SMC 103Y1 – CATHOLICISM

LECTURES: MW2, Carr Hall 404  
TUTORIALS: M3, Carr Hall 107; W1, Carr Hall 107.

Instructor: Reid B. Locklin  
Office: Odette Hall 130  
Phone: 416.926.1300, x3317  
Email: reid.locklin@utoronto.ca  
Office Hours: T 10:10 - 12 noon and by chance or appointment

Email Policy: I will attempt to respond to legitimate email enquiries from students within 3-4 days. If you do not receive a reply within this period, please re-submit your question(s) and/or leave a message by telephone. Where a question cannot be easily or briefly answered by email, I will indicate that the student should see me during my posted office hours.

Course Description

This course offers an introduction to Christianity as it is lived, reflected upon and celebrated in the Roman Catholic tradition. Catholicism flows out of and places enormous value on its roots in the past; hence, we will devote the first major unit of our study to a historical overview. A second unit explores the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, which set out to draw creatively upon this history and make it relevant in the modern world. Finally, our attention will turn to the intellectual richness and diversity of contemporary Catholicism, focusing mainly on selected writings of Pope John Paul II, Julie Hanlon Rubio and Mary Jo Leddy.

The course format will consist of lectures and tutorial discussions. The perspective for the purpose of instruction is that of a “critical insider” to the Catholic tradition; students will, however, be encouraged to form, articulate and defend their own distinctive viewpoints on course material.

Course Objectives

1. To acquire and demonstrate sympathetic familiarity with Catholic history, the Second Vatican Council, and diverse contemporary perspectives on Catholic life and thought;
2. To demonstrate critical understanding of and engagement with major Catholic ideas;
3. To develop and demonstrate academic skills in careful reading and observation, critical analysis, and clear written expression.

Required Texts

- The following required textbooks are available at Crux Books (5 Hoskin Avenue, at Wycliffe College; 416.599.2749)
  - Julie Hanlon Rubio, Family Ethics (Georgetown UP, 2010).

- Students will also need to procure the SMC103Y1Y Course Reader from The University of Toronto Bookstore – 214 College Street (416.640.7900), as well as access to a modern translation of the Christian New Testament (i.e., not the KJV or any paraphrase).

Please see the attached course outline for specific assignments and full bibliographic information.
Assignments and Evaluation

20% – *Class Participation* (attendance, contributions to class and/or tutorial discussions, Unmarked Quizzes, Co-Curricular Summaries, completion and presentation of 2 “lecture minutes,” proposal for Third Term Paper, and other short assignments, as specified by instructors). Term work will not ordinarily receive letter grades, but will be assessed on √-, √, √+, √++ basis (0 for non-completion)—with a √ indicating adequate or satisfactory completion of the assignment.

7.5% – *First Term Paper* (4-5 page Observation/Comparison), due 15 October 2014
**Optional Rewrite, with required appointment with instructor, due 19 November 2014

12% – *Second Term Paper* (5-7 page Analysis/Argument), due 4 February 2015
**Optional Peer Review process (required for first-year students), 9-23 January 2015

14% – *Third Term Paper* (5-7 page Interview/Synthesis), due 25 March 2015

✓ Please note: late papers will be penalized by 2% for each day, or portion thereof, it is delayed (M-F). Papers will not ordinarily be accepted more than one week past the assigned deadline; **papers delayed more than one week will receive a score of 0%.**

12.5% – *Term Examination*, Fall Examination Period (8-19 December 2014)
34% – *Comprehensive Final Examination*, Winter Examination Period (8-30 April 2015)

Marking protocols for tests and term papers will follow the Grading Regulations described on pp. 699-700 of the *University of Toronto Faculty of Arts and Science (St. George Campus) 2014-2015 Calendar*. **NOTE: Failure to attempt every one of these written assignments (tests and term papers) will ordinarily result in failure of the course.**

Academic Expectations

Students are expected to attend lectures and tutorials regularly, to submit assignments on time, and to participate actively in class discussions. It is also expected that reading assignments will be completed by the date and time of the tutorial. Excessive absences (i.e. more than two in a given term) and/or obvious lack of preparation will weigh against the participation portion of the student’s grade. **Please set pagers, cell phones and portable devices to silent mode during class.**

Course materials and announcements will be posted on the Portal (i.e. the Blackboard Academic Suite). Please make it a habit to check this site regularly. Please also request to join the SMC103 Mentoring Network <https://www.facebook.com/groups/558482400918317/?fref=ts>.

