contained in His teaching.
Since the first book is finished, Shields describes it more in detail; he also outlines the general content of the second book. As for the rest, this is his plan:

... the volume for use in the third and fourth grades will make the child familiar with the truths of Christianity as embodied in the organic activity of the Church, in her Sacraments, and in her Ritual. In the book for the fifth and sixth grades the children will become familiar with the exact formulations of Christian Doctrine and they will find the truths of a supernatural order reflected in natural phenomena and also reflected from every page of science. In the seventh and eighth grades the truths of Christianity will be unfolded in connection with the history of the Old and New Testament and the history of the Church.

It is quite interesting to find the papers written in reaction to Shields' presentation appended to his text in the pages of the CEAB. Taken together with his major paper, they give considerable insight into the various stances then (1908) held in the American catechesis. The prime reactor to Shields' material was Father Peter C. Yorke of San Francisco. A capable and popular priest of assorted solid accomplishments, he had authored (with assistance) a series of religion manuals.
then being widely used in western dioceses. As already noted, his Textbooks of Religion for Parochial and Sunday Schools were an attempt to enrich the Baltimore Catechism with stories, pictures, poems, and hymns in a graded series—the first production of its kind in the history of American Catholic religious education. He was also a prominent figure in the Catholic Educational Association and a frequent speaker before its conventions. The year before Father Yorke had given a very well-received paper entitled "The Educational Value of Christian Doctrine," in which he made a strong plea for "religious education" as opposed to "secular education with a period of religious instruction added."

Throughout his energetic career he was a strong proponent of the "co-ordination of religion with the other subjects of the curriculum

Father Yorke received a doctorate in sacred theology (S.T.D.) from the Sacred Council of Studies in Rome for his religion texts in 1906. For further biography on Yorke, cf. Appendix B.

87 Cf. Appendices D-F. In the opinion of this author, Yorke's Textbooks of Religion very much show the influence of the Sulpician Method (cf. Chapter iii, n. 56). For a critique of Yorke's series cf. McMahon, Some Methods of Teaching Religion, pp. 26-51.

88 Yorke gave six major addresses before the Catholic Educational Association between 1907-23. These can be found in the CEAB (1907, 1912, 1913, 1918, 1923) or printed together in Yorke's Educational Lectures (San Francisco: Text Book Publishing Co., 1933). For a posthumous tribute to Yorke by the CEA, cf. CEAB, XXII (November, 1925), 34.

89 CEAB, IV (November, 1907), 225-49. The paper was written in reference to the classic report of the "Committee of Fifteen" published by the National Educational Association in 1905. Yorke's task was to locate the place of religion in the parochial school. In his paper he greatly stresses the "co-ordination" of religion with other subjects in the curriculum and shows how it can be done. In his development, he calls again and again for a vivid, interesting, intelligible, and practical catechesis. Shields was greatly impressed with Yorke's ideas of "co-ordination" and quoted from him approvingly several times (cf. above nn. 81 and 82). Both Shields and Yorke agreed on this point. The same idea was stressed again before the convention by the pioneer historian of Catholic Education in the United States, Father James A. Burns in his paper "Correlation and the Teaching of Religion," (CEAB, XI [November, 1914], 37-49).
and vice versa. Yorke was clearly the chief exponent in this era of, what the present author terms, **progressive traditionalism**. Devoted to the catechism but not uncritically, Yorke did not regard it as the sole means of religious instruction but wished to see it integrated with graphic arts and sacred narrative; he also was a great admirer of the patristic catechesis and tried to restore its biblical thrust to religious education in his own day. Father Yorke was undoubtedly regarded by many, and justly so, as the major catechetical figure in the American Church in that era. His reaction to the "Shields' Method," therefore, would be crucial. Yorke turned down his thumb and forcibly so; for him, Shields departed too much from tradition.

The San Francisco religious educator begins his critique by complaining that Shields did not give the paper he had submitted beforehand.

---

90 Cf. Yorke's earlier article on "co-ordination" in *Review of Catholic Pedagogy*, I (January, 1903), 23-36. A similar article appeared in the *Catholic School Journal*, V (October, 1905), 138-39. The first of these articles is especially representative of Yorke's catechetical views and equally representative of the progressive traditionalism making headway in the American Catechesis in this era.

91 As devoted as Yorke was to the need of catechism in religious education, in the above cited articles (n. 90), he observes: "Consider then for a moment what an admirable instrument for disgusting children with religion the ordinary catechism must be." He finds it "a cross between a dictionary and a table of contents." Yorke shows romantic feeling toward the patristic catechesis: "However full of sap the original catechism was--the catechism of Christian mothers in the days of Agnes and Cecilia--the catechism of Gregory and Chrysostom when the little children clamored around the episcopal throne--all that sap has been squeezed out of it long since." In regard to the conciliar catechism, Yorke finds: "I do not believe, for instance, that any one could convict the Baltimore catechism of a single sentence that would bring a picture to the mind of a child." Still he admits that the Catechism is "an admirable synopsis of Catholic Theology drawn up in unexceptionable language." Clearly, then, Yorke's great effort, with other progressive traditionalists, was to maintain the Catechism but to enrich it.

for comment; therefore, Yorke's criticisms cannot be fully understood until Shields' entire presentation appears in print. Yorke ironically disclaims any expertise in physiological psychology and so he will not contend with the "learned professor" on that ground. He takes several other caustic gibes at scientific analyses in the course of his paper. Yet, he is quick to use a homely analogy involving the process of human nutrition; after briefly reviewing the cycle of ingestion, digestion, and elimination in the every day life of man, Father Yorke makes his point:

... in the teaching of Christian Doctrine there are certain great staples by which the mind and soul are nourished. Prayers, catechism, the Bible, pictures, hymns, the saints, the liturgy, the devotions, Church history and the like, are the old traditional means for the inculcation of Christian Doctrine. No doubt there is much in them that is waste, much that is mere memory-load, much that is unscientific, but that is only saying that they are natural. They are the food on which the Christian people have fed from time immemorial and on them twice thirty generations of Saints have been built up to the full measure of the stature of Christ.

No, Yorke warns, even if there is "an analogy between religious education and secular education ... we must not press the analogy too far"; the Catechesis must adhere to its tradition. Not that the Baltimore Catechism does not need serious revision; it certainly does and it is hoped that the Archbishops will soon reinstitute their committee for that purpose. Father Yorke emphasizes his principal quarrel with the Shields' Method rests on two points. First of all, there is definite need for some type of catechism in the early grades that will give essential formulations of faith to the lips of even younger children; this has been done since apostolic times. Secondly, it is not correct to require a child to learn by rote only what he can fully understand. By this rule even nursery rhymes would be out today since "modern science has found
mysteries in Old Mother Hubbard" and also "dragged to light the prehistoric myth that lay concealed in the four and twenty blackbirds that were baked into the pie." In fine, Father Yorke [who it seems in his suave and highly literate way has been presenting himself as the "common man" of Christian Doctrine] calls the assembled religion teachers to be true to the traditions of their holy founders--one of his favorite themes --and be not afraid "of giving too much of God's truth to the little ones." Yorke's remarks are highly representative of criticisms leveled against the "Shields Method."

The next reactor was Brother Chrysostom, FSC, then professor of philosophy and psychology at Manhattan College. He had translated and edited the respected higher catechisms in the Christian Brother (D-E-F) series and had put together several other college texts. Brother Chrysostom gives strong support to Shields in his paper for the latter's attempts to make religion intelligible and functional to children at each stage of their mental development. He repeats much of Shields' theory in his own words and yet sometimes seems to miss the priest's thrust. On an eminently practical note, however, Brother Chrysostom points out that the large investment of publishers, booksellers, and schools etc. in catechisms will not be lost if the Shields' Method be adopted, since there will still be need of catechisms in the upper grades. The Manhattan educator reminds the convention that many have claimed to be looking for a more psychological approach in the teaching of religion. Well, he challenges, Shields is now giving them their chance and "the

cooperation of this Association ought to do much to give his book and method a fair trial and generous support throughout the United States." Brother John A. Waldron, SM, a Cleveland educator and prominent figure in the CEA, was also among those who gave reactions to Shields' paper. 94 His disapproval of the method can be summed up in one of his paragraphs:

What powers are most alive in a child? Are not his memory, and his propensity to imitate, and not his understanding and his will power? It would, therefore, be a grave error, in my estimation, to suppress or minimize the functions of memory in the early years of religious teaching. The development of understanding must, of course, receive constant attention. In this process the memory will be an efficient aid. Does not every teacher know how constantly the child is drawing from the storehouse of memory undigested facts and truths that have been lying there for years awaiting the call of understanding?

Another pro-memory advocate, Father William J. Egan [assistant pastor at St. Joseph's Church in Dayton], supported catechism in the lower grades against Shields but for a different reason:

... Doctor Yorke says that we cannot wait for that gradual development that Dr. Shields' method seems to require. We all know that many of our Catholic children leave school after the sixth grade, and before leaving school they ought to know their religion. They do well, then, to study their Catechism verbatim, and when their minds unfold later on, their memory will bring back to their understanding the truths that they have learned. ... memory comes first of all!

Father Egan indicates that he, too, is not satisfied with the Baltimore Catechism either, nor with the many "bad translations of mediocre foreign books on religion." A new or a drastically revised catechism is needed, as far as he is concerned.

94 For Brother Waldron's comments, cf. ibid., pp. 231-32.
95 For Father Egan's comments, cf. ibid., pp. 232-33. Egan's comment below that many children leave the parochial school after the sixth grade may indicate that was the grade in which many received First Holy Communion and Confirmation; cf. Chapter ii, n. 9.
After Egan's brief comments, the highly respected Father Edward A. Pace of the Catholic University rose in defence of his colleague. In his gently pointed remarks, he affirms that Shields is not against the cultivation of memory per se but he is opposed to using the child as some kind of phonograph. In the "Shields Method" intelligibility is the key word of all teaching and learning. Pace takes the critics to task one by one, grimly pointing out that it is "an unpleasant fact that many who have been drilled for years in the catechism are rather poor examples of practical teaching." Pace also returns to one of his favorite themes shared with Shields--the consonance of Christ's method of teaching religion with modern psychology. Following the Master's

---

96 For Father Pace's comments, cf. ibid., 233-34. On Pace and Shields, cf. above, n. 78. Pace was very much part of the Catholic establishment of his time. He was considered a meticulous and brilliant, if somewhat slow-moving, scholar by his contemporaries. His scholarship was respected outside the Church. He had spoken before the National Educational Association in 1903 on "The Influence of Religious Education and Motives of Conduct." He had a small list of published writings but contributed many articles to the Catholic Encyclopedia of which he was assistant editor. Shields on the other hand may be said to have "rushed into print." The Shields' Method was supposed to be the result of collaboration between Shields and Pace but apparently Shields could not wait for him. In the remarks cited above even Pace referred to the matter under discussion as simply the "Shields' Method." Pace never wrote out his ideas on religious method fully but reference is made to stenographic notes published by one of his students Lawrence W. McCarthy, OSFD, viz., E. A. Pace, Simple Methods in Religious Instruction (Wilmington, Delaware: Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, n.d.) in Rev. A. N. Fuerst, Systematic Teaching of Religion, I, 90. The present author has made several unsuccessful attempts to locate these notes.


method can bring nothing but better results. Pace points out even Father Yorke's use of the nourishment analogy in his critique of Shields was a very effective use of the "Shields Method." At this Yorke rose quickly to say:

I have a most decided objection to being set down as a horrible example of the method. As I have already hinted the differences that divide my way of looking at the matter and Dr. Shields' way of looking at the matter are very great, nay, fundamental. I did not think this the occasion or here the place to expatiate on these differences . . . . But in view of what Dr. Pace has said I feel it my duty to state that the difference between us is a difference of philosophy, and in my opinion his system of pedagogy is nothing less than revolutionary.

Yorke continued to affirm that "memory-load" and "memory work" are two different things; inaccuracy is the "sin of the new pedagogy"; let us not have this sin in the teaching of religion. As far as Christ's method of teaching:

Our Lord was dealing with grown people, with people some highly and all fairly well trained in their religion. We do not know what His methods would be if He had to deal with a common school. Then it is not fair to insist solely on the parables as His method of teaching. He did also cast His doctrine in the form of abstract and abstruse propositions.

And then Father Yorke gave his parting shot:

I believe we Catholics have in our own philosophy, in our own practice, in our own experience a true Catholic pedagogy and that we do not need to go outside our own resources.

This last point was a favorite theme with Yorke and other progressive traditionalists in the American Catechesis who resisted the "psychologism" of Shields and Pace.

The colloquium ended with Shields. His biographers tell us

---

98 For Father Yorke's additional comments, cf. CEAB, V (November, 1907), 234-36.

99 For Father Shields' final remarks, cf. ibid., 236-37.
that whatever his vexations and disappointments, the "unmade dullard"
never placed the blame on anyone else or spoke sharply to those who
opposed him. Here we have good proof of this. He simply says,
and with justification:

... the content of my paper has not been fully understood and
that as a natural result, my treatment of certain psychological
data has been misinterpreted.

Shields reminds his critics, as Pace had, that he is not against the
careful use of memory; in fact, his method is in direct opposition
to "many things that deck themselves with the name 'modern pedagogy'"
and it is likewise a "corrective on purely psychological grounds of
many things that are supposed to be specimens of 'applied psychology.'"

He again reemphasizes the religious content of his book(s) and insists
that in the end his method is the traditional method of Christ and the
Church.

Shields continued to lecture and publish articles on his method

100

The reference to the "unmade dullard" comes for Shields' unfortunate experience as a young boy when he underwent a period of severe psychological regression; so much so that the family withdrew him from school and he was commonly and unkindly referred to as "Shields' omadhaun: [Gaelic: fool, simpleton]. His own recollections of this difficult period in his life and his progression out of it can be found in his The Making and Unmaking of a Dullard (Washington: Catholic Education Press, 1909). Whatever his problems in school, however, Shields knew his catechism (cf. ibid., 92-93). No doubt his own painful experiences and early learning disabilities greatly contributed to his strong desires to improve elementary education.
In his battles with what he characterized "ultra-conservatism in the teaching of Christian Doctrine" Shields was wont to indict (what he considered) its murderous inefficiency in the instruction of children with the ironical observation that "all the Innocents were not slain by Herod" (cf. Ward Thomas Edward Shields, p. 139). His public style was such, however, not to permit such a polemic in his writings.

102 "The Teaching of Religion," Salesianum V (January, 1910), 38-46; ibid., (April, 1910), 11-22; ibid., (July, 1910), 31-42; ibid., VI (April, 1911), 33-43. Shields contributed the articles at the request of Salesianum, the publication of his alma mater St. Francis Seminary (Milwaukee) where he took his classical studies. The articles contain nothing new or additional to those cited above.

103 "Some Essentials in Elementary Religious Instruction," CSJ, VIII (September, 1908), 110-12; "The Method of Teaching Religion in the Schools," CSJ (November, 1908), 174-75; also above in n. 80. He contributed other brief articles to this periodical but not specifically on religious education. Other short essays appeared in the CSJ which supported Shields, at least partially; cf. CSJ, VI (December, 1906), 203 and (January, 1907), 235-36; also in VII (June, 1907) 71 and VIII (January, 1910), 265-66.
Review (another fruit of his incessant energy). Pace and others contributed some supportive articles. Shields' texts came to be adopted in several dioceses where they are reported to have been used.

"The Teaching of Religion," CER, I (January, 1911), 65-76; "Fundamental Principles in the Teaching of Religion," ibid., (April, 1911), 338-46; "Correlation in the Teaching of Religion," ibid., (May, 1911), 420-29; "The Ultimate Aim of Christian Education," ibid. XII (November, 1916), 301-17. These articles, however, do not add to the previous essays cited above that he had already published in CUB. It can safely be said that Shields did not advance his theories after 1908. In a regular feature of his entitled "Survey of the Field" Shields takes up the question of sex education in CER, IV (December, 1912), 530-46 and VIII (October, 1914), 246-53. In the 1912 article he expansively reviews Gatterer-Krus (Appendix E), Education to Purity. Thoughts on Sexual Training and Education Proposed to Clergymen, Parents, and Other Educators. Cf. also Chapter v, nn. 34-35.


enthusiastically; Ward has given us some of this story. Murphy calculates over a million children used the series from 1908-25. The reaction to his theory and books in the ACELP was more negative than positive; most found them (with Yorke) to be too revolutionary and forsaking of tradition. The Catholic University professor apparently did not choose to become a major figure in the Catholic Educational Association as Yorke and Pace but he did continue to take part in its deliberations and address its conventions. If the greater part of American Catholic religious educators did not accept the full Shields'

---

106 New Orleans, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Peoria, San Antonio, Milwaukee; they were also used in individual schools in other dioceses. Shields reported that in the summer of 1910 he had given twenty-four lectures to over 3,000 teachers "in various institutes" in which he explained his method. He further stated that he had been doing this for several years (CEAB, VII [November, 1910], 329).


108 Cf. above n. 77.

109 Cf. for instance, Rev. Francis L. Kerze, "Catechetics: Dr. Shields' Catechetical Method," AER, XXXIX (December, 1908), 705-11 (which is generally favorable to him); Arthur Preuss, "Shall We Abolish the Catechism?" Catholic Fortnightly Review XVI (No. 1, 1909), 9-12 (which is generally opposed to him); Sacerdos Clevlandensis, "Too Many New Catechisms and Children's Prayer Books," AER, XLVI (June, 1912), 718-21 (which is totally opposed to him). The ACELP criticism of Shields was quite professional but some less public opposition to the Shield's Method had it "evolving Jesus Christ from a robin"; cf. above n. 84. Other brief references appeared to the Shield's Method from time to time, in the ACELP after 1915. A résumé of his views on religious education, although barely mentioning him by name, appeared in A.O., "The Practical Aim of Religious Teaching." Truth, XXIV (March, 1930), 19-21.

110 Shields commented favorably in 1909 on the paper "The Function of Memory in Education" given before the sixth convention by Father George Michael Sauvage, CSC--CEAB, VI (November, 1909), 254-271. He again opened his heart to the convention in 1919 when he spoke on "The Need of a Catholic Sisters' College and the Scope of Its Work"--CEAB, XVI (November, 1919), 476-85. He spoke other times too--but not on religious education.
Method, they were nevertheless influenced by it. Shields' continued emphasis on the vivid, the graphic, the intelligible, the psychologically correct, and, above all the functional, greatly added to the progressive traditionalism that came more and more to dominate the American Catechesis.

OTHER EMPHASSES IN THE CATECHESIS

Biblical Enrichment of the Catechism

Whatever disagreements Shields and Pace had with Yorke and other progressive traditionalists, all were agreed on the need of adding more biblical content to religious instruction. Their articles in the ACELP and their textbooks very much show this. Catechisms in the "Carroll" and Butler tradition had very little scripture in them; whatever biblical quotations they did include were placed there more for apologetic or polemical purposes than for biblical education. The Baltimore Catechism, based on "Carroll" and Butler, contained even less scripture and was frequently criticized for this lack. After 1900, the inclusion of more scripture in catechism became a common thing. Such enriched editions of the BC as discussed above in connection with the Klauder controversy all contained scriptural quotations related to the material studied in each lesson. The same is true of the very popular catechisms of Faerber (D-F), the later editions of Deharbe (D-E), and the large catechism of Groening (E-F)--all used with, but mostly instead of, the BC by many catechists. For those who used the straight BC, Cox (D-E) had compiled and arranged his Biblical Treasury of the Catechism with material for each lesson. The very remarkable Course of Christian Doctrine: A Handbook
for Teachers did the same. Much of this kind of scriptural integration, however, was still more apologetic in intent rather than directed to biblical education.

More direct knowledge of the bible and its contents, as before, was obtained through the use of the bible history. The very popular bible histories of Gilmour (D-F) and Schuster (D-F), written in the prior century, were revised and printed again and again. In order to compete with these widely used volumes, P. J. Kenedy re-issued an adaptation of Reeve (C-E) which, as we have seen in Chapter i, was one of the first Catholic books published in the United States. For the same reason, John Murphy continued to publish the scriptural catechism of the Sisters of Mercy (C-D). Catholic Teaching for Children by Winifred Wray (D) also had a large biblical content. For more advanced use Archbishop Sebastian Messmer translated and edited a biblical handbook by Brülls (E) which had a modest but continued popularity. The scriptural lessons of Urban (E), discussed above, cast in the Munich Method, were also available. Lives of Christ for children by Virginia Merrick (E) and a Carmelite Nun (E) were published for use in the American Catechesis along with the widely acclaimed Jesus of Nazareth by Mother Mary Loyola (E), IBVM, of Bar Convent, York (England). Merrick (E) also wrote a popular Acts of the Apostles. Inexpensive editions of the epistles and gospels, some with notes and provocative questions, were offered continuously by most of the American Catholic publishers. "Cheap printings" of the New Testament were always advertised as well as more expensive and "deluxe" editions of the "Holy Bible." On a higher level, the widely read Practical Commentary

Cf. above, n. 22.
of Bishop Knecht (D-E) was available, as were the biblical works of the American seminary professors Gigot (D-F) and Maas (D). The respected works of Spirago (D-E) also promoted biblical study and integration with catechism.

A large number of articles too appeared in the ACELP during the 1900-15 period calling for an increase of biblical study in the American Catechesis. A reading of these articles shows that the above mentioned works were being widely used in American Catholic religious education, but the biblical and catechismal lessons generally lacked integration. Bible History, more often than not, was taught separately as a sacred study annexed to catechism. Progressive traditionalists constantly sought greater integration between the two. The textbooks of Yorke and the more revolutionary ones of Shields both made a successful attempt at the correlation of biblical themes and materials with doctrine and morals. The same

is true of Wray's (D) work. The above cited ACELP articles also sought better teaching of Bible History through better method and better training of catechists.

Catechesis and Liturgy

While the integration of sacred scripture with catechism was more of a major concern in this 1900-15 period, interest was also shown for the integration of the Liturgy in religious education. As we have seen in Chapter i, Challoner's *Catholic Christian Instructed* and the Bardstown Catechism (following the French *praxis*) contained large sections of liturgical instruction. The Boston Catechism also included a liturgical catechism as Part III. The General Catechism of the First Plenary Council eliminated this section in adopting the Boston Catechism but did include certain abstracts from *Catholic Christian Instructed* on ritual and blessings. The Baltimore Catechism on the other hand, following the "Carroll" and Butler traditions, included no liturgical instruction. This was also true of other contemporary catechisms. A number of instructional texts on the Liturgy, however, were published in nineteenth century and are listed in Appendices C and D of this study. Some of these were still being used after the turn of the century. Paradoxically, fewer works on Liturgy were published in the 1900-15 period when greater integration of liturgy and catechism was being called for in the schools. The *Teachers Handbook*, mentioned above, was strong on integration of liturgy with catechism, and so was Spirago-Messmer (E). The texts of Yorke and Shields had considerable liturgical content. In
this period, ACCEL published a number of articles treating of liturgical education. Slides illustrating the Mass and Liturgy (cf. below) became available as did Bairel's (E) illustrated Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. As mentioned above, inexpensive editions of the epistles and gospels for Sundays and holydays were always available. It would be correct to see in these developments the first stirrings of that great liturgical revival that would so affect American Catholic religious education in succeeding decades.

The Catechesis and Psychology

We have seen that early in the century Bishop Bellord called for imparting of religious education according to the "laws of learning." Shields and Pace made this their major goal but encountered much resistance from other American Catholic educators. Yorke's great point was that the Church did not need to go outside its own tradition to learn how to teach religion. Many agreed with him on principle; apparently, others agreed with him out of inertia or fear of "psychology." The

classicalists were outraged by the drastic attacks of the "psychologists" on the validity of comprehensive memorization. Those who supported the Herbart-Ziller based Munich Method were favorable to the use of psychology in the Catechesis but it can be said that in this 1900-15 period most American Catholic religious educators rejected or were at least extremely cool to "psychology" as a means to improve catechetical instruction. As we have seen above, Shields claimed his own method was an antidote both to the deficiencies of the classical system and the extravagances of "many things that deck themselves out with the name 'modern pedagogy.'" 114

Pace, himself a student of Wundt, defended his own efforts by writing:

The word 'psychological' again may be criticized as laying too much stress on the mental requirements of the pupil with insufficient concern for the nature of the truth that must be imparted and consequently for the 'unity and purity of doctrine.' In this case evidently the method would be one-sided; but what is more, it would not be psychological in any sense that education could accept and much less would it be available for the teaching of religion. 115

Pace and Shields both agreed on this: their co-religionist opponents did not truly understand what psychology had to offer religious education.

During this period, E. L. Thorndike, G. Stanley Hall, John Dewey and others were working strenuously to change the methodology of American education. Shields and Pace knew of their work and held many points in common with them, but, for whatever reasons, Shields and Pace never quoted or mentioned them in their ACELP contributions.

114 Cf. CEAB, V (November, 1907), 236-37.

115 "Lessons from Liturgy," CER, I (March, 1911), 239-46. Whatever formal essays there were in ACELP on psychology and religious education appeared in CER; cf. above n. 105.
The Use of the Concrete and the Visual in Religious Instruction

While many of the progressive traditionalists were greatly chary of the "psychologists" in seeking to influence religious education, they were friendly to some of their ideas, detached from their theories. This was especially true of the use of the concrete and visual in teaching religion. The use of the catechetical story illustrative of some point of doctrine or practice was widely used even by those less progressive in their methodology. The popularity of Chisholm's (E) Catechism in Examples and Baxter's translation of Spirago's (E) Anecdotes and Examples as well as other collections give evidence to this. The old Sulpician Method and the newer Munich one had greatly stressed the use of the narrative and whatever visual materials were available to the lesson. The Handbook for Teachers, discussed above, gave multiple suggestions on how to use the visual and concrete in teaching religion. Messmer's Spirago's Method (E) did the same. Shields and Yorke made it a great point to pictorialize their texts. Somewhat later the rise of the "objective method" of teaching in American education found friends among the progressive traditionalists in the Catechesis. In this period under discussion, there was also stress on the use of the "magic lantern" and the "sterioptican" in catechetical instruction as well as reference to the possible use of the religious cinema being then produced in France.

116 A Sister of St. Joseph of Philadelphia, "The Objective Method of Teaching Religion," CEAB XI (November, 1914), 277-87. This address is made singular by the author's plea for caution in teaching the life of Christ so as not to encourage anti-semitic attitudes in the students; cf. also Chapter iii, 12.

Father Joseph H. McMahon of New York who was very active in promoting the visual in the Catechesis complained that in this regard:

... it is pathetic to notice how much zealous effort has been stifled by unkind criticism, and by the lamentable indifference of the hide-bound traditionalist who suspects every new idea, and who sees heresy and disloyalty lurking in the shadow of every novelty. It is also gratifying to see how difficulties have been grappled with and overcome. ... 118.

It is apparent that in the first fifteen years of this century, many progressive catechists sought pictures, maps, charts, slides, etc. from commercial sources to enrich the teaching of religion. Where these were not available or could not be afforded, some tried to make their own from old Christmas cards, magazines, or from whatever they could beg or borrow. A sign of the progressive catechist in this period was often a self-gathered collection of visual materials. The *Helper*, listed at the beginning of the chapter, made many suggestions of how the interested catechist could "visualize" the catechism. At one time, its publisher, the Sunday Companion Publishing Company hoped to set up a bureau of visual *catechetica*, but it is not clear how this turned out. Among the commercially produced visual aids in this period were the religious slides and motion pictures of *La bonne presse à société des projections*, available from Paris but with French subtitles. The present author recalls seeing such slides, broken and long-unused, in the storage-rooms of

(October, 1910), 492-93. He especially stresses material developed in Paris (cf. below)

118 Cf. ER, XLIII (October, 1910), 492-93. Here he summarizes a number of letters he had received in response to the first two articles cited above in n. 117. Cf. also [anon.] "Religious Pictures for Schools: Work of a Young Ladies Sodality," *CSJ*, VII (December, 1908), 204.

119 Cf. Rev. John J. McCahill, "Teaching Catechism," ER, XLIV (January, 1911), 93-96. Father McCahill, then president of New York Archdiocesan Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, was seeking 100 persons to found such a bureau with a donation of $50.00 a piece.
several schools in the early 1950's. Throughout Volume XIII (1912-13), the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist announced that sterioptican slides on the Mass, the Liturgy, and prayers of the Church were available from its publisher, Joseph F. Wagner of New York, along with instructions for their use. Scattered references also appear in the ACELP to the helpfulness of the Perry Pictorial Collection (Boston), the Woodbury Reproductions of E. Young and Co., (New York), the Herder Charts (Frieburg and St. Louis), and the Dusseldorf and Vienna Collections (possibly New York based but uncertain). In this period too Canon Carr's A Lamp of the World and Instructor's Guide (Liverpool, 1892), containing many charts and diagrams, was widely used here.

Other Enlargements in Catechetical Instruction

During the period under discussion, there was some small attention paid to the question of sex education. Outside the Church in American educational circles there was considerable ferment on the subject. The references to sex education that appear in the ACELP, as one would expect, contain a very cautious and highly conservative approach to the question. This would be true of such radicals as Shields as well.

In the 1900-15 span, there was little agitation to intensify "social content" in the Catechesis. As we have seen above in the

Klauder controversy, that author had attempted to stress "civic duties" in his catechism and was strongly criticized for it in some quarters. Such themes were thought to be too controversial or adult-oriented by some and/or lacking a "sacral" character by others. There is no formal comment in the ACELP of the period toward what would be called ecumenical or inter-faith understanding today. There was, however, one eloquent plea (given more as a digression) by a Sister of St. Joseph before the CEA in 1914 that warned against unwittingly promoting anti-semitism in students when teaching of the death of Jesus. 121

The Sunday School Catechesis

While the various religious education discussions and controversies of the 1900-15 span more often than not spoke of teaching religion in the parish school setting, the problems of the extra-school Catechesis were always included, at least implicitly. A core of essays also appeared in the ACELP specifically directed to the matter of the Sunday school. The material repeated much of the comment and concern already

121 Cf. above n. 116; cf. also Chapter iii, n. 12.

so forcefully expressed in ACELP during the 1890's and discussed in Chapter iii. There were new developments, however, in the training of Sunday school catechists and the organization of instruction, especially in such large centers as New York and Chicago. Specific attention was also given to the religious education of children in the rural areas as well. Some effort was made to enlist the services of more of the laity in the Sunday school and to bolster the participation of priests, but the parish school nuns still formed the dominant group among the Sunday school catechists. Special studies on the Sunday school were written by Sloan (E), Feeney (E) and Halpin (E) in the era under discussion. In general, however, the extra-school catechesis would have to wait to a later period for its next advance in theory and practice.

POPE ST. PIUS X AND THE AMERICAN CATECHESIS

As one can see, the period from 1900 to 1915 contained a great deal of catechetical activity nationally; it can be said to be a singular period of native growth within the American Catechesis. At the


same time, this prolific time for Roman Catholic religious instruction in the United States was stimulated in some respects and greatly supported by the universal enactments of the then reigning pontiff, Pope St. Pius X. Giuseppe Sarto came to the papal office with a single-minded determination for reform. As Pius X, he put an immense pastoral thrust into his pontificate (1903-14) by which he meant to touch each facet of the Church's life. In his first encyclical letter *E Supremi Apostolatus*, widely reported in the ACELP, the new pope simply explained that his only program was "to restore all things in Christ," which words he took for the motto of his pontificate (*Instaurare Omnia in Christo*). In *E Supremi Apostolatus*, among other things, Pius indicated that revitalizing religious instruction would be one of the means by which the desired "restoration" would be achieved. In a sense, all the activity of Pope St. Pius X affected Catholic religious instruction, but a number of his enactments touched the Catechesis directly: for this reason, the "Pope of the Catechism" and the "Pope of Christian Doctrine" are among the sobriquets applied to him.

---

Pope St. Pius X emerges more and more in current historical comment as a complicated character. He has been pictured as the simple village priest elevated to higher and higher office until he sat on the papal throne where he sought to apply simple and authentic solutions to problems that had become unduly complicated in the Church. He has also been judged a rigorous even ruthless anti-intellectual persecuting and destroying the modernists and even more orthodox progressive in the Church. It has also been suggested obliquely that his great catechetical thrust was part of his plan to restore the masses to the religio-political control of the Papacy in Italy, France and elsewhere. Finally some have seen a dichotomy in his personality which permitted him to be both of these extremes.
Acerbo Nimis

On April 15, 1905, the pontiff issued his encyclical letter Acerbo Nimis, commonly given the English title "The Teaching of Christian Doctrine." Not surprisingly, it received wide coverage in the United States. Practically all the ACELP hailed its appearance and reported its general contents. The American Catholic Quarterly Review, as was its custom with major papal pronouncements, carried the full Latin text with an English translation; the American Ecclesiastical Review and Catholic Mind also carried full English versions. Specific parts were given in the Catholic Fortnightly Review and the Catholic School Journal. Explanations and commentary appeared in the Catholic World and the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist. The ACELP reported the emphases given by the Pope in Acerbo Nimis, viz., many of the ills in the world can be traced to religious ignorance; the clergy and all having the care of souls must regularly and zealously perform the catechetical duty; all age groups, especially the young, are to be included in a comprehensive instructional program; learned works and pulpit oratory cannot do the work of the catechist; and finally,


127 CFR, XII (No. 11, 1905), 322-23; CSJ, V (May, 1905), 57-58.

the devoted laity must actively enter into the work of the Catechesis. Pius X also included a six-point implementation in Acerbo Nimis which the CFR reported more accurately, if less literately, than some of the other ACELP:

1. On every Sunday and holyday of the year, none excepted, all parish priests and, generally speaking, all those who have the care of souls, shall with the text of the Catechism, instruct for the space of an hour the young of both sexes in what they must believe and do to be saved.

2. At stated times during the year, they shall prepare boys and girls by continued instruction, lasting several days, to receive the sacraments of penance and confirmation.

3. Every day in Lent, and, if necessary, on other days after Easter, they shall likewise, by suitable instructions and reflections, carefully prepare boys and girls to receive their first communion holily.

4. In each parish the Confraternity of the Christian Doctrine is to be canonically instituted. Through this Confraternity the parish priests, especially in places where there is a scarcity of priests, will find valuable helpers for catechetical instruction in pious lay persons who will lend their aid to this holy and salutary work, both from a zeal for the glory of God and as a means of gaining the numerous indulgences granted by the sovereign pontiffs.

5. In large towns, and especially in those which contain universities, colleges, and grammar schools, let religious classes be founded to instruct in the truths of faith and in the practice of Christian life the young people who frequent the public schools, from which all religious teaching is banned.

6. In consideration of the fact that in our day adults no less than the young stand in need of religious instruction, all parish priests and others having the care of souls, shall, in addition to the usual homily on the Gospel to be delivered at the parochial mass on all days of obligation, explain the Catechism to the faithful in an easy style, suited to the intelligence of their hearers, at such time of the day as they may deem most convenient for the people, but not during the hour in which the children are taught. In this instruction they are to make use of the Catechism of the Council of Trent; and they are to divide the matter in such a way as within the space of four or five years to treat of the Apostles' Creed, the sacraments, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, and the precepts of the Church.¹²⁹

As the reader of this dissertation can see, most of the above six stipulations of Acerbo Nimis had already been particularly legislated for

¹²⁹ CFR, XII (No. 11, 1905), 332-33.
the American Church, in one form or another, by the Synod of 1791 and the subsequent councils of Baltimore. The first three points of the implementation had been quite generally observed in the organization of the Sunday school, as seen in the previous chapter, and most assuredly through the rise of the parochial school. There is no indication in the ACELP that any significant number of children had ever been formally neglected in this regard. The fifth stipulation, while referring more directly to the situation on the Continent, had been met in the United States by the Catholic high school and academy as well as by the Perseverance and Advanced classes of Christian Doctrine, although the latter seem never to have been notably numerous. Efforts to provide classes for students on non-Catholic college-campuses came only considerably later with a change of attitude in the American Hierarchy. Religious instruction had always been given in American Catholic colleges in one form or another. The fourth stipulation, calling for the canonical erection of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in each parish, was implemented more slowly in the United States and never comprehensively in the formal sense. There is indication, however, that the Confraternity existed in some American dioceses before Acerbo Nimis. The

130 Cf. Chapter i, nn. 20, 37, 46-50, 54-57, 70-83.

131 Cf. Chapter ii and iii. About this same time, the book editor of the Messenger of the Sacred Heart remarked that such post-First Communion classes seem to be less common than they were formerly; cf. MSH, VI (June, 1902), 272.

132 The rise of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) in the United States is more visible after 1920. It was organized on a national basis only in 1934 and held its first national congress the following year. There are indications that the Confraternity existed in New York city, at least, from 1901; cf. references cited above in n.123.
sixth stipulation had often been implemented, by the sermon or instruction given at the traditional Sunday afternoon Vespers and also by the conferences given parish societies.

Uniformitas

Just two months after Acerbo Nimis, Pius X issued the letter Uniformitas to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome ordering that the Compendio della dottrina cristiana, a catechism widely used in northern Italy, be used for private and public religious instruction in the Diocese of Rome and the dioceses of the Roman Province. The pope expressed the hope that the Compendio would be adopted by other dioceses so that, at least in Italy, there would be a uniform catechism. The report of this letter in the European press caused a flurry of excitement in the ACELP that perhaps Pius X was preparing to make the Compendio a universal catechism for the Catholic world, since the First Vatican Council had voted to have one over thirty years before. According to the Catholic Fortnightly Review, this opinion was based on materials appearing in the highly influential Roman Jesuit journal Civiltà Cattolica.

133 Sunday afternoon Vespers, ordered by the Synod of 1791 (cf. Chapter i, n.20) were still widely held in the early decades of this century; on conferences to parish societies, cf. above n. 35.


135 Cf. Chapter i, n. 52; also Chapter v, n. 94ff.

136 CFR, XII (No. 13, 1905), 380-82 and (No. 14, 1905), 410. Cf. also CSJ, V (June, 1905), 70. The Civiltà was thought by many at that time to be the "mouthpiece" of the pope and other highly placed curial officials. The Civiltà had played an important part a decade or so
The CFR reproduced the Civiltà material approvingly in digest form but faulted it for not making it clear that there was great feeling in the Vatican Council against a universal catechism. Some months later, the Catholic Mind printed, in translation, a lengthy article from the Civiltà on the advantages and disadvantages of a universal catechism with the advantages being found more numerous.\(^{137}\) Pursuing the same question, the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist printed an analysis and critique of the Compendio by the renowned catechetical theologian Rev. H. (Heinrich) Stieglitz.\(^{138}\) The great protagonist of the Munich Method (also called by some the Stieglitz Method) pronounces the Compendio to have an even amount of good points and weak ones. He declares he is not opposed to a universal catechism; but, if it does come, it must go beyond the Compendio in catechetical excellence. When another such letter to the Cardinal Vicar appeared in 1912, the Fortnightly Review, almost alone, referred to it.\(^{139}\) The flurry over the universal catechism, therefore, was short-lived in the ACELP and such a uniform volume never emerged. The Catechism of Pius X (Appendix E), as it came to be called, was translated for use in the United States by Bishop Thomas Sebastian Byrne of Nashville but remained a minor catechetical work here.

before in the "Americanism" controversies contrary to the interests of the so-called "Americanist" wing of the Church in the United States and those friendly to it in Europe (especially in France). Hence, the flurry of excitement in the ACELP over its pronouncements.


\(^{138}\) "The Roman Uniform Catechism" HMC, VI (July, 1906), 797-803.

\(^{139}\) FR, XX (No. 9, 1913), 277-78. After June, 1912, Arthur Preuss titled his bi-weekly journal simply Fortnightly Review.
At the end of 1905, Pius X gave another strong impetus to religious education when on December 20 the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued the decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus* which made it a clear point of teaching that Catholics not conscious of serious sin, having a "right intention" and fasting from midnight could in good conscience receive Holy Communion frequently, even daily. Again, the papal enactment was widely quoted and commented on in the ACELP. The text of the decree begins by quoting the Council of Trent that the faithful should be prepared to receive Holy Communion at each Mass attended. It goes on to describe the condition of frequent Holy Communion in the early Church and comes to that period when, for reasons of piety, reception of the Holy Eucharist became less and less frequent. The decree places the responsibility for this latter condition, which it brands a distortion of piety, on Jansenism. Although the Church has long recovered from Jansenistic piety in the main, the papal enactment declares that any surviving elements of Jansenism in regard to the frequency of Eucharistic reception must be resisted and the practice of the early Church restored. To achieve this, *Sacra Tridentina Synodus* contains a nine-point implementation. The ACELP found in the decree, among other things, a clear directive to the catechist to stress the frequent reception of

---


141 On Jansenism, cf. Chapter i, n.44.
Holy Communion in religious instruction. As noted in Chapter 1, the thrust of the major American catechisms was always in favor of frequent reception of the Eucharist. Monthly reception at least was stressed in the United States before 1905, for many decades, in the parochial and Sunday schools and through the various parish societies. An examination of news reports in the ACELP makes this clear. The real stress in the periodicals on frequent and daily reception, however, did not come until after the promulgation of the decree Quam Singulari in 1910.

