

## THE MYSTICAL BODY AND CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE

*"And we thank Thee that darkness reminds us of light."*

T. S. Eliot: *Choruses from "The Rock"*

**S** THOMAS AQUINAS was a man of few words. Despite the almost incredible number of works produced by his pen, despite the constant preoccupation with theological and philosophical writings throughout his adult life, he never indulged in the luxury of literature for its own sake. He was perhaps the purest "classicist" the Western world has even known, if we accept that term in its most restricted sense. For his writings are diamond-hard; they must be held up to the varying lights of each century's experience, if the burning spectrum of wisdom would be seen beneath the multiple facets of his incisive thought. One example of flaming depths walled in an unexcelled brevity occurs at the beginning of his investigations, in the *Third Part of the Summa Theologiae*, concerning Christ the Savior; that treatise which, more than any other, must be thoroughly studied, if the theological dimensions of all great literature are to be understood properly, and if the frustrated yearnings expressed in major contemporary writers are to be appreciated in their full significance.

In the section of the *Summa* to which I refer, S. Thomas asks the question, "If man had not sinned, would God nevertheless have become incarnate?" His answer to this question has not been accepted by all theologians; in fact, some have opposed it rather strongly. Yet the steel coil of his argument, simple as it may seem, is fixed so deeply in the bedrock of supernatural reality that it has never been successfully dislodged. He writes: "Those things which issue solely from the will of God, beyond anything due to creatures, can be known by us only insofar as they are revealed in Sacred Scripture. And since everywhere in Scripture the sin of the first man is cited as the reason for the Incarnation, it is more reasonable to say that God ordained the work of the Incarnation as a remedy for sin, with the result that, if sin did not exist, the Incarnation would not have occurred" (*S.T.*,

III, q. 1, a. 3). S. Thomas goes on to add that this places no limitation on divine omnipotence: the Incarnate God, Jesus Christ, could have come to us without any reference to human sin. But the force of the argument is in no way weakened, since it is based on what the infinitely wise God has told us about His motive in sending Christ to the world. And the magnificent line of the Church's Easter Liturgy, "O happy fault, which has merited . . . so great a Redeemer," annually reaffirms most solemnly the essence of S. Thomas' argument.

The motive of the Incarnation, for God becoming man, in its simplest terms, therefore, was human need; in the beautiful phrase of S. John Chrysostom: "For there is no other reason for the Incarnation except this alone—He saw us cast down to the earth, ruined, enslaved by the tyrant death, and He was merciful" (*Homily on Hebrews: chap. 5, v. 1*). Yet we must not stop at these few sentences from Thomas, the Liturgy and Chrysostom. Human need continues through the ages, and the divine remedy for this need constantly reveals itself in newer guises, in a dazzling kaleidoscope of mercy.

If we think seriously about this truth, we soon realize that it has been operative in our own lives, perhaps during a sermon that gave us new courage in the struggle for good, or during intimate conversation with Our Lord after a fervent Holy Communion. In fact, the truth has become part of common parlance. We often hear it said that there are as many approaches to God as there are men. What else does this mean except that divine mercy quite literally adapts itself to the individual needs of each man? God is not deaf to him who cries sincerely: "Hear, O Lord, my voice . . . have pity on me and listen to me. My heart speaks to Thee, my face seeks Thee; Thy face, O Lord, do I seek" (*Ps. 26:7-8*).

But we should note that divine mercy does not respond to human need in the individual alone. There are wants which afflict whole societies; there is a poverty of spiritual good which causes entire cultures to waste away. We cannot ignore the fact that God in some way always supplies specific remedies for the spiritual needs of mankind at every particular period in history. Divine abundance is never exhausted; God is never out of style.

How are we to know what coin from divinity's treasure is being spent on us in our own day? The first place to look, of course, is in the clearing-house of all supernatural goods on this earth, the Church of Jesus Christ. The Church offers us these supernatural goods, the divine treasure, when she exercises her magisterial and ministerial functions. She gives the Sacraments to the faithful, and thus shows herself the perfect minister. But she also teaches, and we know that as

generation succeeds generation, the Church constantly explains the truths of Faith, constantly penetrates deeper and deeper into the well of mystery over which she is guardian, drawing forth the waters of salvation. Our own times have witnessed a torrent of doctrinal benediction. For in the person of her Supreme Pontiffs and her theologians, she is pouring out the waters of an ancient doctrine, a doctrine that our contemporaries desperately need, a doctrine that offers the solution to current problems as no United Nations nor World Society could ever give. This is the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, that doctrine which clearly indicates to modern man the place where he can find the things he most desires: compassionate understanding, loving friendship, total union. And these three things are not merely desired; they are the summation of contemporary human need. Thus does the splendor of divine mercy shine today, just as it has done all through the ages.