All students in this class are bound by the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters available at <http://www.viceprovoststudents.utoronto.ca/publicationsandpolicies/academicintegrity.htm>. Each individual student is responsible for completing her or his own work, for appropriately acknowledging outside sources used in the preparation of papers and other written work and for avoiding plagiarism or any other academic offence detailed in the Code. For more information on the Code and suggestions on how to avoid an offence, please visit the Student Academic Integrity website (http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/osai/students). To ensure the veracity of written work, students will submit all papers both to the instructor and to Turnitin.com, a commercial anti-plagiarism service engaged by the University of Toronto.

**Please read the following notice very carefully:** Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to Turnitin.com for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University’s use of the Turnitin.com service are described on the Turnitin.com web site.
2014-2015 COURSE OUTLINE FOR  
SMC103Y1Y – CATHOLICISM  

Instructor: Reid B. Locklin, University of Toronto

*Please note that more detailed guides for each month of the course, including reading questions and recommendations for tutorial preparation, will be posted on Blackboard and distributed in class.

Reading assignments should generally be completed no later than the date and time of the tutorial on the week they are assigned (even if the tutorial session does not meet). These assignments may be subject to review and revision, as specified by the instructor.

CR = Course Reader, available from the U of T Bookstore (see syllabus)

Fall Term 2014

UNIT ONE: HISTORY AND TRADITION

8-10 September  
Jesus, the Kingdom of God and the Church


- In Tutorials: Panel of Former Students, “Strategies to Succeed in SMC103”

15-17 September  
Giving Shape to Catholic Identity and Life

⇒ Due at the beginning of class 15 September: Unmarked Quiz #1


- Stewart, *Catholic Church*, 41-62 (ch. 3).


∪ Continued on next page.


22-24 September Church, Empire and Christian Orthodoxy

- Northey, et al, Making Sense, 41-65 (ch. 5). Also recommended: Ibid., 98-122 (chs. 9-10).

**NOTE:** for this and future readings from the Christian scriptures, if you do not have your own modern translation of the Christian Bible (e.g. NAB, NRSV, RSV, NJB, NIV), you can access the biblical texts online at one of the following addresses:

- New Jerusalem Bible: [http://www.catholic.org/bible/](http://www.catholic.org/bible/)

- Stewart, Catholic Church, 63-110 (chs. 4-5).
- Term Paper 1 Workshop.

29 Sep - 1 Oct Monasticism and Religious Life

- Stewart, Catholic Church, 94-95 (sidebar), 111-30 (ch. 6), 182-86 (in ch. 9).
6-8 October  The Medieval Papacy

- Review Stewart, *Catholic Church*, 128-29 (in ch. 6).
- Stewart, *Catholic Church*, 131-94 (chs. 7-9).

13 October  THANKSGIVING - NO CLASSES

15 October  Highs and Lows of Papal Authority
(No tutorials)

- First Term Paper (Observation/Comparison) due at the beginning of class on Wednesday, 15 October.

20-22 October  Thomas Aquinas and the Medieval University

- Romans 1:18-23.
- Stewart, *Catholic Church*, 195-216 (ch. 10).
27-29 October  
Protestant and Catholic Reformations

- Stewart, Catholic Church, 217-41 (ch. 11).
- Selections from Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, ed. H.J. Schroeder (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1941), 51-54, 72-80, 144-50, 160-63 [CR].

3-5 November  
New Worlds and Rival Views

- Stewart, Catholic Church, 242-78 (chs. 12-13).

10-12 November  
From Vatican I to Vatican II

⇒ Deadline for appointments and rewrite proposals (to qualify for a rewrite): 12 November.

- Stewart, Catholic Church, 278-307 (chs. 13-14).

17 November  
READING PERIOD – NO CLASS
UNIT TWO: THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

19 November  The Mystery of the Church
(No tutorials)
⇒ Optional Rewrite of First Term Paper due at the beginning of class on Wednesday, 19 November (only for students who have qualified with a proposal and appointment).

24-26 November  The People of God
⇒ Note: the deadline for submitting the first Co-Curricular Summary is Friday, 28 November.