Quam Singulari

On August 8, 1910, the Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments, at the Pope's mandate, issued the decree Quam Singulari stipulating the proper age for the initial reception of First Holy Communion. Quam Singulari received coverage in the ACELP. The Latin and English versions appeared first, followed by more extensive commentary and explanation. As the ACELP reported, Quam Singulari stresses the love of Jesus for little children as evidenced in the New Testament and recalls that the early Church administered Holy Communion to infants, even at Baptism. The decree goes on to explain the following points: the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), in a period of less frequent eucharistic reception, legislated that the faithful must (under pain of serious sin) confess and receive Holy Communion yearly from the "age of

---

142 Cf. below, n. 153.

143 "Quam Singulari," ER, XLIII (October, 1910), 453-60 and "The Holy See and the Children," ibid., 479-82. Cf. also ACQR, XXXV (October, 1910), 732-37; CM, VIII (No. 17, 1910), 273-82.
reason" or "age of discretion"; such an "age", however, has never been
defined by the Church to the present (1910) time; many learned theologians have commented on this question; the Holy See has frequently resisted efforts to raise the age of first reception. Now, the decree affirms, the question will be herewith resolved by this enactment.

As the other enactments of Pius X, Quam Singulari contains points of implementation; of all the ACELP, the American Ecclesiastical Review gave the most accurate translation of these stipulations:

The S. Congregation on the Discipline of Sacraments, at a general meeting held 15 July, 1910, in order that the above-mentioned abuses might be removed and the children of tender years become attached to Jesus, live His life, and obtain assistance against the dangers of corruption, has judged it opportune to lay down the following norm for admitting children to First Holy Communion to be observed everywhere:

1. The age of discretion required both for Confession and Communion is the time when the child begins to reason, that is about the seventh year, more or less. From this time on the obligation of satisfying the precept of both Confession and Communion begins.

2. Both for First Confession and First Communion a complete and perfect knowledge of Christian Doctrine is not necessary. The child will, however, be obliged to learn gradually the whole catechism according to its ability.

3. The knowledge of Christian Doctrine required in children in order to be properly prepared for First Holy Communion is that they understand according to their capacity those mysteries of Faith which are necessary as a means of salvation, that they be able to distinguish the Eucharist from common and material bread, and also approach the sacred table with the devotion becoming their age.

4. The obligation of the precept of Confession and Communion which rests upon the child, falls back principally upon those in whose care they are, that is, parents, confessors, teachers and their pastor. It belongs to the father, however, or to the person taking his place, as also to the confessor, as the Roman Catechism declares, to admit the child to First Holy Communion.

5. The pastor shall take care to announce and distribute general Communion once or several times a year to the children and on these occasions they shall admit not only First Communicants but also others, who with the consent of their parents and the confessor, have already been admitted to the sacred table before. For both classes several days of instruction and preparation shall precede.

6. Those who have the care of children should use all diligence so that after First Communion the children shall often approach the holy table, even daily, if possible, as Jesus Christ and mother
Church desire, and that they do it with a devotion becoming their age. They should bear in mind their most important duty, by which they are obliged to have the children present at the public instructions in catechism; otherwise they must supply this religious instruction in some other way.

7. The custom of not admitting children to confession, or of not absolving them, is absolutely condemned. Wherefore the Ordinaries of places, using those means which the law gives them, shall see that it is done away with.

8. It is a most intolerable abuse not to administer Viaticum and Extreme Unction to children having attained the use of reason and to bury them according to the manner of infants. The Ordinaries of places shall proceed severely against those who do not abandon this custom. 144

As we have already seen, in regard to the first stipulation of the decree, the "age of discretion" had been by the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore as falling somewhere in between the ages of ten and fourteen for most children; the Fathers of 1866, however, had left room for exceptions. 145 It seems that (before and after the Second Council) age twelve was the locus around which most American English-speaking Catholics, at least, received their First Holy Communion. 146 The required implementation of Quam Singulari changed this by dropping the locus of first reception to around seven years. Material had appeared in ACELP, before Pius' decree on First Communion, calling for an earlier first reception than was then customary in the American Church. 147 This, of

144 "The Holy See and the Children," ER, XLIII (October, 1910), 479-82. Cf. comment in n. 151.

145 Cf. Chapter ii, n. 9.

146 Ibid.

147 Cf. for instance, Rev. Herman J. Heuser, "Suggestions for the Preparation of the Class for First Communion," Catholic School Journal, V (April, 1905), 4-5; also, A Friend of Children, "The Proper Age for First Communion," CFR, XVII (No. 13, 1910), 397-400; Rev. C. A. Shyne, SJ, "Forbid Them Not," ER, XLIII (December, 1910), 641-52. [This essay had been written several months before the promulgation of Quam Singulari.] The Bishop of Galveston is reported in early 1910 to have advised his
course, is not surprising since a papal teaching more often than not comes as the terminus of considerable discussion. Still, *Quam Singulari* must have come with unexpected suddenness to many. While most of the materials in the ACELP occasioned by the decree welcome it with great joy (no doubt sincerely), one can readily sense in reading some of the same materials that many thought the promulgation of *Quam Singulari* to be too sudden, its required implementation too immediate, and its definition of the "age of discretion" too radical. This new locus of seven years of age for First Reception, in the minds of many, might very well destroy the parochial schools; for some, children of such a tender age were not capable of grievous sin; for others, seven years was entirely too young for the required comprehension and reverence in children of the northern clime. 148 Prior to *Quam Singulari*, the pastor, upon whom the various statutes of Baltimore placed the obligation, had several years in which to teach (or see that it was done) the children their prayers, a good deal of the catechism, and how to go to Confession before entering the immediate preparation for First Holy Communion. Now children had to be prepared to go to Confession and receive Holy Communion by at least Trinity Sunday of the first grade year. This created

considerable distress for many.

The second and third stipulation of Quam Singulari attempt to solve some of the immediacy of the first stipulation. They prescribe a very simple catechesis much like the one required in the United States by the Synod of 1791 to be accepted and understood by all who marry before the priest. In addition to this, the children must be able to distinguish between the Eucharist and common or material bread.

Several articles appeared in the ACELP seeking to set forth the necessary catechesis for First Holy Communion and a number of First Communion catechisms were published.

It was the fourth stipulation, however, that caused most of the distress; placing as it does the responsibility of who was to make First Communion not on the pastor, where it had resided in the enactments of Baltimore, but on the father of the child and the child's confessor.

The ACELP contained a number of articles and communications on this point. A number of pastors complained that "young assistants" were

149 Cf. Chapter i, n. 22.

150 John T. McNicholas, OP, "The Age of Children for First Communion," ER, XLII (October, 1910), 482-88; also Lambert Nolle, OSB, "A New Problem for Catechetics," CER, I (February, 1911), 126-36; Rev. Thomas Devlin, "Preparation in the Parish Schools of Children for First Holy Communion," CEAB, IX (November, 1912), 443-52. Father Charles P. Bruehl, later to be prominent in writing on religious instruction, found a tendency to make the new pre-First Communion Catechesis too brief and minimal (Salesianum, VI [April, 1911], 48-49). For essays on the religious education of little children before 1910, cf. CSJ I (January, 1902), 261; VII (December, 1908), 207-08 and (January, 1909), 239 [these last two articles are by Father Thomas Kinkead]; cf. also HM&C, II (March, 1902), 621-24 and VI (November to January), 171-75, 242-47, 317-30.

151 The bulk of this material appeared in the Ecclesiastical Review in various conferences and communication; cf. ER, XLIV (January, 1911), 76-79, 79-81, 81-85; XLVI (April, 1912), 477-80; XLVIII (January, 1913), 21-25. Some of the confusion here resulted from mistranslations in the decree as it had appeared in the ACELP where the term "pastor" had erroneously been used in place of the proper term "confessor."
undermining order in the parishes by seeking to implement the decree too literally. The fifth stipulation, while it places the responsibility of providing public or communal First Communion on the pastor, enjoins him to include those already admitted to the Eucharist by father and confessor in the general group. This fifth point of implementation with the fourth led to the institution of "private" and "solemn" First Holy Communion in that era. It would be an interesting point of research to determine just how widely the fourth stipulation was implemented in the American Church. It seems that whatever confusion originally existed was soon settled with the pastor still in control of the Eucharistic catechesis and who would be admitted to First Communion. The distinction between "private" and "solemn" First Communion remained theoretical in most parishes. The "private" First Communion envisioned by Quam Singulari was not implemented in the American Church until only recently. The age of seven years for initial reception, however, became the standard praxis of the American Church. The decree was likewise scrupulously fulfilled in that each child made his first Confession beforehand which created a difficult problem of instruction and preparation in religious education for many years. It is again only very recently that modifications have been made in the order of initially receiving these sacraments. It is a matter, however, that remains under serious discussion. Throughout Volume XVIII (1911), Catholic Fortnightly Review carried a number of pastoral letters and episcopal enactments which show the many loyal attempts made to implement Quam Singulari and solve some of the immediate difficulties caused by the decree. Another point emerges from an examination of these and other connected materials in the ACELP: while the tradition of the
Church also placed the reception of Confirmation at the "age of reason" or "discretion", the papal pronouncement had nothing to say on this. Some dioceses continued or adopted the practice, therefore, of not administering Confirmation until the age of twelve or upon graduation from the parish school, but other bishops forbade this kind of delay. At any rate, the decree of Pius X on First Communion had considerable effect on religious education. While before, the catechesis of children in the early grades could be given more leisurely; it now had to be given more fully and more intensively. Confirmation, formerly given adjacently to First Holy Communion, was now separated from it by at least several years. Where before the bulk of the catechesis had been aimed at preparation for the reception of the Eucharist, it would now be directed to preparation for Confirmation. Finally, the sixth stipulation of Quam Singulari caused religious education to stress frequent and even daily reception of the Eucharist as called for by Sacra Tridentina Synodus (cf. above) some five years before. This stress was especially effective in the American Church when dealing with younger children who did not possess whatever reluctance there may have been in the piety of adults toward frequent Holy Communion. A number of articles in the ACELP following the promulgation of Quam Singulari indicate the eager attempts to implement its sixth stipulation in the American Catechesis where, as we

152 Cf. ER, XLIII (December, 1910), 715-17; also CFR, XVIII (No. 4, 1911), 105 and (No. 11, 1911), 331, 332.

have seen in Chapter i, more frequent reception of the Eucharist had always been featured.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

By reading thus far, one can see the justice of the contention, made earlier in the chapter, that the 1900-15 period was an especially prolific one for the American Catechesis. From the viewpoint of the ACELP, the older journals published an increased amount of comment on Christian instruction, while some of the new ones were organized, in part at least, to promote religious education. This dual development must be regarded as the interacting cause and effect of greater catechetical concern within the American Church generally during that time. An examination of the comprehensive materials appearing in the ACELP, as done in this chapter, discloses the presence of three broad stances in the American Catechesis in the early decades of this century.

There were the old classicalists, still clinging to the inviolability of the catechism and the comprehensive memorization of its text with verbal perfection. Commonly found among the clergy and catechists, they resisted change in the method of religious instruction, being persuaded that the old way still worked best in the long run. Not that

---

reduction of the eucharist fast from midnight especially for children if Pius X realistically hopes to achieve frequent or daily Communion; for a number of articles and communications in regard to this article, cf. the Fortnightly Review, XIX (No. 11, 1912), 332-33; XX (No. 5, 1913), 141-43; also ER, XLIV (May, 1911), 597. During this period an extremely influential pamphlet in religious education by Francis Cassily, SJ, emerged entitled Shall I Be a Daily Communicant: A Chat with Young People, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1915). It was often mentioned in the ACELP; for a lengthy review, cf. FR XXII (no. 18, 1915), 558-62.
they were not in favor of explaining the catechismal text and having it understood, but for them its memorization (and retention) was the primary objective since this would provide a life-long basis for religious knowledge. The classicalist stance, however, lacked champions and in its pure form continuously lost respectability.

What this study terms progressive traditionalism came to dominate American Catholic religious education more between 1900-15. It was traditional in so far as it retained the catechism as the basis of religious instruction with a continued insistence on some memorization but progressive in so far as it strongly stressed greater explanation of the catechismal text and its enrichment with narrative, picture, hymn, poem, etc. Progressive traditionalism sought greater integration with catechism and bible history and liturgy but also with "secular branches of learning." Indeed, "co-ordination" was a key word. Certainly Father Peter C. Yorke was the most prominent of the progressive traditionalists, but there were other leaders in this stance such as Fathers Thomas F. Kinkead and Herman Joseph Heuser, as well as many other less known clergy, religious, and laity. The Baltimore Catechism, in spite of much criticism of its deficiencies by the progressive themselves, remained the common basis for the kind of explanatory and enriched instruction they attempted to give. The Yorke manuals and the Handbook for Teachers of the Sisters of St. Joseph (Chestnut Hill), among others, are primary examples of progressive traditionalism reduced to practice.

There were others, too, in this period who can be termed catechetical radicals. They, as the progressives, were greatly stimulated by the Bellord essays but more so. His strong attacks on the classical
method and his assault on the catechism greatly encouraged the radicals. They agreed with the progressive traditionalists on many points--such as enrichment and co-ordination--but they tended to set aside the catechism almost entirely, especially in the early grades, and to rely on other methods of instruction. In general, they were more psychologically-oriented and wished to bring religious instruction more in consonance with what they perceived to be the "laws of learning". Proponents of the Munich or Psychological Method can be included among the radicals; certainly the theory, method, and texts of Father Thomas Edward Shields were catechetically radical, although he would not be at all pleased to hear himself or his method categorized as radical. There was also a small minority of radicals who were opposed to any rigorous method (be it that of the classicalists, Shields or Munich) and sought only a free interplay of conversation between catechist and child. While progressive traditionalism was influenced to some extent by the radical emphasis on de-emphasizing memorization and the need for functional outcomes and behavioral changes through religious instruction, its adherents were chary of the radical stress on psychology. While the radical stance had its eloquent and scholarly proponents, it did not win substantial acceptance in the 1900-15 Catechesis. For many, its formulations were incomprehensible and its methods too complicated; for most its whole stance was too forsaking of tradition.

One thing that representatives of all these stances agreed upon was this: when religious instruction did not produce the results that were expected, it was (to use a modern phrase) not the message but the medium that was at fault. In criticizing catechetical outcomes, Bellord
made this especially clear and all religious educators—classicalists, progressive traditionalists, and radicals—followed along with him on this. There was dispute, however, within and between all stances on just what the outcomes of the Catechesis should be. It was and continues to be the same old question: should religious instruction be directed primarily to the "intellect" or the "will"; toward the increase of knowledge or a change in behavior; should it be characterized by rationalism or pietism? Whatever their disagreements, however, they all agreed that religion should be so taught that it would produce a love of God and Christian striving. As one of them put it: "the whole secret" of religious teaching "consists in establishing wishes in the heart of the pupil." 154

Toward the end of this period of ferment and criticism, Father Thomas Crumley, CSC, vice-president of Notre Dame University, contributed an essay to the Catholic World in which he apparently tried to save the Catechesis from some of the condemnation it had sustained. 155 He shows himself to be quite progressive but finds many of the recent criticisms of religious education in the American Church to have been "a little too free and a little too harsh." In going over some of them, he sees:

Another possible source of error in measuring the value of catechetical instruction arises from an overestimation of its purpose. If its purpose is conceived to be the turning out of infant apologists, child missionaries, precocious controversialists, or even youthful defenders of the faith, then our system has fallen short. If on the other hand its purpose is simply and solely, the personal sanctification of the child, then there is not so much room for adverse criticism.


As in all periods of history, there were those who seriously debated and anguished over the above stances, but many others suffered a bewilderment and inertia waiting for more official action. None was forthcoming from the American hierarchy in this period, but, as we have seen, the catechetical influence of the papacy was substantial between 1900-15. While certain enactments of Pope St. Pius X greatly supported catechetical activism in the United States and made substantial changes in the religious education of younger children, the pontiff's persistent reference to "the catechism" in his pronouncements can only be seen to have had the effect of re-enforcing loyalty to the catechism as the basis of instruction. In addition to this, Pius' strong condemnation of theological Modernism in this same period and his equally strong call for doctrinal integralism could only work against the radical stance that had arisen in the American Catechesis.

Clearly then, progressive traditionalism became dominant in American Catholic religious education during the 1900-15 period and it was to remain so for many decades to come.
CHAPTER V

CHANGING ASPECTS OF THE TRADITION
(1916-1930)

The American Catechesis in the 1916-1930 period was concerned with the problems of the catechismal text, the specific strengths and weaknesses of the Baltimore Catechism, the best method of teaching religion, the clarification of aims in a changing era, and, finally, the need to include new materials and stresses in the traditional catechetical content. Essays on all these points were published during the period.

The Catechesis and the ACELP

The bulk of catechetical material published in ACELP1 during the 1916-1930 period appeared in some five periodicals. As before, the problems of the catechismal text itself were often discussed by various contributors in Ecclesiastical Review (1889+).2 Catholic School Journal (1901-64) continued to present an interesting potpourri of shorter articles and items on religious instruction, largely directed to the

---

1The phrase "American Catholic English-Language Periodicals" is represented throughout this study by the abbreviation ACELP. The abbreviation, peculiar to this study, is used for purposes of brevity and exactness.

2Cf. Chapter iv, n.104. Many of these contributors were parish priests. (Hereinafter cited as ER.)
elementary level. More extensive essays on teaching religion, in the several levels of education, were regularly published in Catholic Educational Review (1911-69) and Catholic Educational Association Bulletin (1903+). A lively interest in catechetics was exhibited by the new Catholic School Interests (1922-38), which offered the grade school teacher many practical suggestions on how to enrich religious instruction by use of art-display, simple blackboard techniques, and classroom

As in the 1900-1915 period, "Leslie Stanton (a Religious Teacher)" continued to present a regular column on the teaching of religion and bible history. From 1919-22, "Catechism Teaching" by Rev. M. V. Kelly, CSB, appeared in each issue. Rev. Charles Bruehl, then professor at the Philadelphia Archdiocesan Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo (Overbrook) continued a regular feature on catechetics after 1924. Other authors contributed catechetical features from time to time. In 1930 the periodical changed its format and developed a somewhat more substantial approach under the editorship of Edward A. Fitzpatrick. (Hereinafter cited as CSJ.)

When Thomas Edward Shields died in 1921, the young Toledo priest George Johnson came to the Catholic University. Johnson frequently wrote for the CER; he contributed materials on the grade school Catechesis, some of which were based on the laboratory experiences of the Thomas Edward Shields School (St. Anthony Parish), Washington, D.C. Teaching religion in the high school was treated by Father William Russell, then of Columbia (Loras) Academy of Dubuque, and Dom Virgil Michel of St. John's Abbey, Collegeville (Minnesota). Father John Montgomery Cooper, appointed chairman of the newly organized Department of Religion at the Catholic University in 1920, contributed a number of essays on college religion. In the 1916-1930 period, a number of teachers in the field also sent in catechetical materials. Essays by the Irish-Australian priest John T. McMahon were printed in the journal after 1928. McMahon had taken some of his graduate education at the Catholic University and was for many years Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Perth, Australia. McMahon authored a very interesting book, for the period, viz., Some Methods of Teaching Religion (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1928).

The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, as before, was devoted principally to reproducing the papers and discussions of the Catholic Educational Association conventions. CEAB, following the Association, added the denomination "National" to its name in 1929. (Cited as NCEAB with the 1929 volume).
Only a small amount of catechetical material generally appeared in the older ACELP, viz., Ave Maria (1865-1959), Catholic World (1865+), Fortnightly Review (1894-1935), and American Catholic Quarterly Review (1876-1924). Truth (1894-1935), however, began to publish essays on the teaching of religion toward the end of the period. Among those periodicals founded after 1900, Homiletic and Monthly Catechist (1900+) gave up its catechetical purpose, but some continued interest in religious education was shown by Catholic Mind (1902+), Extension Magazine (1906+), and especially America (1909+).

In addition to Catholic School Interests, some other ACELP founded in the 1916-1930 period showed catechetical concern. Fordham University's Thought (1926+) provided a number of scholarly essays on religious education. Sign (1921+), published by the Congregation of

---

5 Catholic School Interests was first published at Oak Park, Illinois and then at nearby Elmhurst. (Hereinafter cited as CSIN). Cf. also below nn. 64-65.

6 Ave Maria, especially in the fall, continued editorials on the importance of religious education and several times within the 1916-1930 period published the catechetical pronouncements of the English Catholic hierarchy. Catholic World and American Catholic Quarterly Review continued to provide critical reviews of catechetical literature. The ACQR had never done more. Fortnightly Review contained brief catechetical essays on several occasions. (Hereinafter cited as FR).

7 Truth was founded and first published in North Carolina by Father Thomas Price who came to be a cofounder of Maryknoll. Price ceded Truth to the International Catholic Truth Society in 1912. It was then published in Brooklyn.

8 The periodical dropped "and Catechist" from its title with Volume XVIII (1917-18) but resumed some catechetical concern after 1922. After several changes, in 1925 the periodical assumed its present name Homiletic and Pastoral Review. (Hereinafter cited as HPR).
the Passion, gave careful book reviews of new catechetical texts and paracatechismal materials. *Acolyte* (1925+), a popular type of clerical journal, contained articles from time to time on the improvement of religious instruction. *Orate Fratres* (1925+), published by the Benedictine Monks of Collegeville (Minnesota), was devoted to liturgical revival and worked to promote liturgical education within the Catechesis. The lay-edited *Commonweal* (1924+) published some comment on religious education from time to time. *Catholic Rural Life* (1925+) expressed great interest in providing improved religious education to rural Catholics.

While most of the catechetical material appearing in the ACELP listed above is directed to the elementary school Catechesis, much of it also pertains to high school instruction. The population and number of Catholic secondary schools greatly increased in the 1916-1930 period. In previous chapters of this dissertation, ACELP material covering all phases of the American Catechesis has been surveyed and discussed, but discussion in the present chapter is confined to religious education in the grades. Father Xavier Harris has already very ably examined the secondary school Catechesis in this period.  

---

9 Edited by Msgr. Michael Andrew Chapman, who wrote under the by-line "Peregrinus Gasolinus." *Acolyte*, published by Our Sunday Visitor (Huntington, Indiana), was superseded by the *Priest* in 1945.

10 First edited by Dom Virgil Michel, its name was changed to *Worship* in 1951.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE CATECHISMAL TEXT

One of the first and most lasting concerns for a number of religious educators, in the 1916-1930 period, was the problem of catechism-reform. They were not opposed, as were some others, to the use of catechism in religious instruction, but they called for drastic changes in the wording of the catechismal text.

The first article on the question of catechism as a valid teaching tool was published in Catholic Mind; it was a reprint of a sermon given, in the old Cathedral of St. Paul, by Archbishop John Ireland.12 In his forceful and celebratory style, Ireland exalts the catechism as the primary instrument for adult religious education. Throughout his presentation, the great prelate articulates his strongly-felt need for an apologetically-prepared laity in the United States; for him, the continued study of the catechism by American Catholic adults is the most fruitful and immediate way to accomplish this. Ireland's panegyric of the catechism, however, unwittingly offered support to various anti-catechismal forces within the American Catechesis. They agreed that the catechism was an excellent instrument for adults, but for this very

reason it was inappropriate for the religious education of children. The call for catechism-reform made often enough previously, gathered strength in the 1916-1930 period.

Florence Magruder Gilmore, prominent in Catholic settlement work, began the assault on the Catechism, after 1916, in a special communication to the Fortnightly Review; there, she charges that the language of the Baltimore Catechism is a grave stumbling block to children of foreign-speaking parents. She pleads that those in authority recognize the need for simpler and more direct English in the authorized catechism. She judges this was especially necessary for the benefit of numerous boys and girls "who within their own homes hear only Italian or Hungarian or some East-European tongue; whose parents in many cases have fallen away from the practice of their religion, or never knew much about it and seldom mention it to their little ones." Whether she knew it or not, Miss Gilmore repeated some of the ideas so forcefully enunciated, but without much success, by Father Alexander L. A. Klauder in 1901.

---

13 For bibliographical sources related to many of the names mentioned in this dissertation, cf. Appendix B.

14 Florence Gilmore, "A Plea for a Simpler Catechism," FR, XXIV (December 15, 1917), 371-72. Cf. also ER, LXXVI (February, 1927), 169 and LXXVII (December 1927), 632-37. The ER contains many communications during this period concerning pastoral problems caused by the great influx of Italians into the American Church. The reader is reminded that the Baltimore Catechism is often referred to in this dissertation as the "BC" or simply "the Catechism."

Among those commentators who regularly called for reform of the Catechism, the most unyielding voice was that of Father M. V. Kelly, CSB. The Irish-Canadian Basilian did not present an original thrust in his many ACELP contributions, but he did write fluently, with zest and wit. Kelly first presented his ideas through a tripartite essay in Ecclesiastical Review. He explains, there, that he is not opposed to the catechismal method in itself, as some are; he opposes the prevailing practice of comprehensive memorization and especially the comprehensive memorization of unintelligible materials. Kelly repeats the ideas of Bishop Bellord whom he greatly admires and often quotes. As Bellord, Kelly appeals to his own experience to illustrate his points. He regards his experience, however, to be in no way unique but asks his readers if their own encounters do not match his. Every catechist, he asserts, has worked with slow-learning children who cannot memorize the catechism as they are obliged to do--an agonizing experience both for them and their teachers. Likewise, all have had experience with bright children who learn the texts perfectly but show, upon further questioning, they have no understanding of what they have so perfectly learned. Kelly challenges those religious educators who forcefully hold to comprehensive memorization of the catechism, on the classic grounds that what is memorized in childhood will be retained and be better understood.


\[17\] For Bellord, cf. Chapter iv, nn. 1-14ff. Bellord's ideas were quoted with frequency up to 1930 and beyond in the ACELP.
in adult life. "Just who remembers the catechism?" he asks and then continues:

From my own observation I have this fact to record. Among a number of teachers who some time ago were discussing the merits of Butler's Catechism, there were several who maintained the thesis that, despite the numerous unintelligible phrases in the catechism, the fact that these things were stored in the memory was an assurance of their being of value when recalled later on as the intelligence developed. The writer then asked these teachers whether they themselves had studied the Butler Catechism in their primary school days. They averred that not only had they done so but had for years used the same catechism in preparing the juniors of their college for First Communion and Confirmation. When there-upon one of the party took the liberty of inquiring how much of Butler's Catechism the teachers who had taken part in the discussion themselves actually retained, it was discovered that with one honorable exception the twelve or thirteen members of the company were actually unable to repeat a given number of answers in Butler's Catechism. 18

Another point that Kelly makes, in common with other catechismal reformers, is that religious education is supposed to produce religious behavior. Religious behavior is best produced by religious convictions, but such convictions cannot be produced by the memorization of sterile formulae. In connection with this, the Basilian offers a piece of satire that came to be quoted many times in succeeding years. What sensible mother, he wants to know, would teach courtesy to her children through a catechismal exchange like this:

Q. What should be the deportment of children permitted to remain in the drawing room when visitors are present?
A. The deportment of children permitted to remain in the drawing room when visitors are present should be reverential, genial, composed, and characterized by a becoming reticence.

Q. What is meant by reverential deportment?
A. By reverential deportment I mean a conscious and manifest respect for the dignity of those with whom we are permitted to associate.

18 Kelly, "Catechism Teaching," p. 43. Butler's catechism is discussed in the Introduction and Chapter i of this dissertation.
Q. How can children preserve a genial deportment?
A. Children can preserve a genial deportment by replying to all questions with a pleasing countenance, and in a manner free from perturbation and embarrassment.19

No, for Kelly the most necessary task facing religious educators is to clarify the material. He proposes to do this, as others had before him, by rewriting parts of the Catechism. He gives a number of examples of how he has redone certain units to ensure greater comprehension:

[Baltimore Catechism]
On account of the disobedience of our first parents we all share in their sin and punishment, as we should have shared in their happiness if they had remained faithful.

To make a sin mortal three things are necessary: a grievous matter, sufficient reflection, and full consent of the will.

Sacramental grace is a special help which God gives to attain the end for which He instituted each sacrament.

Persons of an age to learn should know the chief mysteries of faith and duties of a Christian, and be instructed in the nature and effects of this sacrament.

Q. From whom does the Church derive its undying life and infallible authority?
A. From the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth who abides with it forever.

[Kelly's revision]
If our first parents had not disobeyed God, we should be as they were before they sinned; since they disobeyed, we are made guilty of their sin and are punished for it as they were.

A sin is mortal when?
(1) When a person does something very bad, and (2) knows it is very bad, and notices what he is doing; and (3) is quite willing to do it.

Each sacrament was instituted to help the person receiving it in some particular way; this help is called sacramental grace.

Persons of an age to learn should know (1) what every Christian must believe; (2) what every Christian should do; (3) what Confirmation is and what it does for us.

Q. The Church will never come to an end, or ever teach anything false; how is it she has this power?
A. Because the Holy Ghost the Spirit of Truth is always with her. 20

19 Ibid., p. 41.
20 Ibid., 284. Cf. also Catholic School Journal, XX (June, 1921), 137-38, for additional examples of his revisions.
Kelly succeeded in having his revised catechism published in two editions, but like all rewritings of the Baltimore Catechism it had only very limited acceptance. The Canadian priest continued to present his ideas for catechism reform in the Catholic School Journal and Ecclesiastical Review. The Ecclesiastical Review also published other communications throughout the period which reflect Kelly's ideas and sometimes even his style.

Presbyter Septuagenarius

In 1927, for instance, a spate of communications, containing the Kelly thrust, filled the pages of Ecclesiastical Review, all assaulting the Baltimore Catechism. They ask a common question: Why has not something better been produced in the past forty years? Presbyter Septuagenarius, for instance, cannot reconcile himself to the fact that American Catholic religious education since 1885 has been overwhelmingly wedded to, what he regards as, an inferior tool, a pasted-together effort that took only a few weeks to produce. He

\[21\text{Cf. Kelly, Appendix F.}\]


\[23\text{Cf. below n. 91.}\]

\[24\text{Presbyter Septuagenarius, "Why Not Have a Better Catechism," ER, LXXVI (February, 1927), 165-74. The Latin pseudonym means "a priest in his seventies." This would place his ordination ca. 1880. On the use of pseudonyms in the ER, cf. Chapter iii, n. 60.}\]
charges that attempts to revise the BC--or even produce better catechisms--remain on the publishers' shelves, resolutely ignored by bishops, school-boards, and pastors. How different the situation would be, he muses, if the catechists were given their choice of text-book; they would soon throw out the BC. Instead, the teachers have not been consulted and all experimentation has been discouraged. What an utterly sterile situation to be in, he laments. Presbyter sums up his discontent in this way:

Our parish schools are using a catechism which no body of trained teachers would recommend. The religious training of our children is suffering by consequence. The great majority of our teachers would welcome a change. Recognizing this, several of our zealous clergy have endeavored to give us something better. Eminent authorities speak of their books in the highest terms. For some reason or other there seems to be little chance of any of these being admitted on school curriculums. Many take the stand that there should be no change until the very best possible is in existence. This is our fatal mistake; persisting in it means that the very best can never appear. It is the constant use of each improvement as it appears that makes something still better possible. While we are waiting, the progress of our children in religious knowledge is being seriously impeded. There should also be some consideration for our Catholic school teachers everywhere obliged to carry on the work with an inferior text book. 25

Continuing correspondence in Ecclesiastical Review greatly supported the charges of the Presbyter and generally agreed that the catechists should be given at least some choice in the catechetical materials they use. 26

---


Most of the correspondents adduced their own longtime experience as a credential for their opposition to the BC. The younger Father John A. O'Brien, just beginning his own long career in American Catholic letters, however, charged that one did not need much experience to see that the current catechetical scene ("one to make the angels weep," he says) is substantially due to the "gross ineptitude of the Baltimore Catechism." O'Brien felt certain that "its present barbarous form" will soon "become a relic of the past."\(^{27}\)

The correspondence of **Presbyter Septuagenarius** also occasioned Msgr. John T. Sharp of Brooklyn to investigate the origins of the Baltimore Catechism. His studies into the matter are discussed in Chapter i of this dissertation.\(^{28}\)

Another result of the **Presbyter** correspondence was the continuing charge that the 1885 catechism was not really a conciliar text, truly "enjoined" by the authority of the Third Plenary Council.\(^{29}\) Those who

---

the Choice of Catechism Is All Important," *ibid.*, LXXVII (September, 1927), 295-98. Several of these strongly reflect the ideas of Father M. V. Kelly (cf. above). Other articles and communications calling for a change of catechismal text to appear in ACELP during this period are: Rev. M. V. Kelly, "Why Are We Using an Inferior Catechism?" *ER*, LXXXI, (December, 1929), 621-23; Edward A. Fitzpatrick, "Wanted: A New Catechism," *CSJ*, XXX (June, 1930), 195-96. Cf. also Fitzpatrick below in n. 53.


\(^{28}\)Cf. Chapter i, nn. 82-85. Msgr. Sharp kindly responded to the inquiry of the present author that he had not been able to find the identity of the **Presbyter**.

held this view concluded that there was no general obligation to use
the BC; therefore the various ecclesiastical authorities should in no
way feel bound to continue to prescribe its use in the American Catechesis. This judgement, although presented forcefully, seemed to consti-
tute little threat to the "enjoined" character of the Catechism. The
American Archbishops addressed themselves several times, in their annual
meetings, to the question of a revision of the Catechism, thus, implicit-
ly at least, affirming its "enjoined" status. 30

The Catechism was not without its defenders in the ACELP of the
period, however; a number of commentators found it the best catechism at
hand, one needing no revisions if properly used, and the worthy subject
of some very unwise and unscientific criticisms. 31 Those progressive
traditionalists, such as Father Peter C. Yorke (cf. below), who worked
to enlarge and enrich catechismal method generally held that the instruc-
tional text was not the most important element in religious education

968-70 and "The Baltimore Catechism," (August, 1933), 1198-99; Rev. F.
A. Walsh [OSB], "Authorization of the Baltimore Catechism," ER, XCIV
(April, 1936), 414-15 and Rev. John K. Sharp, "Authorization of the Balti-
more Catechism," ibid., (May, 1936), 516-18; Rev. Joseph A. Newman,
"The So-Called Baltimore Catechism," Journal of Religious Instruction,
V (October, 1934), 125-29. Cf. also Chapter iii, n. 54, for one of the
original statements of the allegation.

30 Cf. Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," p. 581-
83; also Sister Mary Charles Bryce, "Influence of the Baltimore Cate-
chism," pp. 117-19. Sister Mary Charles also gives information on the
1941 revision of the Catechism, made under the auspices of the American
hierarchy (pp. 194-207).

31 Cf. e.g., F.S.B. "A Word for Our Catechisms," Fortnightly Re-
view, XXVI (April 1, 1919), 104-06; Rev. John A. Cummiskey, "The Cate-
chism in the Teaching of Religion," ER, LXIV (April, 1921), 395-99; Rev.
Henry S. Spalding, SJ, ER, LXV (July, 1921), 67; Rev. Joseph L. Heller,
"The Baltimore Catechism," ER, LXXVI (June, 1927), 651-62; "Scrip and
Staff," America, XXXI (October 1929), 619-20; Rev. J. J. Laux, "Feed
My Lambs," Commonweal, XII (August 6, 1930), 364-65; Rev. Charles Bruehl,
but rather how the skilled and trained catechist used the text. Most of this last group accepted the apparently inalterable fact that the BC was the authorized text and had to be worked with, whatever its pedagogical strengths and weaknesses. No matter what criticisms it continued to sustain and in spite of a number of alternate texts that were available, the Baltimore Catechism remained the major instructional material of the American Catechesis all during the 1916-1930 period.

THE THEORY OF TEACHING RELIGION

In the 1916-1930 period there were still some who held to the traditional or classical catechetical theory of comprehensive memorization of the catechismal text. For them, the stress was on "learning the catechism." Earlier in the period Father Thomas Edward Shields continued to propound his method of religious instruction which, in its positive thrust, had eliminated the use of the catechism in the primary grades. Some other writers in the ACELP continued to give him support.


32 The principal rival of the Baltimore Catechism in this period was Faerber's text (cf. Chapter 1, n. 97). Cf. also Linden and MacEachen in Appendix F.

33 The present author encountered no essays or communications in ACELP formally proposing this theory for use in the Catechesis of the period, but he did encounter references in other materials cited in this chapter which affirm that many clergy and catechists yet held strongly to the classical theory.


35 This would be especially true of articles in Catholic Educational Review by faculty and students of the Department of Education of
The dominant way of teaching religion in the period under discussion, however, was that of those whom the present author terms progressive traditionalists. They did not, of course, use the term in regard to themselves nor perhaps did many of them realize they belonged to a "school." They were traditionalists in their determination to keep the catechism as the basis of instruction but progressive in their efforts to enrich religious teaching beyond the limits of the question/answer units.

Father Peter Christopher Yorke

At the beginning of the period, Father Peter Christopher Yorke, the multi-talented San Francisco pastor, was yet the most articulate and representative proponent of progressive traditionalism. In 1918, he was invited to speak before the Catholic Educational Association convention on the teaching of religion. His address sets forth the basic

the Catholic University of America and the addresses given in this period before the Catholic Educational Association by diocesan superintendents, most of whom were CUA alumni. Most of these articles and addresses are cited below. Cf. also A. O. "The Practical Aims of Religious Teaching," Truth, XXX (March, 1930), 19-21. Cf. also Hannon in n. 68. For opposition to Shields in this period, cf. below nn. 37, 40.

36 Cf. Chapter iv, nn. 86-92, 98. Yorke (Appendices D-F) had been chiefly instrumental in producing the Textbooks of Religion series, seemingly the first modern text book designed for use in the American Catechism.

37 Rev. Peter C. Yorke, "The Teaching of Religion," CEAB, XV (November, 1918), 56-80. In commenting on Yorke's paper, Leslie Stanton (cf. above n. 3) found it such a refreshing contrast "to the unnatural Natural system advocated by some of our worthy institute lecturers who much learning has made injudicious," (CSJ, XVIII [January, 1919], 346). Stanton's comment was obviously a blast at Thomas Edward Shields. On the conflict between Yorke and Shields, cf. Chapter iv, nn. 92-99. The Jesuit educator and author Henry S. Spalding, in another anti-Shields
guidelines followed by progressive traditionalists in the 1916-1930 period. Yorke was then Pastor of St. Peter's Church, San Francisco, where 900 boys and girls were enrolled in the parish school. He had good opportunity to put his theories into practice and, for many teachers in the field, Yorke obviously spoke with authority. The western priest had addressed the CEA convention several times before and with great acceptance. He always covered a large span of material and seemingly loved to show his learning, but, when he got down to the specific topic at hand, he always gave something definite to take and use.

Yorke begins this particular address with a comprehensive listing of those basic religious truths which must form the subject core of Roman Catholic catechetical instruction. He does this, obviously, to underscore the need for some kind of catechismal text in religious education--one of his favorite themes. The San Francisco priest affirms he is all for pedagogical progress, but not at the cost of throwing out the reference, spoke unfavorably of religious education based on "nature studies drawn from robins and milkweeds," (ER, LXV [June, 1921], 67). Cf. below, n. 40.

