

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF

NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING

Postmenstrual Phase of the Menstrual Cycle

Rudolf F. Vollman

Married Love Is an Art

Louise Adams

Contraception, Infallibility and the Ordinary Magisterium

Russell Shaw

Natural Family Planning and Christian Marriage

Vicente J. A. Rosales

An Australian NFP Survey

J. A. Johnston, D. B. Roberts and R. B. Spencer

Volume II, Number 4

Winter 1978

\$5.00 a copy

Contraception, Infallibility, and the Ordinary Magisterium

Russell Shaw

HAS THE Church's teaching on contraception been proposed infallibly? In the ten years since *Humanae Vitae* was published, it has generally been assumed that the answer is no. A major article in the June 1978 issue of *Theological Studies* argues that the answer is yes. Entitled "Contraception and the Infallibility of the Ordinary Magisterium," the article seeks to show that the teaching on contraception meets the conditions for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium set forth by Vatican II. The authors are the Rev. John C. Ford, S.J., professor emeritus of moral theology, Weston College, Weston, Massachusetts, and Dr. Germain Grisez, professor of philosophy, Campion College, University of Regina, Canada.

What follows is a summary of some major elements of the argument made by Ford and Grisez. Although they have reviewed this summary, the author takes sole responsibility for it. Readers interested in pursuing the article in detail should consult the article in *Theological Studies*, which also discusses a number of matters impossible to touch on here.

The second Vatican Council identified specific conditions which must be met for the ordinary magisterium of the bishops throughout the world to be exercised infallibly. The teaching on contraception has been proposed in such a way as to meet these conditions. Obviously this has implications beyond the question of contraception; investigation might show, for example, that the same is true of certain other teachings on matters of faith and morals which have lately been called into question. The present discussion, however, is limited to the issue of contraception.

At the outset it is important to be quite clear about what is being argued.

Russell Shaw is the secretary for public affairs for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the U. S. Catholic Conference, and the author of many books and articles. We reprint this summary, with permission, from the July 1978 issue of *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*.

It is generally acknowledged that *Humanae Vitae* did not propose an *ex cathedra* definition. Many, however, have moved directly from the non-definitive character of Pope Paul's pronouncement to the conclusion that infallibility is simply not at issue as far as the teaching on contraception is concerned. This overlooks the possibility that Paul VI's non-definitive pronouncement was in fact a reaffirmation of something *already* infallibly taught by the ordinary magisterium. Ford and Grisez argue that this is the case.

Criteria Are Stated

It is also important to be clear about what is *not* being argued in this discussion. Among the questions which are not being considered are whether the moral norm ruling out contraception is part of divine revelation and whether Pius XI proposed an *ex cathedra* definition in *Casti Connubii*. Those questions are worth discussing, but they are not discussed here.

Finally, it is important to be clear about what is being assumed in this discussion. The major assumptions are, first, that the Catholic Church does enjoy the charism of infallibility in belief and teaching (though obviously not everything is infallibly believed and taught) and, second, that the ordinary magisterium is exercised infallibly when the conditions set forth by Vatican II are met.

The criteria for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium of the bishops throughout the world are stated by Vatican II in *Lumen Gentium*, 25. The text reads:

Although the bishops individually do not enjoy the prerogative of infallibility, they nevertheless proclaim the teaching of Christ infallibly, even when they are dispersed throughout the world, provided that they remain in communion with each other and with the Successor of Peter and that in authoritatively teaching on a matter of faith and morals they agree in one judgment as that to be held definitively.¹

An important footnote (no. 40) accompanying this statement cites four previous documents.

Two Things Not Said

An examination of the revolution—what one might call the legislative history—of this text within the conciliar process makes clear two things which the Council specifically is *not* saying here: first, that a strictly collegial act is necessary for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium; second, that such an exercise of the ordinary magisterium can occur only when something divinely revealed is proposed for acceptance with the assent of divine faith. Had the Council said either or both things, it would have sharply limited the possibility of an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium of the bishops. In fact, it said neither.

To obtain a clear understanding of the conditions enunciated by Vatican II, it is necessary to look closely at the four documents cited in footnote 40.