1-3 December  Revelation and Sacred Scripture
(No tutorials)
  - Review for Term Examination.

8-19 December  Term Examination on the date and time set by the Registrar for the Faculty of Arts and Science
Winter Term 2015

5-7 January   Church, World and World Religions
⇒ Deadline to request peer review (required for first-year students): 1:00 pm on Friday, 9 January.
  ⇒ Northey, et al, Making Sense, 81-97 (ch. 8).
  ⇒ Vatican II, “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et Spes),” Preface (#1-3) and Part One, Chapter 4 (#40-45), in Flannery, Vatican Council II, 163-5, 206-17.
  ⇒ In Tutorials: Drafting, Reviewing and Revising Academic Writing

12-14 January   A Pilgrim Church
⇒ Draft of Second Term Paper posted electronically no later than 1:00 pm on Friday, 16 January (for those participating in peer review).
  ⇒ Recommended: Review Northey, et al, Making Sense, 41-65 (ch. 5) & 107-22 (ch. 10).
UNIT THREE: CONTEMPORARY CATHOLICISM – VISIONS AND VIEWS

19-21 January  
Pope John Paul II: Faith and Ethics for the Third Millennium

⇒ Peer reviews of Second Term Paper due no later than 1:00 pm on Friday, 23 January (for those participating in peer review).

➤ Vatican II, “Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation (Dei Verbum),” ch. 2 (#7-10), in Flannery, Vatican Council II, 100-104.

➤ Stewart, Catholic Church, 308-29 (ch. 15).


26-28 January  
Building a Better World

➤ Vatican II, Gaudium et Spes #24-26, in Flannery, Vatican Council II, 189-92.


2-4 February  
Conscience, Freedom and a Culture of Life

(No tutorials)

⇒ Second Term Paper (Analysis/Argument) due at the beginning of class on Wednesday, 4 February.


➤ Vatican II, Gaudium et Spes #15-17, in Flannery, Vatican Council II, 177-79.


9-11 February  

The “New Feminism” of John Paul II

- Vatican II, Gaudium et Spes #27-29, in Flannery, Vatican Council II, 192-95.
- M. Cathleen Kaveny, “Defining Feminism: Can the Church and the World Agree on the Role of Women?,” America, 28 February 2011, 14-17 [CR].

16-18 February  

READING WEEK – NO CLASSES

23-25 February  

Julie Hanlon Rubio: Moral Striving in Ordinary Life

- Interview/Term Paper 3 Workshop (in tutorials).

2-4 March  

Christian Families and Human Sexuality

⇒ Proposal for Third Term Paper (Interview/Synthesis) due at the beginning of class on Monday, 2 March.

- Rubio, Family Ethics, 66-127 (chs. 3-4).
- Recommended: Rubio, 164-89 (ch. 6).
9-11 March The Family Meal and the Heavenly Banquet

- Rubio, Family Ethics, 128-63, 214-44 (chs. 5, 8 and Conclusion).
- Recommended: Rubio, Family Ethics, 190-213 (ch. 7).

16-18 March Mary Jo Leddy: The Face of the Stranger

- Vatican II, Gaudium et Spes #53-59, in Flannery, Vatican Council II, 229-36.

23-25 March Power in the Neighbourhood (No tutorials)

⇒ Third Term Paper (Interview/Synthesis) due at the beginning of class on Wednesday, 25 March.

- Leddy, Other Face, 56-107 (chs. 3-5).

30 Mar – Apr 1 Christ In-Between and Among

⇒ Note: the deadline for submitting the second Co-Curricular Summary is Friday, 3 April.

- Leddy, Other Face, 108-39 (chs. 6-7).
- Review for Final Examination.

8-30 April Comprehensive Final Examination on the date and time set by the Registrar for the Faculty of Arts and Science
What on earth are “Lecture Minutes”?  

We all learn in a variety of ways: we read carefully, we listen to others, and the like. Many educational theorists argue, however, that the most successful learning strategies involve some level of “rehearsal” — that is, re-presenting course content in our own words.

To a certain extent, such “rehearsal” is involved in tutorial discussions, term papers, and even tests. In this class, however, students will also re-present lecture material in “minutes” or short summaries presented in class the following lecture session.