38 Cf. Chapter iv, n. 88.

39 He follows the Jesuit moralist August Lehmkuhl (1834-1918) in this listing. Such a listing was also given by the noted Redemptorist moralist Francis J. Connell, early in his career, in "Theological Points for Catechetical Instruction," ER, LXX (April, 1924), 337-43. Considerations such as Connell's could have been of interest only to scholars, certainly not to the majority of catechists or to the proverbial "busy pastor." Other less scholarly presentations on the topic of what should be taught in the Catechesis were prepared by Day (cf. above n. 12) and Rev. B. H. Connelly, CSSR, "Religion for the School: The First Communion Class," CSJ,XXX (June, 1930), 208-11. The theological critique of catechisms continued in this 1916-30 period, as in previous decades; cf. e.g., [Rev. Herman Joseph Heuser], "The Christian Brothers' Course of Religious Instruction," ER, LXXV (September, 1926), 294-305. For other articles on catechetical content, cf. CER,XXVI (May-June, 1928), 267ff, 372ff, and XXVII (January, 1929), 47ff.
catechism. In an obvious allusion to Shields, Yorke maintains that doctrinal formulations cannot be replaced, in the religious education of children, by extensive examples from biology and zoology nor by use of the Socratic method. The need for catechism is implicit in the more basic need for creed. He protests:

The Catholic respect, therefore, for the form of sound words and the Catholic distrust for heretical inaccuracy, not mental sluggingishness nor fear of progress, is the reason why we need the catechism in religious instruction when it has been abandoned in secular subjects. We must realize the teaching of catechism devolves upon others besides priests and teachers. Parents and guardians, and all in charge of children are bound to teach it personally or by others and an authoritative elementary manual containing the things to be taught and cast in the form of question and answer will always be necessary.

For Yorke, authority is the basis of Catholic teaching and "the method of catechism is the method of authority."

Having safeguarded the place of the catechism, the San Francisco educator, however, points out that the textbook is not the most important element in religious education; the most important element is the teacher--another of his favorite themes. Yorke finds too much emphasis in American education generally on the textbook. In the Catechesis too, some blame all their failures on the pedagogical inadequacies of the Baltimore Catechism. This is all wrong for Yorke. The Third Plenary Council summary is like any textbook; it has its strengths and

40 In the history of the Catechesis, certain religious educators who accepted an idealist epistemology favored the use of the Socratic method in teaching religion. Epistemological realists like Yorke opposed them on the basis that religious truth was revealed and extrinsic to man's consciousness; religious truth could not be educed from the mind, rather it had to be put into the mind. Cf. above n. 37.


42 Ibid., p. 65.
weaknesses, but its disabilities can be dealt with appreciably by using graded and vocabulary-added editions. 43 But, again, it is how the teacher uses the Catechism that is all important:...

...we must remember that in the catechesis the catechism is only a tool and a guide, and that the real work is done by the oral instruction. The ideal of the catechesis is that the minds of the teacher and of the pupil must be in perfect tune. The teacher not only propounds the doctrine, but illustrates it, analyzes it, puts it one way now, another way again, and uses in fact every device of the teaching art, even as our Lord Himself instructed His disciples. Then by means of frequent questions the catechist holds their attention, clears their misapprehensions, systematizes their thoughts, insists on the form of sound words, and, finally, as all teaching consists in getting the pupil's mind to work for itself, encouraging the use of questions from the pupil's side to meet his difficulties and round out his knowledge. 44

For Yorke, the catechist must use all the resources of her personality and teaching experience to activate the child toward understanding, accepting, and living religious truth. As he says above, "the ideal of the catechesis is that the minds of the teacher and the pupil must be in perfect tune." The achievement of this kind of harmony takes plenty of work and experience. The catechist must rely strongly on the vivid and the concrete—things that will appeal to the child. She should have many interesting and illustrative stories at hand. Over the years, she should amass her own collection of "pictures, old Christmas cards, advertising specimens, clippings from catalogues, magazines, and newspapers, dolls dressed to show the vestments, postals, crayons and a

43 Cf. Baltimore Catechism in Appendices D-F. Yorke finds equally difficult terms in Arithmetic and Geography. Yorke consistently affirmed the study of catechism and bible history increased the student's vocabulary. A number of commentators agreed with him on this; cf. for instance, Grattan Kerans, "A By-Product of Catechism," America, XXXV (May 1, 1926), 61-62.

score of other things."  

But even more necessary than these is her "notebook" in which, after the school day, she has set down those valuable thoughts, illustrations, and the "way to put it" that have come to her "in the white heat of teaching." She would find these recorded flashes of insight invaluable in preparing future classes covering the same material, especially on those days when "the spark isn't there."

As before, however, Yorke is not content with merely enriching the catechism. He again emphasizes the need of correlation between religion and all other subjects of the curriculum. Above all, there must be strong integration between catechism and bible history.

In making most of the above points, Father Yorke was setting forth nothing really new. He and others had said it all before. He was enunciating, of course, the tenets of progressive traditionalism:

a) need for a catechismal text to provide the basis of instruction and ensure religious orthodoxy, b) the essentially active role of the catechist, c) use of multiple techniques and materials to enrich the catechism, d) strong integration with bible history, and e) correlation with other subjects of the curriculum.

Memorization and the Catechism

In the development of his 1918 essay, however, Yorke did indicate certain changing emphases in catechetical method. This is especially true in regard to the memorization of the question/answer units of

---

46 Ibid.
the catechism. Midway in his comments, he takes up that problem:

There is another question connected with the catechism which you may well ask me. Should we require the children to memorize the answers word for word? Here, as you know, there is a difference of opinion as to the theory and a difference in practice. It is not necessary to go into the reasons for and against, because, as a matter of fact, the wise superior will find out what the pastor wants and will govern her conduct accordingly. This much, however, I would advise, that where there are several priests teaching or examining the children they should be asked to have one system. If the word for word test is required all should require it; if it is not required, then no individual should insist on it.

In the opinion of the present author, Yorke's question and resolution regarding memorization indicate marked change. Yorke himself frequently asserted that he personally was wedded to no one theory in religious education but it is significant nonetheless that he should show himself so permissive in this regard. The proponents of the traditional or classical theory of religious education required comprehensive, if not total, memorization of the catechism. The Sulpician Method, in which progressive traditionalism had its roots, was strong on memorization. Although the Munich Method in its earliest forms did not call for memorization of catechism, its adaptation in the United States made it amenable to such memorization. In 1901, on the other hand, Bishop Bellord had called for drastic reduction of verbatim recitation in religious education, with considerable affect. Several years later Father Shields eliminated the catechism entirely from the lower grades in his theory of primary education, and restricted memory work only to

47 Ibid., p. 70.
48 Cf. Chapter iii, n. 56.
50 Cf. Chapter iv, nn. 1-14ff.
that material that was completely comprehensible to the child. Now by 1918, Yorke takes notice that there is much disagreement within the Catechesis on just how much of the catechism should be memorized. Scattered comments in the ACELP of this period indicate some younger priests trained in American seminaries and teaching Sisters educated at Sisters College (Catholic University) or state universities or local normal schools were actively opposed to emphasis on memorization in religious education. Certainly, various essays emanating from the Department of Education at the Catholic University, and appearing in the Catholic Educational Review, through the 1916-1930 period, are anti-memorization. The addresses of various diocesan superintendents before the Catholic Educational Association (cf. below) express the same thrust, if more guardedly. Most of the superintendents by this time had been educated in Washington. Father Edward Johnson (cf. below), who followed Shields at the Catholic University, was a leader in the anti-memorization forces. Johnson was a gentle man, not given to caustic expression in his writings, but in one of his first ACELP contributions he shows the strength of his feeling against memorizing catechism, with this bit of satire:

How much of the lack of interest among our people in sermons, religious books, and the like, is due to some form of religious indigestion, occasioned by the fact that, when as "new-born babes" they sought milk, they were given roast beef from some theologian's table.  

51 Cf. Chapter iv, nn. 82ff.

52 "Notes on the Teaching of Religion," CER, XXIV (October, 1926), 460. He makes indirect reference here to I Cor 3:1-3. Johnson was not too satisfied with some aspects of the progressive traditional method; in the essay quoted here (pp. 459-60), he remarks:

"Present a formula; elucidate it; drill it into the memory. To insure attention and to make the process as pleasant as possible, a
Some authors agreed with Johnson's position and by the end of the period a new kind of religion text appeared that did not include nor refer to material from the Catechism, as for instance Yorke's textbooks had. These former volumes were the work of Mother Bolton and the Franciscan Sisters of Christian Charity of Manitowoc (Silver Lake), Wisconsin. Others followed, but demand for some memorization of the catechismal text remained dominant in the period.

Some religious educators after 1920 regarded the Sower Scheme as a reputable compromise on the memorization question. Devised for use in the Archdiocese of Birmingham, England, by Father F. H. Drinkwater, it came to be used widely in that country. The Sower Scheme made no use of the Penny Catechism in the infant school (for ages five to seven), stressing rather narrative and experience; the catechism was used as a few stories, some pictures, a stereopticon. Result--information carried along in the memory, with little assurance of real understanding, and very meager possibility that the memorized formula will ever function in the thinking of the learner."

The positive thrust of Johnson's position was to create a Christocentric mentality in the student through meaningful experiences. Cf. below nn. 70-84.


54 On the Penny Catechism, cf. the Introduction, nn. 75-95.
textbook with children aged eight to eleven, but the Scheme called for the memorization of only 100 out of the 400 Penny Catechism question/answer units. Father Drinkwater continued to advance his ideas in the English catechetical journal Sower which was received and read in the United States, as well as through his published works; after 1930 a number of his essays on religious education were published in ACELP. Some attempts were made to adapt the Sower Scheme in this country in certain editions of the Baltimore Catechism and others, where only certain major units were marked for memorization. It is difficult to ascertain, however, how commonly such an arrangement was used here.

The value and necessity of memorizing the catechism remained a disputed point in the American Catechesis for more than two decades beyond 1930.

Other Commentators on Catechetical Theory

A body of essays and communications appeared in the ACELP during the 1916-1930 period further discussing such points as Father


Yorke set forth in his 1918 essay. Similar guidelines for religious education theory were developed in other addresses given before the Catholic Educational Association throughout the period by McCormick, McGlancy, Lamb, Wolfe, and Sharp. Progressive traditionalism...
received a great ally in the new periodical Catholic School Interests (1922-38). Many ongoing features in the magazine and the writings of Cummiskey, Mattimore, and LeSage were all directed toward enriching the Catechism. Religious educators of all stances stressed the use of the narrative hymn, poem, etc. in the catechetical effort. Although which is a classic example of progressive traditionalism at work in this period. For more of Sharp's work, cf. above nn. 28-30.

63 Cf. above n. 5.


attention was directed in the period to the educational use of the phonograph and film, the literature indicates only a small development of such materials for use in the Catechesis. 

Greater Recognition of Student Needs

In his 1918 address, discussed above, Father Yorke indicated the importance of paying greater attention to student's needs. Progressive traditionalism had always stressed the creative role of the teacher. It had likewise recognized student needs in graded and vocabulary-added editions of the Catechism plus its general emphasis on making religious instruction "interesting." In 1918, Yorke said that "the minds of the teacher and the pupil must be in perfect tune," but, for this to be, the teacher must become as a "little child." He did not develop this greatly, but after 1920 one often reads in ACELP of "student needs," the "capacity of the learner," the importance of

[Sister Rose Eileen continued the series with Munich catecheses]. For other references to the Method in this period, cf. above nn. 64, 65, 67. The Munich catecheses of Bairel (cf. Appendix E-F) were widely used. The ACELP of the period contain many articles on teaching hymns and Gregorian Chant to children.


67 Cf. above nn. 37ff.

"assimilation," and "differences" among students. Commentators on method came to stress "objective teaching," the "project method," and most characteristically "self-activity." It was affirmed by these educators that the action and participation of the student, required by these techniques made the religion lesson not only more interesting but also more integrative with the rest of his education and more personal to his own interests and creative talents. The idea of the vivid and the concrete had been stressed by the progressive traditionalists early in the century and among the more progressive there had always been the

69 Educational psychology continued its slow advance in catechetical theory during the period. From 1916, there are increasing references in ACELP to psychology and religious education in the various essays and comments. More formal discussions of the subject can be found in these writings: Sister M. Generose, OSF, "The Principle of Adjustment as Embodied in Christ's Method of Teaching," CSJ, XX (April, 1920), 14-15; Judith F. Smith, "Value of Instincts in Religious Education," CER, XXVI (March, 1928), 163-69; Father John M. Wolfe contributed a series on "Idealism in Culture, Conduct, and the Religious Motive," in CSJ, XXVII and XXVIII (1927 and 1928) and a series on "Lasting Habits, Attitudes, and Practices and the Affective Results of Religious Instruction" in CSJ, XXVIII (1928), also "The Process of Analysis and Synthesis in Relation to the Teaching of Religion," CER XII (October, 1924), 463-71. O'Brien (cf. above n. 27) contributed an essay on how psychological and statistical measurement could be used in the Catholic school. Cf. also below, n. 76, on Montessori. A number of studies emerged from the Catholic University in the 1916-1930 period on psychology and religious education (cf. Rev. Maurice Sheehy, A Decade of Research at the Catholic University of America: List of Research Projects and Writings of Professors and Students, the Catholic University of America, during the Past Decade: 1921-1930, [Washington: Catholic University, 1931], pp. 14-41, 150-51).

call to have students "do things." The greater stress in education generally for "self-activity" in the 1920's fitted in very well with progressive traditionalist theory on the teaching of religion. Concepts of "self-activity" could be agreed upon both by pro and anti-catechismal forces.

All in all, catechetical theory generally began to pay greater attention to student needs in the 1916-1930 period.

THE OBJECTIVES OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The objectives of religious education have always been seen as related to practical outcomes, e.g., to give knowledge of religious truth, to ready the child for the reception of the sacraments, to make him a more religious person both in the "now" and in the future or, in fine, a "practical Catholic" for all his life long. It will be noted that some of these objectives are capable of more proximate realization while others are only more distantly achieved; this situation has always led to some confusion of priorities in catechizing. We have seen in previous chapters that religious educators have often expressed considerable distress over what they referred to as "leakage" from the Church or "collapses of adult life." They were especially distressed when defections occurred among those who had received regular religious instruction in their childhood. Such educators were convinced, to use contemporary categories, that there could be nothing wrong with the "message" of the Catechesis; it could be only the "medium" that was defective. After World War I, this kind of concern was often expressed in catechetical writings found in ACELP. References were increasingly made to
developing changes in American life, viz., the once "restricted environment" of the child was passing away, family and community controls were waning, the radio and cinema were exercising a powerful and often baneful influence, many of the old stabilities were vanishing, etc.

For these reasons, it was concluded religious instruction must be made more life-related, more oriented to future outcomes, more determined to help build (with God's Grace) the "virtue of religion" in the child.

During the period, there was a number of suggestions of how this could be effected. While suggestions varied, all agreed that the Catechesis had given enough attention to intellectual formation; now, it must place greater emphasis on the experiential.

Religious Education and the Liturgy

In his 1918 essay, Father Yorke had said:

According to the best pedological practice, they [children] learn by doing. Good conduct must be established, the sacraments must be frequented, Mass must be attended, prayers must be said regularly, and according to their age, all those habits and practices must be inculcated that in after years will be the mainstay of an upright life.\textsuperscript{71}

Yorke, for one, thought this last and continuing outcome could be produced by good devotional and liturgical experiences in childhood. He vividly showed how to accomplish this, placing strong stress on the integration of liturgical instruction in the classroom with the "Children's Mass" on Sundays and holydays.\textsuperscript{72} Other religious educators proposed

\textsuperscript{71}Cf. above n. 37.

\textsuperscript{72}Rev. Peter C. Yorke, "Teaching of Liturgy in the Elementary School," CEAB, XIV (November, 1917), 270-85. Yorke gives the outline of what later came to be known as the "Dialog Mass." His article is most
the same and similar ideas. The American Church also witnessed the beginnings of what came to be called the "liturgical movement." Those devoted to this revival were strongly interested in integrating liturgy and catechism. They, too, saw liturgy not only as cultic interesting (cf. also Chapter iv, n. 113). One wonders where he got his ideas for this particular kind of Mass participation. Not all religious educators, however, shared Yorke's enthusiasm for the "Children's Mass." The Basilian M. V. Kelly was especially unhappy with this widespread practice. He predicted it created a "specialized situation" from which there would be only minimal carry-over to the post-school years. Cf. Rev. M. V. Kelly, "School Children Assisting at Mass," CSJ, XXI (December, 1921), 239-30 and "Children's Attendance at Mass," CSJ, XXI (January, 1922), 377-78. Kelly often criticized the "Children's Mass" in his various essays.


action but as the most continuous form of religious education in the life of the Catholic. The first ACELP references to the work of Maria Montessori appear in the 1920's and are specifically related to her work with children through liturgy. Those who were persuaded of the necessity and importance of "self-activity" in religious education (cf. above) were also friendly to liturgical integration since so many visual, concrete, and active kinds of things could be done in connection with this.

Msgr. George Johnson

Father Thomas Edward Shields had been greatly concerned with the long-range outcomes of religious education. He had struggled to institute a system that would carefully fit the developmental nature of the child, a religious education that would be compatible with the progressing needs of the child and not one that would be rejected as alien by

Mass to Children," OF, III (September 8, 1929), 353-364; Sister Rose Estelle, OP, "Liturgy and Religious Instruction in the Grades," OF, V (December 28, 1930), 64-69. Orate Fratres also contains communications sent in from clergy and educators which contain information on what was being done locally to impart liturgical education; some of these correspondents, as Bussard and Durand above, were graduates of The Saint Paul Seminary (Minnesota) and show the influence of Father William Busch, professor there since 1917 and, with Dom Virgil Michel, one of the founders of the Liturgical Movement in the United States. There are also a number of articles in the ACELP of the period on teaching children plain or Gregorian Chant for increased participation in the liturgy.

his nature. While a number agreed with what Shields called for, they found his system, to the point he had worked it out, too confusing for use. His textbooks were used less and less in this period, but Father George Johnson kept reflecting and developing his basic ideas. Johnson, as we have seen, took an anti-memorization stance and was greatly devoted to the experiential in catechetical teaching. He frequently wrote that the "ideo-motor theory of ideas" and "Herbartianism" had been greatly overdone in education. For Johnson, changing behavior and affecting conduct was at least as important as giving information. As other commentators in the period, Johnson thought the traditional apologetic stress in the teaching of religion was distortive. Religious education needed as its most primary goal the positive creation of a Christo-centric mentality in the child; this could best be done by offering him authentic experiences in true Christian living. Johnson was always careful to point out that this effect could be achieved only with "help of God's Grace," but the teacher must do her best to work in this direction. "After all," he frequently asserted "the best apologetic is a virtuous life." Johnson also found the liturgy a powerful teaching tool and was eager that children should be taught not just to

77 Cf. above n. 34.
78 Cf. above n. 37; also Chapter iv, nn. 106-07.
79 Cf. above n. 4.
80 Cf. above n. 52.
81 Cf. e.g. "Notes on the Teaching of Religion," CER, XXV (November, 1927), 562-66.
82 Ibid., 565.
recite prayers but truly to pray and even to meditate. He thought religious education should teach them true asceticism; this would really help to ensure their "practical Catholicism." The Catholic University educator often gave suggestions of how to do this. 83 He was also greatly concerned, however, in giving the children more freedom to make their own personal choices and determinations. He judged this freedom had a great deal to do with religious outcomes:

The quality of classroom discipline insisted upon has much to do with the problem. Where there is stern and unyielding regimentation and absence of freedom, there is no chance for any real character formation, let alone growth in holiness. Self-sacrifice imposed from without is not self-sacrifice at all. At its best, it is martyrdom. It usually develops hatred and distrust for everything implied in the situation. But a classroom organized on the basis of Christian charity, a classroom that exhibits all the informal good order of the home, a classroom where teacher and pupils live together and work together on the basis of comradeship and loving common interest, will offer countless opportunities for little acts of self-denial, of mutual helpfulness, of sacrifice that will contribute beautifully to the development of personal holiness. We are dealing here with the counsels, not the precepts, and the spirit of the counsels is not born of compulsion. 84

Msgr. Johnson continued his efforts to vitalize the teaching of religion and bolster the grade-school curriculum with Christian principles until


his sudden death in 1948.

Communicating the "Social Sense."

In the 1920's a number of religious educators stressed communicating a "social sense" to the children. They commonly complained that American Catholic religious instruction was much too concerned with the salvation and perfection of the individual; much greater stress should be placed on social obligations of justice and charity; more attention, paid to "our neighbor."

One of the most forceful and practical expositions of this thrust appeared in Catholic School Journal in a 1920 essay written by Paulist J. Elliot Ross.85 In it, Ross warns catechists to be cautious not to teach a Catholicism devoid of social obligation for this would surely be "an emasculated Catholicism." He gives a number of examples of how children in the grades can be given experiences that will build a social conscience. While many of these experiences require the performance of but small and simple kindnesses, Ross maintains they demand sacrifice and self-discipline from the child. The Paulist expresses great confidence that the repetition of such constructive experiences will engender habits of justice and charity in the young Christians. These same children, later in life as voters, will be called upon to make decisions on "minimum wage laws, social insurance, model housing" etc. For Ross, only early experiences in being just

85Rev. J. Elliot Ross, "Teaching Religion," CSJ, XX (December, 1920), 301-02. The article is of contemporary interest. Holding a Ph.D. degree, Ross was active in working with Catholic students on state campuses. His thought was advanced and controversial according to several of his Paulist contemporaries contacted by the present author.
and charitable will offer suitable background for a "social conscience" in later life. He also judges that "friendly rivalry" that is so often fostered in the classroom and school at large is grossly antithetical to social consciousness.

Nova Scotian Father John R. MacDonald contributed a deeply theological essay to Ecclesiastical Review, demonstrating how social and public consciousness in an authentic correlative of almost every chapter in the catechism. He pleaded for the inclusion a number of "social consciousness" units in the Baltimore Catechism. Frequent reference was made to the need for building a "social sense," in other addresses and ACELP communications published during the period. In material related to grade school Catechesis in this period, the present author encountered no specific reference to racial justice as such. As compelling as some of these statements on "social consciousness" were, they cannot be said to have constituted a major thrust in the Catechesis at this point.


88 Msgr. John Montgomery Cooper included material on the moral dimensions of the "colored problem" in his college religion texts (cf. Appendix E).
Additional Catechetical Aims

While all religious educators who wrote in the period acknowledged the imperative of stressing supernatural values in the Catechesis, a number also felt that the so-called "natural virtues" were not stressed enough. They almost give impression that oftentimes non-Catholics are more ethical in matters of "truthfulness," or "honesty," or "honor," or "fair-play," although no statistical evidence or studies are adduced on such a point. These educators, therefore, called for more "character education" in Catholic religious instruction. They, of course, were committed to the "virtue of religion" objective, so stressed by Johnson and others (cf. above), but they had a special dedication to evoke a down-to-earth, "every day kind of morality," in the children, as well. This is, of course, another example of where Catholic religious educators reacted to a contemporary stress in American public education.

In this period, increasing attention was also paid to developing a "missionary spirit" in young Catholics. Emphasis was placed on creating knowledge of the missions which would lead to prayer and financial support. The mission thrust fitted in well with "social sense" and "Mystical Body of Christ" concepts then being accented. The mission material greatly stressed the basic doctrine of the "Universal Church."

---


Some discussion also appeared in the ACELP on the question of sex education in Catholic schools. The prevailing Catholic viewpoint, however, maintained that sex education was the responsibility of the home; if any reference were made to the subject in the school, it must be made strictly within the context of Catholic morality.

Throughout the 1916-1930 period, religious educators complained of the "overcrowded curriculum," the result of the many demands made on the school by society. The Basilian commentator Father M. V. Kelly, on the other hand, was particularly emphatic in criticizing the parochial school for too readily assuming, or perhaps even usurping, parental responsibility for the religious education of the child. For this reason he charged Catholic education practiced its own form of "Bolshevism" toward the family. Other contributors to the ACELP also stressed that

A. Thill, "Mission Study in the Schools," CEAB, XXII (November, 1925), 355-66; Msgr. R. Sevens, "Mission Work in the Schools," CSIN, VII (June, 1928), 160; Rev. Paul E. Campbell, "Religion in the School, NCEA, XXVII (November, 1930), 483-92. The Catholic Students' Mission Crusade (CSMC) and the Association of the Holy Childhood were particularly active in fostering mission education and support in the Catholic schools. Each organization published a magazine and posters. The CSMC later developed curricular materials.


93 Rev. M. V. Kelly, CSB, "Catechism Teaching: 'Bolshevism,'" CSJ, XX (December, 1920), 329-30. Cf. above n. 92. Kelly's essays on this subject were separately printed by McGough of Grand Rapids and received a rather wide circulation.
one of the aims of religious education should be to see that it begins
and continues in the home.

PAPAL CATEchetical ACTION

Pope St. Pius X had set a high point in papal catechetical
action, but his successors Benedict XV and Pius XI showed concern for
religious education as well. Pope Benedict, even amid the grave prob-
lems he faced during World War I, expressed a desire to unify catechetical
instruction throughout the Catholic world. He had been interested in this
project while yet Archbishop of Bologna. Benedict judged that a uniform
catechism would be one of the ways by which his objective could be
achieved. Seemingly, a number of catechetical theologians were invited
to Rome to work on the catechism-project. Many saw in the papal action
a desire to fulfill the call of the First Council of the Vatican for a

---


95 Cf. Chapter iv, nn. 125ff. In 1917 the new Code of Canon Law (Codex juris canonici) was promulgated by Pope Benedict XV; the new code took effect in 1918. The great revision of church law, however, was initiated and largely accomplished in the pontificate of Pius X. The new pope, however, had greatly worked on the formulation of the Code. Canons 1329-36 are concerned with catechetical instruction. The footnotes to the canons show the previous legislation (from the eighteenth century only) on which the new law is built; the documents of Pius X are frequently mentioned. Since the catechetical canons added nothing new to what had been previously required, there was little discussion of them among religious educators. An explanation of the catechetical canons of the new law did not appear in the ACELP until Rev. Stanislaus Woywood, OFM, "Law of the Code: The Preaching of the Word of God," HPR, XXVII (January, 1927), 423-25.
universal catechism. The Roman activity was reported in the ACELP in 1918 by Father Roderick MacEachen, author of catechetical literature and soon to be Professor of Catechetics at the Catholic University. Apparently, MacEachen had participated in some discussions on the catechism-project while teaching in Rome. Other ACELP contributions commented on his report. Nothing concrete, however, seems to have come from Pope Benedict's desire on this question.

Pope Pius XI in 1923 issued a motu proprio generally referred to as Orbem Catholicum which was reported in the ACELP. It called for schools of religion on the secondary and higher level. The thrust of Orbem Catholicum was directed at European countries where religious schools had been secularized. The Catholic schools of the United States more than fulfilled what the Pope sought; consequently, the motu proprio caused little stir here. In 1930, Pius XI issued his encyclical Divini illius magistrati which became a modern magna carta of Catholic

---


97 "The New Catechism of Benedict XV," Fortnightly Review, XXV (June 11, 1918), 165; cf. also McCormick in n. 58. There were a number of other brief ACELP references to MacEachen's essay.


99 Motu proprio de christianae doctrinae institutione toto orbe Catholico ordinanda, ER, LXIX (September, 1923), 279-81.; "Pius XI and the Promotion of Christian Education," ibid. 281-82.
Education. The extensive letter, however, does not contain a great deal on religious instruction as a separate discipline. Several of the Roman congregations, however, issued catechetical mandates to the local ordinaries during the 1916-1930 period.

PREPARATION OF THE CATECHIST

As we have seen throughout this study, the straight use of the catechism did not necessarily require a greatly active or particularly well-educated teacher. In the classical method of teaching religion, the catechism is the thing. This primary emphasis on the instructional text in teaching religion led to the conviction that better catechisms would lead to better catecheses. As religious educators came to the conclusion that the straight use of the catechism no longer met the needs of the student in rapidly changing times, a much more active role was assigned to the catechist. We have seen this development in previous chapters of this dissertation. During the 1916-1930 period, emphasis on the active role of the catechist became more and more pronounced. A reviewer in Ecclesiastical Review, probably its editor Father Herman Joseph Heuser, observed:

100 "Encyclical Letter on the Christian Education of Youth," ER, LXXXII (April, 1930), 337-72. The encyclical was printed in many different sources. Under Pius XI another papal catechetical directive was issued in 1935, viz., Provido sane concilio; cf. ER, XCI (July, 1935), 49ff.

...the greatest factor in the matter of teaching the catechism in our parish and Sunday schools is the personality of the teacher. A pastor who carefully selects the Brother or Sister or the girl who helps in religious instruction class on Sundays does much more for the upbuilding of religion in the parish than the priest who worries about the defects of the textbook....

This opinion was very much in line with the thinking of Father Peter C. Yorke who, as the most representative protagonist of progressive traditionalism, placed the teacher first and foremost in the Catechesis. Those anti-catechismal forces represented by Father George Johnson had even greater need for a prepared catechist. Johnson had high expectations of the teacher of religion. He expressed this in one of his first columns on religious education in the Catholic Educational Review:

It should be the purpose, then, of the teacher of religion, as the official representative of Christ and the Church to inculcate the truth, the eternal, infallible truth concerning all things that are necessary for salvation. Moreover, it is his responsibility to present this truth in such manner that its beauty, its loveliness, its infinite satisfactoriness, will be revealed to the learner, that his heart and will may be set on fire with love. Thus there will be created in him, with the assistance of divine grace, a desire for all that the truth implies, for the possession of the delights of the House of God as they have been revealed by His Only-begotten Son.

At the end of the 1916-1930 period, Father William T. Kane of Loyola University of Chicago, humorously but still seriously, summed up the needed qualifications of the catechist in this way:


103 Cf. above nn. 36-47.

104 For Johnson, cf. above nn. 70, 79-84. Johnson greatly stressed the professional preparation of the religious teacher through his career. He was always careful to point out the need to develop catechetical skills in this wider preparation.

...a really competent teacher of Christian Doctrine should be, at one and the same time, a saint, a theologian, a sound psychologist, a skilled instructor, a high-pressure salesman, and what is colloquially called 'a glutton for work.' You will see that to prepare a Sister or Brother to be all that is something of a task. 106

The ACELP, however, does not contain much information on what was then being done to prepare the catechist. From the 1890's we know the Catholic Summer Schools and various institutes were designed in large measure for teacher preparation. 107 After 1911 a number of Catholic universities and colleges organized summer sessions and evening divisions. 108 Many parochial school teachers used these opportunities to complete their college education. There were also a number of diocesan normal schools or teachers' colleges. 109 Many religious orders established colleges for the education of their own members. It would be an interesting point for further research to determine just how many ex professo courses on the teaching of religion were offered by these various institutions. The ACELP articles that did appear in this period on catechist preparation yield some data.

Campbell, for instance, commented on a dissertation by Sister Mary Antonia Durkin on The Preparation of the Religious Teacher. 110 Sister


107 G. F. Donovan, "Summer Schools, Catholic," NCE, XIII, 792. Cf. also Chapter iii, nn. 64ff.


Mary found in her studies that the teacher of religion in the late 1920's desired to be given:

1. True knowledge of the fundamentals of her religion,
2. True knowledge of self and self-discipline,
3. Fundamental knowledge of the child nature, and mind, and its workings,
4. A basic education sufficient to serve as a background for the subject-matter to be taught,
5. Some ideas of method and class technique,
6. Definite concepts of the formation of the Christian character.

Campbell was convinced that the groundwork for preparation of the religious teacher of religion should be set in the year of canonical novitiate. That period of intensive spiritual preparation taken before the making of first vows, usually lasting a year and a day, did not permit the study of secular branches, but religious studies were permitted. The director of the novitiate, according to Campbell, should see that a good course in theology be given all the novices and that much consideration also be given to the teaching of religion. Father Kane saw the director of novices as the pivotal person in the preparation of religion teachers. For him, masters and mistresses of novices should be chosen because they have shown themselves to be excellent teachers, but regretfully most of them are chosen because of their piety or "personal acceptability to the higher superiors." If the best teachers in the community were made directors of novices, then,

111 Ibid., p. 471.
112 Cf. Canon 565 in Codex juris canonici; cf. also above n. 95.
113 Kane, "Preparing Our Sisters and Brothers to Teach Christian Doctrine Effectively," p. 426.
114 Ibid. Kane warns that directors of novices should not be kept in office indefinitely but should be sent back into the schools to keep abreast of things as they are. He finds directors who have not been rotated become biased against reality.
Kane finds, "our teaching of Christian Doctrine would be promptly and notably improved." The Jesuit educator also makes the point that religious should be given a good course in Christian Doctrine, not Theology. They are not called upon to be theologians. Besides, he wrly observes:

...not even everyone who has been exposed to a course of theology is a competent theologian, and that the distinction in point of knowledge between our priests and our Sisters and Brothers is not always so profound as we commonly estimate it.115

Kane too concludes that the preparation of the religious catechist must be given a good start in novitiate and normal school, added to in the summer school and Saturday sessions of colleges and universities, and, finally, continued throughout the teaching career. For Kane, preparation for the teaching of religion is never completed. McMahon found that the religious catechist must do a great deal for herself.116 Even though she is on a "starvation diet" in regard to literature discussing the teaching of religion, there are still a number of books and journals she can read to expand her knowledge and increase her skills. Sisters generally do not read enough, he finds, but when some try to read more they have the obstacle that practically all the books are kept in the mother-house library and not in the missions (i.e. convents in the field).

Johnson judges that Sisters and Brothers have the methodology pretty

115 Ibid., p. 423. This is a very interesting point since it can be said (without statistical verification, however) that many of the nuns felt uncomfortable teaching religion under the gaze of the parish priests or priest-superintendents in this and later periods, because of clerical knowledge of theology.

116 Rev. John T. McMahon, "What's Wrong with Our Teachers," CER, XXVIII (September, 1930), 383-90 also "Keep Fit, Spiritually, Psychologically, Intellectually," ibid. (December 1930), 605-16. On McMahon, cf. above nn. 4, 70, 73. It is interesting to find that McMahon always quotes Father Yorke while Father Johnson always quotes Shields.
well but need more theological content; while priests have the content, they need more schooling in method. He hopes that the call of the Holy See, for the teaching of catechetics in the seminary will cause some practical outcomes in the United States. 117 As to the controverted question of just how much theology religious teachers needed, Johnson finds that they should be given a "mature and thorough course in Christian Doctrine," one that would be "more advanced that the best college course in religion that we know at the present time." The Catholic University professor strongly affirms that the religious teacher needs a good education not only in dogma and morals but also in Scripture, ascetics (one of his favorite themes) 118 and liturgy. In regard to liturgy, he observes:

We are hearing much these days about the Liturgical Movement, and this is as it should be, but the Liturgical Movement is valuable thing only in as far as it is ascetical rather than merely asthetical—a difference our teachers must fully understand. 119

Since religious teachers had more and more taken over the Sunday school in this period, there are no essays in the ACELP on the training of lay teachers for religious education. The teaching of religious education in the parochial school was almost totally in the hands of religious, although a number of articles appeared in the ACELP in this period


118 Cf. above n. 83.

119 Rev. George Johnson, "The Preparation of the Teacher of Religion," NCEAB, XXVIII (November, 1930), 422-427 and CER, XXIII (December, 1925), 619-622. Johnson, and others, wrote a number of articles on the professional preparation of the religious teacher in general.
exhorting the parish priests to do their instructional duty in the parish schools. 120

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

The catechizing of public school children continued to be discussed in ACELP during the 1916-1930 period. The ideas of Brother Bazer presented to the 1918 convention of the Catholic Educational Association show yet close adherence to the theory and practice of the Sunday school proposed in the 1890's. 122 The organization and work of the Catholic Instruction League was outlined by Noonan. 123 Founded by Father John Lyons, SJ, on Chicago's west-side in 1912, the League was especially concerned with the children of non-English-speaking parents. By 1928 it had spread to a large number of cities and was particularly active in recruiting lay catechists. Johnson commented on similar work being done in San Francisco. 124

120 Ibid., p. 424.
Aside from obtaining qualified catechists, the Sunday school faced a problem of attendance, especially when parents were not actively concerned with the religious education of their children. The "week-day religious school," the "Gary Plan," or various other arrangements for "released time" during the school day were looked upon by many as the solution of attendance difficulties and several other problems.

A great surge of interest in catechizing public school children in rural districts occurred in this period. The "Religious Vacation School" became especially popular and effective. Correspondence courses were also made available for those rural children who could not attend catechism classes during the year. Msgr. Victor Day of Helena, Montana, with the help of others published special texts for the correspondence courses. Using the Baltimore Catechism as the base of instruction, Day's texts were greatly similar to those Yorke had first published from 1898.


126 For the beginnings of this movement in the previous period, cf. Chapter iv, n. 124.


Those who wrote on religious instruction for public school children were anxious that they be given good and effective catechesis. As always, they expressed concern over "leakage" from the Church. They judged, however, poor facilities and a lack of well-trained catechists often militated against effective results. As noted in Chapter iii, where all the children of the parish, or almost all, were in the public school instruction classes, the organization and implementation of the "Sunday school" generally worked out better. Very often when the parish had a parochial school, the public school instruction tended to be a sincere but "tired" effort. In such cases, too, the Catholic children in the public school would very often come from religiously marginal families. Where the parochial school had room for the public school children of the parish, there was always some disappointment and even pique that caused many to regard the catechetical classes for public schools as unnecessary duplication. Along these lines, Leslie Stanton cautioned religious educators in this period regarding the First Holy Communion of public school children:

See that they differentiate not from the other children in the matter of regulation, dress, or discipline. Do not allow them to trail down the aisle after the others in any old way. Do not put them off by themselves to one side of the church, like little goats. Be sure that such discrimination will be deeply resented by their parents, their uncles, and their aunts.130

ER, LXVII (October, 1922), 404-09. A number of religious communities and organizations offered this type of correspondence course for children and later for adults. On Yorke cf. Appendices D-F; on Day, Appendix F.

129 Cf. Chapteriii, n. 87.

The unfortunate condition that Stanton described (with some hyperbole), where it truly existed, can generally be traced to lack of time and organization rather than any indifference. But a comment in the 1928 Fortnightly Review is more telling and perhaps more representative of the feelings of many devoted to the parochial schools in this period. In reviewing a pamphlet on the improving of public school catechism classes, the reviewer, probably Arthur Preuss himself, cautioned:

> What we miss in the well-meant and useful pamphlet is due emphasis on the fact that catechetical classes never be made so attractive as to become a temptation to a certain class of Catholic parents to send their children to the public instead of the parochial school. It is not unlikely that some day in the future such classes will be our only means of instructing Catholics in the faith; but as long as it is possible to maintain Catholic parochial schools, this infinitely more effective means should not be neglected.

**SOME CONCLUSIONS**

The findings expressed in this chapter affirm the ongoing concern of the American Church for religious education in the 1916-1930 period. The controversy over the need to revise and simplify the Baltimore Catechism continued throughout the fifteen year span. A number of highly vocal critics thought the defects of the Catechism were overpowering but they were not opposed to the use of catechism per se. Others were opposed, however, to the use of any catechism, especially in the lower grades. Progressive traditionalists, such as Yorke, admitted to defects in the Catechism but judged it still to be a worthy and

---

131 "Catechism Class for Public School Catholics," FR, XXXVI (January 1, 1929), 14. As generally, Preuss reflects German-American Catholic concern in his caution.
satisfactory instrument for religious instruction. For them, emphasis should not be placed on the text but rather on the catechist, whose function it was to explain and enrich the text. Anti-catechism educators such as Johnson, put even greater stress on the active catechist. Continued concern was expressed for the better preparation of the catechist, but it is not completely clear how this was implemented.

Insistence on comprehensive memorization of the text, so characteristic of the old classical method, began to wane in this period, but memorization of parts of the Catechism remained dominant in the Catechesis to 1930 and well beyond. By 1930, some texts appeared containing no reference to the Catechism, but even these texts were often used in conjunction with the Catechism.

Most religious educators were enthusiastic about the continued use of the anecdote in teaching, along with whatever other graphic techniques were available. Many were very open to the concept of "self-activity." Accordingly, the Religion class became more "active" in the 1916-1930 period.

Emphasis also appeared in the period to increase the "social sense," liturgical understanding, and "natural virtue" of the catechized. Much concern was expressed to make religious instruction a cause of religious living or "practical Catholicism." From the viewpoint of organization, the "Religious Vacation School" was the most striking development.