The first is a passage from chapter 3 of Vatican I's *Dei Filius*:

Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church either by a solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium proposes for belief as divinely revealed.²

Dei Filius treats of divine revelation; therefore, this solemn teaching concerns matters which are proposed as divinely revealed, to be believed with divine faith. Nevertheless, the passage has a bearing on Vatican II's teaching concerning the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium. It states definitively that it is necessary to believe not only those things which have been defined but also certain things taught by the ordinary magisterium.

Bellarmino Is Cited

Next the note cites a passage added to Vatican I's first schema *De Ecclesia*, namely, a text drawn from Robert Bellarmine. Although the Vatican I document was never completed, the significance of the Bellarmine passage in this context arises from the fact that it is cited by Vatican II to illustrate its own teaching. Bellarmine, rejecting limitations on the Church's infallibility proposed by Protestant authors, wrote:

Therefore, our view is that the Church *absolutely* cannot err, either in things absolutely necessary [for salvation] or in other matters which she proposes to us to be believed or done, whether expressly included in the Scriptures or not. And when we say, "The Church cannot err," we understand this to apply both to the faithful as a whole and to the bishops as a whole, so that the sense of the proposition, *The Church cannot err*, is this: that what all the faithful hold as of faith, necessarily is true and of faith, and similarly what all the bishops teach as pertaining to faith, necessarily is true and of faith.³

Two things must be noted about this. First, Bellarmine refers both to things which are to be *believed* and to things which are to be *done*. Second, he does not limit infallibility to matters explicitly contained in Scripture or to matters which are absolutely essential for salvation.

The third document cited is Vatican I's revised schema for Constitution II, *De Ecclesia Christi*, along with the commentary by Joseph Kleutgen:

And so we now define that this very high gift, by which *the Church of the living God is the pillar and bulwark of truth* (1 Tim. 3:15), is placed in it so that neither the faithful as a whole in believing nor those who are appointed with the power of teaching the whole Church in exercising this office can fall into error. Therefore, all those points which in matters of faith and morals are everywhere held or handed down as undoubted under bishops in communion with the Apostolic See, as well as all those points which are defined, either by those same bishops together with the Roman Pontiff or by the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra*, are to be held as infallibly true.⁴

This is very close to the formulation finally adopted by Vatican II. Where the schema of Vatican I says "held or handed down as undoubted," the par-

allel expression of Vatican II is "to be held definitively." Both support the view that the ordinary magisterium can infallibly teach things which are not divinely revealed but which are necessary for the preservation and further understanding of what has been revealed. Kleutgen's commentary discusses this point at length, arguing among other things that the Church can infallibly teach truths of the moral order which are neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in divine revelation.⁵

The fourth text to which footnote 40 refers is *Tuas Libenter* of Pius IX.⁶ In the passage cited Pius makes the point—later made part of Vatican I's *Dei Filium*—that the act of divine faith is not restricted to dogmas.

The text of *Lumen Gentium* and the documents cited in the accompanying footnote make it clear that, as articulated by Vatican II, there are four conditions which must be met for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium of the bishops throughout the world. These are: that the bishops be in communion with one another and with the pope; that they teach authoritatively on a matter of faith or morals; that they agree in one judgment; that they propose this as something to be held definitively. Each condition deserves separate consideration.

As the history of the conciliar text makes clear, the first condition—that the bishops be in communion with one another and with the pope—does not mean that they must act in a strictly collegial manner. It is necessary and sufficient that they remain bishops within the Catholic Church.

Bishops Act as Teachers

The second condition—authoritative episcopal teaching on a matter of faith or morals—requires that the bishops be acting in their official capacity as teachers, not merely expressing opinions as individual Catholics or as theologians. As for the subject matter of their teaching—"faith or morals"—the formula has a long history.⁷ It is sufficient here to say that nothing in the pertinent documents limits "morals," in the sense intended by Vatican II, in such a way as to exclude specific moral norms, like that on contraception.