Every student will prepare lecture minutes for one lecture each term. In the first term, students will work in teams of 2-3. These teams will meet between lectures, prepare a single “lecture minutes” text in both written and electronic form, and choose one among their number to present it orally at the beginning of the next lecture session — please note: all members of the team will receive the same mark for the first lecture minutes assignment. In the second term, 2-3 students will each prepare their own lecture minutes, and they will decide between them who will present her or his text to the class. In both terms, minutes will be handed in (in print and electronic forms) to be evaluated as part of students’ class participation scores and to be posted on the course web-page.

Minutes should be between 290 and 330 words in length, or approximately one page, double-spaced, in a standard 12-point font. The presentation should take no longer than 5 minutes. See the example on the facing column.

Sample lecture minutes (from SMC216):

5 December 2006

On Tuesday, Michael O’Connor offered a guest lecture on the topic of early Christian hymnody. Drawing on the eighteenth-century Methodist John Wesley, Dr. O’Connor advanced the thesis that, far from being mere “icing,” Christian hymns represent a way of presenting biblical teaching that is both pleasurable and profitable.

Unfortunately, we know relatively little about how and what the earliest Christians sang. The Oxyrhynchus hymn, a third-century fragment, offers a few lines of text and some notations, but no indication of performance practice. It is a sedate hymn with relatively few notes and a simple text. The very simplicity of such music made it a powerful instrument in the various “battles over orthodoxy” in the early centuries of the church: rival groups would organize themselves with chants or rhymes that offered short statements of faith. For this reason, a Synod of Laodicea ruled in 320 CE that private individuals should no longer compose hymns at all; instead, with the exception of such hymns as the “Sanctus” (incorporated into the anaphora), churches should only use texts from the canonical scriptures — especially the Psalms — in worship. Precisely because music has a unique power to bring things to life, it must be treated with caution.

A more enthusiastic view is represented by Ambrose of Milan (340-397). He wrote metrical hymns in strophic form—that is, with repeated stanzas. Many were composed to honour moments of the day in connection to Christ’s life and passion. All these hymns ended with a doxology, which was also a confession of orthodox faith in the Trinity. On one occasion, in fact, when Ambrose’s church came under siege by a group sympathetic to Arianism, the congregation joined in song “after the manner of the Eastern Church” to strengthen themselves and resist their captors.

Lecture concluded with the ambivalent position of Augustine of Hippo (354-430), who approved of singing hymns but feared that the pleasure of the music might distract singers from the meaning of the words.

[Prepared by: R. Locklin, 327 words]
Co-Curricular Summaries for SMC 103

As valuable as the time we spend together in class may be, the university experience also provides other avenues for students to acquire academic skills and to indulge the life of the mind. To reflect this fact, students in this class are required to attend and summarize at least two co-curricular events during the academic year (replacing three tutorial meetings in the academic schedule). One of these summaries must be submitted no later than 28 November 2014; the second must be submitted no later than 3 April. Both may be completed in the fall term, if desired.

Additional events (up to four total, throughout the academic year) may also be summarized for extra-credit in the student’s class participation mark.

What kind of event should I attend?

If you are a first-year student, you are required to attend two academic skills workshops sponsored by the Research and Academic Skills Center (RASC) and/or the Mentoring and Academic Peer Programme. Check the RASC website for more details: <stmikes.utoronto.ca/research/default.asp#tabbed-nav=tab3>. If you would prefer to attend an equivalent programme at another Faculty or College, please consult with the instructor beforehand to verify its eligibility.

If you are a second-, third- or fourth-year student, you are required to attend two public lectures or other academic events on the University of St. Michael’s College campus – on any topic you choose. Events will be announced in class and are also updated regularly on the USMC events page <http://stmikes.utoronto.ca/events/default.asp>.

These restrictions apply only to the two required co-curricular summaries. Students of any year may attend either RASC workshops or academic events for extra credit.

How do I claim credit for the events I attend?

Students may claim credit in one of two ways:

First, students may submit a 100-150 word summary within two weeks of the event, stating the name, place, date and time of the event, summarising the main argument of the speaker(s) and/or discussing important points raised in the workshop. This may be submitted in print or electronic form.

Alternatively, students may live-tweet the event as it takes place, on the Twitter feed for the course (#smc10314). A satisfactory live-tweet consists of: 1) an initial tweet stating the name of the event, place, date and time; 2) no fewer than three subsequent tweets summarising important points raised by the speaker(s). If your Twitter handle does not clearly identify you, please alert the instructor so that you receive credit.