All in all, while the methodology of the Catechesis was directed principally to teaching the material, i.e. the catechism, greater attention was being paid student needs by 1930.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has traced the development of the Roman Catholic Catechesis in the United States from 1784, when the American Church was made a separate jurisdiction, until 1930, when more recent catechetical developments were already discernible. The term "Catechesis" is used throughout the study as synonymous with religious education.

This dissertation began with the Introduction which provides a detailed sweep of the history of catechization from its earliest implementation in the apostolic era down to the crash programs of religious education that characterized Protestant and then Catholic efforts in the sixteenth century. For this reason, the Introduction is titled "From Kerygma to Catechism." From the latter 1500's, the question/answer catechism with comprehensive memorization of its text became the classical material and technique of Christian religious education—a structure that remained dominant for almost 400 years. It was an epoch, indeed, when Catechesis and Catechism were convertible terms. The fifteen decades of the American Catechésis studied in this dissertation lie toward the end of this epoch but well within it.

The present author constructed the Introduction from a large number of secondary sources that he had gathered; he often followed their references into the catechetical monuments themselves. In the Introduction, much consideration is given to the rise of the question/answer catechism and to the specific catechisms of Luther, Canisius, and Bellarmine. Special attention is paid to the origin and development of the English recusant catechisms of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. New
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insight is given into the primacy of the Doway catechetical tradition among English-speaking Catholics. The development of the tradition is traced, by documentary evidence, from its beginning in the Doway Catechism of 1649, through its revisions in the Doway Abstract, and the further reductions of the Abridgement of Christian Doctrine during the 1700's. The eminence of the English-language catechism of Irish Archbishop James Butler II is also stated and indication is given of its possible relation to the Doway Tradition, as well. The catechetical works of Mannock, Hay, Hornibold, etc. are also identified. A correct understanding of all these English-language catechisms is necessary for this dissertation since they formed the initial and continuing basis for Roman Catholic religious education in the United States up to 1930 and beyond.

In Chapter I, the formation of the Roman Catholic catechetical tradition in the United States is discussed, largely through a study of the major American catechisms and the conciliar actions of Baltimore. The "Carroll Catechism" is fully identified and its origin traced back to the English Abridgement of Christian Doctrine by documentary evidence. Mistaken notions of Carroll's authorship are finally clarified. The diocesan catechisms of the 1820's are listed and outlined. The catechism of John England, long thought lost, is identified as extant in an American repository. Special attention is paid to the catechetical action of the Baltimore Councils of 1829, 1852, 1866, and 1884. New and corrective insights are offered into the General Catechism of the First Plenary Council and the relationship of Bishop John Timon to its compilation. Its reliance on "Carroll" and Butler are demonstrated. The catechism of John Henry McCaffrey is newly explained as a vital link in the American catechetical tradition, largely reproducing the General Catechism of 1852 and containing...
within itself all of "Carroll," large portions of Butler, selections from David, and some seemingly original materials. The concluding portion of the chapter is devoted to the origin and sources of the Catechism of Christian Doctrine of the Third Plenary Council. It is found that the compiler of the Baltimore Catechism, largely reproduced McCaffrey and added more of Butler. The Baltimore Catechism, then, is judged by the present author to be basically an intertwinment of "Carroll" and Butler, the two fundaments of the American catechetical tradition. Attention is also paid to the place of Deharbe, Faerber, and other catechisms prominent in the American Catechesis.

In the body of this dissertation the principal research-source was some sixty American Catholic English-language periodicals, consistently referred to as ACELP, which were published between 1830 and 1930. These ACELP are listed in Appendix A. Since most of them lack a cumulative index, and some even a volume-index, it was necessary to institute a volume by volume and often number by number search for materials. From the essays, communications, notices, and book reviews of the ACELP examined, the present author was able to draw copious data on the American Catechesis as it developed in the fifteen decades under investigation. He combined and interpreted this data in Chapters ii to v.

Having assembled a nucleus of catechetical book-titles from his research of the ACELP, the present author also consulted a number of works on American and especially American Catholic bibliography that cover the decades under investigation up to 1900. Combining his own findings with the data gleaned from these bibliographical studies, he constructed Appendices C and D. Since he could find no American Catholic bibliographical studies for the period after 1900, he constructed Appendices E and F
solely on his own preliminary researches. Appendices C to F; then, contain a preliminary but comprehensive checklist of American Catholic catechetical literature published between 1784 and 1930.

An effort was also made to gather biographical sources on the various major personages listed or discussed in the dissertation. These findings are contained in Appendix B.

Combining the data set forth and interpreted in the Introduction and Chapters i-v, with the bibliographical listings of Appendices C to F, the present author now makes this cross-dissertation summary of findings touching the a) objectives b) content, c) theory, and d) materials of the American Catechesis from 1784 to the end of 1930.

CATECHETICAL OBJECTIVES

Roman Catholic teaching sees faith as a gift of God and Christian living as possible only under the inspirations of divine grace. Still, it views man as an active agent in the economy of salvation, one who must use his natural gifts in pursuit of supernatural goals. Salvation, then, is the fruit of God's benefaction and man's cooperation. It has been the constant concern and effort of the Catechesis to inform man and motivate him toward living the Christian life and saving his soul. Religious education then speaks to the mind and to the "heart"; it has intellectual and voluntarist aims; it instructs proximately for Christian initiation and sacramental reception but more comprehensively for life-long living; finally, it prepares through this life for the life to come. Because of these several dualities, religious educators have not always agreed on what to emphasize more, or when to place the stress where, or, and most
importantly, how to implement all these goals concurrently. A further complication has often arisen over the question of how much apologetic stress to include in catechetical formation. Certainly, a believer must be able to understand his beliefs in such a way as to defend them against attack; too much emphasis on defending one's beliefs, however, can be distortive and endanger the positive understanding of one's religion. Such a problem has been particularly acute in the English-speaking Catechesis, since English-speaking Catholics have often lived in a religiously hostile milieu.

During the fifteen decades studied in this dissertation, ambivalences in catechetical aims are to be found in any given era. It can be said, however, that from 1784 to 1865, the stress in the Catechesis was on the intellectual; memorizing the orthodox formulae of the catechism was regarded as the most important goal—always with the hope that the catechismal text would be understood. After 1865, increasing emphasis came to be placed on explaining and understanding the memorized material. In the 1890's learning and understanding was still the basic objective but greater accent came to be placed on "seeking the heart," or more consciously influencing the behavior of those instructed. Defection of the catechized in later life has always distressed religious educators. Around the turn of the century, however, there was much discussion in the American Church and elsewhere on the problem of "leakage" in membership and "adult collapses." Some religious educators after 1900 linked these problems to the failures of religious education. For them, catechetical priorities had been confused; too much emphasis had been placed on the intellectual formation but rather much over-concern with "memory cram." Further, pre-occupation with the immediate goals of sacramental preparation
and the visitations of supervisory personnel had rendered many religious educators myopic; they had not directed their efforts to preparation for life. More genuinely intellectual instruction, greater emphasis on education of the will, more authentic experiences in the practice of piety, and greater attention to the needs of later life were the solutions these critics proposed. The ordering of catechetical goals fell more and more into line with these demands after 1915. By 1925 the need to make religion more concerned with communal rather than individual salvation received some stress. By 1930, while the need to implement all catechetical aims was frequently enunciated and comprehensively worked on, the memorization and understanding of the catechism can still be said to be the most commonly implemented goal of religious educators. It would take another thirty years for this situation to change decisively.

THE CATECHETICAL CONTENT

The initial Christian proclamation or Kērygma was simple, brief, and non-argumentative but it did not prove sufficiently instructive to those who accepted it. They also needed Didachē. Somewhat later some distillations of faith and morals were made for those entering the church: these were the first catecheses. These simple presentations of the apostolic period were followed by the much more extensive catechumenal instructions of the later Fathers. There always seems to have been the question, "Just how much religious instruction is enough?" If after the tribal migrations the formal content of religious instruction became increasingly less, in the era of the catechism the formal content became increasingly more. If the first edition of a particular catechism gave
the basic essentials, later redactions always filled in and extended the initial material.

The major catechisms used in the American Catechesis list and expound the Apostles Creed, the ten Commandments, and the seven Sacraments. There is also an explanation of prayer and particularly the Lord's Prayer. Although catechetical focus on the Lord's Prayer reaches back into apostolic times, the Baltimore Catechism strangely enough does not contain such an exposition even though all its sources do. The major catechisms also list the Beatitudes, the Evangelical Counsels, the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy, the Gifts and Fruits of the Holy Ghost, the Last Things, etc. David, the Boston, and to a lesser extent the General of 1852 contain liturgical catecheses, but the others do not. Generally the major catechisms contain very little scriptural education, but after 1865 this became the function of bible history which presented the principal happenings in the Old and New Testaments. The ACELP in the later nineteenth century contain many essays on the catechetical importance of bible history.

The major catechisms were generally lacking in originality. The need to present "true doctrine" without variations as well as to present a Catholic consensus prevented them from introducing currently controversial materials. Toward the end of the nineteenth century some of the newer large catechisms attempted to be more contemporaneous in topics treated but not the "little" or elementary texts.

The major catechisms are not really polemical nor openly argumentative. They give the Catholic position simply and straightforwardly; they answer classical objections; they indoctrinate positively not negatively. With the exception of Weninger who in one place imputes "bad
faith" to Protestants, no other personally detrimental statements against non-Catholics are to be found in the catechisms. They all treat the axiom "outside the Church there is no salvation," but explain that good men who follow their own consciences will be saved even if they are not Catholics. The Baltimore Catechism includes the idea of "baptism of desire." The makers of the Baltimore, for instance, were anxious to make societal peace with the Protestants. The notable 1847 essays on religious education in the *United States Catholic Magazine* (cf. Chapter ii, n. 7) scolded the authors of certain Catholic teaching novels "for their highly prejudicial depictment of American Protestants." The same essay affirmed that the traditional American Catholic apologetic was much more irenic.

It is safe to say that there are no statements attributing special guilt to the Jews for the death of Christ in the major or even minor American Catechisms. The bible histories, however, present a greater problem. In setting forth the ongoing conflict between Jesus and those who opposed him, they consistently use the Johannine term "the Jews" to group all opposition to Jesus. Neither the author of the Fourth Gospel nor the bible histories make it clear that most of those who supported Jesus were Jews too. Unless the teacher made this clear, one wonders what effect this constant negative use of "the Jews" would have on the student. Then too study of the *Tanach* (Old Testament) itself can easily lead to feelings of exasperation toward "the people" for their stiff-necked failure to keep the Covenant--this is the attitude of the prophets and deuteronomistic editors anyway.

The statement on Jewish guilt given by Gilmour in his *Bible History* (cf. Chapter iii, n. 12) would be seen by many to be anti-Semitic. While Gilmour's statement is catechetically singular, his text was used
more widely and more often used than any other between 1865 and 1930. In the ACELP there is no reference to the problem of communicating anti-semitic attitudes in religious education for the fifteen decades under study, with one noble exception (cf. Chapter iv, n. 116).

The major catechisms all affirm the universality of charity; they clearly teach all men are brothers. They do not, however, contain anything specific on racial justice. Neither do they contain, of course, any modern psychological insights regarding the person. Finally, their approach to the sacraments is quite juridical. However, they are all favorable to frequent reception of the Holy Eucharist and are generally free of so-called "Jansenists" sentiments.

Before 1920, essays of catechetical concern contain no pleas to add to what the catechism treats (except bible history), but after that date there are many calls in the ACELP for the addition of materials and emphases on liturgy and the Mass, racial and social justice, the demands of charity in modern life, recognition of the Church as a missionary force and a reorganization of the entire treatment of sacraments and commandments in terms of God's love, etc. These appeals were foreshadowings of changes in catechetical content and emphasis that were to gain momentum in succeeding decades.

This generally static condition of catechetical content in the major American catechisms did contribute close continuity in the religious education of one generation with the next—a condition which many today scorn as being unrealistic and unavoidably leading to "irrelevance," but which many others yet find highly desirable in leading to the stability of an "unchanging Faith."
As we have seen in the Introduction, memorization of creed, commandments, prayers, and various listings has an ancient history in the Catechesis. The thrust for more comprehensive memorization of catechetical materials, however, dates from the late sixteenth century and is concomitant with the invention of the question/answer catechism. The theory behind this thrust affirms that through memorization the student shows he has studied the material, has made it more fully his own, and, therefore, understands it more completely. If the student does not always understand the memorized material immediately, he will retain it with review and come to a more mature understanding of it in later years.

Given a uniform and greatly developed teaching instrument in the catechism, the function of the catechist is largely to present the question/answer units for memorization, then call for their oral recitation, and later institute their review. The catechist can be aided in this central task by parents, other members of the family, older students, etc., who can "hear the catechism." The catechist need not be too learned but is expected to understand the catechismal material and hopefully to offer some explanation of the question/answer units to the student. The emphasis, however, is on the accurate memorization and retention of the text. The catechism contains the essentials of religious truth; the more the student accurately memorizes and retains its text the greater will be his knowledge of religious truth; the greater his knowledge of religious truth, the more religious he can be expected to be personally. Within the context of modern times, the points outlined above comprise the classical or traditional theory of religious education.
The classical theory of religious education prevailed in the American Catechesis, presumably even on more advanced levels of instruction, for many decades after 1784. Pioneer conditions in the American Church were especially supportive of the simple yet definite catechetical program the theory offered—not that comprehensive memorization did not always present a formidable problem.

The first protest against the use of the method on the secondary level of instruction appeared in the *United States Catholic Magazine* in 1847. The USCM essay decries the lack of proper adolescent-oriented religious instruction in the American Church. It warns, however, that young people will not be drawn to boring, childish, or too formalized instruction and certainly not to a re-memorizing of "the little catechism." Neither do they need pulpit oratory but, rather, a solid, well-informed, and perhaps conversational type of teaching that focuses on contemporary problems. The essay calls for what later (following French usage) came to be known as "familiar instruction." It was a more difficult type of catechesis to give than teaching a catechism lesson; it required a talented, agile, and more learned catechist than the latter. Materials were published in the mid-century to implement this concept of "familiar instruction." It came to be the type of religious education given more often in the chapel than the classroom. At any rate, it called for no memorization from the student. This desire to keep Catholic young people under religious instruction until about eighteen years of age was frequently expressed in the ACELP and led the organization of the "perseverance class" (again following French usage) and later the "advanced class" in the Sunday school; it also led to the continuous development of Catholic academies and high schools. Other essays in the ACELP after
1865 have similar ideas to the USCM essay but show that religious educators generally adopted the large catechism for more advanced instruction rather than "familiar instructions." For this reason, there was constant search throughout the nineteenth century for better catechisms; the idea being, better catechisms would lead to better catechesis. The book reviews of the ACELP make this expectation very clear. While they primarily evaluate the traditional orthodoxy of new texts, they are especially happy with the inclusion of materials current to the times. Just how much memorization of the text was called for on the secondary level is not clear. We know from Chapter iv that the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet in the 1880's were instructed not to seek word for word recitation of the large catechism; on the other hand, some of the large well-organized Sunday schools required the memorization of Deharbe in the advanced classes during the 1890's. The pedagogical texts of the Christian Brothers, translated from the French but published here around the turn-of-the-century, insist on memorization in secondary school religious instruction. This last source, however, and the ACELP essays mentioned above urge the catechist to avoid routine memorization and recitation. They call for "explanatory catechism" in which the question/answer units are taken apart, expounded, illustrated, and discussed, with the student freely asking questions and even "proposing objections"--all this before the material is assigned for memorization. "Explanatory catechism" requires a well trained catechist and a more alert and active student. After 1920, new non-catechismal textbooks were published here for use in the secondary school Catechesis. Many religious educators welcomed these since they made a complete break with the grade school type of instruction. Many of the newer texts attempted to be more oriented to Sacred
Scripture, particularly the New Testament, and to be more Christo-centric in their development of the material.

On the level of elementary religious education, the classical method of teaching religion continued to be used with changes and modifications in the American Catechesis up to 1930. The method, of course, was based on the necessity of catechism. As we have seen above, there was a constant search throughout the nineteenth century for the ideal catechism with the assurance that an improved catechism would lead to improved instruction. All new catechisms were authored with this idea. It is interesting to find that the responsibility for the American conciliar catechisms was put in hands of bishops who had literary background and had published other works as well. The catechisms of 1852 and 1885 both were careful to incorporate current catechismal pedagogy by breaking down older more complex question/answer units into several smaller ones, making each answer a complete statement, and especially by repeating the question asked in the answer given, in order to make a more comprehensible whole. The theological vocabulary of the catechism, however, presented a major problem for elementary teaching. Vocabulary-added editions sought to meet this problem. Others tried to find a solution by simplifying the text but this change did not prove popular. Those in charge of choosing the catechismal text were persuaded that the traditional expressions of religious orthodoxy were essential to religious education and, therefore, must be maintained. While the memorization and recitation of the approved catechism remained the core of elementary religious instruction in the fifteen decades studied, other emphases were added to the basic method.

From the middle decades of the nineteenth century, collections of tales and anecdotes were widely used to illustrate the teaching of the
catechism and presumably to make religious instruction more interesting, as well. There is no discontent with the traditional method, and its presuppositions, registered in the ACELP until the 1890's when a number of authors called for marked catechetical change in the American Catholic Sunday school and grade school. These authors were particularly interested in making the study of the catechism more intelligible and more interesting; they were distressed that children so often did not understand memorized material and found their religion classes so very boring. Illustrating the catechism with stories, poems, and hymns; grading the material to the age of the student; and, above all, implementing the concept of "explanatory catechism" (cf. above) on the grade school level were the principal solutions these revisionists proposed. The same authors saw the need of better organization in the Sunday school and better trained catechists.

They urged clergy and catechists to hold themselves to a more systematic and disciplined effort in teaching religion. As we have seen above, catechist manuals directed to explanatory teaching were commonly available in this period. We also know from Chapter iv that attempts were made to offer better training to Sunday school teachers through the various Catholic summer schools and other institutes. In the opinion of the present author, this thrust in the 1890's which carried over into the twentieth century very much shows the influence of the Sulpician Method in the American Church.

Before 1865, Formby had contributed several essays in the Metropolitan on the need of illustrated material in religious education but also on the Augustinian concept of teaching sacred truth through sacred history. Both points came to be implemented in the American Catechesis through the materials and methodology of bible history. From 1865 to 1930
bible history achieved a complementary status with catechism in American Catholic religious education. Many complained in the ACELP, however, that there was not sufficient integration between the two studies.

After 1900, various essays in the ACELP show further revision in the classical method of teaching religion. The present author has termed this continuing surge "progressive traditionalism." Its adherents, although perhaps they did not regard themselves as belonging to a school, were traditionalists in so far as they required the catechism be kept as the basis of instruction but were progressive in their efforts to enrich its presentation. Progressive traditionalists greatly stressed the active role of the catechist in teaching the catechism and placed less emphasis on perfecting the catechismal text itself. They were friendly to any technique that could make the teaching of religion more intelligible, meaningful, and interesting. They put great stress on the use of narrative and the visual. The importance of "reaching the heart" as well as the "mind" had been stated before them but they were especially emphatic about this need. They greatly desired religious outcomes from religious teaching. Strong "co-ordination" of catechism with bible history and other subjects of the curriculum was another of their major points. Progressive traditionalists continued to insist on the need of memorizing the catechism, but they gave ground on this as time went on. Progressive traditionalist theory can best be seen in the essays of Father Peter Christopher Yorke.

Both before and after 1900 more traditionalist educators sought improvement in the catechismal text particularly that of the Baltimore Catechism. They followed the older theory that better catechisms would make better catechesis, but such theorists seem to have been in a minority. Although many agreed with the need of catechism-reform, the general
emphasis was on enrichment of the prevailing text.

In 1901, the famous Bellord essays acted as a kind of manifesto for anti-memorization forces in the American Catechesis. Some interpreted his writings as being anti-catechismal too, but basically they were not. Bellord saw the need of some kind of catechism, albeit greatly simplified and reduced. Bellord was greatly distressed by "leakage" in the Church. He blamed poor outcomes on poor method. The progressive traditionalists agreed with much of what Bellord said regarding the failures of religious education but could not go as far as he in attacking traditional method and materials. Educators like Shields and Pace, however, thought Bellord did not go far enough in striking down the classical method and its catechisms. Shields was devoted to "teaching as Jesus did." He took this to mean teaching religion simply, natively, developmentally, with no abstract formulae, and certainly with no memorization of material unless it could be completely understood by the child. His theory was directed for us in the primary grades. Even Shields was ready to admit the possibility and even desireability of some catechism and some memorization in the middle grades; whether this was in part a concession to his critics is not clear. Shields textbooks were devoted to the implementation of his theory. Many adopted them, but most found them in the end too difficult to use or too forsaking of tradition. Although his method did not come to be fully developed or accepted, Shields must be considered the first American Catholic catechetical theologian. Before and after his death in 1921, other faculty and, particularly, graduates of the Department of Education at the Catholic University promoted and implemented his ideas.

While most talk of using psychology in religious education came out of the Catholic University after 1910, Kerze's essays in the American
Ecclesiastical Review introduced the Munich Method, also called the "psychological method," to the English-speaking clergy here. In itself the Method was non-catechismal but it came to be correlated with the catechism in the United States in the catecheses of Urban and, later and more importantly, in those of Bairel. The Munich Method was widely promoted in the American Catechesis, but it did not achieve major use.

After 1925, religious educators generally agreed on the value of the "project method" and "self-activity" concept in the teaching of religion. With the liturgical revival in the United States, these techniques were often used in teaching the Mass and liturgy. In this last connection, the theories of Maria Montessori were first mentioned as valuable for use in the American Catechesis. From 1890, one can see greater attention being paid to the needs of the learner in religious education.

From Formby's essays in the 1840's, there had been call for visual illustration of catechetical materials. While bible histories were generally richly illustrated, catechisms were not. The great exception to this was the famous illustrated Baltimore Catechism, published by Benziger Brothers. There were, however, charts and pictures available for catechetical use after 1865 in increasing numbers. After the turn of the century the "magic lantern" was used and some attention was paid to the use of the cinema in religious education. Progressive catechists were urged to make their own collections of graphic materials from Christmas cards, magazines, calendars, advertisements, etc. Between 1916 and 1930, however, the commercial production of visual aid seems to have lagged. There is no mention in the ACELP during this span on the use of the phonograph in religious education. Toward the end of the period, simple single line drawings known as "chalk talks" for blackboard illustration became popular with catechists. Yorke
and Shields had made great efforts to pictorialize their textbooks but their pioneering achievements seem quite drab by modern standards. By 1930 all religious texts were expected to have pictures and illustrations. The little pictorialized texts on the Mass and sacraments by William Kelly have color-work that is striking by any standard to date.

CATECHETICAL MATERIALS

A comprehensive listing of catechetical materials used in the American Catechesis by period is to be found in several appendices of this dissertation: Appendix C (1784-1864), Appendix D (1865-1899), Appendix E (1900-1915), Appendix F (1916-1930). Each appendix is divided into these sections: a) General Materials (Basic and Advanced), b) Bible/Church History, c) Liturgy/Ritual, d) Paracatechismal Materials, e) Materials for the Catechist. A careful examination of each appendix will clearly show what instructional materials were most widely used in each period.

The data contained in the above appendices demonstrates that the general question/answer catechism was the overwhelmingly dominant material used in the American Catechesis between 1784 and 1930. The general catechism fell into one of two categories, viz., the basic or "little" catechism designed to be used in elementary catechization and the "large" or "fuller" catechism written for more advanced instruction. As noted above Chapter i of this study discusses the major general catechisms used in the American Catechesis during the fifteen decades under investigation.
General Materials: Basic

As far as we know, Catholic English-speaking colonists used religious education materials printed in England, Ireland, and on the Continent. But, around 1780, if not before, Father Robert Molyneaux began to publish catechetical texts at Philadelphia. We learn from his correspondence with John Carroll that Molyneaux probably published the Irish Butler's catechism and the English A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine. To the Short Abridgement, Molyneaux added translated extracts on Holy Communion from the French catechism of Languet. Because Carroll gave his approbation to Molyneaux's compilation, it came to be called the "Carroll Catechism." For those receiving Confirmation at Carroll's hands, for the first time in the territory of the thirteen colonies, the Philadelphia priest obtained or published Gother's Instruction for Confirmation. The European origins of these catechisms are discussed in the Introduction and Chapter i.

The "Carroll" and Butler were reprinted again and again for use in the American Catechesis down to the mid-nineteenth century. Parts of the two were also greatly incorporated into the diocesan catechisms of the 1820's, viz., David's (Bardstown), England's (Charleston), and Fenwick's (Boston). The Boston Catechism, revised several times, greatly combined "Carroll" and Butler. In 1853, the First Plenary Council of Baltimore adopted the Boston with several deletions and additions under the title General Catechism. It became the dominant American Catholic catechetical material for the next several decades, although this fact is not understood in American historiography. In the General Catechism of 1852 the "Carroll" and Butler traditions are preserved.
In 1866, Father John Henry McCaffrey presented his catechism for national adoption to the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore. A careful examination of the McCaffrey text shows it to be a reworking of the General Catechism with the "Carroll" Catechism completely preserved; it contains yet further borrowings from Butler, some additions from David, and a considerable amount of seemingly original material. The Fathers of 1866 voted not to accept the McCaffrey text. As a result, it did not have a wide circulation or use in its own form but came to serve as the basis of the Baltimore Catechism some eighteen years later (cf. below).

In addition to the General Catechism of the First Plenary Council, Butler in his own form was commonly used in the 1870's and early 1880's. During the 1860's the catechisms of F. X. Weninger, in German and English forms, were popular, but various editions of the "smaller" catechism of Deharbe, again both in German and English, were even more popular even to the end of the century.

When the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore convened in 1884, many of the Fathers were determined to have a national catechism. This determination resulted in the so-called Baltimore Catechism published the next year. It is not certain just who put the 1885 catechism together but Bishop John Lancaster Spalding certainly played the chief episcopal role in its production. Considerable interest has been shown regarding the sources of the Baltimore Catechism. After an extensive analysis, the present author has concluded that the Third Council text is an amalgam of those major catechisms hitherto used in the American Catechesis. It became obvious to him that the Baltimore compilers used McCaffrey's catechism as their most basic and immediate source. In
McCaffrey, they found "Carroll," Butler, and some David, already combined—almost the whole of the American catechetical tradition to that point. The present author's research further showed that when McCaffrey did not have what the Baltimore's makers wanted, they did several things, a) went back to the General or even to the prior "Carroll" text, b) took yet even more material from Butler (through the recently published Irish Maynooth Catechism), e) seemingly went again to David for several ideas, and finally d) wrote some of their own material. While the Baltimore compilers incorporated material directly from the sources used, they rewrote the question/answer units according to a uniform style. Although not a highly original text, the Baltimore Catechism does show that a great deal of work and care went into its compilation—a fact often denied.

The researches outlined above show the perennial character of "Carroll" and Butler in the American catechetical tradition from 1784 to 1930. They in turn had their roots in the Doway Catechism. It is correct, then, to speak of the American catechetical tradition in these fifteen decades as having been a Doway tradition.

While it sustained much criticism, the Baltimore Catechism remained the dominant instructional material in the American Catechesis from 1885 to 1930 and beyond. It appeared in a widespread illustrated edition almost from the beginning. To remedy some of its difficult words and expressions, vocabulary-added editions continued to be published from 1886. The Baltimore text also appeared shortened in Abstract editions. Other graded editions were also published. Several authors attempted to rewrite the Baltimore in simpler English but their
revised texts did not sell. After 1890, Father Yorke's *Textbooks of Religion for Parochial and Sunday Schools* integrated the catechismal text with pictures, poems, hymns, and stories in a graded series. Yorke's books circulated mostly in the western dioceses. The *Holy Family Series* by Father Francis J. Butler, also combining the Baltimore text with explanatory and complementary elements had some success in New England. Several other editions of the Third Plenary Catechism appeared with more advanced material interspersed between the question/answer units (cf. below). In accordance with the wishes of the Third Council Fathers, bi-lingual editions of the Baltimore appeared in English and various languages from 1886.

While the Baltimore Catechism remained utterly dominant in elementary catechization between 1885 to 1930 (and beyond), there were other catechisms that achieved wide circulation. This would be especially true of the catechismal text of the St. Louis priest Wilhelm Faerber which was published in German, English, and Slavic languages. Practically all editions of Faerber were bi-lingual.

Forsaking the catechismal format entirely, Father Thomas Edward Shields published his *Catholic Education Series* from 1911. Shields' texts attempted to implement his theory of religious education. While his books were used in several dioceses, most educators found them too complicated and forsaking of tradition. After 1925, other series were also being assembled that did not make use of the Catechism, but these materials were yet atypical at this time. Still, they showed the continuing influence of Shields.

The catechetical texts discussed in the several pages above are
the major basic materials used in the American Catechesis from 1784 to
1930. There were many other texts published, some in languages other
than English, that did not achieve the prominence of these major materi-
als. An examination of Appendices C-F will disclose these many but
less prominent titles.

General Material: Advanced

From 1784 to 1910, the elementary Catechesis was largely con-
cerned with the ongoing preparation of young Catholics to receive First
Holy Communion ca. twelve years of age. This fact is fully discussed
in Chapter ii. After the decree Quam Singulari in 1910, of course, the
bulk of catechetical instruction was directed toward reception of Con-
firmation at or before that age. This is discussed in Chapter iv. From
1784 to 1930, however, there is the frequently articulated hope that
Catholic young people be kept under religious instruction until age
eighteen and that adult Catholics would continue to study their religion.
To realize this hope, more advanced catechetical materials had to be
made available. The most characteristic form of these more advanced
materials was the "fuller" or "large" catechism.

Father Molyneaux published the first advanced catechetical ma-
terial here in 1786 which was Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed;
it is discussed below under "Liturgy/Ritual." The listings of Appendix
C show that between 1784 and 1864 the most frequently published large
catechisms were those of Aimé, Collot, Curr, De La Salle, Fleury, Gaume,
Hay, Hornyhold, Keenan, Milner, Penketh, and even the Doway itself.
The most frequently published material in this period, however, was Mannock's Poor Man's Catechism. The European origins of a number of these large catechisms are discussed in the Introduction. None of these authors was American.

While the large catechism was the most common form of advanced catechetical material used during the 1784-1864 period, some texts were tract-like such as those of Gobinet or L'Homond; others were "familiar" or conversational as those of Ségur. A third genre of adult instructional materials were seen by many in the Catholic "teaching novels" authored in the United States during this and the next period. These "teaching novels" are discussed in Chapter ii.

During 1865 and 1899, advanced catechetical material was most commonly found in the works of Deharbe but also in those of Byrne, Collot, Devine, Hay, Hunter, Jouin, Müller, Oakley, Rolfus, Ségur, Weninger, and also in several volumes of the Christian Brothers series. It will be noted that some of the above had been published before 1865 but a number were new. Jouin, Müller, Byrne, and Weninger were American authors, the others were European.

Between 1900 and 1915, Francis J. Butler and O'Brien compiled advanced forms of the Baltimore Catechism; texts of Coppens, Wilmers, and Schouppe were used on the college level; other advanced forms were found in the Christian Brothers series and the works of Deharbe, Geiermann, Lanslots, Rolfus, and Zulueta. F. J. Butler, O'Brien, Coppens, Geiermann, and later Lanslots, were American authors.

Finally, between 1916-1930, the advanced works of Deharbe, Coppens, Wilmers, and now those of Cooper, MacEachen, and Sullivan
were used in the United States Catechesis. Coppens and the last three authors were Americans.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent was published in the United States from 1833 but is discussed below in "Materials for the Catechist."

Many other instructional works were published here between 1784 and 1930 but were not considered to be primarily catechetical by the present author.

Bible/Church History

Reeve's History of the Old and New Testament received its first United States imprinting at Philadelphia in 1784 by Christopher Talbot, probably under the influence of Father Molyneaux. It was reprinted many times in various forms up to 1854 and again in 1901. A New Testament catechism by the American, Power was published at New York in 1824. More of what came to be called a "bible history," however, was provided the American Catechesis in the Abstract of Bishop Challoner, republished here many times between 1834 and 1858. In the pre-War decades, the highly illustrated English biblical texts of Formby were reprinted here and the Irish scriptural catechism of the Sisters of Mercy was widely used. Milner's "scriptural catechism," a basically polemical treatise, was often reprinted as an appendix to various catechisms.

After 1865, as Chapter iii and Appendix D show, there was great stress on the production of materials for biblical education in the United States. This development was due to several reasons but increased German influence on the American Catechesis was one of them. A number of Swiss and German bible histories were published in the
United States in the decade following the Civil War, notably those of Businger and Schuster. Businger was greatly reworked by the American Gilmour in his highly illustrated Bible History, first published here in 1869. Schuster's text received several translations and publishments in the United States up to 1922. Schuster but especially Gilmour remained the principal sources of biblical education in the American Catechesis up to 1930 and beyond.

In the 1865 to 1899 period, the highly illustrated scriptural texts of Formby were again republished here; Brennan adapted a number of Businger's Swiss works, also richly illustrated, for American use; more native texts for school use were authored here by O'Leary and Mother White; more scholarly American scriptural materials were found in the books of Maas and Gigot, both American.

In the 1900 to 1915 period, Gilmour and Schuster were still the most widely used bible histories but Knecht's small bible history was also popular. A number of texts from the previous decades were republished, probably from the old plates. More advanced material was published here in the works of Brülls (translated by Messmer), Gigot, and Knecht (cf. below in Materials for the Catechist).

The 1916-1930 period does not seem to have been an active period for scriptural publishing. At any rate, Gilmour and Schuster were still the dominant biblical materials used by American catechists. Religious educators in this period, however, did call for an increased direct use of the scriptures, especially the New Testament, in the Catechesis. Catholic publishers responded with inexpensive editions of the biblical books. Several attempts had also been made in the nineteenth century to produce "cheap book" editions of the New Testament.
Catechisms in the "Carroll" and Butler traditions contain very little scripture except as "proof-texts" on some controverted point. This condition is especially true of the Baltimore Catechism which in fact contains the least scripture of all. By the time the Baltimore was compiled, however, the use of bible history as complementary to catechism was firmly entrenched in American Catholic religious education. Still, Baxter and then Cox compiled scriptural treasuries in the late 1890's with pertinent biblical quotations correlated with each question/answer unit of the Baltimore. They seem, however, to have had limited use. Other attempts such as Cox's were published before and after 1930. The textbooks of Yorke and Shields both made vigorous attempts to integrate scriptural material. Virginia Merrick's work did the same. A number of works on the life of Jesus for children appeared after 1890. The bible history, however, remained the principal source of biblical education in the American Catechesis to 1930. Gilmour was especially favored because of his extensive quotation ("ipsissima verba") of the biblical text itself.

As far as church history is concerned in the American Catechesis, some materials were always available. The work of the Irish Augustinian Gahan was printed in the United States many times between 1814 and 1871. Reeve's church history was republished here from 1835 to 1864 and a volume from the German by Noethen, from 1871. Formby's illustrated church history was given an American publication both before and after 1865. Another illustrated work by the Swiss Businger was adapted by Brennan and published here from 1881; it contained a special appendix on the development of the American Church by Shea. Larger and more
erudite church histories continued to appear after the Civil War but these were not directed to catechetical use. More school-oriented volumes on the subject first came in the 1850's. B. J. Spalding authored a two volume work on church history here in 1883 for school use, which was republished and later revised. After 1881, the Gilmour bible history contained an appendix on the history of the Church which came to be the principal material used on this subject to 1930. In 1899 the Oechetering authored a separate volume of church history which went through ten editions by 1910. In 1927 Brother Eugene produced two texts on the subject. Laux wrote a very substantial church history in 1930, largely for secondary use. In general, however, church history was treated as an extension of bible history instruction up to 1930. It would seem a crowded instructional program had little room for it.

Gilmour, Oechetering, and Brother Eugene were American authors.

Liturgy/Ritual

Liturgy and ritual are paramount considerations in the Roman Catholic faith and should, therefore, be part of the elementary Catechesis. The "Carroll" and Butler Catechisms, however, give no instruction on liturgy and ritual. David (Bardstown), following the custom of the French diocesan catechisms, gives extensive liturgical catechesis; so does the Boston Catechism. Although the General Catechism of 1852 was largely based on the Boston, it does not include the latter's liturgical catecheses. It does, however, contain two brief appendices from Challoner "On the Mass" and "Sign of the Cross etc." McCaffrey's text has no instruction on liturgy and ritual. It is not surprising, then,
to find the Baltimore Catechism devoid of liturgical instruction, when one considers its sources. On the other hand, Faerber contains a short appendix on the liturgy and ritual of the Mass. All in all, one can see that the liturgical education of American Catholics before 1930, when given at all, was largely extra or paracatechismal.

Perhaps the most singular and enduring source of liturgical education in the American Catechesis is Challoner's *Catholic Christian Instructed*, first published in London in 1737. Christopher Talbot reprinted it at Philadelphia in 1786, under Father Molyneaux's promotion. The text was republished here continuously to 1878 and once or twice beyond that up to 1901. Sometimes Challoner apologetic concern in justifying the ritual distracts from his more positive cultic explanations, but *Catholic Christian Instructed* does give extensive liturgical education.

Before 1865, in addition to Challoner, there were other works printed here from time to time giving liturgical instruction, e.g., those of Alban Butler, Cochin, Bishop England, Vaughn and Oakley—all imports.

After 1865, as with the bible histories, a number of works of German origin on liturgy and ritual were published in the United States in English-language editions. The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and holydays, some with explanations of the text, appeared in "cheap books" editions. McGrath of Philadelphia had published a *Catechism for Mass* in 1852; a number of missals and prayerbooks before and after that contained instructional material. In the 1890's, however, a large number of small texts appeared, many under local auspices, explaining the Mass
and ceremonies of the Roman Rite. These probably show an early reaction here to the rising liturgical revival in Europe. The American works of the Lanslots and Meagher show the same influence.

During the 1900-1915 period, Yorke, Francis J. Butler, and especially Shields integrated liturgical catechesis in their texts. Yorke published a separate brochure on teaching and participating in the Mass. Baierl produced an illustrated text on the Mass in catechismal form. The syllabus-like Handbook for Teachers compiled by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Philadelphia was especially strong on liturgical integration.

Between 1916 and 1930 the really striking multi-colored texts of Kelly on the Mass and sacraments were available for the early grades. Sullivan's Visible Church and Henry's Catholic Customs and Symbols were designed for later grades and high school. Haering's Living with the Church, translated by Bulzarik, and Auxilium were directed to the secondary level. Borgman's Libica, with liturgy, bible, and catechism integrated in each lesson, circulated in higher grades and college. Dunney's Mass was used on all levels in varying ways. Other explanations of the Mass were published, as were several editions of the Sunday and daily missal. The materials produced in this period shows the rising strength of the liturgical revival in the United States. At no time before 1930, however, did liturgical education receive a complementary status to catechism comparable to that of bible history.

Paracatechismal Materials

Various collections of stories, poems, charts, etc. designed to enrich the catechism were produced regularly between 1784 and 1930.
Novels with a catechetical purpose, discussed above under Advanced Materials, were also available from the beginning. Just how often these paracatechismal materials were used in the classroom is not clear, but a number of them were printed over and over again. Perhaps the works of Agnew are the oldest, but Alban Butler's Lives of the Saints also dates from 1811 in American imprints. The Tales of Canon Schmid were immensely popular in the United States from 1841 to the end of the century. So were the stories of Hendrik Conscience. The popular Tracts of Father Furniss were published here from 1859.

After 1865, a large number of collected stories were printed. Perhaps, Catholic Anecdotes translated by Mrs. J. Sadlier was the most popular of these throughout the period, but the compilations of Furniss and others were widely used too. There were also a number of the collected lives of saints, most of them based on Alban Butler's multi-volumed work. Of this genre, Shea's Pictorial Lives of the Saints, first published in New York around 1868 was reprinted again and again well past 1930. In 1889, the St. Basil Hymnal made its first appearance. Although originating in Canada, it occupied a special place in the American Catechesis into the 1930's. Finally, the famous and long-influential juveniles of Father Finn were first authored and published toward the end of the period.

After 1900, Chisholm's Catechism in Examples was reprinted in the United States but it had already circulated in British editions since 1886. Spirago's Anecdotes and Examples adapted to the Baltimore Catechism by Baxter and first published here in 1899 was also widely used. Works first printed in the previous period were again republished.
Between 1916 and 1930, stories collected by Hannon and by Herbst were published; Chisholm and Spirago-Clerke were still widely used. A number of juveniles appeared, some of them devoted to the recently canonized St. Therese of the Child Jesus. The novels of Father Finn were yet popular in the 1920's.