I have said that compassionate understanding, loving friendship and total union are the thing for which modern man yearns. Why? Would it not be more realistic to say that man today wants things like total disarmament, the end of the cold war, peace? To this question I should answer: yes, we do want these things. But I do not think that it is being realistic to limit the boundaries of contemporary need to such things. These are only the fruit of a deeper longing, the longing for compassion, companionship and union. Disarmament, the end of the cold war, peace: these words have become newspaper jargon expressing more fundamental requirements for human salvation. We must look beyond these things we read about in newspapers; too often editorials are as nearsighted as the people who read them.

The point to remember is this: if the Church emphasizes a particular aspect of Revelation during our own generation, we can be sure that this is an indication of the divine mercy responding to a contemporary need. The Mystical Body of Christ, in its fullest meaning, is not directed *only* towards disarmament, the end of the cold war, peace between Russia and the United States. (I qualify the word "peace" in this way, since its latest definition seems to be "tranquillity in Moscow and Washington.") But the Mystical Body doctrine is the sign of divine mercy today. Therefore, we must dig deeper to find the roots of modern needs.

Perhaps we shall find our answers in historical and sociological studies: history records human progress; sociology classifies it. But, in their own way, these areas of investigation are as inadequate as the newspapers for answering our question, although we can never disregard the insight these studies give concerning human affairs. I sug-

gest the possibility, therefore, that human need finds its fullest expression today in literature. History and sociology may give us a vast amount of information; literature does better in the area of understanding, of human awareness.

And what is the vital characteristic of contemporary drama, poetry, fiction? It is a profound concern with the themes of compassion, companionship and union. But more than this is involved. The artistic productions of any period in history, and thus the literature of that period, are an intense reflection of the totality of human living in that epoch. This is so true that we often identify a particular author with his time. Who can separate F. Scott Fitzgerald from the "roaring twenties?" Arthur Miller, in the "Preface" to his *Collected Plays*, makes the same observation while discussing the genesis of his own work, *The Crucible*. In essence, he writes that a playwright is in tune with something in the air of his times; he is perhaps unable to put his finger precisely on that aspect of society which has struck a responsive chord in his imagination, but he nevertheless begins to construct his verbal compositions from the melodies that float through the culture or civilization of which he is a part. It may be that only after he has completed his work will he understand how profoundly this initial empathy has influenced the finished product; perhaps only the perceptive critic will be able to analyze fully this creative dependence. But the fact remains that Miller's experience is merely one example of a stable phenomenon in all artistic creativity. And a close examination of this phenomenon in contemporary literature is of immense value for the understanding of the wants that afflict our society, of the poverty of spiritual awareness that is causing decay in the very heart of our culture.

It is for this reason that we must grasp the fact that the literature of our own day has a far deeper meaning than may perhaps appear from superficial examination. It is imperative that we understand that most of the important literary works today have profound theological implications. Christopher Fry gave expression to the characteristic longing for a spiritual homeland in modern writings, when he wrote in his play *A Sleep of Prisoners*, "The enterprise/Is exploration into God." No matter how twisted, how perverted, how deeply anti-Christian the presentation of this search may be in many writers, they have nevertheless been unable to escape the "lost personality" of their own times. A hunger for the Infinite gnaws at man's heart; today it has become ravenous.

Professor R. W. B. Lewis, in his brilliant analysis of modern fiction *The Picaresque Saint*, has written that "An abysmal sense of

loss . . . is what permeates the atmosphere of the day and what is uttered and dramatized so often in the opening pages of our (contemporary) fiction." And he indicates further that "behind all forms of the sense of loss is the felt loss of the presence or even the life of God" (pp. 25-26). Nietzsche's formula, "God is dead," has found pathetic acceptance in much modern literature, and thus many writers are forced to discover pale substitutes. But what lies behind Nietzsche's statement is something of far more importance than the tragically ridiculous statement itself. Albert Camus points out in *L'Homme Révolté*: "The rebel, who at first denies God, finally aspires to replace Him." This is what has happened in much of modern fiction, as well as all forms of contemporary literature. The Nietzschean formula is nothing but a brief, emotional outburst caused by a deeper resentment. He told the world what he really meant when he wrote: "If there is a God, how can one tolerate not being God oneself?" This brings us closer to the heart of modern literature and gives us an indication of what types of substitution will be found in today's literary endeavors. And a knowledge of these substitutes will enable us to see how salutary the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ is as a remedy for the modern sickness.

It should be noted, however, that today's substitutes for the divine, as they appear in literature, have a certain subtlety about them. Philosophical humanism has, of course, placed man on the divine throne, but Swinburne's cry, "Glory to Man in the highest," is much too blatant a proclamation for modern writers. Having witnessed the conflagration of two global wars and the horror, still with us, of concentration camps, the contemporary writer is too much aware of the perversion of power to allow man the attribute of divine omnipotence. Georges Rouault's magnificent painting *Homo Homini Lupus* (*Man Is a Wolf to Man*) is a profoundly Christian expression of why the modern writer fears a human omnipotence. Thus, we must look elsewhere for the substitutes. I suggest that they can be found in the current denigrated vision of the mystery of Christ, the bland vision that has attempted to strip Him of His Divinity, to separate His Person from His work.

In this essay I have already indicated that an artist does have a powerful affinity with his epoch, that his work reveals a creative dependence upon the atmosphere in which he lives. Now Christ, because He is God, is all-merciful, all-loving; He is, in fact, one with the Father. The night before He died, He prayed in this way: "Holy Father, keep in Thy name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one even as We are" (*John*, 17:11). These attributes of Christ,

His mercy, love and oneness with God, are powerful attractions to His Person in themselves; in a world bleeding from war and cruelty unparalleled in human history, they are irresistible. But the tragedy of the past few generations, by which men refuse to accept the divinity of Christ, has influenced modern writers to the point where they will display immense concern for these attributes "humanized," without any reference to the reality, the Godhead of Jesus Christ, which gives them existence. In this way the current substitutes for God are derived from the mystery of Christ; the true meaning of His mercy, love and oneness with the Father having been lost, modern literature is reduced to the search for human compassion, companionship and union. Even the crassly commercial notion of "togetherness" is really the most vitiated form of these Christ-attributes on the level of the popular magazine.

Because the limits of this essay do not permit a thorough analysis of these notions in all modern writers, I shall try to show how they are operative in one dramatic work. This particular play has been chosen, because it contains a remarkable sympathy for those literary themes which are, in reality, pale reflections of the glorious Christ. Swinburne had no idea of the last, dreadful ironic meaning expressed in his line, "Thou hast conquered, o pale Galilean," which has come to dominate contemporary literature.

That Tennessee Williams' *The Rose Tattoo* is a play with extensive theological dimensions becomes clear after close reading. Expressed in its simplest terms, it is a play about love as the only remedy for human loneliness, but its implications go far beyond the human element. *The Rose Tattoo*, most fundamentally, is a drama of divine love, of which the human element is but a mirror; the divine love, however, has been dragged down to the mud. S. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "We see now through a mirror in an obscure manner" (*I Cor.*, 13:12). What Williams has done is to so darken the mirror that neither the divine nor the truly human reflections can be discerned. He has taken the symbol of conjugal love and represented it in terms of modern man's reversal of values; the quality of animal pleasure (which is valid neither naturally nor supernaturally in conjugal relations) has been substituted for the spirituality of the *Canticles* and of the Christian mystics. The very thing which throughout the whole of Christian tradition has symbolized the intimate relation of the soul to Christ has been perverted, twisted into a meaning that is basically sacrilegious.

It may be well, however, to examine particular aspects of the play, especially in its symbolic values, before stating any more general

conclusions. In this way we can see what is involved in Williams' use of specifically Christian ideas, in a setting totally foreign to them. There is only one reservation that must be made before attempting this somewhat detailed analysis: I shall use the word symbol in its widest possible meaning, that is, in the sense of any ideational content, however vague, which is imaged through speech, character, even scenery.

We may begin with the title itself, *The Rose Tattoo*. The rose is a traditional symbol in the Christian heritage; it represents many things, but one principally has acquired dominance in Western literature. It symbolizes Christian happiness or heaven, that is, knowing and loving God in the beatific vision. This symbolism received its most powerful definitive expression in the *Paradiso* of Dante; it can be seen in a contemporary work that is an acknowledged masterpiece, T. S. Eliot's *Four Quartets*, where the closing line of the last section, "Little Gidding," reads: "And the fire and the rose are one." Williams has taken this idea of happiness for his play: the rose represents wedded love; it appears on Serafina's breast as a sign that this love has produced its fruit, which she feels stirring in her womb. In fact, she calls the fruit of her love with Rosario (another variation of the word), Rosa. The elements of both love and happiness are implicated: love as cause, happiness as effect. But within the total meaning of the play, the love that dominates and ultimately triumphs is a carnal love productive of a carnal pleasure. This last is important, for while the pleasure concomitant with conjugal intercourse is divinely ordained and a positive good, Williams has made it the paramount aspect of human relations. Beyond this, he has even debased it, for Serafina's lament, "Io sono animale," prevades much of the play: when she is deprived of the "love together every night of the week" by the death of Rosario, she descends to the level of the animal, and this is visually imaged in her lack of care for appearance.

The *tattoo* signifies the image of God, that is, man himself. This is merely an adaptation, required by the circumstances of the play, of the reality that man can and does participate in the divine life. For, as S. Thomas indicates, man is most perfectly the image of God, when he is actually knowing and loving God. The tattoo appears when new life is conceived; it is a permanent "attribute" of Rosario, who is the active principle in begetting; it is purposely usurped by Alvaro, as a guarantee of his being allowed to share Serafina's bed. In this last case it takes on the aspect of "grace," the divine gift by which man is received into the supernatural domestic life of the Trinity. And it is most interesting that Alvaro shows the tattoo to Serafina

just before the "supper," another constant symbol in Christian tradition of happiness with God, as is evident in the parables of Our Lord.

The next symbolic element in *The Rose Tattoo* is made up of three things, and it is essentially a reflection of the sacramental rite which stands at the center of Christianity: it is the Mass. The three elements are *wine*, *tears*, and the *supper*, or at least the references to the last. The whole scene (Act II, Scene 1) is an extraordinary secularist representation of the Eucharistic sacrifice. It is in this scene particularly that the constant preoccupation of all serious twentieth century literature, the companion-compassion-union motif, is clearly indicated. The truck-driver Alvaro has been beaten in a fight and he flees into Serafina's house to weep—not only because of the pain he suffers, but also because the report of the fight to his employer may cost him his job. Williams gives an important stage direction regarding Serafina's attitude towards Alvaro at this moment: "We must understand her profound unconscious response to this sudden contact with distress as acute as her own." A quality of animal pity is not lacking from this response, but there can be no doubt that the element of compassion is what Williams intends to convey. In the Christian mystery this is precisely the aspect of communal participation in the Mass as sacrificial. I do not think that the symbolic reference to the mixing of water with wine in the Mass—which signifies the Christian's participation in the "clean oblation" which Christ offered to the Father—can be mistaken. In the play it is reflected in the weeping, both that of Serafina and of Alvaro, which precedes the drinking of the wine. It is also expressed in the awkward handling of the ice which should chill the wine. During the emotional confusion which accompanies this episode, the two characters end up by putting the ice *in* the wine, rather than using it to chill the bottle, as if the coldness of the loveless world—to which Alvaro refers later—will be thawed in the ruby flame of the wine of compassionate understanding. T. S. Eliot uses the same sort of symbolism in *The Cocktail Party*, when at the end of the second act after the three troubled characters have "confessed" to the "priest-psychiatrist," there is a champagne toast "To the Guardians." There is a kind of mutual confession that precedes the wine-drinking in *The Rose Tattoo* also. Moreover, the wine is spilled during this scene, and this is a hint of the idea of sacrificial "libation."

Beyond this sacrificial element of the Mass, the drinking of the wine together is the sacramental aspect of the Christian rite, the faithfuls' participation in the Last Supper. During the Mass at the consecration of the wine, Christ says through His priests: "This is the chalice



of My Blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of Faith; which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins." S. Thomas, in discussing the meaning of this statement, writes that by the words "the new and eternal testament" is signified the primary and principle power operating in the Sacrament through the shedding of Christ's Blood, namely, the ordination of man to the attainment of eternal life, of happiness (*S.T.*, III, q. 78, a. 3). And he cites S. Paul to this effect: ". . . brethren, we are free to enter the Holies in virtue of the Blood of Christ, a new and living way which He inaugurated for us through the veil (that is, His Flesh) . . ." I think that there can be no doubt that in *The Rose Tattoo*, the partaking of the wine is an inauguration into the way of the flesh, but most certainly not in the way that S. Paul meant in this quotation from *Hebrews* (10:19). S. Paul writes "through the veil;" I have written "into the way of the flesh." The change in preposition is of great significance.

The drinking of the wine also objectifies the companion motif. The whole scene is filled with references to the attempt to fill the empty cup of human loneliness: "You are simpatica, molto;" "Love and affection in a world that is lonely—and cold!" The term "companion" is an extension of the original Latin *cum* (with) and *panis* (bread)—the breaking of bread together. The natural sign of human friendship is therein contained, and the connection with the Eucharist is obvious, since in Communion we break the Bread of the Lord. In fact, one of the effects of the reception of the Eucharist, as S. Thomas points out (*S.T.*, III, q. 79, a. 1), is the union in charity of all the members of the Mystical Body. Thus, in the whole scene central elements of the Mass are represented symbolically, even though the symbols have been twisted. We might notice also the fact that the idea of compassion, of suffering with another, is brought down to the actual physical level; for beyond Serafina's being "simpatica, molto," there is the incident in which she draws blood from her own finger, when she pricks it with the needle.

The portrayal of the priest, Father de Leo, in *The Rose Tattoo* is something that should be noted as a graphic representation of the reason (false though it is) why the Christian symbols in the play have been separated from Christianity. He is the official representative of the Church, and as such, when he implicitly breaks the seal of confession, his untrustworthiness is transferred to the Church herself. Thus is organized Christianity pictured as being untrustworthy. Moreover, when Serafina really begins to act like the animal Father de Leo accuses her of being, he is saved from her vulgar importunities by

the community of women, the virtuous souls who lead him away "with comforting murmurs." But note that the virtuous women are the uncharitable ones, the unloving, those who lack Serafina's "simpatica, molto." This is the kind of portrayal of virtue which freezes the blood of the reader of Mauriac's *La Pharisienne*.

There is a further definition, however, of these women in the closing scenes of the play that is even more debasing of the Christian community. It is this band of women at the end of the play, who snatch up the rose-colored shirt and pass it along among themselves until it reaches the top of the hill. What this signifies for the Christian is profoundly disturbing, for in this short scene the whole of Catholicism is pictured as a sort of vicarious sexualism. Because the Christian moral code demands restraint in the matter of sex, and because, in Williams' limited understanding, sex is the basic happiness in human life and the source of value in that life, the Christian community must supply for its inhibitions and repressions by passing along the choice tidbits of sexual gossip which the rose-colored shirt symbolizes. This is Williams' portrait of the righteous (in the hard biographic Puritan meaning of that word) who take it upon themselves to laugh scornfully at the excommunicated one (that is, emancipated)—the member of the family who flees the shackles of the moral code. This same view of Catholicism as vicarious sexualism characterizes James Cozzens' *By Love Possessed*, especially in the scenes between Arthur Winner and Mrs. Polly Pratt. The one major difference is that Williams is essentially a lyric poet, and thus he is more subtle in his representation of a falsehood that has done irreparable harm to the Church. One cannot blame Williams too much for this limited understanding, however; writers like Greene and Mauriac, the Catholics, present essentially the same view, although they are never quite so blatant about it.

We come now to Alvaro himself, the man of virility with the visage of a clown. The *clown* has a noble heritage in Christian art; perhaps this symbol begins with the mocking of Christ or with S. Paul's boast: "We are fools for Christ's sake." But Williams has, as with the other symbols of the play, made a devastating innovation. Man, for him, is a clown only in the truly human aspects of his being. He is perfect in body, and thus possesses perfectly the instrument by which he can attain the "ultimate" in human happiness, sexual union. This dichotomy between the perfection of body and foolish inadequacy of mind and will is directly connected with the question of the tattoo as image and grace. Man is most human, most perfect, most completely the image of God, when he is knowing and loving God. But

for Tennessee Williams the faculties which have been endowed with the capacity for such lofty operations are the very faculties in which man is a clown.

Further, the condition of entrance into the Kingdom, into happiness, is the possession of grace. The clown in *The Rose Tattoo* has himself "clothed" in the sign of the rose, which sign, he thinks, will insure his entrance into the happiness of possessing Serafina's body. Williams sees the connection between the marking with a sign of destiny and that destiny itself; the sign, however, is effective only on that level which Williams conceives of as being the ultimate in human values.

*The Rose Tattoo* reverts once again to the aberrations of the Old Testament times, when the Hebrew prophets thundered denunciations against the "high-places," those centers of pathetic idolatry where sacred prostitution clutched the bodies of pagans, so that they became impotent in the love that is truly divine. There are many things implied in the clown symbolism, but I think that a real sense of the difference between the Christian use of that symbolism and that which Tennessee Williams presents in this play can be seen best by comparing the play with the clown motif in the paintings of Georges Rouault. This great artist was concerned with many of the same problems that are reflected in the Williams' play, but the difference is profound, and I might add that the order, divinely established in the universe, is never upset in the Rouault works.

There are many other aspects of *The Rose Tattoo* which deserve serious theological inquiry, especially the character of the sailor, Jack Hunter, who is a remarkable "Christ-figure," although this symbolism is more deeply hidden than the obvious portrait of the corporal in William Faulkner's *A Fable*. To this should be added an investigation of the very first scene of the play, as it establishes in its essential features the whole symbolic value and tonality of the work. But what has been indicated in this essay, I think, clearly highlights the theological dimensions of Tennessee Williams' artistic preoccupation. And it is important to remark, despite the repetition, that Williams is only one example of attitudes and tendencies that pervade the whole of serious modern literature. For this reason I should recommend a close study of R. W. B. Lewis' *The Picaresque Saint* for one who wishes to see how the companion-compassion-union theme dominates the work of such writers as Alberto Moravia, Albert Camus, Ignazio Silone, William Faulkner, Graham Greene and André Malraux. There are, of course, more writers involved in the same thematic material, but the above list is certainly representative of modern literature.

Thus, it can be said with some assurance, that because the artist is necessarily dependent upon the age in which he lives and because his finished work is an intense reflection of the vital aspects of his own generation, the artistic productions of the twentieth century have an intimate connection with the needs of modern man. Further, it should be added that the companion-compassion-union theme is, in reality, a pale substitution for the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. In the Mystical Body we find true companionship, for vital membership in that Body requires the possession of sanctifying grace, which makes us brothers of Jesus Christ and adopted sons of His heavenly Father. There is in this Mystical Reality true compassion, for it is here alone that suffering discovers the only value it possesses. As S. Paul said: ". . . what is lacking of the sufferings of Christ, I fill up in my flesh for His Body, which is the Church" (*Colos.*, 1:24). And finally, it is only in the Mystical Body of Christ that true and lasting union is achieved, union with God and union with our fellow men, for it is only here that man, quite literally, partakes of the Bread of Union.

There is a frightening darkness in the world today; one by one the sinfulness of man has snuffed out the lights of human values. But it is a darkness that *reminds us of the light*, to use the beautiful words of the prayer that closes T. S. Eliot's hymn to the Church, *Choruses from "The Rock."* These secular yearnings for companionship, compassion and union, of course, are not effective yearnings for the Mystical Body; no pagan desired the Most Holy Trinity, for the simple reason that he knew nothing about It. Yet it remains true that these expressions of longing for a spiritual homeland do indicate to use the needs of contemporary society. And we do know that because the motive of the Incarnation was human need, and because God always provides a remedy for human need in any particular period of history, the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ is the divine response to the questions being asked in our society today, no matter how vague these questions may be in the consciousness of modern man.

Perhaps it would be well to conclude our discussion with the title of Christopher Fry's latest play, his "winter comedy," *The Dark Is Light Enough*. In this context we do not refer to the darkness that "reminds us of the light," but to the darkness of Faith. Once our contemporaries give their assent by Faith to the truths revealed to mankind by Jesus Christ, they will discover that Fry's title has profound meaning for them. For in the obscurity of a living Faith, *The Dark Is Light Enough*.