➢ If you live-tweet a lecture, conference or workshop, consider letting the speaker or organiser know what you are doing ahead of time – it might prevent misunderstandings!

Co-Curricular Summaries will not receive letter grades, but will be assessed on √-, √, √+, √++ basis (0 for non-completion) – with a √ indicating adequate or satisfactory completion of the assignment. Each summary submitted for extra credit (up to 4) will qualify for +2% in the class participation portion of the student’s final mark, or +1% if the summary is weak or incomplete.
“I don’t have time to do the reading!”

Obviously, in order to do well in a course, you will eventually have to complete the readings very carefully—typically this will require between 3 and 4 hours of preparation for each and every class. However, particularly as we come to the end of the term, you may not always be able to commit this time before each class.

So what do you do if you cannot complete the reading?

BRING THE READINGS TO CLASS

First and foremost, please bring the readings with you to class. If you have not read, and you do not have the readings with you, you make yourself a completely passive learner . . . which, for most students, means that you are unlikely to do much learning at all. There are exceptions to this rule, but they are few. Most people learn most effectively through engagement.

If you do not have time to complete the readings, however, you can still engage with them. Here are some suggestions:

- If you have only 5 minutes for preparation: take a quick look at handouts and/or secondary source assignments to get a sense of the reading. A secondary source may summarize a primary source very succinctly.

- If you have only 15-20 minutes to prepare: Do the above, plus read all of the chapter headings in the reading, if they exist. Often, this will allow you to hone in on a short statement of the most essential points: for example, a section labelled "The Main Point of My Argument" is very likely to be of central importance to whatever we will discuss in class. This doesn't help with every source but it is a good tool to keep in your academic kit.

- If you have an hour: read the first and last paragraph of each chapter of a selection, and the first and last sentence of every paragraph, and slow down here and there to read passages that are obviously central. For most authors, this will give you a very good idea of the main argument.

- What if you have no time at all? Bring the reading with you to class.

(Adapted from an email rant by Prof. Reid Locklin; used with permission)
In the first three weeks of this course, we are studying the formation and development of Catholic faith, life and worship in the first five centuries of the Church. Our main sources are the narration of this history by Cynthia Stewart in *The Catholic Church*, as well as primary sources drawn from the Christian New Testament, the *Didache*, the *Apostolic Tradition*, the *Didascalia*, the early creeds, and the writings of Augustine of Hippo.

For this assignment, you will be asked to write a short paper of approximately 1200-1500 words length (4-5 pages), in which you reflect critically upon the relation between a contemporary Catholic worship experience and one “church order” from the early centuries of the church. This paper is worth 7.5% of your final course grade.

To complete this assignment, you will need to:

☑ Carefully observe a Catholic Mass—if you happen to be Catholic, it is preferable that this be elsewhere than your home parish. There are many churches in the immediate vicinity—see the attached handout entitled “Observing a Catholic Mass” for some suggestions.

☑ Compare what you observe to one of the following “church orders” from the early church:
  - The *Didache*
  - The *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome
  - The *Didascalia* of the Apostles

☑ Formulate a clear thesis statement and select the evidence you will use to illustrate and/or support your thesis. You can draw upon the Stewart textbook for background, but the primary sources for the paper should be: 1) your observation of the liturgy and, 2) your one selected church order. *This is not a research paper; you should not use any outside sources.*

☑ See the marking protocol on the reverse of this page, the handout “What Should My Essay Be” (on Blackboard, under “Assignments & handouts”), as well as resources from the University of Toronto writing centres for further details on format, style and grading criteria. *Your papers will not be read for some “party line” or “doctrinal fidelity”—they will be evaluated according to the clarity of your thought and quality of your writing!*

**NOTE:** full bibliographic information for all sources using Chicago style (see Northey, 154–161).

Turning in the Paper:

☞ **Before the beginning of lecture on 15 October**, submit the electronic version of the paper to Turnitin.com (follow the instructions with the handout, “What Should Your Essay Be?”).

☞ **At the beginning of lecture on 15 October**, submit the hard copy of the paper to the instructor, including a complete bibliography or reference page.