Materials for the Catechist

Many of the advanced materials published in the United States during the fifteen decades period under discussion were used by the catechists themselves for their own fuller education and understanding. There were, however, some works specifically written for the training of the catechist.

The catechism issued by the Council of Trent was designed as a catechetical source-book for those who were charged with the duty of religious instruction. The 1829 Dublin edition of *The Catechism of the Council of Trent* was first published here in 1833. Republished several times before 1860 at Baltimore, it was printed again in 1870 and 1905 at New York. Numerous nineteenth century European editions of the Dublin edition can be found in Catholic libraries here, as well. In 1923, a new American translation of the Tridentine text was produced by McHugh and Callan; it was used for the next several decades.

American catechists made wide use of various commentaries published on the catechismal texts they were using. This was particularly true of Perry's explanation of England's Catholic catechism which was practically identical with the American "Carroll." Perry was first published here in 1855 and republished continuously to 1930 and beyond.
After 1891, Kinkead's *Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism* was widely used. Schmitt's commentary on Deharbe's small catechism had been published here first in German and then in English from 1870. Faerber issued four volumes of commentary on his catechism between 1899 and 1902. There were never republished, but Girardy reduced them in 1906 to a one volume commentary in English, which was republished several times. The two volumes of scriptural commentary by Knecht widely used by teachers of bible history was first published in the United States in 1910 but had circulated in German and other English-language editions here before that.

Methodology on the teaching of religion can be found in various works of pastoral theology and pedagogy published here in the fifteen decades under discussion but there were also an increasing number of books and treatises devoted principally to catechetical method. The first of these was an American translation of Hamon's explanation of the Sulpician Method first published here in 1861. A more extensive and native work was authored by Lambing in 1875. His *Sunday-School Teacher's Manual* is well worth reading. Dupanloup's *Ministry of Catechizing* was first published here in English translation about 1890. There is evidence that *Catechism or Sunday School* by the English Father Furniss widely circulated in the United States in the nineteenth century but there is no listing of an American imprint of this work. Spirago-Baxter was first published here for use of the catechist in 1899.

After 1900, works on catechetical methodology by Bellord, the Christian Brothers, Halpin, Nist, Nolle, Sloan, Feeney, and Spirago-Messmer appeared. Bishop Bellord's essays, *Religious Education and Its*
Failures, was the most explosive and widely circulated of these. After 1916, the collected essays of M. V. Kelly on the teaching of religion were published. The American religious educator MacEachen produced a volume on catechetical methodology and the German work of Gatterer and Krus, translated and adapted as Theory and Practice of the Catechism, was published here. In 1929, Sharp's comprehensive and practical Aims and Methods in Teaching Religion and Bandas' scholarly Catechetical Methods were made available to religious educators.

FINAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In the judgement of the present author this dissertation demonstrates a vital and continuous catechetical concern in the American Catholic Church from its organized beginnings to 1930. There is extensive evidence of self-criticism and efforts to improve religious instruction in practically every period of the fifteen decades investigated. Conciliar action was significant, but American Catholic educators and catechists worked more continuously and effectively. From 1830 onward, and with increasing frequency, commentators on religious education appear in the ACELP criticizing and defending the condition of the American Catechesis and offering suggestions, both minor and major, for stabilizing or modulating its development. Classicalists, progressive traditionalists, and radicals, as the present author characterizes them, all showed concern. Although disappointment in the outcomes of catechetical instruction was expressed often enough, the charge was never made that religious education was being neglected in the American Church. The problems of the Catechesis were never seen as major problems for American Catholicism.
Even those catechetical commentators who saw need for improvement in the methodology and effect of the Catechesis, agreed that the job was being faithfully done. Yet each period produced religious educators who zealously worked to improve what they had received and the bulk of catechists were moved by them.

In regard to future research, several points are suggested. In Appendices C-F, the present author has assembled a preliminary checklist of American Catholic Catechetical materials published in the United States from 1784-1930. As far as he knows, the listing is in most respects exhaustive. Most of the works listed are extant. This, then, opens the possibility of researching the content of the major catechetical works used in any given period. Such a study would be a significant addition to the intellectual history of American Catholicism. Further study could be made of the development of certain emphases in catechetical literature during the close to 150 years. While the efforts of such religious educators as Shields, Yorke, and Kinkead have been competently investigated and given scholarly exposition, the work of Faerber and Bruehl, for instance, have not. The origins of the catechisms of the First and Third Councils of Baltimore are still not completely clear. The specific development of the American Catechesis among German-American Catholics has not yet been studied. The same is true regarding other ethnic groups within the American Church.

In regard to studies of the American Catechesis beyond 1930, the task of the researcher should be made easier for two reasons. The first of these is the institution of the Catholic Periodical Index in 1930. In this most valuable research tool, there is a complete listing of catechet-
ical literature as it appeared in the ACELP period by period. The present author had to examine the ACELP studied, volume by volume and very often issue by issue -- a process that was highly educative but extremely time-consuming. In 1931, the Journal of Religious Instruction was founded by Ellamay Horn and published by De Paul University (Chicago). It was the first journal among the ACELP devoted exclusively to religious education. It would be a most valuable resource in researching the development of the American Catechesis beyond 1930. Other catechetical periodicals such as Lumen Vitae, Living Light and the Catechist would be equally valuable for more recent periods. A researcher of the post 1930 American Catechesis would have no difficulty in finding voluminous ACELP material.

Finis
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L/1P - Cincinnati, O., June 24, 1865.
Letters to and from Archbishop James Gibbons:

Case 77: T1 - Rev. Januarius De Concilio to Archbishop James Gibbons, Jersey City, N. J., April 4, 1884.
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Brontius, Adolphus [Edward Gary]. The Catechist Catechized; or Loyalty Asserted in Vindication of the Oath of Allegiance against a New Catechism set forth by a Father of the Society of Jesus, to which is annexed a Decree made by the Fathers of the same Society against the said oath With animadversions upon it. By Adolphus Brontius a Roman=Catholick. n.p. 1681.
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APPENDIX A

The principal research-source used in this dissertation was the bulk of American Catholic English-language periodicals (ACELP) published between 1830 - 1930. A listing of these ACELP is given below. Where abbreviations were used in referring to given periodicals in the text of the dissertation, these abbreviations are indicated. ACELP examined in broken series are marked with a single asterisk (*); those only spot-checked are marked with a double asterisk (**). Considerable bibliographical data on the ACELP listed here can be found in the text of the dissertation. Sources containing additional information can be found above in Chapter ii, n. 2. The dates enclosed in parentheses give the years of publication of the individual ACELP. Following this listing of the ACELP published between 1830 and 1930, a further listing is given of periodicals published before 1830 and examined in preparing this dissertation.

Acolyte (1925 - 1944), superseded by the Priest in 1945.

ACHR - American Catholic Historical Researches (1884 - 1912).

ACQR - American Catholic Quarterly Review (1876 - 1912).


AM - Ave Maria (1865 - 1959).

America (1909+).

BQR - Brownson's Quarterly Review (1844 - 1863; 1873 - 1875).

Carmelite Review (1892 - 1906).*

Catholic Cabinet (1843 - 1845).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Catholic Mind (1902+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCR</td>
<td>Catholic Reading Circle Review (1891 - 1897), titled Mosher's Magazine (1898 - 1903) and Champlain Educator (1903 - 1906). Catholic Record (1871 - 1878).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRL</td>
<td>Catholic Rural Life (1925+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSHM</td>
<td>Catholic School and Home Magazine (1892 - 1897).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIN</td>
<td>Catholic School Interests (1922 - 1938).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUB</td>
<td>Catholic University Bulletin (1895 - 1928).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Catholic World (1865+). Commonweal (1924+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Donahoe's Magazine (1879 - 1908).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Cf. AER. Expositor or Young Catholic's Guide (1830 - 1831). Extension (1907).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNR</td>
<td>Cf. CFR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPR</td>
<td>Cf. HM&amp;C. Globe (1889 - 1904). Helper (1905 - 1913).*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McGee's Illustrated Weekly (1876 - 1882).*

Magnificat (1907 - 1968).

Metropolitan or Catholic Monthly Magazine (1830).

Metropolitan (1853 - 1859).

Milwaukee Catholic Magazine (1875).

Monthly (1865).

Messenger (1907 - 1909), superseded by America (1909+).

MSH - Messenger of the Sacred Heart (1866 - 1967).

NCEAB - Cf. CEAB.


OF - Oorate Fratres (1925+), titled Worship in 1951.


Pastoralblatt (1886 - 1925).**


Rosary Magazine (1891 - 1968).*

Salesianum (1873 - 1878).

Salesianum (1906+).

Sign (1921+).*

Sacred Heart Review (1888 - 1918).**

Sunday Companion (1900 - 1927).*

Sunday School Messenger (1868 - 1887).**

T&O - Teacher and Organist (1890 - 1910), final volume titled Catholic Education Review.*

Thought (1926+).

Truth (1894 - 1935).*
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APPENDIX B

Considerable attempt has been made to find biographical material for the various persons named in this study. Where this material can be found is listed below. Where such material has already been given in the dissertation-text, reference to that place is given below. When a name does not appear in this list, it is due to one of several reasons: a) biographical material on this person is easily found in standard reference works; b) no relative material was found on the person, c) the person has been mentioned only incidentally in the text or notes. In regard to this last group, when the present author came across biographical data concerning these, he did include their names in this list.

Collections and individual works cited below are fully given in the General Bibliography of this dissertation under "Biographical Sources and Studies." Most of these articles or works cited give references to additional biographical materials. A system of short-title listings and respective abbreviations is given below:

A - American Catholic Who's Who (1911).
C - Catalogue générale des livres imprimés de la bibliothèque nationale.
D - Catholic Encyclopedia.
E - Catholic Encyclopedia and Its Makers.
F - Catholicisme, hier, aujourd'hui, demain.
G - Catholic Who's Who (and Yearbook). (British)
K - Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique.
L - Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.
M - Gillow, A Literary and Biographical History (etc.)
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Letter designations following the names listed below indicate relative biographical material can be found in the above sources.


Allen, William Cardinal (1532-1594): D, J, M, S.

Ambauen, Rev. Andrew (b. 1847): A.

Auger, Pere Edmond, SJ (1530-1591): D, K.

Astete, Padre Gaspar, SJ (1537-1601): S.


Baird, Ella (fl. 1900): A.


Benedict XV, Pope (1854-1922): F, S.
Benziger: D, S.
Bolton, Mother Margaret, RC (b. 1873): B (1934/35), N, V.
Brownson, Josephine Van Dyke (d. 1942): B (1934/35), N, V.
Brownson, Orestes (1803-1876): I, D, S, W (Maynard).
Bruehl, Rev. Charles (b. 1876): B (1934/35+), N.
Bussard, Rev. Paul (b. 1904): B (1934/35+), N.
Butler, Rev. Alban (1710-1763): D, M, S.
Byrne, Most Rev. Thomas (1841-1923): A, H.
Byrne, Msgr. William (1833-1912): A, S.
Canisius, St. Peter (1521-1599): D, K, L, P, S, T, U.
Carey, Mathew (d. 1839): W (Bradsher).
Carroll, Archbishop John (1735-1815): D, I, S.
Chapman, Msgr. Michael Andrew (b. 1884): B (1934/35+), N.

Chateaubriand, François Rene Vicomte de (1768-1848): C, D, K, L, S.

Cheverus, Jean Louis Lefebvre de, Cardinal (1768-1836): S.

Chrysostom, Brother (John Joseph Conlon), FSC (b. 1863): A, E.


Cochem, Pater Martin von, OFM, Cap.: (1630-1712): D, P, U.

Cochin, L'Abbé Jacques-Denis (1726-1783): D.

Collot, M. Pierre (fl. 1763): C.


Connelly, Very Rev. Francis J., CSSR (b. 1888): B (1934/35+), N.

Conway, Katherine (fl. 1900): A.


Cooper, Msgr. John (1881-1949): A, E, N, S.


Cox, Rev. Thomas (b. 1860): A.

Crumley, Rev. Thomas, CSC (b. 1872): B (1934/35).


Cummings, Rev. Jeremiah (1814-1866): D, S.


Curr, Rev. Joseph (ca. 1780-1847): M.


De Concilio, Msgr. Januarius (1836-1898): S,
Ecclesiastical Review (LXXXI, 578).


Dhuoda (fl. ca. 841): D.

Donahoe, Patrick (1811-1901): D, W (Frawley).

Donlevy, Rev. Andrew (b. 1694): D.

Donnelly, Eleanor (1838-1917): A, I.

Dorsey, Anna Hanson (1815-1896): D, I.


Drane, Mother Augusta Theodosia (1823-1894): D.

Drinkwater, Rev. (b. 1886): G (1928), N (1952).

Driscoll, Rev. James (1859-1922): D, E.

Drury, Rev. Edwin (b. 1845): A.

Dubourg, Most Rev. L.G.V. (1766-1833): D, H, I, S.

Dubois, Louis-Ernest, Cardinal (1856-1929): C, L, S.

Dupanloup, Felix, Bishop (1802-1878): C, D, K, L, W (Graham).

Durward, Rev. John (b. 1847): A.


Eccleston, Most Rev. Samuel (1801-1851): D, H, S.


Errington, Rev. Anthony (d. inter 1719-1724): M.

Eugene, Brother, OSF (d. 1876): B (1736/37).
Eyre, Rev. Thomas (1784-1810): M.


Faerber, Rev. Friedrich Wilhelm (1841-1905): b. Paderborn, Germany; ordained priest of Archdiocese of St. Louis, 1865; for many years editor of Pastoralblatt; pastor of St. Mary's Church, St. Louis (1868-1905), influential in founding Sisters of St. Mary (St. Louis).

Feehan, Most Rev. Patrick (1829-1902): H, I, S.

Feeney, Rev. Bernard (fl. 1900): onetime professor of Catechetics at St. Bernard Seminary (Rochester) and The Saint Paul Seminary (St. Paul).

Fenelon, François De Salignac De LaMothe (1651-1715): D, L, S.


Fink, Rt. Rev. Louis, OSB (1834-1904): H, S.

Finn, Rev. Francis (1859-1928): A, I, S.

Finnotti, Rev. Joseph Mary (1817-1879): S.

Fitton, Rev. James (1805-1881): S.

Fitzpatrick, Edward (1884-1960): B (1934/35+), S.


Fleury, L'Abbé Claude (1640-1723): D, L, S.

Fontaine, Nicholas (1625-1709), (Le Maistre de Royaumont - ?): C.

Formby, Rev. Henry (1816-1884): M.

Furniss, Rev. John, CSSR (1809-1865): D, R.


Gaume, L'Abbé Jean-Joseph (1802-1879): D, L, S.

Geiermann, Rev. Peter, CSSR (1870-1929): R.


Gigot, Rev. Francois, SS (1859-1920): A, E, S.


Girardy, Rev. Ferreol, CSSR (1839-1939): A, R.

Glancey, Canon M.F. (b. 1854): E, G.

Gobinet, Charles (fl. 1783): C.

Goesbriand, Rt. Rev. Louis (1816-1899): H, S.

Glennon, Rev. M.L. (fl. 1879): Priest of the Diocese of Newark; onetime assistant of St. Bridget's Church, Jersey City, and pastor of Holy Spirit Church, Ashbury, N.J.

Gother, Rev. John (d. 1704): D, M.

Constantine (Graham), Brother, FSC (fl. 1910): E.


Hald, Rev. Henry (fl. 1930): V.

Halpin, Rev. Patrick (b. 1847): A.

Hamon, L'Abbé André - Jean (pseud.: J. Huen-Dubourg) (fl. 1840).

Hattler, Rev. Franz, SJ (1829-1907): P.


Herbst, Rev. Winfred, SDS (b. 1891): N.

Herder: D, S.

Heuser, Rev. Herman Joseph (1852-1933): S.

Hewitt, Very Rev. Augustine, CSP (1820-1897): I, S.


Hirscher, Johann Baptist (1788-1865): D, S, U.

Hogan, Rev. William (1788-1848): S.

Honorius of Autun (1080 or 1090 - ca. 1156): S.

Hornbyhold, Rt. Rev. John (1706-1778): D, M.

Houdet, L'Abbé René (fl. 1790): American Catholic Historical Researches (XXIII, 74-75).

Hudson, Rev. Daniel, CSC (1849-1934): S.

Hughes, Most Rev. John (1797-1864): D, H, I, S.

Huntington, Jedediah Vincent (1815-1862): D, I.


Ireland, Most Rev. John (1838-1918): H, I, S.

Janssens, Most Rev. Francis (1843-1897): H.

John of Thoresby, Cardinal (d. 1373): S.

Johnson, Msgr. George (1889-1944): B (1934/35), S, V.


Kane, Rev. William T., SJ (b. 1880): B (1934/35+).


Kenedy: S, W (Healy).

Kemf, Rev. Joseph G. (b. 1893): N.


Lacordaire, Pere Jean-Baptiste Henri (1802-1861): C, D, L, S.

La Farge, Rev. John (1880-1963): S.


Lambing, Rev. Andrew Arnold (1842-1918): A, I, S.


Lanslots, Rev. Daniel, OSB (b. 1859): Q.

La Salle, St. Jean-Baptiste de (1651-1719): D, S.

Laux, Rev. John Joseph (b. 1878): B (1936/37+), V.


Ledesma, Padre Jaime (1520-1575): T.


LeMaistre de Sacy, Isaac-Louis (1613-1684) (Le Maistre de Royaumont -?): C, L.

LHomond, Charles-Francois (fl. 1783): C.

Linden, Rev. Jacob, SJ (1853-1915): P.

Lingard, Rev. John (1771-1851): M, S.

Liguori, St. Alphonsus, CSSR (1696-1787): D, L, R, T.

Loyola, Mother Mary (b. 1845): B (1934/35), E, Q.

Luebbermann, Rev. Boniface, OSB (1852-1910): E.


McCaffrey, Rev. John Henry (1806-1881): S.


McMahon, Msgr. Joseph (1862-1939): E, S.

McMillan, Rev. Thomas, CSP (d. 1930): Catholic educator for fifty years, largely at St. Paul the Apostle (New York).

McNicholas, Most Rev. John (1877-1950): S.


Mannock, Rev. John, OSB (1681-1764): M.

Maréchal, Most Rev. Ambrose (1764-1828): D, H, I, S.

Mary, Sister, IHM (f1. 1930): V.

Meagher, Rev. James (b. 1848): A.

Meifuss, Rev. John F. (b. 1860): A.

Merrick, Mary Virginia (1866-1955): A, S.

Messmer, Most Rev. Sebastian (1847-1930): E, I, S.

Mey, Gustav (1822-1877): P, S, U.

Michel, Dom Virgil (1890-1938): B (1934/35), S.

Milner, Rt. Rev. Dr. John (1756-1826): J, M, S.

Miltner, Rev. Charles, CSC (b. 1886): N.

Molyneaux, Rev. Robert, SJ (1738-1808): I, S.

Müller, Rev. Michael, CSSR (1825-1899): R.
Murray, John O'Kane (1847-1885): D (XVI).
Murphy & Co., John: S.
Nampon, Père Adrien, SJ (1809-1869): T.
Nolle, Rev. Lambert, OSB (b. 1864): G (1918+).
Oakley, Canon Frederick (1802-1880): M.
O'Brien, Rev. John (fl. 1870): Professor of Sacred Liturgy at St. Mary's Seminary (Emmitsburg, Md.).
Oechtering, Msgr. John (b. 1845): A.
O'Hara, Most Rev. Edwin V. (1881-1956): A, B (1934/35+), H, S.
Overberg, Bernard (1754-1826): D, P, S, U.
Pace, Msgr. Edward A. (1861-1938): B (1934/35), E, S.
Pecham (Peckam, Peccam), Archbishop John (ca. 1240-1292): D.
Pellico, Sylvio (1788-1854): D.
Penketh, Rev. William, SJ (alias Rivers), 1679-1762): M.
Perry, Rev. John (1804-1860): M.
Pise, Rev. Charles Constantine (1801-1866): D, I, S.
Pius XI, Pope (1857-1939): S.
Pius X, Pope St. (1835-1914): A, D, L, S.
Pouget, François-Aimé, Oratorian (1666-1725): C, D, L, S.
Power, Rev. John (1792-1849): S.
Preuss, Arthur (1871-1934): B (1934/35), N, S.
Price, Rev. Edward (1805-1858): M.
Purcell, Most Rev. John (1800-1883): D, H, I, S.
Pustet: D, S.
Quadrupani, Padre Carlo Giuseppe, Barnabite (1740-1806): S.
Reeve, Rev. Joseph, SJ (1733-1820): M.
Ripalda, Padre Jeramino de (1553-1618): T, U.
Rolfus, Rev. Herman Ludwig (1821-1896): D, P.
Ross, Rev. John Elliot, CSP (1884-1946): B (1934/35+), N, V.
Rufinus of Aquileia (345-410): D, L, S.
Rutter, Rev. Henry (vere Banister), (1755-1838): M.
Sadlier, Mrs. J. (Mary Anne Madden), (1820-1903): I.
Sadlier: S.
Sailer, Bishop Johann (1751-1832): D, P, S, U.
Scannell, Canon Thomas (1854-1917): E.
Schmitt, Canon Jacob (1834-1915): P.
Schwenniger, Rev. Anton B. (fl. 1885): Priest of the Archdiocese of New York, active in German-American affairs, author and editor.
Ségur, Mgr. Louis-Gaston de (1820-1881): C, D, L, S.
Sharp, Msgr. John (b. 1892): B (1934/35), V.


Singenberger, John (1848-1924): S.

Sloan, Rev. Patrick (fl. 1920): V.

Smith, Rev. John Talbot (1855-1923): S.


Spalding, Most Rev. Martin J. (1810-1872): D, I, S.

Starr, Eliza (1824-1907): D, I.


Talbot, Christopher (d. 1839): ACHS Records (XV, 121-24), W (Griffin).


Turberville, Rev. Henry (ca. 1607-1677): M.

Turner, Msgr. James (b. 1857): A, E.


Vaux, Laurence (1519-1585): D, M.


Waldron, Brother John, SM (1859-1937): S.

Walsh, James, M.D. (1865-1942): A, B (1934/35+), S.


Wenham, Provost John George (1820-1895): M.


White, Rev. Andrew, SJ (1579-1656): D, S.
White, Mother Catherine (d. ca. 1879): Religious of the Sacred Heart (New York), teacher and author of bible histories.

White, Rev. Charles Ignatius (1807-1878): I, S.

White, Rev. Thomas (alias Blacklow), (1593-1676): D, M, S.


Wiseman, Nicholas Cardinal (1802-1865): J, M, S.

Wolfe, Rev. John M. (b. 1881): B (1934/35+), V.


Zulueta, Rev. F.M. de, SJ (b. 1853): G (1908+).

Zumarraga, Bishop Juan de, OFM (1468-1548): S.
APPENDICES C - F
This bibliography of the American Catechism was basically assembled from the present author's researches into American Catholic English-language periodicals and his search of the many libraries listed in the Acknowledgements of this dissertation. He also used the various studies of American and American Catholic bibliography listed in the General Bibliography of this study under "Bibliographical Sources and Studies."

It should be noted that while this checklist has been researched and is presented here with care and precision, it was not done nor is it presented under the rubric of library science. This checklist was compiled to show the sweep and character of Roman Catholic catechetical materials published here during the fifteen decades investigated by this study. The number of editions listed under each title indicate the presumable intensity of use in the Catechesis.

This bibliography mainly lists English-language imprints but an effort has been made to include French and German titles as well. Some few Polish titles are also given.

The use of the asterisk (*) indicates that the present author has examined the particular edition so marked in hand or by photoduplication. A question mark (?) indicates uncertainty in the data. When an advertisement was used as a source, this is indicated by the symbol [advt]. When ibidem is used, it indicates that the publisher and city is the same as the edition given immediately before.

This checklist is divided into Appendix C (1784-1864), Appendix D (1865-1899), Appendix E (1900-1915), and Appendix F (1916-1930). Each of the appendices is subdivided into General Materials: Basic and Advanced, Bible/Church History, Liturgy/Ritual, Paracatechismal Materials, Materials for the Catechist.

In determining what titles should be included in this checklist, the present author made his own decision. He was not always completely consistent.
APPENDIX C (1780 - 1864)

GENERAL MATERIALS - BASIC AND ADVANCED:

The following materials are listed as General in contrast to the more specialized works found elsewhere in this appendix. General Materials are both basic and advanced, considering the age-group for which they were intended. Some single works, however, claim that they are at once suitable for children and adults.

The General Materials fall, as a rule, into three categories: catechismal (small, large, abridged, fuller), familiar (conversational, less formal), and the tract-like.

There is evidence that the first catechetical materials printed in the United States were published at Philadelphia ca. 1780 by Father Robert J. Molyneaux; the materials almost certainly included Challoner's revisions of A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, Butler's Catechism and probably Gother's Instruction on Confirmation (cf. "Letters from Rev. Rob't Molyneaux to Rev. John Carroll, 1784-1805, from the Baltimore Archives," American Catholic Historical Researches, VII [n.s.], [July, 1912], 267-78). None of these imprints are known to be extant (cf. however, Challoner in Liturgy/Ritual section).

General catechetical literature printed between 1780 and 1864 yet extant or at least known to have been extant are listed below:


Baltimore: John Murphy, 1847, 1856, 1859.

[ANONYMOUS.] Instructions for First Communion.

Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., 1841

[ANONYMOUS.] Mrs. Herbert and the Villagers or Familiar Conversations on the Principal Duties of Christianity.

*2 vols. Baltimore; Fielding Lucas, Jr., n.d. [ca. 1838] Ibid., 1856
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[British reprint; catechetical instructions given through dialog in the form of a quasi-novel; cf. Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix.]

[ANONYMOUS.] Instructions upon the Sacrament of Confirmation. Authorized by Superiors


[ANONYMOUS.] On Confirmation, Questions to be Proposed to Those Who Are about to Receive the Holy Sacrament of Confirmation. With Answers to the Same.


[ANONYMOUS.] The Youth's Directory; or Familiar Instructions for Young People Which Will Be Found Useful to Every Sex, Age, and Condition of Life, with a Number of Historical Traits and Edifying Examples. Translated from the French.

New York: R. Coddington, 1845.
2nd ed. New York: E. Dunigan and Brother, 1851.

[already advt. by Fielding Lucas Jr. in 1841]

AN ABRIDGEMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Cf. "Carroll Catechism."


[AIME, M. CHANOINE D'ÉGLISE D'ARRAS.] Catechism on the Foundations of the Catholic Faith. For the Use of the Young and the Old: Followed by the Celebrated Conversation of Mr. Fenelon with Mr. de Ramsay; and by Several Extracts on the Existence of God and on the Worship Which Is Due Him, from the Letters of the Illustrious Archbishop of Cambrai M. de Fenelon.

Baltimore: Bernard Dornin, 1810.
*New York: Economical School, 1810, 1811.
Ibid., 1812 [?].

[Bowe (items 4-5) correctly identifies this work as a translation of an 1801 Paris ed. of Aimé. The U. S. imprint carries no author.]
ASTETE, REV. GASPAR, SJ. The catechism of Astete in Spanish was offered for sale ca. 1850-90 by the New York publisher E. Dunigan and by those (after Him) who continued to use his plates.

BARDSTOWN. Cf. David, this section.

BELLARMININE, ST. ROBERT. The Small Text Catechism. Translated by C. B. Fairbanks.

Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1853.

[Italian/English text]


Boston: n.p., 1828 [advt.]

[.] A Short Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine, Newly Revised and Augmented for the Use of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Boston.

Boston: n.p., 1835.
*New York: John Doyle, 1835, 1839 [?].
*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1846.
Ibid., ca. 1858 [advt.].

[Boston incorporated "Carroll" and added a "Part II" of more extensive materials (largely taken from Butler), plus selections from Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed; General later incorporated most of Boston in its own text.]

BUTLER, ALBAN. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix.

BUTLER, MOST REV. DR. JAMES II. Archbishop Butler's catechism was widely used in the United States, in its own form, especially by the Irish clergy. With "Carroll," it was dominant in the American Catechesis before 1852. It served as a source for David, England, Boston and General before 1865; afterwards it was used by McCaffrey (1866) and served as one of the principal sources of the Baltimore Catechism (1885), both listed in Appendix D.
Father Molyneaux very probably was the first to publish Butler in the United States (cf. note under General Materials, above). Parsons [No. 68] lists what he considers may be the first American imprint of Butler, viz., A Catechism for the Instruction of Children. The Seventh Edition with Additions, Revised and Corrected by the Author. (New York: Campbell, 1788). He based this inclusion on material found in T. B. Scannell, "Doctrine, Christian," Catholic Encyclopedia, V (1911), 80, 81. Evans does not list this imprint, nor do Lewis M. Stark and Mared D. Cole (A Checklist of Additions to Evans' American Bibliography in the Rare Book Division of the New York Public Library [New York: New York Public Library, 1960]), where one might expect to find it. Evans, however, does list [No. 21611], The Mother's Catechism for Young Children, (New York: Samuel Campbell, 1788); further investigation showed this to be the work of John Willison (1680-1750).

Canon Scannell's article, cited above, is very informative but carries great confusion on this particular point. Further investigation by the present author showed that Scannell used material to support his statement almost certainly taken from Lawrence Renehan (Collections of Irish Church History, Volume I, Irish Archbishops, ed. by Daniel McCarthy, [Dublin: C. M. Warren, 1861], 555), where the material quoted refers to a Butler imprint in the Diocese of Ossory, Ireland and not in the United States. One wonders where Scannell got the title of the Campbell-published U. S. imprint (not from Finotti).

Extant editions of Butler printed in the United States include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Philadelphia: W. Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Philadelphia: W. Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Philadelphia: W. Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>New York: D. &amp; J. Sadlier [Sadlier also circulated editions here published by them at Montreal.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>New York: E. Dunigan and Brother (James Kirker), ca. 1855 [advt.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Boston: Patrick Donahoe [Donahoe also imported editions from Ireland under his label.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>New York: Patrick O'Shea, n.d. [ca. 1864].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>New York: Patrick O'Shea, n.d. [ca. 1864].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[The above appeared under varying titles with varying appendices but the title given is most representative.]


New York: Patrick O'Shea, 1859. [presumed to be abridged from Butler.]

[Cf. Butler in Appendix D - E.]

CANISIUS, ST. PETER. Catholischer Catechismus [etc.] Verfasst von Adam Britt, Pfarrer der Kirke zur Heiligen Dreifaltigkeit.

*Philadelphia: Conrad Zentler, 1810.

............. Der Kleine Catholische Catechismus [etc.]

Reading, Pa.: Carl A. Bruckmann, 1819. [taken from Parsons, No. 605, who took it from Timpe; non-extant]

............. Kleine Catechismus.

Baltimore: J. T. Dangsche, 1834.

[It is presumed, without further examination, the last two listed are Canisius; cf. also Appendix D.]

["CARROLL" CATECHISM.] The so-called Carroll Catechism, with Butler, was dominant in the American Catechesis. It was first published here probably by Father Molyneaux ca. 1780 (cf. note under General Materials, above). It was later incorporated into David, Boston, General before 1865, and afterwards by McCaffrey (1866) and the Baltimore Catechism (1885), both listed in Appendix D. The present author's investigations have found that the "Carroll" was actually a reprint with very slight alterations of the British A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine - - first published in London in 1729 (as a rewriting of the older Abstract of the Doway Catechism) and revised by Bishop Richard Challoner in 1759 and 1772. In England, the Challoner-revised Abridgement came to be known as the "Penny Catechism." The American version came to be known here as the "Carroll Catechism," since Bishop John Carroll had given it his approbation. Later, many mistakenly came to think he had actually written or compiled it. The American version contained an appendix of Eucharistic material from a catechism of the anti-Jansenist Jean-Joseph Lanquet and a daily spiritual exercise shortened and rewritten from Challoner's text.
The following is the data on the "Carroll" Catechism:

The Roman Catholic Primer, to Which Is Added with
Approval, a Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine with
a Short Daily Exercise; also Further Instructions from the
French Catechism of John Joseph Lanquet, Formerly Archbishop
of Sens.

Philadelphia: W. Spotwood, 1786. [Evans -- probably
taken from an advt.].

A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine. Newly
Revised for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States
of America. To Which Is Added a Short Daily Exercise.

12th ed. [sic.]. Albany: Charles R. and George
Webster, 1801.
Baltimore: John W. Butler, 1805 [advt.].
*New York: Bernard Dornin, 1808.
n.p., 1812, 1815.
*Philadelphia: William Fry, 1816 [prtd. with Bazeley,
C. W. Arithmetical Rules].
*Baltimore: n.p. [Fielding Lucas Jr. ?], 1818 [hymns
added.].
*Philadelphia: For the proprietor, 1823.
Baltimore: Fielding Lucas Jr., 1825, 1826 [?], 1836 [?],
1841. [There are other Lucas eds. with n.d.].
*Philadelphia: [Eugene Cummiskey ?], 1835.
*New York: J. Doyle, 1839.
Baltimore: n.p. [?], 1846.
New York: E. Dunigan, 1849, 1855 [advt.].

[Cf. note above on Boston and General.]

Catéchisme contenant les éléments de la Foi Catholique Romaine avec
les prières du matin et du soir, les litanies du S. Nom de
Jesus, celles de la S. Vierge, de N.S.J.C.


[of uncertain origin; titles vary.]

Catéchisme ou abrégé de la foi Catholique, publié par order de, Mgr.
L'Archevêque de Paris pour le fideles de son diocese et enseigné
CATECHISME DE LOUISIANE (NOUVELLE ORLEANS). Catéchisme pour la province de la Louisanne [etc.]. Redigé par le R. F. Hilaire, protonotaire du St. Siege, et superieur general de la mission des Capuchins [etc.].

New Orleans: Denis Braud [Imprimeur], 1764. [taken from Songe who took it from McMurtie].

[It had a controversial history; non-extant, it may be very well the same text as the Catéchisme ou abrégé listed above, because of its Capuchin connection; from what we know, this would be the first catechism printed within the territory of the present United States.]

---

Catechisme imprime par l'ordre de Monseigneur L.G.V. Dubourg pour être seul enseigne dan son diocese.

New Orleans [?]: n.p., 1817.
2ième ed. New Orleans: Buisson et Boimare, 1829. [issued by Bishop Joseph Rosati then apostolic administrator of the See].

"Une nouvelle édition" of this catechism was published for use in New Orleans (Lyons: Perisse Freres, 1841) at the mandement of Mgr. Antoine Blanc; it was republished a number of times in the United States.

nouv. éd. Libraire Michen et Desportes, 1861.

[It is possible that the Catéchisme de Louisiane was printed at New Orleans after 1764 but before 1817. Note the catechism carries the classical mandement of the Ordinary in the manner of French diocesan catechisms, oftentimes abbreviated "p. e. s. e. d. s. d."; cf. also Appendix D for later editions.]
There is indication that the *Catechisme a l'usage du diocèse de Québec -- Grand et Petit --* was used in the American Catechesis in the Northwest and almost certainly in the Mississippi Valley and New England (cf. John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in America* [4 vols.; Chicago: D. H. McBride, 1886-92], III, 96.) This study, however, has been unable to locate any United States imprints of the Quebec Catechism. The catechism was, of course, readily available from Canada. French and English editions of the Quebec Catechism in United States repositories can be found in NUC Pre-1956, 99:197.

*Catechisme de Saint Louis.* *Catechisme imprimé par l'ordre de Monseigneur Joseph Rosati, état du Missouri, être seul engagé dans son diocese.*

["Une nouvelle édition" of this catechism printed for use St. Louis (Lyons; Perisse Frères, 1841) seems to be a co-printing with *Catechisme de Louisiane*; mandement of Rosati's 1841 edition bears date 1833, indicating an earlier printing. On the mandement, cf. *Catechisme de Louisiane*.]

**Challoner, RT. Rev. Dr.** Cf. "Carroll" and Gother; also in Bible/Church History and Liturgy/Ritual, this appendix.

**Charity, Order of** First Communion: A Series of Letters to the Young.

Baltimore: Murphy & Co., 1851


[translated from the Italian]

**Chateaubriand, Vicomte de.** The Genius of Christianity or the Spirit and Beauty of the Christian Religion. . . . A New and Complete Preface, Biographical Notes on the Author and Critical and

4th rev. ed. Ibid., 1862.
8th rev. ed. Ibid., 1870.
[native U. S. imprint]

[CLINTON, REV. A. C. SJ.] Frequent Communion or the Advantages and the Necessity of It Asserted and Proved from the Scripture, Authority and Tradition.

New York: G. F. Bunce, 1831.
[originally published in England in 1780; advt. for sale by Father Gabriel Richard at Detroit ca. 1810, which may indicate an earlier U. S. ed., cf. also this section, Appendix D.]

COLLOT, REV. PIERRE. Doctrinal and Scriptural Catechism or Instructions on the Principal Truths of the Christian Religion. Translated by Mrs. J. Sadlier.

[used in Christian Brother schools; cf. Appendix D.]

CONSCIENCE, HENDRIK. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials section, this appendix and Appendix D.


CUMMINGS, REV. JEREMIAH W. Songs for the Catholic School and Aids to Memory for the Catechism, Being a Catechism in Rhyme, With original melodies by Domenica Soeranza.

Definitions and Aids to Memory from the Catechism,
Being a Catechism in Rhyme.

*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1862.
[native U. S. imprint]

CURR, REV. JOSEPH. Familiar Instructions on the Faith and Morality of
the Church Adopted to the Use of Both Children and Adults.

Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1829.
*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1836.
Donahoe, 1849.
Ibid., 1854, 1858, 1859 [?], 1862.
[a British work republished here; published again ca.
1875.]

[DAVID, RT. REV. BISHOP JOHN BAPTIST.] An Abridged Catechism for Small
Children with the Approbation of the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Bardstown.


Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown. Printed by
the Authority of the Right Reverend Benedict Joseph Flaget,
Bishop of Bardstown.

*Bardstown: N. Wickliffe and Bailey, 1825.

Catechism of the Catholic Religion by Rt. Rev. John

rev. ed. Ibid., n.d. [1854].

Katechismus der Katholischen Religion.

*Louisville: Otto Scheefer und Doern, 1850.
Boeswalt's revision of David was republished into the twentieth century at Louisville.

DEBONEY, MARIE JOSEPH GUSTAVE. Village Evenings or Conversations on Principal Points of Morality.

Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., ca. 1841 [advt.].


[Cf. Appendix D, this section.]

DOWAY CATECHISM. Cf. Turberville, Rev. Henry, this section.

DUVALL, EMMA. Spirit Sculpture or the Year before Confirmation.

Ibid.: H. & C. McGrath, 1853.

[native U. S. imprint]


*Baltimore: John Murphy, 1839.

[An abridged edition was also prepared.]

ENGLAND, RT. REV. BISHOP JOHN. Catechism of the Roman Catholic Faith, Published for the Use of His Flock, by the Right Rev. Father in God, John Bishop of Charleston.

*Charleston: Henry J. Egan, 1821.  
Charleston: J. Dennehy, 1827.
[center of some controversy; long considered lost; first listed by Shoemaker in 1970; advt. for sale by Fielding Lucas Jr. up to ca. 1845]

FLEURY, ABBÉ CLAUDE. Larger Historical Catechism. Part I. Containing an Abridgement of Sacred History. Part II. Containing the Dogmatical Parts of Religion.

1795. [title-page missing; Parsons lists as possible American imprint, but Bowe judges it is not.]

 ***** Catechismus historicus minor.


*Detroit: Theopilus Mettez, 1812.
[printed on Father Gabriel Richard's press]

***** Fleury's Short Historical Catechism, Containing a Summary of Sacred History and Christian Doctrine. Translated from the French and Revised. Published with the Approbation of the Right Reverend Bishop. [John Cheverus]

Boston: J. Belcher, 1813.
*New York: Joseph Idley, 1819 [titles vary.]

***** Fleury's Short Historical Catechism, Containing a Summary of Sacred History and Christian Doctrine. Translated from the French. Revised [sic] by the Right Reverend Bishop Cheverus.

Baltimore: Fielding Lucas Jr., n.d. [ca. 1820, ca. 1840].
*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, n.d. [ca. 1820], n.d. [ca. 1837].