The third condition—that the bishops agree in one judgment—identifies universality as a requirement for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium. What is necessary, however, is the moral unity of the body of bishops in union with the pope, not an absolute mathematical unanimity such as would be destroyed by even one dissenting voice.⁸ Furthermore, if this condition has been met for a considerable period of time in the past, it would not be nullified by a future lack of consensus among bishops. To put it another way, the consensus of future bishops is not necessary for the ordinary magisterium to have taught something infallibly or for it to do so now. Otherwise one would be in the absurd position of saying that it is literally impossible that the conditions for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium be met until the end of time, since at any moment in history the consensus of future bishops

is an unknown. As for the evidence that this condition has been met, it would seem to lie essentially in this: that in different times, places, and cultural circumstances, responding to different challenges, setting the teaching in different intellectual frameworks, and very likely offering different arguments to support it, bishops have repeatedly proposed the same judgment concerning a matter of faith or morals as one to be held definitively.

Faithful Corroborate

It bears noting that, corresponding to the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium in teaching, there is an infallibility of the body of the faithful in believing.⁹ The faith and practice of members of the Church whose belief and behavior are in conformity with what is proposed by the ordinary magisterium provide a kind of corroboratory evidence of the universality of its teaching.

The fourth condition—that the bishops propose a judgment of faith or morals to be held definitively—means at least this: that the teaching is not proposed as something optional, either for the bishops or the faithful, but as something which bishops have an obligation to hand on and which Catholics have an obligation to accept. In the case of moral teaching, however, it is unlikely that those proposing the teaching will ordinarily present it as something to be held intellectually as true; it is more likely that they will propose it as a norm which followers of Christ will try to observe in their behavior.

Vatican II's teaching on the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium is not substantially new. Catholics have always believed the apostles and their successors to enjoy an unfailing charism of truth in proclaiming Christ's teaching. St. Vincent of Lerins as early as the fifth century sought to formulate the conditions for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium.¹⁰ In recent years, however, some have attempted to divide the sources of Catholic belief from the Church's assurance of the truth of what is believed. Thus attention is directed separately to Scripture, to apostolic preaching, to the contemporary magisterium, to philosophical argumentation; and, in each case separately, the question is asked whether the source is able to establish definitively the truth of the teaching in question. If not, the teaching is held to be questionable, perhaps untrue. Vatican II's teaching on the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium is an integrating remedy to the debilitating consequences of this strategy. The teaching of the ordinary magisterium of the past provides a firm ground for the teaching of the Church in the present.

Are Conditions Met?

For the purposes of this discussion, however, the crucial question remains: Does the teaching on contraception meet the conditions identified by the Council for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium of the bishops dispersed throughout the world? It does. The demonstration that this is so lies in showing, first, that at least up to 1962 the teaching was universally pro-

posed by Catholic bishops and, second, that it was proposed as something to be held definitively.

As to the first point, John T. Noonan, Jr., in his historical study of the Church's teaching on contraception, sums up the evidence this way:

The propositions constituting a condemnation of contraception are, it will be seen, recurrent. Since the first clear mention of contraception by a Christian theologian, when a harsh third-century moralist accused a pope of encouraging it, the articulated argument has been the same. In the world of the late Empire known to St. Jerome and St. Augustine, in the Ostrogothic Arles of Bishop Caesarius and the Suevian Braga of Bishop Martin, in the Paris of St. Albert and St. Thomas, in the Renaissance Rome of Sixtus V and the Renaissance Milan of St. Charles Borromeo, in the Naples of St. Alphonsus Liguori and the Liege of Charles Billuart, in the Philadelphia of Bishop Kenrick, and in the Bombay of Cardinal Gracias, the teachers of the Church have taught without hesitation or variation that certain acts preventing procreation are gravely sinful. No Catholic theologian has ever taught, "Contraception is a good act." The teaching on contraception is clear and apparently fixed forever.¹¹

Since Noonan's book was published in 1965, a great many scholars have dealt with this topic and examined the data. None has published evidence to contradict Noonan's point. On the contrary, the evidence shows that, at least until 1962, Catholic bishops dispersed throughout the world universally agreed in their judgment and teaching on the morality of contraception. A review of the writings of theologians officially recognized by the representatives of the magisterium points to the same conclusion: not that the theologians unanimously agree in their principles or their arguments (which no one would expect); rather, they agree that individual contraceptive acts are intrinsically wrong and constitute the matter of grave moral evil.