☞ **Absence from class** will not excuse any student from submitting a paper on time. If you have an emergency situation, you need to contact the instructor right away!
**Paper-Specific Objectives:**

**CLOSE READING/OBSERVATION:** Paper reveals careful attention to a Catholic liturgy and one of the assigned “church orders.” Facts used are accurate, and you demonstrate grasp of the material.

**COMPARISON:** Your paper notes relevant and interesting points of comparison between the Catholic liturgy and the “church order.” Your own reasoning and imagination are revealed in developing the point(s) of similarity and difference among sources.

**ARGUMENT:** You have articulated a clear and original thesis, which is supported by a logical and cohesive development of your argument. To substantiate your argument, you have included relevant narrative and/or description, drawn from both sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Academic Writing Standards:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INTRODUCTION:** Your introduction establishes a context and background, clearly defines the question or problem you will address in the paper, and offers a strong statement and/or outline of your argument.

**STRUCTURE:** Your paper has a logical structure, in which the paragraphs flow from one idea to the next and support the overall argument. This is maintained throughout the paper.

**CONCLUSION:** Your conclusion sums up the preceding arguments, draws together the paper, and adds insight to the discussion.

**GRAMMAR AND USAGE:** The paper displays a command of standard written English, with few errors in grammar or usage.

**TONE AND STYLE:** The tone of the paper is reasonable, well-written and flows well from one section to the next. When referring to human beings, you avoid using gender-exclusive or prejudicial language.

**USE OF SOURCES:** Your paper uses a combination of direct quotation, paraphrase and summary. Direct quotations are not overused and are relevant to your discussion. They are properly introduced and formatted.

**CITATION STYLE:** The sources of direct quotations and paraphrased material are correctly cited using Chicago style.

**FORM:** Paper is the assigned length, without sacrificing content or style, and is clear and clean, with a title that reflects the argument of the paper.

---

**These criteria will be given approximately double weight in evaluating the paper.**

Base Grade: ________ Late Penalty (if any): ________ Final Grade: ________

**Additional Comments:**
In the second unit of this course, we are studying the vision of renewal offered by the bishops of the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). Our main sources are selected conciliar documents (from Sacrosanctum Concilium [SC], Lumen Gentium [LG], Dei Verbum [DV], Gaudium et Spes [GS], Dignitatis Humanae [DH], and Nostra Aetate [NA]), along with secondary readings from Stewart, Donovan, Ratzinger, Gaillardetz, Rahner, Doyle, Dulles, and O’Malley.

For this assignment, you will be asked to write a paper of approximately 1300-1800 words length (5-7 pages) based on one of the “claims” listed below. Your paper should develop arguments both for and against the claim, as well as arguing your own position on the same claim. Your arguments must be based on a close reading of relevant texts from Vatican II, drawing on at least TWO documents, including at least ONE of the four Constitutions (LG, SC, GS, DV).

To complete this assignment, you will need to:

☒ Select one of the following “claims” about the Council:

1. The bishops of the Second Vatican Council set out to make the Catholic Church much more like a democracy, didn’t they?
2. Vatican II taught that the Catholic Church alone possesses the authentic truth about God and the unique means of salvation. Right?
3. The authority of the Christian Scriptures was more strongly emphasized by Vatican II than the authority of popes and bishops, wasn’t it?
4. Vatican II placed strict limits on the extent to which liturgical worship and Church teachings can be adapted to make them more attractive to modern society. Correct?
5. The Second Vatican Council both recommended and itself revealed a genuine attitude of open, mutual dialogue between the Catholic Church and the wider world, didn’t it?

☒ Select at least two documents of the Council and draw evidence from these documents both to support and to contradict your chosen claim. The claims are deliberately open-ended: you should be able to build a reasonable case both for and against the selected claim (following Thomas Aquinas: “it would seem that,” and “on the other hand”), though not necessarily in that order. Remember that you must draw on at least one of the four Constitutions.

☒ Evaluate these arguments and present your own position on the claim clearly – your own position will serve as the thesis of the paper. You might find that you concur with one of the positions you present; or that your own position is somewhere between the claim and its opposite (as in “I agree, but…,” or “Not really, but…,” or “These positions miss the central issue…,”). This is not a research paper; you need not use any outside sources.

☒ See the marking protocol on the reverse of this page, the handout “What Should My Essay Be,” as well as resources from the University of Toronto writing centres for further details on format, style and grading criteria. Your papers will not be read for some “party line” or “doctrinal fidelity”—they will be evaluated according to the clarity of your thought and quality of your writing!