[Basic translations are British reprints; Lucas offered a 4 part Fleury for sale ca. 1841 possibly a British imprint.]
FORMBY, HENRY. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.

FRENCH CATECHISMS. Cf. various Catéchisme de, Aimé, Fleury.

FURNISS, JOHN. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix.


  Baltimore: Hedian & O'Brien, 1853.
  *31st ed. [sic], Baltimore: Kelly, Hedian, & Piet, 1859.

An Abridgement of the Catechism of Perseverance.
Translated by Lucy Ward.

London: C. Dolman; Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1854.

[first published at Paris (1847) in 8 vols; both abridgements British imprints; cf. this section Appendix D.]


  *Baltimore: John B. Piet & Co., n.d. [ca. 1853].
  *Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1858.
  Ibid. 1859 [?].
  New York: D. & J. Sadlier, 1862 [Illustrated].

[General incorporated "Carroll," parts of the Boston; there is evidence that the General was printed locally in other parts of the country; it received a later printing in German (1865) and undoubtedly earlier ones; General was compiled and edited by Bishop John Timon, CM, of Buffalo; cf. also Appendix D, this section.]
GERMAN CATECHISMS:

Katechismus, oder kurzer inbegriff der Christkatholische lehre.

Cincinnati: K. Bereinzur, 1842.  
[titles vary]

Katechismus der Christkatolischen Lehre in Fragen und Antworten.

New York: M. Reichert, 1850.  
Cf. also Canisius, David, General, Reuter, Neumann.

GOBINET, L'ABBÉ CHARLES. Instructions of Youth in Christian Piety.  
Taken out of the Sacred Scriptures and Holy Fathers. From the French.

2 vols. in 1. Philadelphia: For the proprietor, 1823.  

[first published at Paris in 1655; first published here from British ed.]


*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1847, 1848, 1859, 1862.  

[a revision of Gother's original work (published at London in 1687) made by Bishop Richard Challoner and first republished at London in 1732.]

. Catechism or Instructions for Confirmation.

*Philadelphia: H. & C. McGrath, 1852.

. Instructions for Children.

*Philadelphia: Timothy Lynch, 1851. [advt. to 1860]
Fr. Molyneaux may well have printed Gother's Instruction on Confirmation at Philadelphia ca. 1785 or at least imported it; cf. note under General Materials, above.

HAMON. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

HAY, RT. REV. BISHOP GEORGE. An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine.

*Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1800; 1803.
*Baltimore: Bernard Dornin, 1809. [published "with some alterations in the language."
Baltimore: Fielding Lucas Jr., 1827, 1831. [advt. by Lucas up to 1845].

Hay's Abridgement is based upon his larger works, listed below; a British reprint and not a compilation of Bishop John Carroll, as some judge it to be.

The Pious Christian Instructed in the Nature and Practice of the Principal Exercises of Piety Used in the Catholic Church.

*Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1800.

The Devout Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word.


The Sincere Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ, from the Written Word.

*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1831; 1862.
Boston: Kelly, Hedian, & Piet, 1860.
Boston: Noonan & Co., n.d. [?].

[British reprints; cf. Appendix D, this section]


*Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1789. [erroneously attributed to Chaloner.]
Detroit: J. M. Miller, 1810. [again erroneously attributed to Chaloner.]
The Real Principles of Catholics: or a Catechism of General Instructions for Grown Persons: Explaining the Principal Points of the Doctrine and Ceremonies of the Catholic Church. By the Rt. Rev. Dr. Hornihold [sic].

*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1813.
*Philadelphia: Bernard Dornin, 1819.
Lancaster, Pa.: Peter Fox, 1827.
*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1837. [with name spelled "Hornyhold"].

[advt. by Fielding Lucas Jr. (Baltimore) in 1845]

The Commandments and Sacraments Explained in Fifty-Two Discourses. By the Rt. Rev. Dr. Horniold [sic]. To Which Is Added, King Henry the Eighth's Defence of the Seven Sacraments against Martin Luther.

*Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., 1821, 1832, 1855.

[probably reprint of 1814 or 1821 Dublin ed.]

HOUDET, REV. RENÉ. A Treatise on Morality, Chiefly Designed for the Instruction of Youth. Translated by Michael Fortune.

*Philadelphia: By the author, 1796.

[probably a native U. S. imprint]


Detroit: A. Cockshaw, 1811 [Printed on Father Richard's press as an appendix to La Journée Du Chrétien.]


KEENAN, REV. STEPHAN. Cf. Scheffmaker and Montpellier.
L'HOMOND, M. L'ABBÉ CHARLES-FRANÇOIS. Pious Lectures Explanatory
Of the Principles, Obligations, and Resources of the Catholic
Religion. Translated from "la Doctrine Chrétienne par

*1st Amer. ed. from 8th Eng. ed. Philadelphia:
Bernard Dornin, 1817.

Instructions on the Doctrine, Duties, and Resources
of the Catholic Religion. Translated from "la Doctrine

[taken from the 8th English ed.]

[1st published at Paris before 1794; cf. L'Homond in
this section, Appendix D.]

LIGUORI, ST. ALPHONSUS. Instructions on the Commandments and Sacraments,
from the Italian of St. Liguori by a Catholic Clergyman.

Boston: Louis Sweeney, 1847.
*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1846, 1861 [?].

[republished occasionally, e.g. New York: Benziger
Brothers, 1898]

LINGARD, REV. DR. JOHN. Catechistical Instruction of the Doctrines
and Worship of the Catholic Church.

*New York: Patrick Casserly and Sons, 1840.
*2nd ed. rev. & corr. Ibid., 1841.
Ibid., 1842 [?]

[British reprints]

MANNOCK, REV. JOHN OSB. The Poor Man's Catechism; or the Christian
Doctrine with Short Admonitions.

*1st Amer. ed. from 5th London ed. Philadelphia: Bernard
Dornin, 1815.
Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, ca. 1837 [advt.].
Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., n.d. [ca. 1841].
Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1850, 1852.
New York: E. Dunigan & Brother, 1852, 1855, 1858.
*Baltimore: Kelly, Hedian & Piet, 1859, 1866.

[first published at London in 1752; republished in U. S. again after 1865, e.g. Boston: Patrick Donahoe, ca. 1875 (advt.)]

MERCY, SISTERS OF. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.


Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1820, 1821.

[first published at Wolverhampton, England in 1820: generally referred to as "Milner's Scriptural Catechism": often appeared as an appendix in "Carroll" and Butler catechisms in this era; actually more apologetical than biblical in its purpose.]


Philadelphia: n.p. ca. 1856 [advt.].


*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1852.
2nd ed., rev. and corr. Ibid., 1855, 1857 [?].
Ibid., 1863
NEUMANN, RT. REV. JOHN NEPOMUCENE CSSR. Kleiner Katechismus der römisch - katolischen religion.

Pittsburgh: Victor Scriba, 1845 [?], 1846.
Baltimore: John Murphy, 1853, 1855.

[Titles vary; after 1852 "Mit Genehmigung des National-Conciliums von Baltimore" is added to the title.]

Katholischer Katechismus.

Baltimore: John Murphy, 1855.

[It is reported that by 1880 the Kleiner had passed through thirty editions and the Katholischer eighteen editions; it is uncertain how original Blessed Neumann's work was; cf. also Bible/Church History, this appendix.]

An Abridged Catechism of the National Council.

Philadelphia: n.d. [ca. 1860].

[PENKETH, REV. WILLIAM.] River's Manual: or Pastoral Instructions upon the Creed, Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, Collected from the Holy Scriptures, Councils, Fathers and Approved Writers in God's Church. With prayers, etc.

New York: John Doyle, 1835, 1846.
Boston: Thomas Sweeney, 1852.
*Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1857.
Boston: Patrick Donahoe, n.d. [ca. 1861].

[first published in England in the early 18th century; "P. River" was the alias of the recusant priest William Penketh; titles vary; cf. also Appendix D, this section.]

POWER, JOHN. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.
QUADRUPANI, PADRE CARLO GUISEPPE [BARNABITE]. The Christian Instructed: Or Precepts of Living Christianity in the World. From the Italian of Quadrupani.

*Boston: J. A. Capes, 1850

The Christian Instructed, With Selections from the Works of St. Francis de Sales.


[British reprints; republished at New York: D. & J. Sadlier, 1884.]

REEVE, JOSEPH. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.

REUTER, REV. FRIEDRICH CAESAR. Katechetisher Unterricht für die Christl. Katholische Jugend.

*Baltimore: Samuel Saur [sic], 1797.

RIPALDA, GERONIMO, SJ. Catechismo de la Doctrina Christiana of Ripalda was offered for sale ca. 1850-1890 by the New York publisher E. Dunigan and those who continued to use his plates. There were also imprints of Ripalda at New Orleans [n.p., 1864]; cf. National Union Catalog of Pre-1956 Imprints, 99 (Washington: Mansell, 1970); cf. also Appendix D and E.

RIVER. Cf. Penketh, Rev. William, this section.


. A Dogmatic Catechism Wherein Diverse Points of the Catholic Faith and Practice Assailed by Modern Heretics Are Sustained by an Appeal to the Holy Scriptures, the Tradition of


Controverskatechismus.
Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet, 1848.

[Scheffmacher was first published at Cologne in 1723; Keenan was a priest in Scotland; was published again after 1865 (e.g., New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896).]

SCHMID. Cf. Bible/Church History and Paracatechismal sections, this appendix.

London: Richardson & Son; Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1854.

[an American imprint co-published in London; a reversal of Murphy's usual policy of co-publishing British imprints; cf. Appendix D.]

SPANISH CATECHISMS. Cf. Astete and Ripalda.

TIMON, JOHN. Cf. General Catechism.

TRENT, CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL OF. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

*New York:  John Doyle, 1833.
Baltimore:  Fielding Lucas, Jr., ca. 1842 [advt.].
*New York:  E. Dunigan, 1843 [44?].
*New York:  E. Dunigan and Brother (James B. Kirker), 1860.

[reprinted from 1820 Dublin ed.; advt. successively by Dunigan, T. W. Strong and P. J. Kenedy until ca. 1890]


*Philadelphia:  Eugene Cummiskey, 1833, 1839 [?].

[Irish reprint; advt. by Cummiskey as late as 1871; later published at New York by P. J. Kenedy]


*Philadelphia:  H. McGrath, 1850, 1852, 1853, 1864.

[published with slightly varying titles]

. Instructions on the Sanctity and Dignity of the Marriage State.


WENINGER, REV. F. X. [FRANZ XAVER'] SJ. Summa Christiana.

n.p., n.d. [taken from the preface of one of his later works]
Vollständiger Katechismus der Christ - Katholischen Lehre.

*Cincinnati: Kreuzburg und Nurre, 1859.

[cf. also under Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; also General Materials, Appendix D.]

* * * * *

BIBLE/CHURCH HISTORY

Reeve (cf. below) was the first bible history published here; Gahan, the first church history (cf. below). Larger illustrated lives of Christ by deLigny (from 1852) and Rutter (from 1844) were first issued fascicularly and then as a whole. The same was done for Gentilucci's life of the Blessed Virgin Mary (from 1857). These larger works were directed to education of the family. The works listed below were more designed for a formalized catechesis, but, again, this author has taken leeway in this listing.

[ANONYMOUS.] Catechism of Sacred History. Abridged for the Use of the Schools Translated from the French by a Friend of Youth.

Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1852, 1855.
Cincinnati: P. Walsh, 1858.
Baltimore: Kelly, Hedian, & Piet, 1859.

[Christopher Irving, very probably the "Friend", compiled a number of catechisms for several subjects in the curriculum.]


Cincinnati: German Catholic School and Reading Society, 1845. [advt.]
[ANONYMOUS.] Pictorial Bible and Church History Stories for the Young.


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1863.

[a Swiss reprint; cf. Appendix D; Benziger Brothers German-language bible histories were offered for sale here ca. 1853, almost certainly Swiss imprints.]


[cf. General Materials and Liturgy/Ritual sections this appendix; also this section, Appendix D.]

COCHEM, PATER MARTIN VON OSFC. Leben und Leiden Jesu Christi.

Baltimore: John Murphy; Pittsburgh: George Quigley, 1846.

. Life of Christ.


[first published at Frankfort in 1689; other German editions of von Cochem's works were reprinted here; cf. Appendix D]
FORMBY, REV. HENRY. Pictorial Bible Stories for the Young. From Creation to the Death of Joseph.

Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1856. [issued in parts].

The Seven Sacraments of the Catholic Church; or the Seven Pillars of the House of Wisdom. A Brief Explanation in Connection with Corresponding Types in the Old Testament. Illustrated with Designs by J. Powell. Engraved by the Brothers Dalziell.

Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1856.

The Twelve Mysteries of the Holy Childhood. With Engravings of Each Mystery by Artists of the School of Dusseldorf.


Pictorial Bible and Church History Series. From the Beginning of the World Down to the Present Time. With Designs, Vignettes, Diagrams, Maps, &c. by C. Clausen, J. H. Powell, Harvey, and Others.

3 vols. London: Burns and Oates; Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1858. [previously issued in parts from 1856].


[British works, co-published here by Murphy; cf. also Appendix D]

L'HOMOND, M. L'ABBÉ. L'Homond's selections from the Vulgate text of the Old Testament were published here (1786, 1810, 1811, etc.) but were designed primarily for use in the Latin class; cf. also General Materials.

MERCY, SISTERS OF. A Catechism of Scriptural History. Compiled by the Sisters of Mercy for the Use of Children Attending Their Schools. With Engravings Illustrating the Subject.

2nd ed. Ibid., 1854.
Ibid., 1857, 1859.

[Cf. also Appendices D-E.]

MILNER, RT. REV. DR. JOHN. Cf. General Materials, this appendix.

NEUMANN, RT. REV. JOHN NEPOMUCENE, CSSR. Biblische Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testamentes zum Gebrauch des Katholischen Schulen. Pittsburgh [?]: 1847.

[Cf. Appendix D.]

NOETHEN, REV. THEODORE. History of the Bible, for Use of Schools, Translated and Compiled from the Works of the Most Celebrated German Writers.

*Baltimore: Kelly, Hedian, and Piet, 1860.

[native U. S. imprint]

*New York: James Cunningham, 1824.

[native U. S. imprint but probably a translation or compilation from European sources; financed by subscribers who are listed]

REEVE, REV. JOSEPH, SJ. The History of the Old and New Testaments. Interspersed with Moral and Instructive Reflections, Chiefly Taken from the Holy Fathers. From the French.


*New York: D. & J. Sadlier, 1853 [new ed. illust.].

[one of the original works of American Catholic bibliography; first published in London in 1780; titles slightly vary; English Jesuit Reeve is said to have translated and greatly recast the French L'Abrégé de Royaumont; cf. also Alban Butler's A Selection in Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix]

A Short View of the History of the Christian Church from Its First Establishment to the Present Century.


[titles vary; cf. Appendices D-E]

SADLIER, MRS. J. A New Catechism of Sacred History, Compiled from Authentic Sources for Catholic Schools.

[Irish-born Canadian/American Mary Anne Madden Sadlier was a prolific translator and compiler of catechetica (mostly from French sources) ca. 1850-80; apparently she worked closely with the Brothers of the Christian Schools; she wrote many of what are called "Catholic teaching - novels"; cf. Collet and De La Salle in General Materials, this appendix; cf. Sadlier in Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix and Appendix D.]

SCHMID, CANNON CHRISTOPH VON. Biblische Geschicte.

Cincinnati: Kreuzburg und Nurre, ca. 1853 [advt.].

[advt. in large and small editions by Kreuzburg und Nurre and then by Benziger Brothers for another 15 years.]

The Youth's Book of Sacred History.

New York: Robert Coddington, 1851.

[Cf. Paracatechismal Materials, below.]

*LITURGY/RITE*

Devotional works, hymnals, prayerbooks were printed in the United States from 1760 onward. Fielding Lucas, Jr. published an octavo Missale Romanum in 1835 and had advertised a Pocket Missal the previous year. In 1829 he had published a 2nd ed. of the Office of Holy Week (missal and breviary) in Latin and English. Many of the prayerbooks contained liturgical instruction, the works listed below were more basically instructional.

*Philadelphia: H. & C. McGrath, 1852.


Philadelphia: M. Fithian, 1839.


n.p., n.d. [ca. 1847].

[ANONYMOUS.] Corpus Christi, or the Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament.

New York: E. Dunigan, 1853.

[Dunigan published a series of booklets (ca. 30 pp. each) during 1853 on major feasts and festivals of the Church year.]

BARRY, REV. WILLIAM J. The Sacramentals of the Holy Catholic Church or Flowers from the Garden of the Liturgy.

Cincinnati: John P. Walsh, 1858.

BUTLER, REV. ALBAN. The Moveable Feasts and Fasts and Annual Observances of the Catholic Church.


[British reprint; cf. also Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix.]

CHALLONER, RT. REV. DR. RICHARD. The Catholic Christian Instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, and Observances of the Church. By Way of Question and Answer.

*Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., 1841.

[ arranged for each Sunday of the year.]

[C. T. ?] The Layman's Ritual: Containing the Proper Method of Christian Duties, Both Religious and Moral: Drawn Out of Holy Scripture, the Roman Ritual, the Catechism and the Parocus by C. T. for the use of His Flock: to Which Is Added by the American Editor, the Order of the Mass, Vespers, Hymns, etc.

New York: John Doyle, 1834.
Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., 1844.

[first printed at London 1698]

ENGLAND, RT. REV. JOHN. An Explanation of the Construction, Furniture, Ornaments of a Church, of the Vestments, of the Clergy, and the Nature of the Ceremonies of the Mass.

Baltimore: Fielding Lucas, Jr., 1834, 1841 [?].
Baltimore: John Murphy, 1852, 1856.

[first published for English-speaking visitors to Rome in 1833.]

The Roman Missal, Translated into the English Language for the Use of the Laity. To Which Is Prefixed an Historical Explanation of the Vestments, Ceremonies, [etc.].

*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1826, 1843, (also 1865).

[There is evidence that the 1843 edition came in two forms: a Sunday and a Daily missal; New York: D. & J. Sadlier continued to publish the work ca. 1877.]

Translation of the Formula for Conferring Orders in the Roman Catholic Church according to the Latin Rite. Published by the Authority of the Rt. Rev. John England, D.D., Bishop of Charleston.

Charleston: William S. Blair, 1830.

KENRICK, RT. REV. FRANCIS PATRICK. Form of the Consecration of a Roman Catholic Bishop.


LINGARD. Cf. General Materials, this appendix.

OAKLEY, REV. FREDERICK. The Order and Ceremonies of the Most Holy and Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass, with an Appendix on Solemn Mass, Vespers, Compline, and Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament.

New York: Catholic School Book Co., 1859.

[British reprint; cf. Appendix D.]
WISEMAN, NICHOLAS CARDINAL. Four Lectures on the Offices and Ceremonies of Holy Week, as Performed in the Papal Chapels. Delivered at Rome in the Lent of 1837.


[republished after 1865, e.g., New York: Kelly, Piet & Co., 1870]

* * * * *

PARACATECHISMAL MATERIALS

The paracatechismal category, as named and designed by the present author, refers to works that were available to supplement the catechism in giving religious instruction during the 1780-1864 period. Such works, as listed here, include the so-called Catholic "teaching novel" that became widely used after 1840 as a vehicle of "popular theology," especially among Irish Catholics, in the United States. Agnew's Geraldine is perhaps the first of these. The rest are not listed here, but a number of them have been examined by Willard Thorp ("Catholic Novelists in Defence of Their Faith, 1829-1865" [American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, LXXVIII, Pt. 1], 25-117.) Various collections of the lives of the saints are also listed here rather than in Liturgy/Ritual. In addition to these collections, a number of volumes appeared on individual saints. Also listed here are various "tales," stories, anecdotes, etc. written with catechetical concern.


3 vols. Ibid., 1839.

[British reprint; republished again after 1865, e.g., new ed. New York: P. O'Shea, 1890]

[ . ] Tales of the Sacraments by the Author of Geraldine.
3 vols. in 1. New York: W. J. Cunningham, 1847.
*Philadelphia: H. & C. McGrath, 1852, 1856.


Baltimore: Bernard Domin, 1811.

The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Other Principal Saints. Original Monuments and Other Authentic Records. Illustrated with the Remarks of Judicious Modern Critics and Historians.


[The English priest's Lives were reprinted in this multi-volume form, or parts of it, again and again. After 1865, they were reduced to a more manageable one volume form with illustrations, for widespread use in the American Catechesis; cf. Appendix D, this section.]

CONSCIENCE, HENDRIK. After 1854, John Murphy & Co., of Baltimore, began to publish the tales and stories of the Flemish author Hendrik Conscience. Murphy continued to do this to the end of the 19th century. It was his response to E. Dunigan's Tales of Canon Schmid (cf. below). Each of Conscience's works had a strong religious message; cf. Metropolitan, V (January, 1857), 62-63.

DRANE, AUGUSTA THEODOSIA. Catholic Legends. A New Collection, Selected, Translated and Arranged from the Best Sources.

[pen-name of Mother Francis Raphael, British Dominican nun; a large number of her religious novels were published in U. S.]

FURNISS, FATHER JOHN, CSSR. Tracts for Spiritual Reading. Designed for First Communions, Retreats, Missions.


[Irish editions of this English Redemptorist's work widely circulated in the United States; cf. also Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; also this section, Appendices D and E.]


*New York: D. & J. Sadlier, 1851, 1856, (also 1865 and ca. 1878 [advt.]).

SCHMID, CANON CHRISTOPH VON. The many Tales of Canon Schmid were widely published in the United States after 1841. The stories of the Bavarian priest had been first translated into French and later into over twenty languages. The first American imprints were translations from the French and probably were reprintings of British works. While many American publishers put out the Tales, they were the specialty of E. (Edward) Dunigan of New York who in 1841 made them the basis of "Dunigan's Popular Library of Instruction and Amusement." Each Tale was bound separately and widely used as "premiums" in the American Catechesis. P. J. Kenedy continued to publish the Tales under the Dunigan title to the end of the 19th century. Each Tale had a "moral" and a religious message, but they celebrated the so-called natural virtues, as well; their favorite theme was that confidence in God would be rewarded. Each Tale carried illustrations.

[Cf. Schmid in Bible/Church History, this appendix; cf. also this section, Appendix D.]
MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST

Many of the larger or fuller catechisms listed above were used by catechists for their own more advanced education and understanding. Some of the familiar instructions were designed to be either used by the catechist in addressing the students or given to older students to read for themselves. There were, however, some works specifically written for the use of the catechist; this, of course, did not preclude the older or more advanced students from using them. The American Catechesis in this period (1780-1864) hopefully looked to the better and more faithful students of the Perseverance Class to become catechists themselves.

Catholic Sunday School Classbook.

Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1857.

[non-extant and perhaps only an organizational and mark-book]


New York: D. & J. Sadlier, 1856 [?].

[contains material on catechetical instruction; cf. also this section, Appendix D.]

FURNISS, FATHER JOHN CSSR. The English Redemptorist Father Furniss was widely acclaimed for his work with children in England and Ireland 1855-65. His work Catechism or Sunday School circulated here in Irish editions. It is uncertain whether or not this work received a U. S. imprinting. Cf. also Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix.


*Cincinnati: John P. Walsh, 1861.

[Cf. also Appendix D, this section.]
LE BRUN, CHARLES. Le directeur des enfants, depuis l'âge cinq ans jusqu'à douze.

*Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1811.

[French reprint from 17th century]

PERRY, REV. JOHN. A Full Course of Instructions for the Use of Catechists: Being an Explanation of the Catechism, Entitled "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine."


[a British work commenting on the "Penny Catechism" (cf. note on "Carroll" Catechism in General Materials, this appendix;) the "Penny" and "Carroll" were so similar, Perry was republished in the U. S. into the 20th century; cf. Appendices D-E-F.]

[TRENT, COUNCIL OF]. The Catechism of the Council of Trent. Translated by Rev. J. Donovan.

Baltimore: John Murphy, n.d. [ca. 1845].
*Baltimore: F. Lucas, Jr., n.d. [ca. 1850].
*Baltimore: Lucas Brothers, n.d. [ca. 1856].

[first published in Dublin 1829; various U. S. imprints listed as being published before 1833 are erroneously dated; actually they have n.d., the 1829 date being erroneously taken from Jeremiah Donovan's preface.]


*Cincinnati: Kreuzburg und Nurre, 1858.
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1861.


[Cf. General Materials, this Appendix; also this section, Appendix D; native U. S. imprints.]
APPENDIX D
APPENDIX D (1865 - 1899)

GENERAL MATERIALS - BASIC AND ADVANCED:

The following materials are listed as General in contrast to the more specialized works found in other sections of this appendix. General Materials were both basic and advanced, considering the age-group for which they were intended. While some single works claim a suitability for all ages, there is in this period an increasing effort to provide materials for different levels of comprehension. As in Appendix C, the General Materials of this period fall into three categories: catechismal (small, large, abridged, fuller), familiar (conversational, less formal), and tract-like.

[ANONYMOUS.] Instructions and Devotions for Confession and Communion. For the Use of Convent Schools. Compiled from Approved Sources and Approved by a Priest.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1887.

[ANONYMOUS.] Instruction and Catechism for Confession. To Be Used by Children Preparing to Receive the Sacrament of Penance.


[ANONYMOUS.] Instructions for First Communion and Confirmation.


[ANONYMOUS.] Familiar Discourses to the Young, Preceded by an Address to Parents. By a Catholic Priest.
2nd ed. Ibid. [title varies]

Boston: Thomas B. Noonan, 1880.

[ANONYMOUS.] Little Catechism on the Infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff.  
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1876.

ASTETE, REV. CASPAR SJ. Cf. Astete in Appendix C.

BAGSHAWE, REV. JOHN B. The Catechism Illustrated by Passages from the Holy Scriptures.  
*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1871.  
[British reprint; the basic English-language catechisms had very few scripture-quotations.]

. The Threshold of the Church. A Course of Plain Instructions for those entering Her Communion.  

Baltimore Catechism. What was called the Baltimore Catechism was first published in 1885 and published continuously in various editions to the present time. No effort is made here to give a comprehensive listing of its multiple printings by practically all Catholic publishers. Such a listing is not needed with the Baltimore Catechism, as with other catechisms, since its widespread and intensive use is so very well known. What follows is a select and representative listing:
A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Prepared and Enjoined by Order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1885.

[The above entries are representative in that the Baltimore Catechism received a printing from almost all Catholic publishers and locally from many institutional printing shops.]

A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Prepared and Enjoined by Order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1886.

[This famous Benziger ed. with some 20 engraved illustrations, good paper, large type with bold-faced questions, much whitespace, etc. was probably used more widely than any other edition of the Baltimore Catechism.]

An abridged ed. of the Catechism also appeared irregularly to the 1890's. After 1890, the Catechism appeared in forms Nos. 1-3, containing differing amounts of the same materials.

Katholischer Katechismus von Dritten Plenar-Concil von Baltimore.
Translated by Rev. A. B. Schwenniger.

*Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet, 1886.

[German/English text; cf. Schwenniger, this section; another German/English text was printed at Columbus, O.: St. Joseph's Orphan Home, ca. 1885.]

Abrége du catéchisme de la doctrine chrétienne, ordonné par le troisième concil plénier de Baltimore, et traduit en français par l'ordre de Monseigneur l'Archeveque de la Nouvelle-Orléans.

New Orleans: Lafargue Frères, n.d. [ca. 1885].
[Another abrégé was issued at New York (n.p.) ca. 1886; there must have been a French version of the full Catechism available, as well.]

Catechismo della Dottrina Christiana, Preparato e Prescritto per ordine del Terzo Concilio Plenaria di Baltimore. Translated by Msgr. Januarius De Concilio.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1886.

In addition to the German, French, and Italian versions listed above, there is indication that a Polish translation may have been made as early as ca. 1890 but it is not known to be extant. There are extant translations in Flathead (trans. by Filippo Canestrelli, SJ, publ. Woodstock, Md.: Woodstock College, 1891), Innuit (n.p., n.d.), Hawaiian (Partika: 1891). Cf. Baltimore Catechism in Appendix E for translations after 1900.


[The first of many vocabulary-added eds. of the Baltimore Catechism issued by several publishers; other eds. had vocabulary, hymns, and prayers]

After 1891, a number of eds. appeared with the question/answer units numbered to coordinate with Kinkead's Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism (cf. Kinkead in Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; also in General Materials, Appendix E.)

For scriptural additions to the Baltimore Catechism, cf. Baxter and also Cox in the Bible/Church History section, this appendix.

The authorship of the Baltimore Catechism is still not determined. It is often alleged that Msgr. Januarius De Concilio (above) had some hand in it, but its principal compiler almost certainly was Bishop John Lancaster Spalding (Peoria). As to its sources, cf. Chapter i, nn. 99-105.
BAXTER. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.


*New Orleans: n.p. [Catholic Propagator ?], 1875.

[Cf. Appendix C, this section.]

BOLD, PHILIP. Catholic Doctrine and Discipline Simply Explained. Revised and edited by Father Eyre.


[reprint of older British work]

BOSTON CATECHISM. Cf. Appendix C; although, in a sense, superseded by the General Catechism (cf. below), many preferred the Boston Catechism and it was still available during this period; cf. also (below) New Catholic Sunday School Manual.

BRENNAN. Cf. BUSINGER-BRENNAN in Bible/Church History, this appendix.


*2nd ed. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1881.

Ibid., 1886.

[one of a number of such volumes, published in this period.]

BUSINGER-BRENNAN. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.
BUTLER, MOST REV. DR. JAMES II. The Most Rev. Dr. James Butler's Catechism, Revised, Enlarged, Approved, and Recommended by the Four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland as a General Catechism for the Kingdom. To Which Is Added the Scriptural Catechism by Rt. Rev. Dr. Milner.

Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1871, 1874, 1875, 1876, *1878. [1874 & 1878 were abridged eds.]
Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham, n.d. [ca. 1872].
Boston: Patrick Donahoe, n.d. [ca. 1872].
New York: T. Kelly, n.d. [ca. 1881].
New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1884.
*Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner, n.d. [ca. 1898].

[Cf. Appendices C & E; also New Catholic Sunday School Manual, this section; above titles vary.]

BYRNE, VERY REV. WILLIAM. The Christian Doctrine of Faith and Morals, Gathered from the Sacred Scriptures, Decrees of Councils and Approved Catechisms.

*Boston: Cashman, Keating & Co., 1892.
[contains no question/answer units]

BYRNE, VERY REV. WILLIAM. The Authorized Catechism of Christian Doctrine, with Explanatory Notes.

*Boston: Flynn & Mahoney, 1894.
[native U. S. imprints]
CANISIUS, ST. PETER. Katechismus des Seligen Petrus Canisius S.J. Edited by P. Gall Morel.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1865.

Catechismus Biblicus Minor. Edited by P. Gall Morel.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1865.

["CARROLL CATECHISM."] A Short Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine.

*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1878.

A Short Catechism for Use of the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.


A Short Catechism for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States.


A Short Catechism of the Christian Doctrine.

Oswego, N. Y.: n.p. 1880.

[Cf. Appendix C; also New Catholic Sunday School Manual, this section.]

CLINTON, REV. A. C. SJ. Advantages and Necessity of Frequent Communion, Asserted and Proved from Scripture, Authority, and Tradition, By a Father of the Society of Jesus.

Detroit: A. C. L. F. Kilroy, 1884.

[Cf. Appendix C, this section.]

COCHEM. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.


[Cf. Appendix C, this section.]


New York: F. Pustet, 1880.

. Little Sunday School Manual for Beginners.

New York: F. Pustet, 1880.


Buffalo: Volksfreund Press, 1889.

COX. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.

[CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS, BROTHERS OF THE.] Exposition of Christian Doctrine by a Seminary Professor: Dogma.


[Cf. also Appendix E. the Brothers used these in their own catechetical formation for many decades; widely used in preparatory seminaries; translated from the French by Brother Chrysostom, FSC (John Joseph Conlon); cf. also in Paracatechismal Materials and Materials for the Catechist, this section also De La Salle (below)]

CONATY. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.
DAUSCH, REV. MICHAEL, PRIEST OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF BALTIMORE. A Short Catechism for Young Men and Young Women Contemplating Marriage.

Carroll, Baltimore Co. Md.: n.p., 1873 [printed at St. Mary's Industrial School for Boys]

[Cf. Girardy, Lambing]

DAVID. Cf. this section, Appendix C.

DEHARBE, REV. JOSEF, SJ. The catechetical works of Father Joseph Deharbe, a revision of Canisius, appeared in Germany in 1847-48. Deharbe achieved almost universal use, having been translated into many languages. His dominance in the Catechesis (ca. 1850-1920) has been referred to as the "Era of Deharbe." Adopted for use in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, here, in 1850, German-language editions of Deharbe were advt. by Kreuzburg und Nurre (Cincinnati) in the 1850's; whether or not these were U. S. imprints is not clear but such did follow in the 1860's. After 1862, an English-language edition of Deharbe translated by Rev. John Fander (London: Burns & Oates, 1862) began to circulate here. After 1869, American publishers issued English-language editions. The following data concerns German and English U. S. imprints of Deharbe:

German-Language Editions:


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1866, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1875.
St. Louis: Franz J. Saler, 1867.
*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1880, 1898.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1892 [German/English].

[titles vary; some eds. came with the large introduction (ABRISSE) on sacred history, others did not.]

Kleiner katholischer Katechismus (Nr. 2).

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1866, 1896 [German/English].
Kleiner katholischer Katechismus (Nr. 3).

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1886.
St. Louis: Franz J. Saler, 1869 [Anlangsgründe (etc.) für die unteresten Klassen].
New York: Fr. Pustet, 1878 [same title as 1869 Saler].

The above German-language imprints of Deharbe carry a variety of titles; without examining the text, it is not always clear what number an individual ed. falls under; the above listing contains some interpretation of uncertain data.

English-Language Editions:


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1869, 1882.


*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1875.
Ibid., 1876, 1879, 1880, 1891.

[Fander's trans. (London: Burns & Oates, 1862) had circulated widely in U. S.]

A Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion etc. Translated by Rev. John Fander, Revised, Enlarged, and Edited by the Rt. Rev. Patrick N. Lynch [Bishop of Richmond, Va.].

New York: Schwartz, Kerwin, and Fause, 1876, 1877, *1880.
*New York: Catholic School Book Company, 1878.
New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1882, 1883, 1884.

[above eds. have varying titles: Lynch's Deharbe came in small, intermediate and large forms (as the German-language eds.); advt. to 1900.]


*Huntington, Indiana: Catholic Printing Co., 1895.

Deharbe's Large Catechism Translated by a Father of the Society of Jesus of the Province of Missouri From the German Edition prepared for the United States with the Approval and Cooperation of the author.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1882.

[basically the same as Benziger's 1869 ed. (cf. above); contains some effort at grading by marking more difficult question/answer units with an asterisk.]


[Note Lynch's Deharbe (above) came in 3 forms.]

Polish-Language Editions:

Katechizm Rzymsko-Katolicki Wierszy Dla Szkol Polskich w Ameryce.

*2nd ed. Chicago: W. Dyniewicza, 1879.

Katechizm Rzymsko-Katolicki Mniejszy Dla Szkol Polskich w Ameryce.

*Chicago: W. Dyniewicza, ca. 1879 [advt.].
Polish diacritical marks not given here; at first these were not identified as Deharbe's, but later advts. carried his name in parentheses; probably reprints of Poland's Deharbe (1862); probably the 1st ed. was issued at Milwaukee.

Deharbe Commentaries:

Cf. Schmitt in Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

DE LA SALLE, ST. JOHN BAPTIST. A Christian's Duty to God by the Venerable John Baptist De La Salle. Translated with Notes and Other Additions.

*New York: De La Salle Institute, 1884.

[ Cf. this section, Appendix C; but this is a different work from Mrs. Sadlier's trans.; cf. Christian Schools, Brothers of, General and Paracatechismal, this appendix; cf. De La Salle in Materials for the Catechist, this appendix and Appendix C; the above work was electrityped and printed at the New York Catholic Protectory, Westchester, New York, where many New York publishers, in this period had work done; John Murphy & Co. (Baltimore) carried the copyright.]

DEVINE, REV. ARTHUR, CP. The Commandments Explained according to the Teaching and Doctrine of the Catholic Church.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1897.

. The Creed Explained according to the Teaching and Doctrine of the Catholic Church.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1892, 1897.

. The Sacraments Explained according to the Teaching and Doctrine of the Catholic Church - With an Introductory Treatise on Grace.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1899.

[British reprints]

DUPANLOUP. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

FAA DI BRUNO, REV. JOSEPH PSM. Catholic Belief or a Short and Simple Exposition of Catholic Doctrine. Author's American ed.; Edited by Rev. Louis A. Lambert.

*15th ed. [sic]; New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.

[A number of British editions also circulated here; the author was a missionary in England; Benziger published its Amer. ed. to 1911]


St. Louis: B. Herder, 1895, 1896 [4. aufl.], 1898 [6. aufl.].

[Cf. Appendices E-F; also Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; after 1896, eds. of Faerber were generally bi-lingual.]

FANDER. Cf. Deharbe, this section.

FITTON, REV. JAMES. Hints to Youth, in and out of Sunday School.

[one of many such volumes printed in this period.]

FLEURY, ABBÉ CLAUDE. The Complete Catechism; or Fleury’s Short Historical Catechism, Continued down to the Recent Vatican Council. Revised by Rev. Henry Formby.

*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1871.

[Cf. Fleury, Appendix C; cf. Formby in Bible/Church History section, this appendix and Appendix C.]

FORMBY. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.

FURNISS. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials section, this appendix.


. The Catechism of Perseverance: or an Historical, Dogmatical, Moral, Liturgical, Apologetic, Philosophical, and Social Exposition of Religion from the Beginning of the World down to Our Own Days.


[Cf. this section Appendix C.]


New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 1862, 1880. [this latter ed. was also titled the Illustrated Catechism.]
Buffalo: n.p. 1865.
St. Louis: n.p. 1867.
*Chicago: John Graham & Co., 1867. [Graham & Co. lists itself as "booksellers and immigration agents."]
*New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1872.
St. Louis: Patrick Fox, n.d. [ca. 1875].
New York: De La Salle Institute, 1884.

[Cf. Appendix C; also New Catholic Sunday School Manual; superseded by Baltimore Catechism (above).


*Buffalo: C. Wiedmann, 1865.

[There must have been U. S. German-language eds. before the above.]


Augusta, Ga.: J. T. Paterson, 1864.
*Baltimore: John Murphy, 1869.

GIBBONS, JAMES CARDINAL. Faith of Our Fathers; Being a Plain Exposition and Vindication of the Church Founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ.

*Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1876.

[reprinted in many editions to the present time; primarily used for convert-instruction but frequently used in the school catechesis as well.]

GIBSON. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.
GIGOT. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.

GILMOUR. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.

GIRARDY, VERY REV. FERREOL, CSSR. Popular Instructions on Marriage.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896.

[Cf. Dausch and Lambing, this section; Girardy issued Popular Instructions in Prayer and Popular Instructions to Parents among his many publications; for a listing, cf. ACWW, p. 243.]

GLEASON, REV. JAMES CSC. Catechism of Christian Doctrine or a Comprehensive Summary of Dogma and Moral Theology, Prepared Chiefly for the Use of Schools, Academies, and Colleges. With a Short Catechism for the Use of Young Children, to Which is Appended a Small Prayerbook in Which Will Be Found All the Necessary Prayers for Those Who Wish to Lead a Christian Life.

*New York: P. O'Shea, 1879.


[called "Newark Catechism" from diocese of origin.]

GOBINET. Cf. Appendix C.


*Milwaukee: Hoffman Brothers, 1865.

[also called Dubuque Catechism.]
HAY, RT. REV. BISHOP GEORGE. The Sincere Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ. From the Written Word.


[Cf. Appendix C.]

HEUSER, H. Cf. under Deharbe (English-language eds.), this appendix.

HUBE, REV. JOSEPH. Frequent Communion. Translated by Rev. Charles Barchi, SJ.

*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1891.

HUNTER, REV. SYLVESTER. Outlines of Dogmatic Theology.


[college text; British reprint]

INDIAN CATECHISMS. Cf. this section, Appendix C.

JAEGERS, REV. JOSEPH. Instructions for First Confession. Translated by a Priest of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1891.

JOUIN, LOUIS S.J. Evidences of Religion.

*New York: P. O'Shea, 1877.
*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1897.

[college text; native U. S. imprint]
KINKEAD, REV. THOMAS L. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; also Baltimore Catechism, this section.

KNECHT. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.


Baltimore: Kelly & Piet, 1867, 1869.
*New York: P. O'Shea, 1880.

[Cf. this section, Appendix E; also (below) Pellico, Sylvio, this section.]

LAMBERT. Cf. Faa di Bruno, this section.


*Notre Dame: Office of Ave Maria, 1873.

Mixed Marriages; Their Origin and Their Results.


[first of a number of works to appear on mixed marriages before 1900; cf. also Dausch, Girardy, this section; also Lambing in Materials for the Catechist, this appendix and in General Materials, Appendix E.]

L'HOMOND, ABBE CHARLES-FRANCOIS. Christian Doctrine or a Catechism of Faith and Morals. Translated by Rev. Patrick O'Mallon.

*New York: Concord Cooperative Printing Co., 1885.
new impr. ed. Ibid., 1898.

[Cf. Appendix C, this section.]
LIGUORI, ST. ALPHONSUS. Cf. Appendix C, this section.

LOYOLA, MOTHER MARY [IBVM]. First Communion. Edited by Father [Herbert] Thurston, S.J.


—. Confession and Communion.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1898.

—. Child of God; or What Comes of Our Baptism.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1899.

[Cf. Bible/Church History, Appendix E.]


MAAS. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.


*Baltimore: Kelly & Piet, 1865.
*New York: P. O'Shea; Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1866, 1869.
*abrgd. ed. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1866

[The 1865 ed. was sent to the U. S. bishops, selected clergy and laity for examination and comment; proposed as a national catechism to II Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866) but not adopted; used in 1884 as a principal source of the Baltimore Catechism.]
MANNOCK. Cf. this section, Appendix C.

MERRICK. Cf. Bible/Church History section, Appendix E.

MULLER, REV. MICHAEL, CSSR. Catechism of Christian Doctrine for Parochial and Sunday Schools.

*rev. ed. Ibid., 1876 [No. 1].

. Familiar Explanation of Christian Doctrine. Adapted for the family and more advanced students in Catholic Schools and Colleges [IV].


[Such a large consortium of co-publishing was rare.]

. Catechism of Christian Doctrine for Beginners, No. I.

*Baltimore: Kreutzer Brothers, 1875, 1876.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.
Ibid., 1888 [in German and English eds.].

. Catechism of Christian Doctrine for Parochial and Sunday Schools. No. II.

Baltimore: Kreutzer Brothers, 1875, 1876, 1879.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1876, 1888.
[eds. in German and English]

. Catechism of Christian Doctrine for Academies and High Schools, No. III.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1877.
God the Teacher of Mankind: A Plain, Comprehensive Explanation of Christian Doctrine.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1877.

God the Teacher of Mankind, or Popular Catholic Theology, Apologetical, Dogmatical, Moral, Liturgical, Pastoral, Ascetical.

*Vol. I. The Church and Her Enemies.
*Vol. II. The Apostle's Creed.
*Vol. III. The First and Greatest of the Commandments.
*Vol. V. The Dignity Authority and Duties of Parents. Ecclesiastical and Civil Powers.
*Vol. VI. Grace and the Sacraments.
*Vol. VIII. The Sacraments of Eucharist and Penance.
*Vol. IX. Sacramentals - Prayer etc.

St. Louis: B. Herder, ca. 1879-1883.
New York: Benziger Brothers, ca. 1880-1886.


*Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham, 1870.

NEUMANN, RT. REV. JOHN NEPOMUCENE. Katholischer Katechismus.

18 aufl. Baltimore: John Murphy, 1882.
21 aufl. Ibid., 1889.


32 aufl. Ibid., 1888.
38 aufl. Ibid., 1889.
Small Catechism of the Catholic Religion, . . . .
Translated from the 3rd German edition. Rearranged and Enlarged by a member of the C.SS.R.

Baltimore: Kreuzer Brothers, 1884.


Baltimore: Gebruders Kreuzer, 1882.
5 aufl. Ibid., 1886.
neuausg. Ibid., 1893.

Intermediate Catechism of the Catholic Religion.

Baltimore: Kreuzer Brothers, 1884.

[Cf. this section, Appendix C.]

NEWARK CATECHISM. Cf. Glennon, Rev. M. L.


[contains Boston Catechism plus Prayers and hymns; an example of manuals offered by various Catholic publishers in this period with choice of catechismal text, viz., "Carroll," Boston, General, or Butler; such a diffusion of catechisms caused the Third Plenary Council to seek a uniform text; cf. Baltimore Catechism, this section; after 1885 the Baltimore Catechism was offered in the Sunday school manuals.]

OAKLEY, FREDERICK CANON. A Manual of Popular Instructions on the Commandments and Doctrines of the Church.

*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1867.
2nd ed. Ibid., 1872.
[British reprint]

New York: Peter F. Collier, 1879.

New York: P. O'Shea, 1863.
New York: D. & J. Sadlier, 1872, ca. 1878 [advt.]

Percival, Rev. Henry R. *A Digest of Theology: A Brief Statement of Christian Doctrine [etc.].*
*Philadelphia: John J. McVey, 1893.*


Phillips. Cf. (above) Baltimore Catechism, this section; also Phillips in *General Materials,* Appendix E.

Pierick, R. SJ. *Catechism of Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.*
Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1874.
[one of a number of works promoting devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus in this period.]

Polish Catechisms. *Krot Katechizm Rymsko-Katolicki.*
Chicago: Somulski Publishing Co., 1892.
[European reprint; cf. also under Baltimore Catechism and Deharbe, this section.]
QUADRUPANI. Cf. Appendix C.

RIPALDA. Cf. Appendix C.


*2nd ed. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.
Ibid., 1894.
[from the German]

ROLFUS, REV. HERMAN L. Illustrated Explanation of the Commandments. Adapted by Rev. Ferreol Girardy, CSSR.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1897.

Illustrated Explanation of the Holy Sacraments. Adapted by Rev. Ferreol Girardy, CSSR.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1898.

[illustrated by selections from the Bible, Fathers, Councils, anecdotes, etc. rather than visually; adaptations from the German; cf. this section, Appendix E.]

RUSSO, REV. NICHOLAS, SJ. The True Religion and Its Dogma.


SCHEFFMAKER. Cf. this section, Appendix C.


*Conception, Mo.: Abbey Printing Office, 1898.
A Short Catechism of the Christian Religion, for Smaller Children, No. II.

*Conception, Mo.: Abbey Printing Office, 1898.


New York: Charles Wildermann, 1895.

A Catechism for the Catholic Schools in the United States of North America.

New York: Charles Wildermann, 1895.

A Small Catechism [etc.].

New York: Charles Wildermann, 1895.

[Cf. Schwenniger under Baltimore Catechism (above), this section.]

SCHMITT. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

SCHUECH. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

SCHUSTER. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.


Once Every Week: A Treatise on Weekly Communion.

.___. Plain Talks on Great Truths.

New York: P. O'Shea, 1880.

[British eds. of Ségur's Familiar Instructions and Evening Lectures on All the Truths of Religion (2 vols) were widely used in U. S.; cf. Appendices C & E.]

SLOAN. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

SPIRAGO. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.


*Springfield, Mass.: Philip J. Ryan, 1876, 1877.

STANG. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

TRENT, CATECHISM OF COUNCIL OF. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.


[Cf. Appendix C for other eds. of Douay in this period.]

TURNER. Cf. (above) Baltimore Catechism, this section.
URBAN. Cf. Bible/Church History and Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

VEROT, RT. REV. AUGUSTIN. Cf. (above) under General Catechism.

WEHAN. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1865.

The Large Catechism of Christian Doctrine.

*Cincinnati: John P. Walsh, 1865.

Grosser Katechismus der Christlichen Lehre Zum Gebrauche für Katholische Schulen.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1866.

The Larger Catechism of Christian Doctrine, for the Use of Catholic Schools.

New York: P. O'Shea, 1865.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1866.

Kleiner Katechismus [etc.].

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1866.

The Smaller Catechism [etc.].

*Cincinnati: John P. Walsh, 1865.
New York: P. O'Shea, 1865.

Kleinester Katechismus zum no thwindigsten Unterrichte für die erate heilige Kommunion.
neueste aflage. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1866, 1869, 1870, 1871.

[Cf. Appendix C; also below in Materials for the Catechist and Paracatechismal Materials.]

WHITE. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1891.

[from the German; widely used on college-level into the 1940's; cf. Appendix F.]


[combines catechism and bible history etc.; an effort toward "co-ordination".]


*San Francisco: n.p. [P. J. Thomas, Printer], 1896.

[_____________________________________________________] Textbooks for Religion [etc.]. Third Grade.

*San Francisco: Monitor Publishing Co., 1898. [described as containing preparation for 1st Confession.]

[early effort at "co-ordination" of bible history, catechism, hymns, poems, etc., using Baltimore Catechism as the base; cf. this section, Appendices E and F.]
BIBLE/CHURCH HISTORY

There was a great rise in the use of bible history in the school Catechesis in this period. In Appendix C, works available for such instruction were largely from British sources. In this appendix, it is apparent that the increasing use of bible history resulted largely from German influence in the American Catholic Church. While some bible histories contained a section on church history, special catechetical volumes on this last subject also appeared. It will be noticed that toward the end of the century a considerable amount of materials for younger children appeared.

[ANONYMOUS.] Bible History for Little Children.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1887, 1894.


New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1890.


New York: Fr. Pustet, 1866.

[ANONYMOUS.] Bible and Church History Catechetically Arranged for the Use of Children in Catholic Schools to which is added a full chronological table. Illustrated Edition.

*Baltimore: Kelly & Piet, 1888.

BAXTER, REV. JAMES J. Manual of Bible Truths and History. Adapted to the Questions of the Baltimore Catechism.

*New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1898.
BEAULERK, REV. HENRY, SJ.  
_Jesus: His Life in the Very Words of the Four Gospels._  
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896.

BRUNEAU, REV. JOSEPH, SS.  
_Harmony of the Gospels._  
*New York: Cathedral Library Association, 1898.

BUKHAUSER, REVEREND JODOCUS ADOLPH.  
_History of the Church._  
New York: Fr. Pustet, 1893.

BUSINGER, REV. L. C. [LUKAS CASPAR].  
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1865, 1875 [gives author's name], 1899 [neusausg, bearbeitet von Arnold Walter].  
[Swiss reprints; probably the basis for Gilmour's work (below)]

.  
_The Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and His Blessed Mother._ Translated and adapted by Rev. Richard Brennan.  
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1881.  
[This popular work was first issued in thirty-eight parts between 1879-1880 in nearly 1,000 illustrated octavo pages.]

.  
_Christ in His Church: A Catholic Church History._  
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1881.
COCHEM, PATER MARTIN VON. Life of Christ. Adapted by Bonaventure Hammer, OSF.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1897.

[Cf. Cochem in this section, Appendix C; in Liturgy/Ritual, this appendix.]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1898.

[first issued serially from 1894 by Conaty; designed for 14 yrs. and older; native U. S. imprint]

COX, REV. THOMAS E. Biblical Treasury of the Catechism.


[quotations from the Bible arranged according to the question/answer units of the Baltimore Catechism.]

FORMBY, REV. HENRY. The Life, Passion, Death and Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1870, 1873, 1880.


*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1871.

. A Brief Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine of the Seven Sacraments in Connection with Their Corresponding Types in the Old Testament. Illustrated with Extensive Original Designs by J. Powell, Engraved on Wood by the Brothers Dalziell.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1872.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1872.


New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1873.

. Pictorial Bible and Church-History Stories, From the Earliest Down to the Present Times.


. Sacrum Septenarium; or the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, as Explained in the Life and Person of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for the Guidance and Instruction of Her Children.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1874.

[CPS co-published Formby's works with British firms; cf. also Appendix C; profusely illustrated.]

GIGOT, REV. FRANCIS E. SS. Outlines of the Life of Our Lord.


. Outlines of Jewish History from Abraham to Our Lord.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1897.


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1898.

[native U. S. imprints; cf. this section, Appendix E.]

2nd ed. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1879.

GILMOUR, REV. RICHARD. Bible History: Containing the Most Remarkable Events of the Old and New Testaments. Prepared for the Use of Catholic Schools in the United States.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1869.

GILMOUR, RT. REV. RICHARD. Bible History: Containing the Most Remarkable Events of the Old and New Testaments. To Which Is Added a Compendium of Church History.

*[new ed.]. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1881, 1890.  
*[new ed.]. Ibid., 1894.

[a perennial volume in the American Catechesis; cf. Gilmour in Appendices E and F; probably based on Businger.]

HEUSER. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section, this appendix.

KERR, LADY ANABEL. Before Our Lord Came: an Old Testament History for Young Children.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1889.

[British reprints or co-publishing]

KNECHT. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

MAAS, REV. A. J., SJ. The Life of Jesus Christ according to the Gospel History.

St. Louis: E. Herder, 1891, 1897.

McDEVITT, REV. JOHN. Introduction to the Sacred Scripture. In Two Parts.
*2nd ed. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1895.

A Day in the Temple.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1892.

The Gospel according to Saint Matthew.

Christ in Typology and Prophecy.
[native U. S. imprints]

MERCY, SISTERS OF. A Catechism of Scripture History, Compiled by the Sisters for the Use of Children Attending Their Schools. Revised by M. J. Kerney.

26th Amer. ed. Ibid., 1873.

Boston: John A. Boyle, 1884.
[Cf. Appendices C & E.]

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1890.

NEUMANN, RT. REV. JOHN NEPOMUCENE. Biblische Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testamentes zum Gebrauch des Katholischen Schulen.
NOETHEN, REV. THEODORE. A Compendium of the History of the Catholic Church, from the Commencement of the Christian Era to the Ecumenical Council With Questions Adapted to the Use of the Schools, Compiled and Translated from the Best Authors [etc.].

Baltimore: John Murphy, 1871.

[compiled from German sources; advanced material]

OCHETERING, REV. J. B. A Short Catechism of Church History for the Higher Grades of Catholic Schools.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1899.

[native U. S. imprints; cf. Appendix E.]

O'LEARY, REV. JAMES. Bible History, with Maps, Illustrations, Examination Questions, Scriptural Tables, and Glossary. For the Use of Colleges, Schools, Families, and Biblical Students.


. Bible History.

New York: P. J. Kenedy, ca. 1899. [advt.]

REEVE. Cf. Appendices C and F, this section.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1881.

[from the German]

SADLIER, MRS. J. A New Catechism of Sacred History, Compiled from Authentic Sources for Catholic Schools.

Ibid., 1866, 1890 [?], 1891 [?].
New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1895.

[Cf. this section, Appendix C; cf. General and Paracatechismal sections, this appendix; the 1890 and 1891 Sadlier eds. bore different names and were perhaps different works.]

SCHMID, CANON CHRISTOPH VON. Biblische Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testamentes.

St. Louis: Franz J. Saler, 1869.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1880.
2 vols. Benziger Brothers, 1865, 1875 [19 auflage].

[Cf. this section, Appendix C; cf. Paracatechismal Materials, Appendices C-D-E; above titles vary.]

SCHUMACHER, [?]. Kern der heiligen Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testamentes für den Jugendunterricht in den katholischen Schulen.


SCHUSTER, REV. DR. IGNATZ. Bilder-Bibel 40 Darstellungen der wichtigsten Begebenheiten des Alten und Neuen Testamentes. Mit einer Textbeigabe kurze biblische Geschichte von Dr. I. Schuster.


Die biblische Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testamentes für katholischen Volksschulen. Mit 114 Bildern und einer Karte.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1880.

Illustrated Bible History of the Old and New Testaments for the Use of Catholic Schools. Revised by Mrs. J. Sadlier.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1876, 1889.

[a perennial volume; cf. this section Appendices E-F; Schuster was rev. by Gustav Mey at Frieburg (Herder) in 1875.]

SPALDING, REV. B. J. [BERNARD JOSEPH]. The History of the Church of God from the Creation to the Present Day.

*vol. II. Ibid., 1884.
*Ibid., 1890. [illustrated]

[native U. S. imprint]


New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1891.


New York: Patrick O'Shea, 1874.

[B]. Bible History: To Which Is Added a Short History of the Church. For the Use of Schools. By the Author of "Lessons in Bible History."


[native U. S. imprints]
This appendix shows a great rise of materials available for liturgical education within the Catechesis. As in Appendix C, one can see here the strong place of Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed, first published in the United States in 1786. The German influence, as in bible history, is also very noticeable in the liturgical works listed here. One can notice an intensification of liturgical publishing in the 1890's.

New York: Catholic Book Exchange, 1898.

[ANONYMOUS.] Ceremonies of Holy Week Explained.
St. Paul: Catholic Truth Society, 1894.
[adapted from C.T.S. of London publication]

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1893.
[adapted from a European, possibly Italian, work; several Catholic publishers put out Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year; some contained explanation, as above, some did not; most were what were called "cheap books," printed on pulp stock with light paper covers.]

[ANONYMOUS.] Illustrated Mass Book for Children.
*Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, ca. 1878 [advt.]

Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1896.
BAYERLE, BERNARD GUSTAR. The Ecclesiastical Year. Its Festivals and Holy Seasons. To Which Is Added the Lives of the Saints for Each Day by Dr. Alban Stolz. Translated from the German by Rev. Theodore Noethen.


[primarily for home]

BRENNAN, REV. RICHARD. Explanation of the Our Father and Hail Mary.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896.

[adapted from the German of Rolfus]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1892.

[often represented as an appendix of later works]

CHALLONER, RT. REV. DR. RICHARD. The Catholic Christian Instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, and Observances of the Church. By Way of Question and Answer.

*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1869.  
St. Louis: Patrick Fox, 1868 [102nd ed.].  
Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1868 [102nd ed.].  
New York: P. O'Shea, ca. 1875.  
Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1878  
New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1884, 1893, 1896, 1897, (also 1901).

[Cf. also Appendix C; "102nd ed." is probably a British figure.]

CLARKE, REV. RICHARD F. SJ. The Devout Year.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1893.

COCHEM, PATER MARTIN VON, OSFC. Explanation of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896.

[Early 18th cent. German works; an 1896 German-language ed. was printed by Benziger, as well; cf. Cochem in Bible/Church History, Appendix C.]

CURRIER, CHARLES WARREN. The Mass: A Popular and Comprehensive Explanation.

Baltimore: Gallery, 1899.

DURAND, REV. ALFRED SJ. Catholic Ceremonies with an Explanation of the Ecclesiastical Year.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896.

DUTILLET, ABBÉ HENRI-ALEXANDRE. A Little Catechism of the Liturgy. Translated by Rev. August M. Cheneau [SS].

Baltimore: John Murphy, 1897.

ENGLAND. Cf. Appendix C, this section.


Ibid., 1893.

[For school and home]
HIMIOBEN, REV. HEINRICH. The Beauties of the Catholic Church, Her Festivals and Her Rites and Ceremonies, Popularly Explained. Translated and Adapted by Rev. F. J. Shadler.

8th ed. Ibid., 1889.
[for school and home]


Boston: Doyle & Whittle, 1894.
Boston: Flynn & Mahoney, 1898.

[one of a number of popular works on the Mass issued here in the 1890's by smaller Catholic publishers and local educational groups (e.g. Catholic Truth Society as formed in various cities of the U. S.)]

LAMBING, REV. A. A. [ARNOLD ANDREW]. The Sacramentals of the Holy Catholic Church.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1892.

[Cf. Lambing in General and Materials for the Catechist sections, this appendix; native U. S. imprint]


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1898.

[native U. S. imprint]

MEAGHER, REV. JAMES LUKE. The Festal Year, or the Origin, History, Ceremonies and Meanings of the Sundays, Seasons, Feast and Festivals of the Church during the Year.

5th ed. Cazenovia, N. Y., ca. 1887.
New York: Russell Brothers, 1895.
Teaching Truth by Signs and Ceremonies; or the Church, Its Rites, and Services Explained to the People.

25th ed. Cazenovia, N. Y.: By the author, ca. 1887.
[native U. S. imprints; cf. this section, Appendix E.]

O'BRIEN, REV. JOHN. A History of the Mass and Its Ceremonies in the Eastern and Western Church.

[native U. S. imprint; advanced material]

OAKLEY, CANON FREDERICK. Catholic Worship: a Manual of Popular Instructions on the Ceremonies and Devotions of the Church.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1872.

The Order and Ceremonies of the Most Holy and Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass, with an Appendix on Solemn Mass, Vespers, Compline, and Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1872.
Boston: Patrick Donahoe, ca. 1875 [advt.].

O'DONNELL, REV. JAMES H. Liturgy for the Laity; or An Explanation of Sacred Objects Connected with Divine Worship.

[native U. S. imprint]

ROLFUS. Cf. Brennan, this section.

New York: Fr. Pustet, 1891.

[from the German]

SINGENBERGER, JOHN. Short Instructions in the Art of Singing Plain Chant.


[an indication of the influence of the German Caecilian movement in the U. S.]

WISEMAN. Cf. Appendix C, this section.

* * * * *

PARACATECHISMAL MATERIALS

As in Appendix C, the Paracatechismal section, as named and designed by the present author, refers to works that were available to supplement the catechism. During the 1865-1899 period there was an increasing effort to "enrich" the catechism in giving religious instruction. Listed here are the various "tales," stories, anecdotes, collections of poems, novels, etc. written with catechetical interest. In several instances, here and above, reference is made to Georgina Pell Curtis, The American Catholic Who's Who (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1911). (Hereinafter cited as ACWW.)

[ANONYMOUS.] Tales from the Diary of a Sister of Mercy.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1868.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.


BRELIVET, S. The Picture Church for Children; or the Teaching of the Church Made Known to Little Ones by Pictures, Stories, Examples, and Parables.


BUGG, LELIA HARDIN. The Correct Thing for Catholics.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1891.

[at least 12 eds. published after this one]


CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS, BROTHERS OF. Catholic Anecdotes; or the Catechism in Examples. Translated from the French by Mrs. J. Sadlier.

Ibid., 1870, 1873, 1876 also in 3 vols., 1885, 1896.

CLEMENT, CLARA ERSKINE. A Handbook of Christian Symbols and Stories of the Saints, as Illustrated in Art. Edited by Katherine E. Conway.

Boston: Tucknor & Co., 1886.

[For other works by Conway, cf. ACWW, 114-15.]
CONSCIENCE, HENDRIK. Tales of Hendrik Conscience.
Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1865.
[Cf. this section, Appendix C]

CONWAY, KATHERINE E. Cf. Clement.

DONNELLY, ELEANOR C. Short Lives of the Saints or Our Spiritual Bouquet
Culled from the Shrine of the Saints and the Garden of the Poets.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1889.
[Donnelly authored many Catholic books for children used in the Catechesis; for a partial list cf. ACWW, 161-62.]

FINN, REV. FRANCIS JAMES, SJ. The juveniles of Father Finn were widely used as paracatechism. For a listing, cf. ACWW, 204.

FURNISS, REV. JOHN, CSSR. Tracts for Spiritual Reading, Designed for First Communions, Retreats, Missions, &c.
Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Company; St. Louis: James Hart & Co., 1866.
*Ibid., 1869.
New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1882, 1890.
[Cf. this section, Appendix C; apparently his series of Books for Children were never republished in U. S.]

GRUSSI, REV. ALPHONSE MARIE, CPPS. A, B, C, for Children. A Series of Stories for Young Readers, with a Word, Now and Then, to Parents and Grown Folks.
New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1889.
HATTLER, REV. FRANZ SERAPHIN. *Flowers from the Catholic Kindergarten or Stories of the Childhood of the Saints.* Translated from the German by T. J. Linesey.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1889.

KELLER, REV. JOSEPH A., [COMP.]. *Stories for First Communicants. For the Time before and after Holy Communion. Drawn from the Best Authors.*

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.

KLAUDER, REV. ALEXANDER L. A. *Catholic Practice: The Parishioners' Little Rule Book.*

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1898.

LAMBERT, REV. LOUIS A. *Illustrated Ecclesiastical Map of the United States and Canada.*

Boston: Thomas B. Noonan, 1885.

MURRAY, JOHN O'KANE. *Little Lives of Great Saints.*


*Lives of the Catholic Heroes and Heroines of America.*

*New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1880.

O'REILLY, REV. BERNARD. *Heroic Women of the Bible and the Church; Narrative Biographies of Grand Female Characters of the Old and New Testaments, and of Saintly Women of the Christian Church, Both in Earlier and Later Ages.*


[a number of O'Reilly's works, such as these, were published in the 1870's.]

PRICE. Cf. Appendix C, this section.

[ST. BASIL, CONGREGATION OF.] The St. Basil Hymnal: Containing Music for Vespers of all the Sundays and Festivals of the Year. Three Masses and over Two Hundred Hymns. Compiled from Approved Sources.

*Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1889.

[This hymnal occupied a special place in the American Catechesis into the 1940's; cf. Rev. Michael V. Kelly, CSB in Appendix F.]

SCHMID, CANON CHRISTOPH VON. Tales of Good Fortune. Adapted by Rev. Thomas Jefferson Jenkins. [illustrated]


[Cf. this section, Appendix C; the Tales of Canon Schmid were published by P. J. Kenedy under the Dunigan label to 1900; in 1898 Benziger Brothers published about 10 of the Tales individually; Dublin and London eds. of Schmid's Tales circulated here, often in better bindings as "prize" or "premium" books.]

SHEA, JOHN GILMARRY. Pictorial Lives of the Saints, with Reflections for Every Day in the Year. Compiled from Butler's Lives and other Approved Sources.

New York: Benziger Brothers, ca. 1868 [advt.].
*2nd ed. Ibid., 1878.
Ibid., 1887, 1894, 1899.

[reprinted to ca. 1935; cf. Appendix F, this section.]

STARR, ELIZA ALLEN. Pilgrims and Shrines.


---

Patron Saints.

Chicago: n.p., 1869.
Baltimore: John B. Piet, 1881, 1883.
*Chicago: By the author, 1886.

TREACY, JAMES J. Historical Biographical Stories, Sketches, Anecdotes.


WENINGER, REV. F. X. [FRANZ XAVER]. Lives of the Saints. Compiled from Authentic Sources with a Practical Instruction on the Life of Each Saint for Every Day of the Year.

*New York: P. O'Shea, 1875.

[issued previously in twelve fascicles; cf. General and Materials for the Catechist sections, this appendix and Appendix C.]

The Catholic Publication Society of New York published the Illustrated Catholic Sunday School Library from 1868. Made up of several series with nine volumes each, it achieved considerable popularity. For a listing of titles, cf. Catholic World, VII (June, 1868), 432-34; a 4th series was published in 1871.


Patrick O'Shea of New York published the illustrated Popular Juvenile Library in several series of twelve vols. each, ca. 1868;
for titles, cf. Catholic World, VIII (January, 1869), 573.

Peter Cuningham of Philadelphia published the Catholic Youth Library ca. 1867.

Henry McGrath of Philadelphia published the Parochial & Sunday School Library, Brother James' Library ca. 1865.

The back cover of the Ave Maria often carried a listing of these various juvenile libraries.

* * * * *

MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST

As noticed in Appendix C, many of the larger or fuller catechisms in this period were used by the catechists for their own education and instruction. In this period, however, there was an increase of works designed specifically for the catechists. Again, this did not preclude the older students from reading them or from their being used as fuller catechisms. From 1865-1899, as in the previous period, the American Catechesis hopefully looked to the better and more faithful students of the Perseverance or Advanced class to become catechists themselves. Materials for the Catechist, published in this period, are:

[ANONYMOUS.] Katechetisches Senfkörnlein oder Praktische Anleitung für Kinder, welche noch nicht lesen können in der Schule oder zu Hause, auf die erste Katechismusklasse vorzubereiten.

Buffalo: Office der Christlichen Woche, 1879.

[ANONYMOUS.] Teachers Manual to Be Used in the Catholic Schools of the New York Archdiocese.


[contains materials for religion teacher and catechist;
a number of dioceses issued such, often in more abbreviated form, after 1900.


*Milwaukee: Hoffman Brothers, 1890.

[German/English text; native U. S. imprint; uses Baltimore text; contains no theory.]


*St. Louis: E. Carreras, n.d. [1883].

Catholic Teacher's Improved Sunday School Handbook.

New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1866, 1869.

[non-extant; perhaps only a classbook]

DE LA SALLE, ST. JOHN BAPTIST. Management of the Christian Schools.

New York: De La Salle Institute, 1887.
*New York: P. O'Shea, 1893.

[contains sections on catechetical method and organization; cf. this section, Appendix C.]

DUBOIS, LOUIS-ERNEST CARDINAL. Zeal in the Work of the Ministry by Which Every Priest May Render His Ministry Honorable and Truthful. Translated by C. A. Comes de Giancourt.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1882.
* 2nd ed. Ibid., 1892.

[contained material on catechetical teaching]
DUPANLOUP, MGR. FELIX, AP. The Child. Translated by Kate Anderson.

Boston: Thomas Noonan, 1873.
*Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1875.

The Ministry of Catechizing.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, n.d. ca. 1890.

[printed in England under the Benziger label from a ca. 1890 ed. by Griffith, Farran & Co.; references to an 1868 Benziger ed. are almost certainly erroneous, in the judgement of the present author; the English ed. above was directed for use in the Church of England Sunday-school endeavor; Dupanloup's work, titled L'Oeuvre par excellence was originally published in 1868 at Orleans.]


St. Louis: Amerika Press, 1894.

Commentar zum Katechismus für die katholischen Pfarrschulen in den Vereinigten Staaten von W. Faerber, Bearbeitet von Verfasser des Katechismus.


Principles of a Good Catechism for Catholic Children.

St. Louis: B. Herder, n.d. [ca. 1897].

[Cf. General Materials, this appendix; also this section, Appendix E.]


*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1891.
GIBSON, REV. HENRY. Catechism Made Easy.


HAMON, M., SS. A Treatise on the Catechism. Translated by Mary F. Snowden (of New Orleans).

*Cincinnati: John P. Walsh, 1866.

[Cf. Appendix C, this section.]

HEUSER, REV. HERMAN J. Chapters of Bible Study: Or a Popular Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture.

*New York: Catholic Library Association, 1895.

[originally lectures given to teachers attending Catholic Summer School (Lake Champlain).]

KINKEAD, REV. THOMAS L. An Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism: For the Use of Sunday School Teachers and Advanced Classes.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1891.

[native U. S. imprint; reprinted again and again; cf. Appendix E-F; widely used by those seeking to implement the concept of 'explanatory catechism']


[British imprint dist. here by B. Herder of St. Louis: taken from 10th German ed.; cf. Appendix E, this section.]
LAMBING, REV. A. A. [ANDREW ARNOLD]. The Sunday-School Teacher's Manual; or the Art of Teaching Catechism.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1875, 1877.

[contents repeated by Lambing in later periodical articles]

LIVIUS, REV. THOMAS, CSSR. Father Furniss and His Work for Children.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1896.

[British reprint; cf. Furniss in this section, Appendix C; cf. Furniss in Paracatechismal Materials, this Appendix.]


*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1898.

MULLER, REV. MICHAEL, CSSR. Hints on the Subject of Catechisms.

New York: Benziger Brothers, n.d.

PERRY, REV. JOHN. A Full Course of Instruction in Explanation of the Catechism. Edited by Rev. E. M. Hennessy.


[British reprint; cf. Appendices C-E-F; widely used as a larger catechism, as well.]

SCHMITT, KANON JACOB. Erklärung des Kleinen Deharb'fachen Katechismus.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1870, 1894.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1894.

[Deharbe wrote 5 vols. of Erklärung for his Katholischer Katechismus which were never republished here; he also wrote Kürzeres Handbuch zum Religionsunterrichte which very probably received a U. S. printing, viz., New York: Fr. Pustet, 1868.]

Instructions for First Communicants. Translated from the German of Rev. Dr. J. Schmitt of Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany.

*New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1881.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1889, 1898.

Manual of Confirmation, Containing Instructions and Devotions for Confirmation Classes. In Two Parts.

*New York: J. Schaefer, 1889.

[The above two texts used Deharbe as a catechismal base.]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1894.


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1899.
[translation and editing of an Austrian work; cf. Appendix E, this section.]

STANG, RT. REV. WILLIAM. Pastoral Theology.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1897.

[contains material on catechetical teaching]

[TOHER, REV. EUGENE]. Catechism Made Easy; or a Simple Explanation of Christian Doctrine, Especially Intended for Sunday Schools. By a Secular Priest.

*New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1899.

[arranged by the Sundays of the Church year; contained earlier concept of "familiar instruction".]

[TRENT, COUNCIL OF]. The Catechism of the Council of Trent. Translated by Rev. J. Donovan.


[Cf. Trent, Council of in Appendices C, E, F.]

WENHAM, PROVOST JOHN GEORGE. The Catechumen: an Aid to the Intelligent Knowledge of the Catechism.


[British eds. widely circulated here.]


*ausgabe nr. 2. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1865.

*Ibid., 1868.

. Catechismi tres, systematice coordinati pro plena juventutis christianae instructione.

*Cincinnati: Typis Roberti Clarke, 1871.

[Cf. this section, Appendix C; also General and Paracatechismal sections, this appendix.]
APPENDIX E
APPENDIX E (1900 - 1915)

GENERAL MATERIALS - BASIC AND ADVANCED

The following materials are listed as General in contrast to the more specialized works found elsewhere in this appendix. General materials were both basic and advanced, considering the age-group for which they were intended.

The Baltimore Catechism was the dominant general material used in this period. Faerber's catechism was also widely used in its several bi-lingual editions. The use of the Deharbe catechisms declined in this period but his work was preserved in the manuals of Jacob Linden. Because of the strong hold of the Baltimore, fewer other catechisms were produced in this period than in previous eras, although the Baltimore itself was published in a number of different editions. The enriched catechisms of Yorke signaled the wave of the future. The works of Mother Loyola also provided a new type of catechesis. Father Thomas Edward Shields provided an even more radical, if less widely accepted, departure from the traditional catechism. The period also witnessed the appearance of a number of catechisms designed to prepare for the earlier First Communion called for in 1910 by Pope St. Pius X (Quam Singulari).

The following titles are offered for the 1900-15 period:

[ANONYMOUS.] Catechism on Things Necessary to Be Known by Little Children.


[ANONYMOUS.] First Communion Catechism.


[perhaps the work of Father Herman Joseph Heuser.]
First Communion Catechism.

First Communion Catechism.
*New York: Bureau of the Holy Name Society, 1911.
[perhaps the work of (later archbishop) John McNicholas OP]

First Communion Catechism.
Chicago: John P. Daleiden Co., n.d. [ca. 1915].

BAIERL. Cf. Liturgy/Ritual section.

BALTIMORE CATECHISM. For earlier data, cf. Appendix D. As before 1900, the principal publishers and several institutional print shops continued to publish the Catechism in various editions during this 1900-15 period.

Bi-lingual eds. of the Catechism were published in this period (cf. Kinkead, this section, below). A Polish only ed. was published at Chicago: Wl. Dyniewiczka, 1907.

For special eds. of the Catechism (vocabulary-added, explanatory, enriched, co-ordinated, etc.), cf. this section (below) Butler, Kelley, Kinkead, Klauder, Mullet, O'Brien, Phillips, and Yorke; also St. Joseph, Sisters of, in Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

The Baltimore Catechism continued to be the dominant catechetical material in this period, with Faerber (below) its only principal rival.

Cf. also Cox and Baxter in Bible/Church History section.

BELLORD, RT. REV. BISHOP JAMES. A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine and Practice.
7th Amer. ed. Ibid., 1911. [5,000 copies]  

[Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]


*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1900, 1911.


BRULLS-MESSMER. Cf. Bible/Church History section.


*Boston: Thomas J. Flynn, 1903.

* The Holy Family Series of Catechisms, No. 2. For Use of the Confirmation Class. [etc.].  

*Boston: Thomas J. Flynn, 1902.

* The Holy Family Series of Catechisms, No. III. For the Use of the Advanced Class. [etc.].  

*Boston: Thomas J. Flynn, 1904.  

[generally referred to as the "Holy Family Series"]

BUTLER, MOST REV. DR. JAMES II. The Most Rev. Dr. James Butler's Catechism, Revised, Enlarged, Approved and Recommended by
the Four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland as a General Catechism for the Kingdom.

New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1901.

[Cf. this section, Appendices C and D.]

CAFFERATA, REV. HENRY T. The Catechism Explained.


[Other British eds. circulated here.]

CARMELITE NUN. Cf. Bible/Church History section.

CASSILY, REV. FRANCIS, SJ. Shall I Be a Daily Communicant?

*Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1915.

[influential in promoting frequent Communion]


[an abridgement of the 3 vols. listed in this section, Appendix D; the above Manual was the work of Brother Chrysostom (John Joseph Conlon).]

Catechism of Christian Doctrine, No. 3.

*Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey, 1911.

[Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

CHISHOLM. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials, this appendix.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1903, 1906, 1912 [10th-12th eds.], 1914 [13th-15th eds.], *1915 [16th-18th eds.].
[college text; native U. S. imprint; cf. this section Appendix F.]

COX. Cf. Bible/Church History section.

DAVID. Cf. this section, Appendix C.

DAY, V. Cf. this section, Appendix F.

Ibid., 1902.

*New York: Schwartz, Kerwin, and Fause, 1908, 1912.[6th Amer. ed.]

[Cf. this section, Appendices D and F; cf. Linden (below) in this section.]

. Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Specially Adapted for use in the parochial schools of the United States by a Father of the Society of Jesus.
[also published in German/English ed.]
Sredni Katechizm Religii Rzymsko-katolickiej Dla Szkol Parafialnych Ulozyl Ks. Feliks Ladon C.R.

Chicago: Spolka Wydawnictwa Polskiego, 1901.

[judged to be a reworking of Deharbe but a different translation from the Deharbe Polish-language catechisms listed in Appendix D; an intermediate catechism; Polish diacritical marks not included here.]

B. Herder (St. Louis) advt. a Spanish Deharbe in 1901; a Lithuanian Deharbe was published by Katalika press (Chicago) in 1904.


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1904.


[Cf. Messmer under Spirago in Materials for the Catechist and under Brulls in Bible/Church History, this appendix.]

DEVINE, REV. ARTHUR, CP. The Law of Christian Marriage according to the teachings and Discipline of the Catholic Church.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1908.

DRURY, REV. EDWARD, PRIEST OF THE DIOCESE OF LOUISVILLE. What the Church Teaches: An Answer to Earnest Inquirers.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903.

[more for convert instruction]
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.

[principally for instruction of non-Catholic party before a mixed marriage]

FAA DI BRUNO. Df. this section, Appendix D.

FAEBER, REV. W. [FRIEDRICH WILHELM]. Katechismus fur die katholischen Pfarrschulen der Vereinigten Staaten: Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States.

*Ibid., 1909 [13th ed.].

Katechizm dla katolickich szkol parafialnych w Stanach Zjednoczonych.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1906.
abridg. ed. Ibid., 1906.

[Polish/English eds.; Polish diacritical marks not included here.]


*Chicago: Bohemian Benedictine Press, 1901, 1908.
abridg. ed. Ibid., 1903.

[Bohemian/English eds.; Bohemian diacritical marks not included here.]


Youngstown, Ohio: O. Svovoda's Print, 1910.
*Youngstown, Ohio: A. B. Koller Print, 1913.

[Slovene/English eds.; Slovene diacritical marks not included here.]
FINK, RT. REV. LOUIS MARIE, OSB. A Catechism of the Catholic Religion, Preparatory to First Holy Communion.


[A larger catechism by Fink (rev. ed.) was published Ibid.]

FURNISS. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials section.

GATTERER - KRUS. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.


. The Convert's Catechism.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1911.

. First Communion Catechism.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1911.

GILMOUR. Cf. Bible/Church History section, this appendix.

GROENINGS, REV. JACOB, SJ. A Catholic Catechism for the Parochial and Sunday Schools of the United States. Translated by Very Rev. James Rockliff, SJ.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900.

[native U. S. imprint; appeared in German, German/English, and English eds.]
A Catholic Catechism for the Intermediate Classes [etc.]. Translated by the Very Rev. James Rockliff, SJ.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900.

[Cf. note on ed. above; also this section, Appendix F.]

HALPIN. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

HOLY FAMILY SERIES. Cf. Butler, Rev. Francis J.

JAEGERS, REV. F. H. Instructions for First Confession. Translated by a Priest of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1909.

[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]


Cumberland, Md.: American, Inc., 1913.


KINKEAD, REV. THOMAS L. For earlier data, cf. Kinkead under Baltimore Catechism (this section), Appendix D. In 1901, Benziger Brothers published the "Kinkead Series" of the Baltimore Catechism. Edited by Father Kinkead in a graded series of 5 booklets (Nos. 00-4), it was coordinated with his Explanation (cf. Kinkead in Materials for the Catechist, this appendix). The series was set-up in this way:

No. 4: Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism.
No. 3: The whole Baltimore Catechism & material included from No. 4.
No. 2: 1/2 question/answer units of No. 3.
No. 1: 1/2 question/answer units of No. 2.
No. 0: 1/2 question/answer units of No. 1.
No. 00: Prayers and Acts.

KLAUDER, REV. ALEXANDER L. A. A Catechism of Catholic Teaching: Being the Catechism of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, Newly Arranged with Additional Questions and Answers and with Word Meanings and Short Explanations.


[subject of considerable controversy; cf. Paracatechismal Materials, Appendix D.]

KNECHT. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section; also Bible/Church History, this appendix.

LACORDAIRE, PERE HENRI-DOMINIQUE. Letters to Young Men.


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

LAMBING, REV. A. A. [ANDREW ARNOLD]. Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1904.

. The Fountain of Living Water: Thoughts on the Holy Ghost.

New York: Fr. Pustet, 1907.

[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

LANON, FELIX, CR. Cf. (above) Sredni Katechizm under Deharbe.

LANSLOTS, REV. D. I. [DANIEL ILDEPHONSE] OSB. Catholic Theology or the
Catechism Explained. With a Preface by the Rt. Rev. F. A. Gasquet, O.S.B.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1911.

[Cf. Liturgy/Ritual, this appendix.]

LINDEN, JACOB, SJ. Katholischer Katechismus fur die Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1914 [1915?].

Catechism of the Catholic Religion.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1915. [taken from the 1900 German ed.]

[Cf. this section, Appendix F; Linden's works were a revision of Deharbe.]

LOYOLA, MOTHER MARY [IBVM]. The Soldier of Christ or Talks before Confirmation. Edited by Father [Herbert] Thurston, SJ.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900.

[British reprint; cf. also Bible/Church History, this appendix; also General Materials, Appendix D.]

LYONS, REV. JOHN M. Catholic Instruction: Our Easter Duty.

Chicago: Catholic Instruction League, 1913 [English/Italian text].


*Wheeling, W. Va.: Catholic Supply House, 1911.

Intermediate Catechism of Christian Doctrine.

*Wheeling, W. Va.: Catholic Supply House, 1911.


MUFF, REV. CELESTIN, OSB. Katechesen fur die vier oberen klassen der Volksschule.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.

[uses the Munich Method: a European reprint]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.

[designed to implement style of Father Furniss (cf. Materials for the Catechist, Appendix C.]

NOLLE, LAMBERT, OSB. A Simple Catechism.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1910.

[British reprint; cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]


*Chicago: John B. Oink, 1902.

[prepared at the request of parochial and Sunday-school teachers attending the Catholic Summer School (Lake Champlain); cf. this section, Appendix F.]
My First Catechism of the Catholic Faith and Practice.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1912.

O'KEEFE, REV. THOMAS B. An Introduction to the Catechism for Infant Classes and for Some Converts.


PACE, REV. EDWARD A. Cf. note under Shields, this section.


[Cf. Baltimore Catechism, Appendix D.]


[ ] Larger Catechism. Part Second of the Abridgement of Christian Doctrine for Higher Classes. Prescribed [etc.].


[contains liturgical catechism]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.
REEVE. Cf. Bible/Church History section.

ROLFUS, REV. HERMAN LUDWIG. An Illustrated Explanation of the Commandments. Adapted by Very Rev. Ferreol Girardy, CSSR.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900.

. An Illustrated Explanation of the Apostles Creed. Adapted by Very Rev. Ferreol Girardy, CSSR.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.

[these volumes are illustrated by Scripture and anecdotes rather than visually; cf. this section, Appendix D.]

ST. JOSEPH, SISTERS OF. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section.

SCHAFFLER. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section.

SCHMID, PLACIDUS, OSB. A Catechism of the Catholic Religion for Catholic Schools and Catholic Homes.


. A Catechism Primer of the Catholic Religion for Little First Communicants.


SCHOUPE, REV. FRANZ XAVER, SJ. A Course of Religious Instruction: Apologetic, Dogmatic, and Moral. For the Use of Colleges and Schools. Translated from the French.

[uncertain data; used in the U. S. but only London: Burns & Oates eds. found here to date; cf. Liturgy/ Ritual, Appendix D.]
SCHUSTER. Cf. Bible/Church History section.

SEGUR, MGR. LOUIS-GASTON DE. Answers to Objections against the Catholic Religion. Translated by M.V.B.


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

SHIELDS, REV. THOMAS EDWARD. Religion: First Book.

*Washington: Catholic Correspondence School, 1908.

Religion: Second Book.

*Washington: Catholic Correspondence School, 1909.

Religion: Third Book.


Religion: Fourth Book.


[There were readers for grades 3-5 in the Shield's series; cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; Father Edward A. Pace played some initial but undetermined role in authoring this series.]

SLOAN, REV. PATRICK J. A Catechism of Christian Doctrine for the First Grade.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.

... A Catechism of Christian Doctrine for the Second Grade or the First Communion Class.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.
A Catechism of Christian Doctrine for the Third Grade.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1912.

[Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

SPIRAGO-BAXTER. Cf. Paracatechismal Materials section.

SPIRAGO-CLARKE. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section.

SPIRAGO-MESSMER. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section.


Hartford, Conn.: Catholic Transcript, 1903.

[reprinted from series in Catholic Transcript]

URBAN. Cf. Materials for the Catechist section.

WAGNER, REV. NICHOLAS M. First Communion Catechism for Home and Class Use.

Brooklyn, N. Y.: By author, 1911.

WILMERS. Cf. this section, Appendices D and F.

WIRTH, REV. EDMUND J., ED. Divine Grace: A Series of Instructions Arranged according to the Baltimore Catechism.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1904.
WRAY. Cf. this section, Appendix D.

YORKE, REV. PETER C. *Textbooks of Religion for Parochial and Sunday Schools:*

[For First Grade, cf. this section, Appendix D.]

Second Grade.

5th & rev. ed. Ibid., 1904.

Third Grade.

5th & rev. ed. Ibid., 1904.
*Ibid., 1915.

Fourth Grade.

5th & rev. ed. Ibid., 1904.

Fifth Grade.

5th & rev. ed. Ibid., 1904.

A Short Course of Religious Instruction.


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1907.

[1st series (London: R. & T. Washbourne) circulated here; cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]
BIBLE/CHURCH HISTORY

Biblical catechesis in this 1900-15 period was given principally through the bible history. The works of Gilmour and Schuster were the most extensively used for this purpose. It was a period too, however, in which greater integration of scripture with catechism was made. The works of Yorke, Shields, and Francis Butler (cf. General Materials, this appendix) all contained this integration. Works for younger children continued to appear, as did college-level materials of biblical instruction.

The following titles are offered for this 1900-15 period:

[possibly the work of Mme. De Ségur]

BAXTER. Cf. this section, Appendix D.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1910.
[Brulls' Bibelkunde]

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1913.
[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

   St. Louis: B. Herder, 1900.

COX, REV. THOMAS E. Biblical Treasury of the Catechism.
   [Cf. Appendix D; quotations from the Bible arranged according to the question/answer units of the Baltimore Catechism.]

GIGOT, REV. FRANCIS, SS. General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures.
   New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900.

---

Biblical Lectures.
   Baltimore: John Murphy, 1901.

---

Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament.
   vol. II. Ibid., 1906.

---

Ten Popular Essays on General Subjects of Sacred Scripture.
   Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1901

---

General Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture.
   [Cf. this section, Appendices D and F.]
GILMOUR, RT. REV. RICHARD. Bible History, Containing the Most Remarkable Events of the Old and New Testaments. To Which is Added a Compendium of Church History.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1919.

[Cf. this section, Appendices D and F.]

KNECHT, BISHOP FRIEDRICH JUSTUS. A Child's Bible History.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1890.

[Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix; also this section, Appendix F.]


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1904.

LOYOLA, MOTHER MARY [IBVM]. Jesus of Nazareth.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1906.

[Cf. General Materials, this appendix and Appendix D.]

MAAS. Cf. this section, Appendix D.

MERCY, SISTERS OF. A Catechism of Scriptural History Compiled by the Sisters of Mercy for the Use of Children Attending Their Schools.

Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. [advt. up to 1915].

[Cf. this section, Appendices C and D.]

MERRICK, MARY VIRGINIA. The Life of Christ for Children. A Course of Lectures Combining the Principal Events in the Life of Our Lord with Catechism.
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1909.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1912.

MULLANY, REV. JOHN F. Bible Studies.
Syracuse, N. Y.: Mason Press, 1903.

NASH, REV. JOHN. Practical Explanation and Application of Bible History.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902.

O'DONNELL, REV. JAMES H. Jesus Christ: A Scriptural Study.
Boston: Hurd and Everts Co., 1900.

OECHTERING, MSGR. J. H. A Short Catechism of Church History.
[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

O'LEARY, REV. JAMES. Bible History.
New York: P. J. Kenedy, ca. 1901 [advt.].
[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

REEVE, REV. JOSEPH, SJ. Bible History.
New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1901 [advt.]
[Cf. this section, Appendices C and D.]
ST. JOSEPH, SISTERS OF. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

SCHUSTER, REV. DR. IGNATZ. Cf. this section, Appendices D and F. The Schuster bible history was not revised in a new ed. during this period but was continuously reprinted and used.

URBAN. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

WRAY. Cf. General Materials, this appendix.

* * * * *

LITURGY/ritual

There was a rise in the integration of Liturgy with catechism in this 1900-15 period. The works of Shields, Yorke, and Francis J. Butler contained this integration (cf. General Materials, this appendix). The syllabus-like Handbook for Teachers produced by the Sisters of St. Joseph (cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix) was especially strong on liturgical integration. Strangely enough, this study has encountered very few works of specifically liturgical education for this period, although a number of such works first published in the late 1890's still were reprinted and circulated after 1900.
The following titles are offered for this 1900-15 period:


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

BAIERL, REV. JOSEPH J.  The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, Explained in Form of Questions and Answers, Enlarged and Illustrated for School Use.


CHALLONER, RT. REV. DR. RICHARD.  The Catholic Christian Instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, and Observances of the Church. By Way of Question and Answer.

New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1901.

[Cf. Appendices C and D; this ed. reprinted by use of the mid-nineteenth century stereotype plates; typographically very poor.]

COCHEM.  Cf. this section, Appendix D.

DURAND.  Cf. this section, Appendix D.

LANSLOTS.  Cf. this section, Appendix D.

MAGNAN, ABBÉ ARISTIDE.  Catéchisme de la très Sainte Messe.

MEAGHER, REV. JAMES LUKE. The Festal Year, or the Origin, History, Ceremonies and Meanings of the Sundays, Seasons, Feasts and Festivals of the Church Year.


Teaching Truth by Signs and Ceremonies; or the Church, Its Rites, and Services Explained to the People.


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

ST. JOSEPH, SISTERS OF. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.

VAUGHAN, HERBERT CARDINAL. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1900.


[data incomplete]

*        *        *        *        *

PARACATECHISMAL MATERIALS

Enrichment of the catechism characterized the Catechesis in the 1900-15 period. As in the 1890's, great stress was placed on the use of the anecdote to illustrate the catechismal lesson. Catholic publishers continued to publish juvenile novels that had a teaching purpose and the various "tales," so widely used in the previous century, continued to appear.

New York: Benziger Brothers, ca. 1901 [advt.].

BERTHOLD, REV. THEODORE. Little Lives of the Saints for Children.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900.

BRENNAN, REV. THOMAS J. A Simple Directory of Catholic Terms.


CHISHOLM, REV. D. The Catechism in Examples.


[1st British ed. (1886) had wide circulation in U. S.]

CONROY, REV. JOSEPH P. Talks to Boys.


DONNELLY, ELEANOR CECILIA. For a listing of her paracatechisma, cf. ACWW, pp. 161-62.

FINN, REV. FRANCIS JAMES, SJ. For a listing of his paracatechisma, cf. ACWW, p. 204.

FOGG, MARY LAPE. Credo or Stories Illustrative of the Apostles.

FURNISS, FATHER JOHN, CSSR. Tracts for Spiritual Reading, Designed for First Communions, Retreats, Missions, etc.

*New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1904.

[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

HOLY CHILD OF JESUS, RELIGIOUS OF THE SOCIETY OF THE. In this period (1900-15), a number of booklets (@ 60¢) were authored by the above religious sisters, but the data of publication is incomplete. Some titles advertised are: Mary the Queen, Lessons of the King [Parables], Talks with Little Ones about the Apostles Creed, Queen's Festivals [Feasts of BVM], Gift of the King [Holy Eucharist], Miracles of Our Lord, Story of the Friends of Jesus [anecdotes].

REGER, REV. AMBROSE, OSB. How Johnny Was Baptized. A Narrative with a Lesson.

n.p.: Corbin Kent: Sacred Heart Church, 1912.

SADLIER, ANNA TERESA. For a listing of her paracatechisma, cf. ACWW, 574-75.

ST. JOSEPH, SISTERS OF. Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this Appendix.

SHEA. Cf. this section, Appendices D and F.

SPALDING, REV. HENRY S., SJ. For a listing of his paracatechisma, cf. ACWW, p. 616.

SPIRAGO, REV. FRANZ. Anecdotes and Examples Illustrating the Catholic Catechism, Supplemented, Adapted to the Baltimore Catechism, and Edited by Rev. James J. Baxter.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1904, 1908.
As Catholic publishers before 1900 (cf. this section, Appendix D), Matre & Company of Chicago published *After School Stories* in three series of ten booklets each during this period. The various series contained reprints from *Ave Maria* and short stories by Maurice Francis Egan, Father Francis Finn SJ, Mary Catherine Crowley, L. W. Reilly, Anna T. Sadlier, and other more contemporary authors. The works of older authors such as Canon Schmid, Mrs. J. Sadlier, Hendrick Conscience were also included.

* * * * *

**MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST**

The surge toward "explanatory catechism" so noticeable in the 1890's reached a climax in this 1900-15 period. Progressives called upon the catechist to exercise an increasingly more active role in catechizing. While most of the works listed below kept the catechism as the basis of religious instruction, they attempted to show the catechist means of explaining and enriching the catechismal text. The Handbook for Teachers compiled by the Sisters of St. Joseph (Chestnut Hill) is particularly representative of the progressive thrust. Bellord led the protest against comprehensive memorization of the catechism and Shields sought to eliminate its use in the earlier grades altogether. The catechism survived these assaults, however, and remained the dominant catechetical material. But more and more catechists attempted to implement the progressive thrust for explanation and enrichment.

BELLORD, RT. REV. BISHOP JAMES. Religious Education and Its Failures.  
*Notre Dame: Ave Maria*, 1901.

*[Cf. General Materials, this appendix.]*
[CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS, BROTHERS OF THE.] Elements of Practical Pedagogy.

*New York: LaSalle Bureau, 1906.

[contains material on the teaching of religion]


Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey, 1912.
*2nd ed. Ibid., 1913.

[from the French, cf. this section, Appendices C and D; also General Materials, this appendix; also Graham, this section.]

CORSI, COSMINO CARDINAL. Little Sermons on the Catechism, from the Italian of Cosmino Corsi, Cardinal Archbishop of Pisa.


[reprinted from the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist]


St. Louis: B. Herder, n.d. [ca. 1901].


St. Louis: B. Herder, 1906.

[a reduction of Faerber's 4 vols; cf. General Materials, this appendix; cf. this section and General Materials, Appendices D and F.]

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1907.

FERRERES, REV. JOANNES, SJ. The Decree on Holy Communion: A Historical Sketch and Commentary. Translated by H. Jiminez.


Swanton, Vt.: By the author, 1901.

GATTERER, REV. MICHAEL, SJ, AND KRUS, REV. FRANCIS, SJ. Education to Purity: Thoughts on Sexual Training and Education Proposed to Clergymen, Parents, and Educators. Translated and edited by Rev. C. Van Der Donckt.

*New York: F. Pustet, 1912.

... Theory and Practice of the Catechism. Translated by Rev. J. B. Ceulmans.

*New York: F. Pustet, 1914.

[from the German]


New York: Joseph H. Wagner, 1913.

[native U. S. imprint; reprinted from Homiletic Monthly.]

[GRAHAM, BRO. CONSTANTINE, FSC]. The Young Christian Teacher Encouraged or Objections to Teaching Answered. With an Introduction by Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding. By B. C. G.
*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1902.

[Cf. also Christian Schools, Brothers of, this section.]

HAGAN, REV. JOHN. A Compendium of Catechetical Instruction.

[translated and adapted from the Italian work of Ranieri]


*2nd series. Ibid., 1905.


. Instruction and Moral Teaching of Children.
[all reprinted from Homiletic Monthly and Catechist; native U. S. imprints]

HOWE, CANON G. E. [GEORGE EDWARD]. The Catechist or Readings and Suggestions for the Explanation of the Catechism of the Christian Doctrine. With Numerous Questions and Examples from Scripture and History and an Appendix of Anecdotes and Illustrations.

[first published in England in 1895; cf. this section, Appendix F.]
KINKEAD, REV. THOMAS L. An Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism: For the Use of Sunday School Teachers and Advanced Classes.

New York: Benziger Brothers, [?].

[republished throughout this period but dates uncertain; cf. Appendices D and F.]


[Cf. this section, Appendix D; distributed in U. S. by B. Herder of St. Louis.]


[ Cf. also Bible/Church History, this appendix.]

MAZURE, PERE H. OMI. First Communion of Children and its Consequences. Translated by F. M. de Zulueta, SJ.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1910.

[British reprint]

MERRICK. Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.

NIST, REV. JACOB. The Practical Catechist from the German of James Nist. With an Introduction by James Linden, S.J. Adapted by Rev. Ferreol Girardy, CSSR.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913.


NOLLE, LAMBERT, OSB. The Catechist in the Infant School and Nursery.
PERRY, REV. JOHN. A Full Course of Instructions for the Use of the Catechist: Being an Explanation of the Catechism Entitled "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine."

St. Louis: B. Herder, [?].

[republished throughout this period but dates uncertain; cf. Appendices C-D-F.]


[syllabus for "enriched" or correlated catechism given for grade-by-grade use; abundant materials and suggestions for "co-ordination" with bible/church history, liturgy/ritual, and other grade-school subjects; uses the Baltimore Catechism but adaptable to other catechismal texts; beautifully printed and bound]


New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1901, 1902.

[reprinted from Homiletic Monthly and Catechist; where it had been translated from the German; uses narrative-approach; contains no question/answer units]

SCHMITT, KANON JACOB. Manual of Confirmation, Containing Instructions and Devotions for Confirmation Classes.

SHIELDS, REV. THOMAS EDWARD. The Teaching of Religion.
Brookland, D.C.: Catholic Correspondence School, 1907 [1908?].
[20 chapters of correspondence study; mimeographed]

Teachers Manual of Primary Methods.
[contains his theory on teaching religion; cf. General Materials, this appendix.]

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1907.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1909.
[native U. S. imprints; cf. General Materials, this appendix.]

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
[from the Austrian]

The Catechism Explained [etc.].
*New York: Benziger Brothers, [?].
[republished throughout this period but dates uncertain; cf. Appendix D.]
STANG, RT. REV. WILLIAM. Pastoral Theology.


[contains material on catechetical instructions; cf. this section, Appendices D and F.]

TAYLOR, REV. J. B. Behold, the King Cometh to Thee! Plain and Practical Instructions and Readings for the Preparation of First Communicants.


[reprinted from Catholic Publication Society plates; cf. this section, Appendices C-D-F.]

URBAN, REV. A. [PSEUDONYM?]. Teacher's Handbook to the Catechism: A Practical Explanation of Catholic Doctrine for School and Pulpit: With Special Regard and Minute Directions for the Catechizing of Children.


[native U. S. imprint; republished with some changes from Homiletic Monthly and Catechist; uses narrative-approach with no question/answer units.]

. Teacher's Handbook to Bible History: A Practical Commentary upon the Principal Events of the Old and New Testaments, with Directions for Their Application in the Religious and Moral Training of Children.


[native U. S. imprint; republished with some changes from the Homiletic Monthly and Catechist; uses Munich Method.]
Sunday School Teacher's Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism.  

*New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1908.  
[native U. S. imprint]  

ZULUETA, REV. F. M. DE [FRANCIS], SJ. Early First Communion.  

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1911.  

[British reprint; cf. also General Materials, this appendix.]
GENERAL MATERIALS: BASIC AND ADVANCED:

General Materials, basic and advanced, were produced in this period, as before. Among the basic materials, the Baltimore Catechism continued to predominate. A number of new textbooks, however, for grade school Religion began to appear. Following the lead of Yorke, they used a highly integrated approach. Such manuals were developed by Mother Bolton, the Franciscan Sisters of Christian Charity, the Grand Rapids Dominicans and others. While many continued to use O'Brien, Wilmers, and the Christian Brothers series in high school, a new type of book appeared in the works of Borgman, Russell, Cassilly, and Campion. Cooper instituted a new approach on the college level. All these new works pulled away from the Catechism or eliminated it entirely.

A preliminary listing of the General Materials produced between 1916-1930 follows:

[ANONYMOUS]. A Simple Course of Religion for Little Ones Preparing for Their Holy Communion.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.

Baltimore Catechism. The Baltimore Catechism continued to be the predominant material in the American Catechesis. The special editing of Kinkead was widely used. Similar editings by Jehlika, Kelly (James), Deck, Kelly (M.V.), O'Brien and others were also used. Father Yorke's series was still used in older and revised forms. As before, most Catholic publishers offered the Baltimore in one form or another. Cf. Appendices D - E, this section.

Bolton, Mother, RSC. The Spiritual Way.

[considered a very "modern" approach in 1929; for lower grades; cf. also Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

BORGMAN, REV. HENRY, CSSR. LIBICA.

*Baltimore: John Murphy, 1930.

[an integrated approach through Liturgy, Bible, and Catechism; designed for high school and college.]


[teacher-manuals available]

CARROLL, REV. PATRICK J. The Man God.


[high school and college material]

CASSILLY, REV. FRANCIS, SJ. Religion, Doctrine, and Practice.

*Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1926.

[high school text]

. Catechism of First Communion.

*Chicago: Catholic Instruction League, 1917.

CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS, BROTHERS OF. Catechism of Christian Doctrine.


[grade school material]
CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

COOPER, REV. JOHN M. RELIGION OUTLINE FOR COLLEGES.
Course I: The Catholic Ideals of Life [1924].
Course II: The Motives and Means of Catholic Life [1926].
Course III: Christ and His Church [1930].
Course IV: Life Problems [1928].


COPPENS, REV. CHARLES, S.J. SYSTEMATIC STUDY OF RELIGION.

*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1925. (designated 28, 29, 30 eds.)

[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

DAY, REV. VICTOR. EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM.


[greatly similar to Yorke's approach: designed for Religious Vacation school use; cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

DECK, REV. E. M. THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM WITH EXPLANATION.

*3 nos. Buffalo: Rausch and Stoekel, 1929.

DOMINICAN SISTERS [GRAND RAPIDS]. WITH MOTHER CHURCH: A LABORATORY MANUAL OF RELIGION. GRADES I - XII.

DOYLE, REV. FRANCIS X., SJ. The Defense of the Catholic Church, Combined with a Study of the Life of Christ Based on the Gospels.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.

[1st volume in "Truth of Christianity Series"; college text]


[Cf. this section, Appendices D and E; cf. Linden in this section, this appendix.]

FAERBER, REV. W. Catechism for Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States.


[Cf. this section, Appendices D-E; cf. also Girardy, Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

FRANCISCAN SISTERS OF CHRISTIAN CHARITY (MANITOWOC). Religion Teaching Plans, Outline Lessons Based on Modern Principles of Education as Exemplified in Practical Class Use. Edited by Sister M. Inez, OSF.
GERTRUDE, SISTER MARY. Catholic Nursery Rhymes.  
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

GIRARDY, REV. FERREOL, CSSR. Catholic Faith.  
*St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1916.

HORAN, ELLAMAY. Practices of Charity for Boys and Girls.  
*Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1929.  
[used for middle grades]

EATON, MARY. The Little Ones.  
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1930.

JACOBS, REV. JOSEPH F. A New Method of Religious Instruction.  
*Blasdell, N.Y.: Our Mother of Good Counsel Church, 1919.  
[does not use question/answer method]

JEHLICKA, REV. DR. FRANCIS. Graded Catechism.  
[uses the Baltimore Catechism; adds explanation; adds further questions and explanation, clearly marked as additions to the Baltimore text; for upper grades.]
KELLY, REV. JAMES F. *Catechism of Christian Doctrine.*
[uses the Baltimore text with some simplification; used for grades 2-8.]


[ ] The Baltimore Catechism with Explanations.
*Chicago: John P. Daleiden, n.d. [ca. 1921].
[Cf. Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

KELLY, REV. WILLIAM R. *Our First Communion.*
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.
[brilliant color illustrations in all the above]

. *Assignments and Directions in the Study of Religion.*
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.
[work-book to go with Our Sacraments, given above]
KINKEAD, REV. THOMAS L. A Catechism of Christian Doctrine.


[Cf. this section, Appendix D; also Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

LANSLOTS, REV. DANIEL IDELPHONSE, OSB. Catholic Theology or the Catechism Explained.


[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

. The Three Divine Virtues.


LAUX, REV. JOHN. A Course of Religion for Catholic High Schools and Academies.


[Cf. Bible/Church History, this appendix.]

LINDEN, REV. JAMES, SJ. Catechism of the Catholic Religion.

*Vol. II. Ibid., 1916, 1928.

[Vol. I for lower grades; cf. this section, Appendix E.]


*St. Louis: B. Herder, 1923.
*2nd ed. Ibid., 1924.

[advanced material]
LE ROY, MGR. A. Credo: A Short Exposition of Catholic Belief. Translated by E. Leahy and edited by Rev. George O'Neil, SJ.


MC CABE, REV. F. X., CM. His Mystic Body.

St. Louis: Vincentian Press, 1925.

MAC EACHEN, REV. RODERICK A. First Communion Catechism.


Religion: First Course.


Religion: Second Course.


Religion: Third Course.


Religion: Fourth Course.

*New York: Macmillan Company, 1924.

[designed for the first four grades; teacher's edition available for first three vols. cf. this section, Appendix E; also Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

MARIST BROTHERS. Catechism of the Blessed Virgin Mary for Use in Parochial Schools and Academies.

*Poughkeepsie, N. Y.: St. Ann's Hermitage, 1925.
O'BRIEN, REV. THOMAS. **Advanced Catechism of Catholic Faith and Practice**
Based on the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore Catechism.

*Chicago: J. B. Oink, 1922.

[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

RIPALDA, GERONIMO, S.J. **Catechismo de la Doctrina Christiana.**


ROBINSON, REV. W. F., SJ. **The Seven Fold Gift: A Study of the Seven Sacraments.**

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1922.

ROSS, REV. J. ELLIOTT, CSP. **Christian Ethics.**

*New York: Devin-Adair, 1919.

RUSSELL, REV. WILLIAM H. **Your Religion, What It Means to You.**

*St. Louis: Herder Book Co., 1926.

SCHMITT, REV. JOHN. **How to Teach Our Little Ones from Five to Eight Years for Parents and Teachers.**


SEARLE, REV. GEORGE, CSP. **How to Become a Catholic. Practical Instructions for Converts.**

New York: Paulist Press, 1919.

STOCKMAN, MSGR. P. J. **High School Catechism or the Baltimore Catechism Explained.**

SULLIVAN, REV. JOHN F. Fundamentals of Catholic Belief.


WEIGAND, REV. JOSEPH A. A Simple Course of Religion for Little Ones in Preparation for Their First Holy Communion.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1921.

[Cf. this section, Appendices D-E.]

WHITE, REV. CHARLES J. Jesus Our Friend.

*New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1925.

YORKE, REV. PETER C. Textbooks for Parochial & Sunday Schools.


[Cf. Yorke in Appendices D and E.]
While Gilmour and Schuster continued to predominate in the scriptural Catechesis, it will be noted below that many new materials designed for younger children appeared.

[ANONYMOUS]. Bible Stories for Children.

[ANONYMOUS]. The Life of Christ in Pictures.

[ANONYMOUS]. A Simple Life of Jesus for His Little Ones.


St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1930.

ANNA LOUISE, SISTER. Bible Stories for Children.

ANNA LOUISE, SISTER. Bible History of the Old and New Testament with Compendium of Church History.
BROWNSON, JOSEPHINE VAN DYKE. Catholic Bible Stories from the Old and New Testaments.


__________. To the Heart of a Child.


A CATHOLIC TEACHER. Bible Stories for Children.


EUGENE, BROTHER, OSF. Book of Religion for Catholic Elementary Schools. A Compendium of Bible and Church History.


__________. Important Events in Church History.


FLANNERY, REV. EDWARD. Gospel Sidelights.

Hazardville, Conn.: St. Bernard's Church, 1916.

GONZAGA, SISTER MARY. Christ in the Old and the New Testaments: Bible History and Catechism Combined.

St. Louis: B. Herder, 1929.

GIGOT, REV. FRANCIS. A Primer of Old Testament History.

New York: Paulist Press, 1919.

[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]
GILMOUR, RT. REV. RICHARD. Bible History Containing the Most Remarkable Events of the Old and New Testaments. To Which Is Added a Compendium of Church History.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1919, 1923.

[Cf. this section, Appendices D-E.]

HALD, REV. HENRY M. Readings from Sacred Scriptures.


[KELLY, REV. M.V.] Scripture Treasures.


[selected from Old and New Testaments; designed for use in memorizing bible texts; used for upper grades; cf. General Materials and Materials for the Catechist, this appendix.]

KNECHT, BISHOP FRIEDRICH JUSTUS. The Child's Bible History.

*St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1928.

[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

LAUX, REV. JOHN JOSEPH. Church History: a Complete History of the Catholic Church to the Present Day.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930.

[Cf. General Materials, this appendix.]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1917.

[advanced material]
MC DEVITT, REV. HERBERT CP. The Life of Christ in Text and Pictures.


[pictures from plaster models by Domenico Mastroienni.]

SCHUSTER, REV. DR. IGNATZ. Illustrated Bible History of the Old and New Testaments for the Use of Catholic Schools. Revised by Mrs. J. Sadlier.

*new ed. ["carefully improved by several clergymen."]
St. Louis: B. Herder, 1916.

[Cf. this section, Appendices D and E.]

SHEPERSON, SISTER MARY FIDES. Gleanings from the Old Testament.


* * * * * *

LITURGY/RITUAL

The steady rise in this period of what came to be called the Liturgical Movement is reflected in the Liturgy/Ritual Materials listed below. A great focus was placed on explicating the Mass and encouraging the use of the missal.

[ANONYMOUS]. The Small Missal.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.
ALPHONSUS, SISTER M. I Go to Mass.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1929.

BRITT, REV. MATTHEW, OSB. (Ed.). The Hymns of the Breviary and Missal.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924 or 5.

BUSH, REV. WILLIAM. The Mass Drama.

*Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1930.

[advanced material]

CHARITY, SISTERS OF (Ed.). Auxilium.

*New York: Frederick Pustet, 1925.

[treats the Roman ritual and liturgy, high-school material]

DUNNEY, REV. JOSEPH. The Mass.


FLYNN, REV. EDWIN. Seeing God, the Story of the Mass.


[illustrated with some color prints; used for lower grades]

GAFFNEY, REV. FRANCIS A., OP. Teaching Children the Mass.

HAERING, OTTO, OSB. Living with the Church. Translated by Rembert Bulzarik, OSB.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930.

HUEGLE, GREGORY. Catechism of Gregorian Chant.


KELLY, REV. WILLIAM R. The Mass for Children.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1927.

[Cf. General Materials, this appendix.]

HENRY, RT. REV. HUGH T. Catholic Customs and Symbols.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

LASANCE, REV. FRANCIS XAVIER. New Missal for Every Day.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.

[one of the great staples of liturgical education and piety]

MACDONALD, BISHOP A. The Mass Explained.

Boston: Gorham Press, 1930.

ST. DOMINIC, SISTERS OF [ADRIAN]. My Gift to Jesus.

ST. JOSEPH, SISTERS OF [CHESTNUT HILL]. The Objective Teaching of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

[Sullivan, Rev. John F. The Visible Church.

* * * * * * *

PARACATECHISMAL MATERIALS

Paracatechismal materials continued to be used in the 1916-1930 period. A large listing of paracatechismal works available in 1930 and before can be found in Sister M. Agnesine, SSND, "Religious Books for the Grades and Junior High School," (Catholic School Journal, XXXI [November, 1930], 407-09). The listing contains all data except the year of publication. Sister Agnesine's article shows the large number and variety of paracatechismal materials available by the end of the 1916-1930 period. Titles included in the article are generally not reproduced below.
[ANONYMOUS]. A Little Saint of the Modern Home.  


*St. Louis:  Queen's Work, 1930.

*New York:  Benziger Brothers, 1929.

CAULEY, REV. PETER. Court of Conscience.  
Erie, Pa.:  By the author, 1924.  
[treats of Confession]

CHAPMAN, REV. MICHAEL ANDREW. A Garland of Saints for Children.  
New York:  F. Pustet, 1929.

CLARKE, REV. JOHN P. A Rose Wreath for the Crowning of St. Therese of the Child Jesus.  
New York:  Benziger Brothers, 1925.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.

. The Home Virtues.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1926.

DUCHAUSSOIS, REV. P., OMI. Mid Ice and Snow: The Apostles of the Northwest.
New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1924.
[treats of Grey Nuns and OMI.]

ELEANORE, SISTER M., CSC. Talks to Our Daughters.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

GARESCHÉ, REV. EDWARD F., SJ. Sodality Conferences: Second Series.
*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.

HANNAN, REV. JEROME DANIEL. Teacher Tells a Story.

HERBST, WINFRED, SDS. Tell Us Another.
*St. Nazianz, Wisc.: Salvatorian Fathers, 1926.
[Editor of the juvenile serial Manna]

HEUSER, REV. HERMAN JOSEPH. In the Workshop of St. Joseph.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1926.
HIGGENS, REV. JAMES. Stories of Great Heroes.

HULL, ELEANOR. The Poem Book of the Gael.
   Chicago: Browne & Howell, 1929.

LAPP, JOHN A. The Catholic Citizen.

LOYOLA, MOTHER. King of the Golden City: An Allegory for Children.
   *New York: Benziger Brothers, 1922.
   [Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

MC KEE, J. R. Dame Elizabeth Barton OSB.
   New York: Benziger Brothers, 1926.

MC MUNIGLE, MARY. Pittsburgh Art Course.
   [Art correlated with Religion; for the grades]


   Wonder Stories of God's People.
   [strong on dramatizations; a large part of the material had appeared in Catholic School Interests.]
MEYER, REV. FULGENCE OFM. Jesus and His Pets [i.e. children].
Cincinnati: St. Anthony Messenger Press, 1925.

MOFFAT, REV. J. E., SJ. Another Visit to God's Wonderland: First
Steps in Meditation for Children.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930.

O'CONNOR, MRS. ARMEL. Great Saints for Little Children.
Mary's Meadow Press, 1924.

SPECKLING, INEZ. Life of Blessed Therese of the Child Jesus.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.

SPECKLING, INEZ. *Boy.*
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

TAGGART, MARIAN AMES. Pamela's Legacy.
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

* * * * *

MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST

In the 1916 - 1930 period continued stress came to be placed
on the active and inventive catechist. The increased number of works
on catechetical theory and methodology listed below reflect this.
BAIREL, REV. J. J. [JOSEPH JAMES]. The Commandments Explained according to the Munich or Psychological Method for the Use of the Intermediate and Higher Grades, Based on the Baltimore Catechism (no. 2.), as an Aid to Catechists.


--------- . The Creed Explained [etc.].


--------- . The Sacraments Explained [etc.].


--------- . Grace and Prayer Explained [etc.].


[author given as Religious of the Cenacle of St. Regis]

BOSSUET, BISHOP JACQUES BENIGNE. The Continuity of Religion from "Discourses on Universal History" by Bossuet, the "Eagle of Meaux." Translated by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Victor Day.

*Helena, Montana: By the author, 1930.

[Cf. General Materials, this appendix.]
CASSILY, REV. BERNARD, SJ. Teacher's Manual, Based on the Practical Plan of the Catholic Instruction League.

*Chicago: Catholic Instruction League, 1917.

CHRYSOSTOM, BROTHER [CONLON, JOHN JOSEPH] FSC. Development of Personality.


[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

COOPER, REV. JOHN M. Sex Education in the Home.


CUMMINS, REV. PATRICK, OSB. Character Formation in Our Schools.


New York: Benziger Brothers, 1926.

[British reprint]


[Cf. Liturgy/Ritual section, this appendix.]

FITZPATRICK, EDWARD A. The Foundation of Christian Education.

FURFEY, REV. PAUL HANLEY. *You and Your Children.*
New York: Benziger Brothers, 1929.

*2nd ed. New York: F. Pustet, 1924.*
[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1924.*
[previously circulated for many years in British editions.]

[studies released-time for religious instruction]

HOWE, CANON G. E. [GEORGE EDWARD]. *The Catechist: or Headings and Suggestions for the Explanations of the Catechism [etc.]*
[Cf. Materials for the Catechist, Appendix E.]

New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1918.
[Example of advanced material intended for mature reader but often used on the college level in this period to create "social consciousness."]

Zeal in the Classroom: Pastoral Theology for Clergy and Religious Engaged as Teachers.

*2nd ed. Chicago: John P. Daleiden, 1922, 1926. Ibid., 1926.

Bolshevism in Our Schools.


[a plea for less school interference in parental responsibility as primary religious educator; cf. General Materials, this appendix.

KINKEAD, REV. THOMAS L. An Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism of Christian Doctrine. For Use of Sunday-School Teachers and Advanced Classes.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1921.

[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

KIRSCH, REV. FELIX M., OFMCAP. The Catholic Teacher's Companion.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

KIRSCH, REV. FELIX M. AND ARENTH, SISTER MARY AURELIA. Practical Aids for Catholic Teachers.


MACEACHEN, REV. RODERICK A. The Teaching of Religion.

MAYER, DR. HEINRICH. Katechetic.

*Freiburg im Breisgau: B. Herder; St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1924.

NIST, REV. JAMES. The Practical Catechism from the German of James Nist with an Introduction by James Linden, S.J. Edited by Rev. Ferreol Girardy, C.S.S.R.


[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

O'CONNOR, REV. JEROME, SJ. AND HAYDEN, REV. WILLIAM, SJ. Chalk Talks or Teaching Catechism Graphically.

*St. Louis: Queen's Work, n.d. [ca. 1930].

O'TOOLE, GEORGE BARRY. The Case Against Evolution.

*New York: Macmillan Co., 1925. [reprint].

PAULA, SISTER MARY. Talks with Teachers.

New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925.

PACE, MSGR. EDWARD A. Stenographic Notes of Lawrence W. McCarthy, Covering a Series of Lectures by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Pace, Taken during the School Year 1927-28. Two Volumes in One.

Wilmington, Del.: Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, n.d. [mimeographed]

[located at Mullen Library, Catholic University of America]

PERRY, REV. JOHN. A Full Course of Instruction in Explanation of the Catechism. Edited by Rev. E. M. Hennessy.
*St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1930 (50th to 55th editions).

[Cf. this section, Appendices C-D-E.]

SHARP, JOHN K. Aims and Methods in Teaching Religion.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1929.

SLOAN, REV. PATRICK. The Sunday School Director's Guide to Success.


[Cf. this section, Appendix E.]

SPIRAGO, REV. FRANZ. The Catechism Explained [etc.]. Edited by Rev. Francis Clarke, SJ.

*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1921.

[Cf. this section, Appendix D.]

TRENT, COUNCIL OF. Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests: Issued by Order of Pope Pius V. Translated and annotated by Joseph A. McHugh, O.P. and Charles J. Callan, O.P.


[Cf. this section, Appendices C-D-E.]


*New York: Benziger Brothers, 1921, 1924.

[Cf. General Materials, this Appendix.]
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