If the teaching was universal, however, was it also proposed to Catholics as something to be held definitively? Several considerations show that it was.

The first consideration is a negative one. No evidence has come to light that anyone proposed this teaching as a private opinion, a probable judgment, or a lofty ideal which there was no blame in failing to achieve. It was proposed instead as an obligatory moral teaching.

What Was Intended?

Second, the teaching is that contraceptive acts are the matter of mortal sin. Third, when in modern times the teaching was challenged from outside the Church, it was repeated with insistence and emphasis. Fourth, the teaching was often proposed as a divinely revealed moral norm. This is not to say that it *is* divinely revealed (a question excluded from this discussion). In this context, rather, the point is significant for the light it sheds on the intention of those proposing the teaching. If, in doing so, they contended that the teaching was divinely revealed, this can only mean that they proposed it as something to be held definitively; they would hardly have done the contrary—i.e.,

at the same time maintained that the teaching was divinely revealed yet proposed it as something which need not be held definitively.

Having reached this point, it is useful briefly to examine the major statements on contraception by Pius XI, Pius XII, and Paul VI and to do so in light of what has been said up to now.

In condemning contraception as a sin against nature, Pius XI appeals to Scripture, to Augustine's exegesis of Genesis 38:9-10, and to the constancy of the Church's tradition. He declares himself to be restating, on behalf of the Catholic Church, something willed by God and pertaining to salvation.¹² Pius XII, officially summarizing the teaching of his predecessor, says he solemnly proclaimed anew the fundamental law concerning the procreative act. He states the matter emphatically: "This teaching is as valid today as it was yesterday; and it will be the same tomorrow and always."¹³ Paul VI is less emphatic but no less clear. He says among other things that it would be impossible to accept some conclusions of his Commission for the Study of the Problems of Population, Family, and Birthrate because they are not compatible with "the moral doctrine on matrimony, proposed by the magisterium of the Church with constant firmness" (*Humanae Vitae*, 6). He speaks of "the constant teaching of the Church" (*ibid.*, 10 and 11), says the Church by its teaching on contraception "promulgates the divine law" (*ibid.*, 20), and declares the teaching on contraception to be part of the "saving teaching of Christ" (*ibid.*, 29).

Neither Pius XI, Pius XII, nor Paul VI says the teaching on contraception has been proposed infallibly by the ordinary magisterium; but that is not the point. What they do say is not only compatible with this view, but supplies evidence for it.

Thus, a review of the data establishes that the teaching on contraception has been proposed in a manner which meets Vatican II's criteria for an infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium. The controversy of the last fifteen years does nothing to change this fact, nor, if one accepts the criteria, does it call into question the objectively certain truth of the teaching. It is not the teaching which needs to be rethought but the widely held supposition that the teaching is or could be false.

Noonan Chooses Development

A number of questions and objections will naturally be prompted by this argument. Here it is possible to touch on only a few.

This discussion does not consider the question of whether the Church's teaching on contraception is divinely revealed. Many of those who have handed on the teaching have said explicitly that it is, and this fact cannot lightly be set aside. At the same time, for purposes of this discussion, it is conceded that the teaching might not be divinely revealed. Noonan, for example, argues that, in condemning contraception, the Fathers of the Church were not re-

pro-
tate-
light
ls to
y of
f the
Pius
nly
. He
yes-
pha-
sible
ems
with
the
con-
ach-
ares
rist”
tion
the
lies
tion
fal-
een
as it
the
the
this
h's
ave
ht-
led
ues
re-

stating primitive teaching but were making a fresh initiative. Supposing for the sake of argument that this is so, this should be viewed as a case of an authentic development of earlier Christian moral doctrine rooted in revelation. Such a view is entirely compatible with the view that the teaching on contraception has been infallibly proposed by the ordinary magisterium.

However, this points to another question. If the Church's teaching is a product of doctrinal development, how can we be certain that we have not been witnessing a further process of development in the controversy over this teaching which has been underway in the Church since 1963? This is the position taken by those, like Noonan, who argue for a "development" by which the Church's teaching would continue to safeguard those human goods which the traditional teaching was meant to safeguard, while making allowance for particular contraceptive acts within a marriage basically oriented to responsible parenthood.

The question of development of doctrine is a large and complex one. There has been authentic development in the Church's teaching on a number of matters, including questions of marital morality. An authentic development of doctrine, however, cannot be one which contradicts what has previously been infallibly taught, understood in the sense in which it was taught. First to say 'A' and then to say 'not-A' does not constitute a development; it is to say contradictory, incompatible things. It is true that the Church's teaching on contraception defends the values of procreation and the rectitude of marital intercourse while rejecting selfish and hedonistic motives for engaging in intercourse. This, however, is not the whole of the teaching proposed by the ordinary magisterium. Rather, the specific teaching has been that certain acts intended to prevent procreation are in themselves gravely sinful; and it has never been taught that any such acts are good, permissible, or even only venially sinful. It would be extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to say what values the tradition has always sought to safeguard and what subjective attitudes it has always rejected; but it can be said with certainty that the tradition handed on by the ordinary magisterium condemns contraceptive acts as gravely wrong.

Noonan and others have used the analogy of the Church's teaching on usury to argue that the teaching on contraception can change. Taking interest was once severely condemned and is now permitted. The same sort of change, it is said, could occur in the case of contraception.¹⁴ With respect to the argument advanced here, however, this amounts to begging the question—the question being whether the condemnation of the taking of interest was infallibly proposed by the ordinary magisterium. In fact, it was not.

Scripture and the Fathers of the Church as well as the decrees of councils and popes up to 1450 condemn the taking of interest on loans to the poor and the greed of usurers; but they say nothing about charging interest as such nor

do they envisage modern economic conditions in which money markets determine moderate rates of interest.¹⁵ Noonan himself makes the crucial point in discussing scholastic theories of usury:

Nothing here meets the test of dogma except this assertion, that usury, the act of taking profit on a loan without a just title, is sinful. . . . This dogmatic teaching remains unchanged. What is a just title, what is technically to be treated as a loan, are matters of debate, positive law, and changing evaluation. The development on these points is great. But the pure and narrow dogma today is the same today as in 1200.¹⁶

Other objections have been raised and no doubt will continue to be raised which draw analogies with other alleged changes in the moral teaching of the Church. In many cases, the thrust of these objections is either to deny or to limit drastically the infallibility of the Church. As noted at the outset, the charism of infallibility is assumed for purposes of this discussion. Nevertheless, it is helpful to sketch the strategy for responding to such objections.

In some cases it appears that a teaching infallibly proposed has later been changed. On further examination, however, this is seen not to be so, for the change authoritatively admitted by the Church does not contradict what was previously taught if it is understood in the precise sense intended. In other cases, a teaching was proposed by the ordinary magisterium and later contradicted; but it was not in fact proposed infallibly, since it was not solemnly defined nor was it taught by the ordinary magisterium in a manner that met the conditions identified by Vatican II (e.g., some members of the magisterium may have proposed the teaching as something to be held definitively, but this was not the universal teaching of bishops dispersed throughout the world; or all members of the magisterium might have joined in proposing a teaching, yet refrained from proposing it as something to be held definitively, as could well be the case in purely disciplinary or devotional matters).

Outsiders' Views Don't Count

Two final objections should be noted. First, during the controversy over *Humanae Vitae* the dissenting views of Christians outside the Catholic Church were often cited as evidence against the teaching. Essentially, however, the views of those who are not in communion with the pope simply do not count with respect to the universality which is a criterion of infallible teaching. This is not to say that they do not share in God's revelation (much less his grace) or that their opinions have no value. It is only to say that their views are beside the point as far as what is at issue here is concerned.

The second, similar objection concerns the fact many Catholics believe contraception to be morally permissible. This is cited as evidence of the *sensus fidelium*. However, this subjective "sense" is not independent of revelation, tradition, and the magisterium, the objective means of communicating God's revelation in and through the Church. On the contrary, the subjective sense

of the faithful must be judged for authenticity in reference to the objective teaching of the Church; the *sensus fidelium* is reflected, not in those who dissent from the received teaching of the Church, but in the witness of those who hold to that teaching.

Few Are Negative

At the time of the publication of *Humanae Vitae*, many statements about the encyclical were issued by individual bishops and national hierarchies. Of the statements by individual bishops, the overwhelming majority seem to have been supportive of the encyclical and its teaching. Only a very few were negative in character; fewer still contradicted the teaching of the encyclical. As for statements by episcopal conferences, their teaching also is overwhelmingly consonant with the encyclical, though each statement has its own special character.

Two points need to be emphasized about the divergences between the bishops' statements. The first is that no hierarchy fails to accept the encyclical. All of them accept it and all of them commend it to their people's acceptance. The second is that such divergences as there are, exist within the broader context of wholehearted acceptance of the main thrust of the encyclical's teaching on marriage.¹⁷

At the same time, it must be acknowledged that certain of the hierarchies introduce qualifications with respect to the teaching, in an effort to provide some pastoral mitigation. Most do so without contradicting the teaching. A few, however, go further and, if they do not implicitly contradict it, at least put forward the strange idea that something which is objectively the matter of grave moral evil may also be permissible or even obligatory for some persons. Had there always been such teaching by Catholic bishops, the universality identified by Vatican II as a criterion for the infallible exercise of the ordinary magisterium would not be verified in the case of the teaching on contraception. However, an implicit contradiction of the teaching by some bishops in 1968 takes nothing away from the fact that the conditions identified by Vatican II had already been met in the case of this teaching. It does nothing, in short, to remove the objective certitude of the teaching.

The Aim Is Pastoral

In summary, there is an extremely strong case for the view that the teaching on contraception has been infallibly proposed by the ordinary magisterium. If the issue were something less sensitive and controversial than contraception, there would be little or no doubt on the matter in the mind of anyone who believes the Church to possess the charism of infallibility and accepts the conditions identified by the Council as valid and true. This has extremely important implications for episcopal teaching, theological discussion, and pastoral practice. The aim should be, not to impose a harsh new burden on Catholics, but to act in an authentically pastoral manner to alleviate the confusion about the Church's teaching on contraception which for the past fif-

teen years has been for so many people an agonizing part of their lives as Catholics.

Notes

- 1 The translations of this and all other quoted documents whose originals are in Latin are by Ford and Grisez.
- 2 H. Denzinger and A. Schoenmetzer, S.J., *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, ed. 34 (Barcinone: Herder, 1967), 1792 (3011).
- 3 J. D. Mansi et al., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Arnhem and Leipzig: H. Welter, 1926), vol. 51, 579C.
- 4 Mansi, vol. 53, 313AB.
- 5 Mansi, vol. 53, 324-31.
- 6 Denzinger-Schoenmetzer, 1683 (2879).
- 7 See M. Bevenot, "Faith and Morals in Vatican I and in the Council of Trent," *Heythrop Journal* 3 (1962), pp. 15-30.
- 8 Mansi, vol. 51, 224-25.
- 9 Cf. *Lumen Gentium*, 35; *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, 6.
- 10 S. Vincentii Lirinensis, *Commonitorium Primum*, cc 2 et 23; J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*, vol. 50, 639-40 and 667-69.
- 11 John T. Noonan, Jr., *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 6. The author immediately goes on to suggest, however, that the teaching is not in fact fixed forever.
- 12 *Casti Connubii*, AAS, 22 (1930), pp. 559-60.
- 13 "Address to the Midwives," AAS, 43 (1951), p. 843.
- 14 John T. Noonan, Jr., "Authority, Usury and Contraception," *Cross Currents* 16 (winter 1966), pp. 71-75.
- 15 See A. Vermeersch, S.J., "Usury," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 15 (New York: Appleton, 1912), pp. 235-38, and the works cited by him; Thomas F. Divine, S.J., *Interest: An Historical and Analytical Study in Economics and Modern Ethics* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1959), pp. 5-11, 24-35, and 45-64.
- 16 John T. Noonan, Jr., *The Scholastic Analysis of Usury* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957). pp. 399-400.
- 17 Austin Flannery, O.P., "Commentary or Qualification?" in John Horgan, ed., *Humanae Vitae and the Bishops: The Encyclical and the Statements of the National Hierarchies* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972), pl 355.