NOTE: full bibliographic information for all secondary sources (in University of Chicago/standard footnote format) is available in the purple course outline—attached to the syllabus.

Turning in the Paper:

☒ Before the beginning of lecture on 4 February, submit the electronic version of the paper to Turnitin.com (follow the instructions available on Portal).

☒ At the beginning of lecture on 4 February, submit the hard copy of the paper to the instructor, including a complete bibliography of all sources cited or consulted in preparing the paper.

☒ Absence from class will not excuse any student from submitting a paper on time. If you have an emergency situation, you need to contact the instructor right away!
**Paper-Specific Objectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SELECTION:</strong></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have identified appropriate documents from the Second Vatican Council and used them effectively to develop responses to the selected claim. You have taken note of those discussions directly relevant to the claim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **CLOSE READING:** Paper reveals careful attention to the selected documents of the Second Vatican Council. Facts used are accurate, background details are provided as necessary, and you demonstrate grasp of the material. |

| **ANALYSIS:** You successfully develop initial arguments both for the claim and for its opposite, based on evidence from Council documents. Your own reasoning and imagination are revealed in developing these positions. |

| **ARGUMENT:** You have articulated your own, distinctive position on the selected claim—your thesis—which is supported by a logical and cohesive development throughout the paper. Your own argument follows from your analysis of arguments for and against the selected claim. |

| **CRITICAL EVALUATION:** In and out of your analysis, you have offered original, thoughtful and critical evaluations of the opposing positions and of the teachings of the Second Vatican Council in relation to the selected claim. |

**General Academic Writing Standards:**

| **INTRODUCTION:** Your introduction establishes a context and background, clearly defines the question or problem you will address in the paper, and offers a strong statement and/or outline of your argument. |

| **STRUCTURE:** Your paper has a logical structure. Paragraphs flow from one idea to the next and support the overall argument. This is maintained throughout the paper. |

| **CONCLUSION:** Your conclusion sums up the preceding arguments, draws together the paper, and adds insight to the discussion. |

| **GRAMMAR AND USAGE:** The paper displays a command of standard written English, with few errors in grammar or usage. |

| **TONE AND STYLE:** The tone of the paper is reasonable, well-written and flows well from one section to the next. When referring to human beings, you avoid using gender-exclusive or prejudicial language. |

| **USE OF SOURCES:** Your paper uses a combination of direct quotation, paraphrase and summary. Direct quotations are not overused and are relevant to your discussion. They are properly introduced and formatted. |

| **CITATION STYLE:** The sources of direct quotations and paraphrased material are correctly cited using Chicago style. |

| **FORM:** Paper is the assigned length, without sacrificing content or style, and is clear and clean, with a title that reflects the argument of the paper. |

Base Grade: __________ Late Penalty (if any): __________ Final Grade: __________

**Additional Comments:**
In the second term of this course, we are examining contemporary views of Catholicism that offer different visions of God and the world and embrace the whole scope of human living. Our primary sources for exploring these visions and views in the final unit are: selected documents of Pope John Paul II, Julie Hanlon Rubio’s *Family Ethics*, and Mary Jo Leddy’s *The Other Face of God*, along with selections of the Second Vatican Council documents and other Catholic authors.

**For this assignment**, you will be asked to write a paper of approximately 1300-1800 words length (5-7 pages), in which you choose a topic related to the Catholic vision(s) of human life and develop this topic in a creative synthesis—drawing together ideas from course readings, at least one personal interview, and at least one other source from the course or from your own research. This paper is worth 14% of your final grade.

**To complete this assignment**, you will need to:

- **Select a topic, an interview subject and other resources.** In thinking about these, consider that you will be *required* to draw on the following sources in writing your paper:
  
  - One or more chapters of John Paul II, Julie Hanlon Rubio, and/or Mary Jo Leddy.
  - *At least one personal interview*, with either: 1) someone who considers herself or himself a “faithful Catholic” (but who is not a member of this class) and/or; 2) someone who holds *some form of leadership post in a Catholic institution* such as a Catholic school, a Catholic social service agency, a Catholic hospital, or a Catholic political organization—*but not ordinarily a church*.
  - *At least one other resource*, e.g., an additional interview, other documents we have read in this class, a media report related to your topic, and/or some additional supporting research, if desired.

- **Conduct your interview.** See the handout “Personal Interviews” for advice on how to conduct this interview and how to use what you learn in your final paper. Be sure to *ask and receive permission* from your subject. **YOU MUST ATTACH A SIGNED STATEMENT OF CONSENT (AVAILABLE ON BLACKBOARD) TO THE BACK OF YOUR PAPER.** Use a pseudonym in the paper itself (including the bibliography), rather than a real name, to protect your interview subject’s identity.

- **Formulate a clear thesis statement** and select the evidence you will use to illustrate and/or support your thesis. Your final paper will present, in a short form, your synthesis around this *common theme, central argument or key insight* into contemporary Catholic living. It will draw selected ideas from your reading, interviews and other research to develop this insight in a distinctive, creative way.

- **See the marking protocol on the reverse of this page, the handout “What Should My Essay Be” (on Blackboard) as well as resources from the University of Toronto writing centres for further details on format, style and grading criteria.** Your papers will not be read for some “party line” or “doctrinal fidelity”—they will be evaluated according to the clarity of your thought and quality of your writing!

**NOTE:** full bibliographic information for all sources (in University of Chicago/standard *footnote* format) is available in the course outline—attached to the syllabus.

---

**Turning in the Proposal and Paper:**

- **At the beginning of lecture on 9 March**, submit a paper proposal. The form of this proposal will be discussed in class. This proposal will count as term work (like your lecture minutes), and thus will not receive a letter grade. Instead, it will be assessed on a $\checkmark-, \checkmark, \checkmark+, \checkmark++$ basis (0 for non-completion)—with a $\checkmark$ indicating adequate or satisfactory completion of the assignment. **It will not be accepted late at all; if you do not submit it on time, you will receive a 0.**

- **Before the beginning of lecture on 25 March**, submit the electronic version of the paper to Turnitin.com.

- **At the beginning of lecture on 25 March**, submit the hard copy of the paper to the instructor, including a complete bibliography as well as a signed waiver with complete contact information for your interview subject, which will be removed and retained separately by the instructor. As usual, *absence from class* will not excuse any student from submitting a paper on time. If you have an emergency situation, you need to contact the instructor right away!
**Paper-Specific Objectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The paper reveals care in seeking out an interview subject(s), asking appropriate and thoughtful questions, and integrating what you learn into your overall argument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have selected a chapter of John Paul II, Rubio, or Leddy, at least one interview subject, and other source(s)—to support your creative synthesis. These sources are (a) relevant in themselves and (b) effective in combination. Your focus is sufficiently narrow to permit substantive enquiry and discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your paper notes relevant and interesting points of comparison and connection among the sources you have selected. Your own reasoning and imagination are revealed in developing the point(s) of similarity and difference among sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARGUMENT:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have articulated a clear and original thesis, which is supported by a logical and cohesive development of your argument. Your paper stresses analysis (critical examination which brings out the essential elements) over narrative, and notes counter-evidence (where relevant) and offers some response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL SYNTHESIS:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your use of sources, argument, and conclusion reveals significant original insight(s) and an implication(s), a creative connection(s) among disparate materials, and/or new interpretation of the chosen theme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Academic Writing Standards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your introduction establishes a context and background, clearly defines the question or problem you will address in the paper, and offers a strong statement and/or outline of your argument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your paper has a logical structure. Paragraphs flow from one idea to the next and support the overall argument. This is maintained throughout the paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCLUSION:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your conclusion sums up the preceding arguments, draws together the paper, and adds insight to the discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAMMAR AND USAGE:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The paper displays a command of standard written English, with few errors in grammar or usage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TONE AND STYLE:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tone of the paper is reasonable, well-written and flows well from one section to the next. When referring to human beings, you avoid using gender-exclusive or prejudicial language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE OF SOURCES:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your paper uses a combination of direct quotation, paraphrase and summary. Direct quotations are not overused and are relevant to your discussion. They are properly introduced and formatted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITATION STYLE:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sources of direct quotations and paraphrased material are correctly cited using Chicago style.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM:</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper is the assigned length, without sacrificing content or style, and is clear and clean, with a title that reflects the argument of the paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Grade: __________  Late Penalty (if any): __________  Final Grade: __________

Additional Comments: