
This book needs no summing up, no further reviewing. During the past six months The Phenomenon has been reviewed by experts in many fields; it would be difficult to name a single journal having the remotest relation to the subject of Fr. Tielhard’s controversial contribution which has not devoted great amounts of space and critical attention to this book. Most readers, therefore, know who Fr. Teilhard is and what his The Phenomenon is all about. What is far more needful than another review of the book is a review of the reviews. We have Casebooks on The Turn of the Screw, Othello, Ezra Pound and King Lear, revealing the wide latitude of critical opinion on the meaning and value of these works. If the interested reader were to place before himself the two dozen or so important American reviews of The Phenomenon published to date, he would have an astounding and most baffling casebook of contradictory impressions. In this essay, I should like to comment on these reviews, and to suggest how, in their contrast, they reflect the true value of this book.

By far the greater number of reviews have praised The Phenomenon enthusiastically, though for widely different reasons. A few have criticized it severely. A most sanguine review claimed that it was the single important courageous response to Pope Pius XII’s invitation in his Humani Generis to investigate the evolutionary hypothesis in the context of Catholic theological thought. The reader must have been somewhat baffled, then, when he read in another review that Humani Generis, which was written after (1950) the contents of this book were well known to the European audience, expressly repudiates the central thesis of this book—the assumption of the fact of total evolution—and is aimed directly at the “imprudent zeal” of those who would abandon the traditional “principles and funda-
mental tenets" of metaphysical reasoning which best defend the Faith, as the reviewer claimed this book seems to do.

Some reviewers found in *The Phenomenon* a refreshingly novel approach to Catholic philosophy, a philosophy which could embrace the "new cosmological and anthropological look," eirenic enough for the contemporary mind and free from the tiresome "scholastic" terminology of "essences," "existence," "potency and act," "natures," etc. These reviewers, however, were not professional philosophers, but, for the most part, men engaged in other fields who thought that Catholic philosophy needed a "shot in the arm." It was not surprising, then, to read the reply of some professional philosophers, to whom exact and technical terms in their field are of utmost value, who argued that one might as well say that they are tired of hearing about "valence" in Chemistry, "neutrons" in Physics and "nebulae" in Astronomy. Professional competence requires adequate and exact language, and the terminology of traditional philosophy, for those who are competent enough in the field to appreciate it, has been proven by long professional experience to be most useful and necessary.

More surprising than this controversy among the reviewers is the fact that Fr. Teilhard himself, in his Preface, expressly ruled his book out of the category of a philosophical tract. As some reviewers insisted, any attempt to attach philosophical (ontological) meaning to the concepts and arguments in *The Phenomenon* is a misreading of the book. Yet the constant references by reviewers to the "philosophy" of Fr. Tielhard show that he failed to keep even the experts from misreading the book.

In that same Preface, Fr. Tielhard warns the reader not to consider *The Phenomenon* a theological treatise either. However, some reviewers saw in this book a "new theological look," or, at least, a theoretical basis for a "new theology." Again, for the most part, these comments were made by those who seem to think that any book which mentions God, Christianity, evil, etc. must be a theological tract. But even some professional theologians understood this book to raise fundamental theological questions, and many readers, especially non-Catholics, have come to regard *The Phenomenon* as the formulation of the Catholic Church's position on the theory of evolution. This is largely the result of the excessively enthusiastic attempts on the part of some reviewers (and lecturers) to draw out theological implications which, if they were to follow Fr. Teilhard's own instructions, cannot validly be inferred from *The Phenomenon*. Because of this inability to read the book according to this canon of neutrality (and perhaps it cannot be so read), much theological controversy has arisen.
among reviewers about the book's orthodoxy on such matters as: the spirituality and immortality of the soul, immanence, pantheism, pan-psychism, the Redemption, evil, etc.

Some reviewers were willing to take Fr. Teilhard at his word. *The Phenomenon* is not philosophical or theological, it is *scientific*. Its strength lies in its basic scientific approach and method, its theoretical validity and the logical necessity of its inferences. Fr. Tielhard was not a trained philosopher or theologian; he was an expert paleontologist. *The Phenomenon* stands or falls on the strength of its scientific and logical impunity. So hailed many reviewers. But none of them successfully answered the most devastating review of one of America's foremost paleontologists, who characterized the work a piece of "mystical science," whatever that might be. Fr. Teilhard's interpretation of general (total) cosmic evolution as a teleological, spiritualistic, anthropomorphic unfolding, ever seeking the transcendent Omega, is not an *inference* from scientific fact or theory, says that reviewer, but a gratuitous assumption brought to the data *ab extrinsico* by the author who is under the sway of a higher superstition. (It is interesting that the materialistic and mechanistic interpretation of evolutionary processes proposed by the American paleontologist-reviewer is, by the very same token, not an inference from the data but a gratuitous assumption). The charge has been sustained, and even Fr. Tielhard's most ardent European defenders have admitted that *The Phenomenon* is not science "in the strict and modern sense."

As a scientific work, they say, it is rather to be compared to the general approach and sweep of Aristotle's *Physics*, a kind of evolutionary cosmology giving a new scientific interpretation to universal physical and biological processes in keeping with the latest experimental hypotheses and data. However, readers who have an intimate acquaintance with the natural philosophy of Aristotle's *Physics* and the rest of his natural treatises are reluctant to admit the alleged resemblance of Fr. Teilhard's phenomenalistic method and Aristotle's naturalistic method. For them, the "science" of *The Phenomenon* no more resembles the science of Aristotle than it does the science of Dr. G. G. Simpson.

Some critics, willing to admit that not much defense can be made of the book on theological, philosophical and scientific grounds, claim that it is a magnificent piece of cosmological *poetry*; that it has long poetic passages, many of which, even in translation, are memorable and inspiring. Other critics of *The Phenomenon* bristle when they hear this book defended as a piece of poetry. Again, it is the case of the non-professional
reader who is most willing to call it poetry. A poet of some reputation, however, leveled heavy criticism upon this evaluation, repudiating the bulk of the book as "ambiguous and ineffectual use of metaphor." The poet uses metaphor to elicit or evoke a concrete personal response. Therefore he must use analogy, metaphorical imagery, with great lucidity and clarity. The one outstanding quality of this book, says our critic, is its ambiguous use of metaphor. If it must be called a poetic work, it is bad poetry.

In paging through the reviews, pro and con, there emerges at least one point of agreement: The Phenomenon, whether directly intended or not, tends to generate conviction about something. It is persuasive. It is an effective piece of rhetoric in the grand old sense of the liberal art of persuasion. Now it is certainly true that there are many factors extrinsic to the book which tend to alert the reader and make him feel that what he is reading is, if not important, at least unusual. The fact that its author was an internationally respected priest-paleontologist, that his works (non-scientific) have never received Ecclesiastical approbation, the fact that he was not allowed to teach or lecture by his Order, the fact that the atheist Sir Julian Huxley wrote a highly laudatory Introduction to the English edition of The Phenomenon, these and scores of other notorious contingencies have aided in making this book a "must" on the reading list of the American Catholic intellectual. (In their own sophisticated way, intellectuals are as given to fads as are the masses).

Apart from the extrinsic rhetoric of the intellectual atmosphere into which this book has been received, there are a great many reviewers and critics who are willing to admit every limitation mentioned in this review or reviews thus far—and all its inherent contradictions—and still maintain that it is an important book. What is its recommendation? The Phenomenon, as a communication between science and the other related disciplines, persuades the reader that the first steps toward an improved dialogue between science and Catholic theology have been taken. Fr. Teilhard has formulated a dialogical problem and on the basis of his formulation, a dialogue between science and theology (and philosophy) is possible for the first time.

Unfortunately, however, the trained dialectician is quick to perceive false optimism in this area. If The Phenomenon is the first step to a dialogue between science and theology, by the rules of dialectics alone, it is doomed to failure. There can be a dialogue only on the condition of agreement to disagree; there must be what the dialectician calls topical
agreement. There must be a way to establish perfect understanding about a common subject of inquiry and the exact question to be disputed about the subject. This calls for language which is both neutral and adequate to express all the elements of both the pros and the cons.

The attempt to synthesize evolutionary theory and theology in The Phenomenon of Man suffers the severest of inadequacies of language and expression. The concepts used in this work are totally ambiguous, as the critics' strange diversities of interpretation plainly attest, and this lack of clarity makes true dialogue impossible. The terms used in this book are neither neutral, accurate nor adequate for expressing the total realities at issue in the discussion. On the hypothesis of total evolution, which is at best conjectural, Fr. Teilhard attempts to describe the origin of all things in terms of process in purely phenomenological language. In doing so, he eliminates from the attempted dialogue any possibility of retaining essential differences, so important for both biology, philosophy and theology.

In addition, the author's creation of such terms as "hominization," "biosphere," "noosphere," "pre-consciousness," "withinness and withoutness," etc. places his attempt at synthesis in the order of the aesthetic of ambiguous analogies rather than the scientific and logical, thus making dialogue the more improbable. This language is inadequate both for biology and theology, for it is not neutral to both, nor does it express the totality of things and events, nor does it admit of the refinement necessary for accuracy in matters of evolutionary theory. Furthermore, the language of phenomenological process is as unsatisfactory for philosophy and theology as it is for biology and anthropology, for, besides terminology for process and change, we must have terms for natures, essences, species, ontological duality and causality. No practiced dialectician, no matter what his biological, philosophical or theological predilections might be, would attempt a dialogue based upon the canons of open discussion with the limited and ambiguous terminology of The Phenomenon. As is evident from the discussions of the experts who have reviewed the book to date, so great is the ambiguity, non-neutrality and inadequacy of the language alone, minimal topical agreement is unavailable. There can be no dialogue when the discussants cannot even agree to disagree.

In summary then, what is to be said of the value of The Phenomenon as reflected by the contrast and temper of the reviews of expert observers of the American intellectual scene? Among Catholic intellectuals, Fr. Teilhard has generated a great deal of heat but very little light. In spite of wide-spread non-professional enthusiasm for The Phenomenon’s novel
attempt to give evolutionism a spiritualistic and teleological interpretation, professional philosophers call it bad philosophy, professional theologians call it bad theology, professional poets call it bad poetry, professional scientists call it bad (mystical, which is worse) science, and, whatever its rhetorical advantage, professional dialecticians call it impossible dialogue.

Perhaps the best evaluation of the situation of Fr. Teilhard in this country was made by a member of his own Order when his confrere's non-scientific works were beginning to be translated and published contrary to the wishes of the Church and the Jesuit Order. Fr. G. Bosio, S.J. remarked in *Civiltà Cattolica* (1955) that Fr. Teilhard was a great scientist, which no one could deny in the face of his paleontological research, his abstracts and his international fame. But in other fields, he was completely untrained and incompetent, which is evident from the essential ambiguity of his thought. Those who are insisting upon translating and publishing the non-scientific works which Fr. Teilhard himself refused to publish (we have been promised that the American public will soon have five of his treatises on metaphysics and theology) are doing a great disservice to Fr. Teilhard which can only cause damage to his memory, to his science and possibly to the Faith to which he ever adhered.

Raymond J. Nogar, O.P., Ph.D., S.T.Lr.
Albertus Magnus Lyceum
Dominican House of Studies
River Forest, Illinois


Patterned after the *Harvard Case Histories in Experimental Science,* this paradigm of mature scholarship, which cuts across the fields of paleography, history of science and philosophy, is a necessary prologomenon to the solution of a vexing modern problem. This problem, a fundamental one in the constant search of man for a satisfying explanation of the physical world in which he lives, has to do with the much-discussed and largely confused issue of the relationship between science and philosophy. By an intensive examination of the works of the German Dominican, Theodoric of Freiberg (c. 1250—c. 1310), Fr. Wallace has succeeded in
unearthing a clear-cut example of the fruitful combination and natural harmony of the Aristotelian and the early modern scientific methodologies which Theodoric used to advance the beginning science of optics. As is evident from the title, methodology is the primary concern of this study. "His (Theodoric's) works are characterized by the type of question he asks, and the way in which he goes about seeking an answer. It is this procedure, *in actu exercito*, which we refer to as his methodology" (p. 21).

A member of the Albertus Magnus Lyceum of Natural Science and equipped with a long and profound training in both Thomistic philosophy and mathematical physics, the author exposes, in the light of this case study, the traditional relationship between science and philosophy. The disruption of this harmony by the deficient subjective philosophy and methodology of Descartes is one of the main reasons for the unfortunate bifurcations in scientific education today. Fr. Wallace concludes that a natural development of Aristotelian method was responsible for significant progress in science by Theodoric. He further points out that, after Theodoric, Descartes' method yielded singularly sterile results, whereas the prodigious Newton, using substantially the same basic procedure as the medieval scientist, made great advances in this same field.

There are many opinions today concerning the relationship of science and philosophy. For the vanishing positivists, philosophy—Hegel's is cited as the prime example—is nothing but stultifying day-dreaming (Reichenbach). For the ordinary scientist, it is a fascinating after-dinner topic of conversation, and little else. Thomists, in general, see a very close connection between science and philosophy. Some, contrary to St. Thomas, confuse the philosophy of nature with metaphysics (Koren). Others distinguish science and philosophy by reason of the method and consequent certitude they grant to each (Maritain). Still others see the special sciences as extensions of the general philosophy of nature when it is perfected by considerations of particular types of mobile bodies (V. E. Smith, Wallace). Among those of the last group who deny a specific distinction between the philosophy of nature and the special sciences, there are those who maintain the purely dialectical character of the conclusions of the experimental sciences (De Koninck). This present thesis is a cogent vindication of what seems to be St. Thomas' own doctrine of the specific and methodological unity of the philosophy of nature and the special sciences.

In the first part of his study, Fr. Wallace carefully examines the philosophical background of Theodoric as manifested in his logical works which show him to be in the main line of Aristotelian tradition, though
with certain original peculiarities. A further study of his work on the elements, *De Elementis*, shows that Theodoric's consequent approach to physical problems was thus Aristotelian in character, "with the ideal being certain, intellectual knowledge of the world of nature, attained through the discovery of proper causes, and expressed in its most developed form through causal definitions and demonstrations manifesting properties which flow from these causes. This ideal is not attained immediately in physical science, but requires induction from detailed observations of natural phenomena, which in turn is elaborated through cogitation and the search for intelligible aspects in the things observed" (p. 128).

Fr. Wallace then approaches Theodoric's optical studies with this question: "The key question which now begins to emerge is this: did he ever achieve his ideal by giving a strict demonstration of the properties of any physical phenomenon, or was he forced by the very nature of the subject matter he was investigating to abandon this ideal and substitute another type of knowledge in its stead?" (p. 130). In other words, does the logical apparatus of Aristotle work only in the realm of generalities and break down when confronted with concrete physical problems?

The author answers this question by following step by step the development of Theodoric's optical investigations in his work on the rainbow, *De Iride*. After an analysis of the scientific methodology therein employed, Fr. Wallace comes to the conclusion that while remarkable progress had been made over that indicated in his previous work on the elements due to additional methodological factors, still, "each development is made in the context of an underlying Aristotelian methodology in such a way that it is a refined extension of that methodology, harmonizing with its basic structure and aiding in its search for causes, and finally terminating in the goal which Theodoric has set for himself, namely certain, demonstrative knowledge of the rainbow" (p. 227). That the additional factors which account for the success of Theodoric's work have an affinity with modern scientific procedures may be seen in his use of classification, his experimenting precisely as ordered to falsification, the consequent interplay of theory and experiment, and the discovery of the proper causes of radiant phenomena, following the method of the *Analytica Posteriora* (Aristotle's treatise on the method of arriving at scientific certitude). Thus for him, as for all the scholastics, including Robert Grosseteste, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, there is no essential difference between science and philosophy, the terms *scientia* and *philosophia* being used interchangeably to designate a common method aimed at discovering causes" (p. 237).
The Scientific Methodology is studded with gems of insight into many particular problems of vital concern to philosophers of science. As one instance, we cite merely two brief passages in regard to hypotheses, the mainstay of modern research. "Theory invokes principles which have only a logical, explanatory value, while the demonstration is based on principles which are at the same time causes of the phenomenon being explained. The demonstration is certain precisely because, in considering something which comes to be in the order of nature, the investigator terminates his knowledge in the realities which make the phenomenon come to be, which is another way of saying that he has discovered the causes which make it to be what it is. Theodoric's knowledge of the rainbow was of this type, because he ascertained its causes; but his knowledge of radiant colors as such was not, because he had to be content with their explanation in terms of common, provisional principles. How one recognizes a cause and distinguishes it from a principle is a problem in its own right, which cannot be treated here at any length. Suffice it to mention that for Theodoric himself, as we have already seen, the recognition of any cause is an intellectual activity which requires a certain insight, an "intus-legere," which is only attained after much patient study of a particular subject-matter" (p. 241). "The certitude and permanence of such contributions (as Theodoric's explanation of the rainbow) cannot be logically explained by the hypothetical procedures at the base of modern "scientific method," while they can be explained in terms of the demonstrative procedures of natural philosophy; this is manifested by Theodoric's demonstrations of the properties of rainbows and by Newton's defense of his experimentum crucis, where the latter explicitly rejects that anything "certain" in science can derive merely from hypothetical explanations" (p. 296).

The insufficiency of such provisional explanations as hypotheses is shown by the dilemma of the modern scientist who has two worlds to contend with. He has confronted himself with both the ordinary world of "common-sense" and the imagined "scientific" world. For Theodoric (and for Newton), no such conflict was possible for the simple reason that contact with the real world was never lost. Employing the traditional three-stage procedure of dialectics, analysis, and synthesis, he began his researches with a consideration of the real world of experience and ended up by connecting up the causes discovered in the process to the same real world. In the first phase, the dialectical phase of this method, after the initial collection and classification of experimental facts, further experiments are ordered rather to falsification than to verification of theory. The
verification of a theory by experiment has nothing to say about its truth because of the danger of the fallacy of affirming the consequent. But the crux of the method is the second stage, the causal analysis. This is a purely intellectual activity, a penetration of the order existing among a larger number of detailed facts gathered in the course of experimentation. This insight, the slow-maturing fruit of laborious cogitation by which the intrinsic order in things is known, is the only guarantee of certitude. The final phase, the synthesis, ties up the causes "seen" in the analytic phase with the sensible properties which flow from these causes. This connection is made by way of demonstrative syllogism, usually implicit, in which the middle term, the connective, is not only the logical principle of certitude, but the actual cause of the property demonstrated. It is this method that is so brilliantly exposed and commented upon in Fr. Wallace's study.

This intensive case study is an indispensable addition to the library of every serious student of philosophy of science and the history of ideas. It is a welcome and refreshing approach that clears away much of the confusion surrounding a difficult problem. Finally, it adds significantly to such recent fine works in the history of science as Weisheipl's Early Fourteenth Century Physics, etc., and Nature and Gravitation, and Marshall Clagett's University of Wisconsin publications, and to those in scientific methodology as Glutz Manner of Demonstrating in Natural Philosophy, and Wallace's own "Some Demonstrations in the Science of Nature."

Thomas Le Fort, O.P.


Christ and Apollo by Jesuit Father William F. Lynch is an important addition to a growing body of literary criticism which concerns itself with "that true and fundamental relevancy of the literary organism to reality," to use the author's own words. As a critical study, its most significant contribution to this admittedly broad discussion stems from its recognition of the place that theology holds in literary investigations. It is, however, a difficult book, a book which all too frequently partakes of the modern hesitation to take a clear position regarding the questions it raises. But the fact that it does raise the questions is an important step in the right direction.

Despite many brilliant insights concerning the enervating influence
of such theological aberrations as Pelagianism and Manicheism in modern literature, *Christ and Apollo* cannot escape the charge of oversimplification. And although Father Lynch does not hesitate to call the book “an exploration . . . (which) nowhere speaks its final mind at any one point,” he is fairly articulate in the matter of governing principles. It is precisely the limitations that these principles impose on literary criticism, particularly the restrictions coming from the attenuated concept of theology expressed in the book, which destroy, at least in part, the very real value *Christ and Apollo* possesses.

The success of the book, of course, must be judged—as must all critical theory in the fine arts—from the illumination it sheds on particular works of art, in this case, literary works. And it is from this vantage point that the limitation of Father Lynch’s principles becomes evident. His explanation of the title of the book is a case in point. After describing the literary process as “a highly cognitive passage through the finite and definite realities of man and the world,” he sets himself the task of showing “that the finite and the definite are not flat but have dimensions, and these dimensions can include even the theological.” With this in mind, Father Lynch places Apollo as the symbol for

a kind of infinite dream . . . for everything that is weak and pejorative in the “aesthetic man” of Kierkegaard and for that kind of fantasy beauty which is a sort of infinite, which is easily gotten everywhere, but which will not abide the strained gates of limitation that leads to stronger beauty. Let him also stand for a kind of autonomous and facile intellectualism, a Cartesianism, that thinks form can be given to the world by the top of the head alone, without contact with the world, without contact with the rest of the self.

Christ, on the other hand, stands for

the completely definite, for the Man who, in taking on our human nature (as the artist must) took on every inch of it (save sin) in all its density, and Who so obviously did not march too quickly or too glibly to beauty, the infinite, the dream. I take Him, secondly, as the model and source of that energy and courage we again need to enter the finite as the only creative and generative source of beauty.

Aside from the numerous questionable phrases in the above statements and granting that an author has the right to identify his symbols in the way best suited for highlighting the purpose of his book, nevertheless the artificial dichotomy that is set up in this distinction between Christ and
Apollo has devastating effects in the judgment of a work, e.g., like T. S. Eliot’s *Four Quartets*. In a later chapter of *Christ and Apollo* Father Lynch finds fault with this great poem; for him “with relation to time and its problems, his (Eliot’s) . . . poetic images show a tendency to keep bouncing and leaping off this line in the direction of ‘eternity’ and all its analogues. It does not evince a native inclination to pursue the possibilities of the line itself.” As we understand Father Lynch’s criticism in the light of the symbolic value given to *Christ and Apollo*, one must object to Eliot’s verging towards the position of Apollo, since “a native inclination to pursue the possibilities of the line” (the “dimension of Christic time” is here meant, as the author later states) would preclude any concern with “bouncing and leaping off . . . in the direction of ‘eternity.’” The only difficulty with this judgment, and it is a fundamental one, is the fact that Christ is more than the finite and the definite; Christ “did not march too quickly or too glibly to . . . the infinite,” for the simple reason that He did not have to march to the infinite at all! He is Infinite. And any poem whose whole burden is Christ the Lord—and the *Four Quartets* ultimately is concerned with no other subject—must of necessity bounce off into the infinite, to eternity. This sort of criticism is unjustified, since the principle governing the judgment is really a Procrustean bed, for which the critic is forced to cut down great masterpieces to a predetermined size.

The discussion of the theological dimension in literature is unfortunately crippled in *Christ and Apollo* by a basic misconception concerning the nature of theology itself. In a recent article entitled “Theology and Human Sensibility” Father Lynch described theology as “the study of and concern for the relations between man and God” (cf. *The Critic*, April-May, 1960, Vol. XVIII, No. 5). He did not intend this, of course, as a proper definition of theology, but the statement is an indication of the attitude which he takes towards the place of theological principles in literary criticism. As expressed in *Christ and Apollo*, this theological attitude is one severely limited; ultimately it reduces theology to a kind of Christology with a decided concentration on the Humanity of the Savior. In fact, it seems that at times we are faced with something that can only be designated a homocentric theism. Because of this initial bias, the central mystery of Christianity, that of the Most Blessed Trinity, along with all the truths concerning the Oneness and the Attributes of God, would seem to have no place in the theological appraisal of literature, according to Father Lynch’s principles. But the fact remains that throughout the ages there have been great works of art produced which are concerned precisely
with these theological truths. One has only to mention *The Satin Slipper* of Paul Claudel, the comedies of Molière, the whole corpus of Shakespeare's work, and the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, none of which can be explained with reference to a limited Christology alone. Further, it must be stated that any valid principle for the judgment of literature must have an analogous validity in the criticism of all the other arts. Since this is so, Father Lynch will have great difficulty exploring the theological dimensions of the music of Bach and Mozart, the paintings of Greco and Cézanne, and the architecture of the Gothic masters, if he restricts himself to the principles set forth in *Christ and Apollo*.

We are forced to call particular attention to this misapprehension regarding the nature of theology, because in a book written by a priest with Father Lynch's excellent reputation, too many may accept the limiting principles without grasping their inapplicability to recognized masterpieces. Just how inappropriate they become can be seen from another example of the author's literary exegesis of the *Four Quartets*. According to Father Lynch the Christian imagination in the poem "is finally limited to the element of fire, to the day of Pentecost, to the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples." Why this is something to be objected to is never made entirely clear. But in answer to the objection, we must say first that no one poem can pretend to exhaust the potential of the Christian imagination, and if it does express "the element of fire . . . the day of Pentecost . . . the descent of the Holy Ghost" as well as the *Four Quartets* does, then it has accomplished a great deal indeed. Secondly, it seems impossible to grasp the total meaning of the closing lines of the poem,

```
Quick now, here, now, always—
A condition of complete simplicity
(Costing not less than everything)
And all shall be well and
All manner of thing shall be well
When the tongues of flame are in-folded
Into the crowned knot of fire
And the fire and the rose are one,
```

if these are interpreted as limited to fire and the Holy Ghost. In the whole poem the subject is Christ, as we have indicated above, and the last sections would seem to refer to the total reintegration of the created universe into the "new creation" of the divine kingdom. Certainly one must take cognizance of the "rose" in the last line, and noting the marked influence of
Dante evident throughout the poem, we are forced to say that the rose symbolizes much the same thing it does in the final cantos of the *Divina Commedia*, viz. the perfect happiness of the Beatific Vision. Yet such an interpretation must lie outside the sphere of Father Lynch’s principles, since it involves more than the relations of men to the Humanity of Christ. We can never do without the Humanity of Our Lord in any supernatural activity, but Christ Himself told us that He came that we might possess everlasting life and this means, to use His own words as recorded by St. John, “that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ” *(John, 17:3)*. Why Father Lynch should refuse the poet the right to image, as far as is humanly possible, the first part of Our Lord’s statement is something we cannot understand. There is a suspicion, however, that the modern concern with the Christ-mystery in a thousand diluted forms has produced in his critical estimate a peculiar kind of hindsight that looks at everything in literature through the glass of contemporary works. In the effort to get beyond the current glorification of man, he has attempted to find the true image of man in the humility of Christ. No one can deny that Father Lynch has made a contribution in this respect, but it is also evident that he has gone too far. Christ, as Man, also possessed the perfection of magnanimity, and each man should strive for this virtue also. After all, we were made “a little lower than the angels!” And it is not entirely just that a writer, inspired by the magnanimous in art, should be berated when he reaches out to infinity, as Eliot has done in the *Four Quartets*.

Although the limited Christology of *Christ and Apollo* is the basic defect of the book, there are further difficulties which merit some attention. In the opening chapter entitled “The Definite,” a purely arbitrary division is made “between the two forms of the imagination, between the men of the finite and the men of the infinite.” These two forms are identified as the “gnostic” (infinite) and the “Hebraic” (finite). Why are there only two forms of the imagination? One wonders just where Sophocles fits in! It is also at this point that the vocabulary becomes utterly confusing: e.g., the infinite is equated with “the endless, the dream.” Perhaps the discussion would have been helped if the author had adhered to the Aristotelian terminology of the particular and the universal, for this is what he is attempting to explain. The difference is that Aristotle recognized the interplay between the two that produces a perfect marriage in great works of art; Father Lynch tries to separate them, and as happens with most divorces, the results are chaotic.
But this difficulty with his own terminology becomes minor, when it is compared to what has happened to the scientifically precise language of theology and philosophy in *Christ and Apollo*. The examples are too numerous to mention, but these seem to be the most exasperating: pp. 173-174, the opposition set up between “unmoving” and “act”; p. 174, “there is no such thing as an abstract metaphysics; it is composed of images . . .”; p. 158, “Philosophy can only speculate about things already done. Theology and Christ can act. . . .”

There is much more that can and should be written about *Christ and Apollo*; even if the book is at times intellectually tiring, there is much in it that is good. We have chosen to discuss its limitations, however, because they are fundamental. If the observations herein expressed seem to be harsh, this comes only from a profound conviction that nothing is more necessary to literary criticism today than theological judgments. Father Lynch has attempted to give some such judgments, but working from a crippled theological outlook, he has not been entirely successful. At least we can hope that the book will generate intelligent discussion of the problems it raises; from such discussion there may come more acceptable solutions to crucial difficulties in modern literary thought.

Thomas Marcellus Coskren, O.P.

---


A prominent American educator, astonished at the current interest in the Montessori Method in the United States, recently wrote from England: “For some unknown reason, I understand that the Montessori Method has caught on in the United States, particularly among Catholics.” A cursory reading of Mr. Standing’s book will go a long way toward acquainting the reader with the many reasons why there is a revival of interest in the Montessori Method, not only in the United States, but in many parts of the world.

The thing that impresses one most is the integrity and high-mindedness of the woman who developed the Method. In 1896 Maria Montessori became the first woman in Italy to take the degree of Doctor of Medicine and in the same year was appointed assistant at the Psychiatric clinic in the University of Rome. During her frequent visits to the asylums she became interested in defective children and it became increasingly clear to her
that mental deficiency was more of a pedagogical problem than a medical one. Led to an intensive study of the two French authorities on feeble-mindedness, Jean Itard and Edouard Séguin, she soon opened her own orthophrenic school dedicated to the education of these unfortunate children. She continued to devour all the studies on the subject, visited London and Paris to observe new methods, and gave herself up whole-heartedly to the actual teaching of the children. "These two years are indeed my first and only degree in pedagogy" she remarked in later years.

Under her direction the inferior mentalities of these children developed to an amazing degree until they were eventually able to compete in examinations with normal children. But this success posed a new problem for Dr. Montessori. What was the value of an education that allowed normal children to remain on such a low level? Resigning from her position as Director of the School, she devoted several more years to the study of philosophy and psychology, while continuing her lectures at the University of Rome where she held the chair of Anthropology.

But all of this was by way of preparation for the work that lay ahead. In 1906 a slum district of Rome was being cleared and the wretched and homeless children were collected into one spot to be cared for; Dr. Montessori was asked if she would supervise them. She readily consented since she was eager to work with normal children. "Sixty tearful, frightened children, so shy that it was impossible to get them to speak; their faces were expressionless, with bewildered eyes as though they had never seen anything in their lives, without anything to stimulate their minds—dejected, uncared for." The results that she obtained with these children in the space of a year reads like a fairy tale. "In the whole history of education, from the time of Plato to the present day, there is no episode more remarkable than the series of happenings which came tumbling into being, one after the other, during the next six months. Nothing that took place in Pestalozzi's school in Inverdun, or in Froebel's Anstalt at Neuheim, or among Tolstoy's peasant children can equal it for sheer wonder."

Among the discoveries made in her "Casa dei Bambini" were the definite preferences of the children for work instead of play, order instead of disorder and quiet instead of noise. These alone would have been sufficient to revolutionize the theories about educating children, but there were others more startling. The children were found to possess a spontaneous interest in their work; once they became interested there was little need for rewards or punishments. They began reading at a very early age. But perhaps most spectacular thing was the "writing explosion" that took
place without the children being taught, once "the inner elements of preparation were completed." Is it any wonder that Maria Montessori became famous overnight, and that doctors, educators, psychologists and many others flocked to Rome to see this amazing school?

There is no doubt that some very startling things were happening and Mr. Standing discusses many of them in some detail. But leaving the facts and happenings to the child-psychologists and the behaviorists to evaluate, we should like to discuss the principles behind the facts. The world-wide interest in her discoveries led Dr. Montessori to formulate the results into a practical system embodying definite principles, which when once known could be applied by trained teachers in varying circumstances and under changing conditions.

There is one principle that is more basic than all the others: "that the child is in a continual state of growth and metamorphosis, whereas the adult has reached the norm of the species." Although she is primarily concerned with the intellectual growth of the child, she never forgets that there is a corresponding and dependent physical and emotional development. The child's intellect does not work in isolation; Montessori never commits what Maritain calls the "sin of angelism." "On the contrary, more than in any other system of education, her whole method is based on a deep understanding of the relationship between these two elements—mind and body." Her insistence on the natural, essential inseparability of soul and body, and hence the unity of operations in man in this life is thoroughly in accord with the principles of Aristotle and St. Thomas. St. Thomas never forgot this essential unity and neither does Dr. Montessori.

Nowhere is this more evident than in her doctrine of the "sensitive periods." "Children pass through definite periods in which they reveal psychic aptitudes and possibilities which afterward disappear. During such a period the child is endowed with a special sensibility which urges him to focus his attention on certain aspects of his environment." Numbered among the periods are those for language (much earlier than one would think); the period for order, which is often completely overlooked in the life of the child; the period for learning good manners; the period of love of silence; the periods for writing and reading etc. Although developed more highly than in the thought of St. Thomas, he would certainly admit that there are stages in psychological and sensitive growth at which responses vary even in relation to similar objects. The Montessori analysis of these stages is an addition to St. Thomas' psychology which fits neatly into his broader pattern.
There is no more interesting study in psychology than the reaction of the intellectual part of man, concerned with universal abstract ideas, and the bodily part, concerned with the senses directed to the outside world. Dr. Montessori did not start with the theories of Aristotle and St. Thomas on abstraction, but observing her children she describes a process that counterparts their theory to an amazing degree. "She started with the child, the free child busily working with material objects. But observing the child and his reactions she saw this process of spontaneous abstraction taking place before her eyes." Her terminology is not exact but it is accurate enough.

Another principle that would have been familiar to St. Thomas is that of the natural order in man and the essential rightness of the natural appetites upon which Montessori bases the freedom allowed the children in her schools. The love of order, preference of work to play, ability to concentrate, love of silence and rapid advance in proficiency are all consequences of this appreciation of the power and goodness of man's natural appetites, and the growth of self-discipline is a more remote effect.

We could enumerate further instances where the principles of the Montessori Method dovetail nicely with those of St. Thomas. A system based on so much intelligence and kindness cannot help but agree with the Angelic Doctor. But there is a point at which there might have been disagreement between them if we understand Mr. Standing's account correctly. There is practically no mention of the role of the parent in the education of the child; for St. Thomas that role is paramount. Those who are called to the task of adapting the Montessori Method to the needs of the modern world should give consideration to publicizing her principles in the popular journals, so that parents might begin to apply these principles in the home. This would be in keeping with Doctor Montessori's ideas; she was vitally interested in having the environment of the child prepared and the training begun as soon as possible. Such a venture would be an easy affair in the United States where parents are vitally interested in anything that has bearing on the education of their children, and where the means of communication are so advanced.

The Thomistic principle that is never enuntiated in Mr. Standing's book but which seems to underlie all of Maria Montessori's thinking is that "grace perfects nature." All of her efforts seem to be toward preparing the child for the supernatural. "Montessori was well aware that Faith is a super-natural endowment, and does not belong to us by nature as do the gifts of the senses, instinct, emotion, reason and will." In this volume, Mr.
Standing concentrates on the child's intellectual development, but he admits that more volumes have to be written to deal with Montessori's ideas, first among them one that would be devoted to applying her vitalizing principles to the teaching and practice of religion. But even in her work on the natural level, one has the feeling that she is always pointing to the supernatural. "Reason is our highest natural endowment, but there is a realm of reality which yields up its secrets neither to deductive nor inductive reasoning, but rather to what one might describe as the total functioning of the whole personality—including the obedient will. This is the realm of revealed truth." How well Maria Montessori prepares the senses, the intellect and the will of the child for this supernatural reality.

Mr. Standing's book, while at times a little too rhapsodic, is also disordered in its presentation. But he has done well to make the discoveries of this great teacher available to the public. A bibliography of Dr. Montessori's published works would have added much to the usefulness of the volume. For those interested in further information about the Montessori Method, the American Montessori Center is located at 5 Lenox Drive, Greenwich, Conn.

J. D. Campbell, O.P.

Christian Life Series, Chicago, Fides:

The Christian Life Series, now completed, is the fruit of a most ambitious attempt to order and synthesize all the important conclusions of Thomistic theology, Biblical study and liturgical scholarship into a four volume textbook series for the religion department of the Catholic high school.

The principal author of the set is Sister Jane Marie Murray, although she has collaborated with Fr. Barrosse, a scripture scholar, on two of the volumes that deal with his specialty. Their work is backed by a group of consultants that reads like a Who's Who in American Catholic education:

Sister Jane Murray has been guided, it would seem, by three loves in composing these volumes: her first love is for the *Summa* of St. Thomas; her second for the results of German scholarship in Christian catechesis; and her third is for the twentieth century emphasis on sacramental theology, man's union with God as a member of the mystical body through grace.

The aim of the series, "'to cooperate with grace in forming Christ Himself in those regenerated by baptism'" (Bk 2, v) shows both the sacramental and the German influences, the latter in the education of the whole man, both his intellectual and moral life. The adolescent must not only learn; he must be drawn to practice his faith, to come into intimate contact with Christ in His sacraments and in the liturgy. From this contact the student will achieve an ever deeper knowledge and appreciation of the reality and meaning of the Faith. To teach and to draw, to arouse student attention and to enliven, the Germans recommend use of the liturgy and Sacred Scripture. Sister Murray has set up a program that covers the essentials of the story of man's redemption three times, once in the liturgy (Bk. 1. *Going to God* (9th Grade), once through Sacred Scripture (Bk. 2, part 1—God Reveals Himself to Men (10th grade), and once following the order of the *Summa* (Bk. 2, part 2—God and Creation through Bk. 4 (grades 10-12). Actually, Scripture is used again in the third cycle in connection with St. Thomas's tract on the life and suffering of Christ.

The German influence is also to be seen in the pages at the end of each chapter. Here questions and projects divided into "Things to know" and "Things to do" are listed: write a paper . . . prepare a panel discussion . . . give an oral report all help the student integrate what he has learned with his daily life.

Fr. Louis J. Putz, C.S.C. has contributed a list of things to do entitled "Laboratory for Apostolic Life" at the end of each unit. They, too, help the students apply the doctrine to the apostolate. They go down as far as the "observe" and "judge" stages of Catholic Action meetings, leaving the decision to "act" or not up to the judgment of the class. Mention should also be made of the list of books for further reading that follow each unit, and the indexes at the end of each volume.

The books are published with good bindings on gloss paper. Art
reproductions, drawings, two-color charts, and maps appear at least once in every ten pages. The type is large and clear, the matter divided into headings and subheadings of a page or two in length. Units are preceded by summaries of coming material and are introduced by attention rousing questions.

The Series is not a catechism. Educators presume the catechism is learned by the time the child enters high school. High school is the time to deepen and to broaden knowledge of basic truths. The depth and breadth of sacred doctrine in these books is quite startling. The seminary graduate will be at once impressed with the marvelous order, stemming largely from the *Summa*. The principal arguments and conclusions of the *Summa* follow one right after the other in clear straightforward sentences. The incarnation is right because it is a proof of God's goodness, for it is characteristic of goodness to give of itself. The incarnation's motive is man's sin because this is the only motive God has made known to us. This most significant event in human history was put off by God until man was convinced of his helplessness to overcome sin, of his need for divine intervention. In all points of controversy between the schools, the Thomistic position alone is presented: Mass is a sacramental sacrifice; minor orders are part of the sacrament; extreme unction is for the dying, removing the *reliquiae peccati*. Frequently arguments turn out to be a digest of an article of the *Summa*:

Since Christ's human nature was united directly with the divine nature, we might be inclined to think that there would not be need for Him to have sanctifying grace. . . . Actually, however, if there were not sanctifying grace in Christ . . . his soul would be lacking in a perfection which souls of men were meant to possess. By sanctifying grace, then, his soul was perfected . . .

(Bk. 4, 14) (cf. III, 7, 1.)

Scattered Greek words (e.g. hypostases, evangelium) explain the meaning of words etymologically. The sign and the reality of each sacrament is given together with a translation of the form, even in the case of the priesthood. Scriptural units discuss the difference between inerrancy and inspiration, the oral and written gospel. The content of the Apostolic kerygma and the solution to the problem raised by the evolution of dogmas are included. Literary genres, religious teaching, author's background, the science of archeology, and the study of ancient languages are first explained and then used as tools in an exegesis of the book of Judith. Pius XII's
"Divino Afflante Spiritu" is quoted at length to encourage biblicists to study archeology, ancient history, literature etc.

Although impressed with order, the conciseness, the number of topics covered, the modernity of the volumes, one cannot help but question the aptness of the series for high school students. Is the only difference between religion 12 and fourth year seminary theology that senior religion gets a digest of the seminary courses presented in non-technical terminology? The outline and the abstract is not for the neophyte but for the one who has already been over the matter. Should all the ground be covered in each four year cycle? Should not the text stick to a few important points and get them across using many concrete examples. Is it wise to use the same arguments for both ages, and summarized arguments at that. On this point the author seems to part company with the Germans:

The Scientific approach of theology is also too abstract . . . to appeal to young people. An arrangement . . . will . . . have to be chosen which, while not dispensing with a systematic approach, will permit divisions more closely related to life. . . . Not in abstract terms but most concretely.

(Jungmann, *Handing on the Faith*, p. 370.)

As a teacher's reference work, as a well written and beautifully ordered summary of the whole corpus of theology, Sacred Scripture and the significant contributions of current studies, the Christian Life Series is a must for every library. Careful study of its pages should inspire high school teachers to bring their courses up to date. Its conciseness should help them to grasp the heart of the truths they are expounding. The books could also be readily adapted for use in adult discussion groups. R.M.V.

**Sacramental Prayer** by Conrad Pepler, O.P. St. Louis, Herder, 1960. 148 pp. $2.75.

This little volume is a collection of essays all of which previously appeared in article form in various reviews. There have been many books and articles written on Liturgical Prayer contrasting this form of prayer with private prayers and devotions, but Father Pepler's work is unique because it shows that the Sacraments must be the foundations of all prayer, liturgical and private. The author shows that the Sacraments are the basis of all prayer by proceeding from the principle that the Sacraments are the main channels of grace. Prayer cannot be a one-sided activity of the creature
trying to approach God. It must be a mutual intercourse between the two, and the first mover in this act must always be God operating through His Sacraments.

Father Pepler considers the separation between prayer and the liturgy, and how the present liturgical revival has begun to rejoin the two. He examines the function of the body in worship, the close connection between prayer and penance, the cult of images and the Blessed Virgin. The Holy Eucharist occupies the center of the spiritual life, as a queen served by the other six Sacraments.

Because the volume is a collection of essays which previously appeared in article form, there is little organization among the chapters. This is excusable since the author intended that these essays serve only as an introduction to Sacramental Prayer. He makes no pretense at offering exhaustive information on this subject. Meditation on this volume will draw the reader closer to God through the Sacraments. He will perceive how his prayer and sacramental life are controlled by the Holy Eucharist. L.T.

Mother of the Redeemer. Edited by Kevin McNamara. Sheed & Ward. 258 pp. $4.00.

This is a collection of the lectures on Marian doctrine and devotion delivered by eminent theologians and mariologists during the summer of 1958 at Maynooth Union Summer School.

Mother of the Redeemer has many things to recommend it as a Marian must. It gives the up-to-date arguments and conclusions on various important Marian topics: Our Lady in the Scriptures and in the Patristic Age; the Divine Maternity, Immaculate Conception and Perpetual Virginity; her role as Co-Redemptrix and Mediatrix, the Assumption; Queenships; and Mary’s relation to the Church. Guidance is furnished regarding the definitions about Mary and the still controversial; only major opinions are given and occasionally positions are taken and admirably defended with sound and lucid theological reasoning drawn from a wealth of Marian literature. Of particular value are the abundant quotations from papal documents. The footnotes accompanying each lecture afford the reader with a rich and selective bibliography for further reading and study.

Amid the ever increasing number of Marian books, Mother of the Redeemer is of special worth since it presents all the important contemporary Marian issues in a theological yet understandable synthesis, the fruit of the studies of modern mariologists. A.H.C.

Mr. Daniel-Rops has given us a rather unusual book about Mary. He has gathered together all the pertinent scriptural texts, some writings of the Fathers and most of the apocryphal references. As an introduction which covers about half of the book, we have Mr. Daniel-Rops' own investigation of the development of the ever-increasing devotion to the Mother of God, as well as a rather cursory treatment of the growth of Marian doctrine. This is not a theological treatise, but rather a good source book of the existent data and writings about Mary. The apocryphal writings are not always interesting enough to warrant the inclusion of so many of them. Perhaps a happier choice would have been to include more patristic texts. Unfortunately, the reproductions of paintings are somewhat pedestrian which detracts somewhat from the worth of this otherwise commendable work.

J.D.C.


This volume was written by a theologian and yet it will suit the palate of scholar and layman alike. It is the author's intention to explain the role of Mary in God's redemptive plan, to help us pick her out from the dazzling array of saints and sinners who, in the wide-stretching tapestry of Redemption, approach or turn away from the all merciful figure of Christ.

In the march towards his objective, Bishop Suenens takes us along a chronological path which follows Mary through her entire life, both her earthly yesterday and her heavenly today. Each station along the way is a great mystery of our faith—the Immaculate Conception, the Annunciation, the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Divine Motherhood, the Assumption, the Mediatrix—a chance to pause for a moment in the precious shadows of each deep mystery to learn more precisely the privileges of Mary.

Of course this book is not written in the light and pleasing style of a popular Chesterton, but it is not a mere compilation of a scholar's pen-scratched notes either. It is not uncomfortably abstract, but rather living and lucid in style, affording a deeper insight into the real life of the holy Mother of God.

D.H.

St. Jerome was a nasty man but he became a Saint and therein lies the hope of millions. As Fr. Steinmann indicates the ill-tempered have a fine patron in the Bethlehem Bible scholar. His caustic wit he reserved for critics, heretics and personal enemies; even saints were scalded, among them St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom and St. Ambrose. The ardor of his love for his friends, however, far surpassed the heat of his anger towards his enemies. His most dedicated disciples were women: Marcella, Paula and Eustochium, to whom he lectured on the Bible and dedicated most of his multitudinous works. The Bible was his great passion and he is still looked to as the greatest of all Biblical scholars. He was a controversialist par excellence and was trigger-fast in defense of himself or his work. His craving though was for peace which he never had until death gave it to him. Such was Jerome the man, a great bundle of seeming contradictions.

Fr. Steinmann tells the story well. He uses Jerome to club a couple of current “hydras” (a Jeromian Favorite) into oblivion: anti-intellectual clerics and over conservative Biblical scholars. Jerome’s language undergoes quite a change in passage from Latin thru French to English. At the last port The Saint sounds more like a twentieth century writer than a fourth century Doctor of the Church. This has the pleasant effect of making usually dull quotes quite comfortable reading. Fr. Steinmann allows some doubts about the facts of St. Jerome’s life to exhibit themselves on his pages. Others he, perhaps less happily, eliminates, e.g., the starting point of St. Jerome’s great translation of the Old Testament. Fr. Steinmann states flatly that the first book translated was Job, while others posit Samuel and Kings and still others the Prophets. Admittedly this may be a minor point. One of far great importance, however, is the handling of the Jerome-Rufinus battle. Fr. Steinmann favors Jerome’s behavior, making the matter one of Jerome’s glories. On the other side Fr. Cayre and other Patrologists favor the vanquished Rufinus, painting the affair as a black page in Jerome’s life. In all fairness the reader should know that there are two sides to this story.

Still a modern language life of St. Jerome, even if one-sided, is welcome, especially for the choleric men of our generation. J.V.B.
Pamphlet Bible Series. New York, Paulist Press, 1960. 75¢ each (paper).


Fr. Murphy continues his brief commentary on Exodus exercising, it seems, a preference for brevity over commentary. He excludes altogether separate treatment of chapters 24, 30 and 31 preventing inclusion of a paragraph on anointing with oil in the Old Testament. The three great Jewish feasts, Passover, Weeks and Tabernacles, barely get a mention where expansion could be reasonably expected. However, since this is the only commentary in English on Exodus available to the general reading public and since even in its abbreviated form it contains plenty of information, who can complain? The quote most likely to shake those who can only look backwards in Biblical matters—

"... chapters 19-24 (the Covenant on Mount Sinai) are not an historical report of the details of the events occurring on Mount Sinai. Instead, they give us a theological interpretation of these events as they were understood and liturgically reenacted by the people of Israel" (p. 5).

If Fr. Murphy has a short commentary, Fr. Stuhlmueller has a "short-short." He leaves out practically all technical data but does bring out relevances of Leviticus to Christ and the Christian dispensation. A happier term of description for sacrifices described in Leviticus 3; 7:12-21; 19:5-8 might be "sacrifices of communion" (French Bible) rather than "peace offerings." The danger of confusing them under this title with the sacrifice of the New Law is not that great. Besides Fr. Stuhlmueller's description better fits "sacrifices of communion." The elaboration on the great Jewish feasts supplies the lack noted above in Fr. Murphy's commentary. Once again this is a welcome first and with each succeeding volume of this pamphlet Bible series the Catholic Bible reader's immeasurable debt to the Paulist Press increases.


Those who are using Herder and Herder's A Catholic Catechism (translated from the German) in class will welcome this teacher's manual for use in conjunction with it. The numbers and titles of the lessons are the same in each.
Teaching the Catholic Catechism presents doctrine in concrete terms, in a language a child in elementary or secondary school can understand, and intersperses it with things to be done and with problems that can only be answered from the child's personal experience. Only one point from each lesson of the Catechism is selected and developed along the lines of the Munich method in five stages: Aim, Preparation, Presentation, Explanation, and Application. "The Virtue of Penance," for example, concentrates on the motives for sorrow for sin: worldly, servile and filial fear. Its Aim is to get children to distinguish the three by examples. The Preparation spotlights the teaching that external action alone is not the only criterion in judging the goodness of an act by contrasting the morality of the conduct of a boy missing Mass out of lazy indifference with that of one missing Mass because of ill health. Once the problem is located and attention aroused, the Presentation cites an example of each of the three kinds of sorrows. Peter's sorrow after denying Christ three times exemplifies the third type. The Application deserves quotation: "Leo is at the bedside of a dying man: a priest cannot be found. What must he do?" (p. 98).

The emphasis of this manual, of the whole German catechetical movement, is not so much on imparting instruction and information—the work of the catechism book with its passages to be memorized and explained—but on laying the ground for a deep and lively faith. "Catechism today should produce much the same effect in the children as a retreat does" (Handing on the Faith, Jungmann, p. 93). Catechesis cannot be restricted solely to religious instruction, to something that need only be known. "Catechesis must be religious moral direction; it must be a part of pastoral work" (Ibid., p. 92). In former years this deep plowing wasn't necessary in the schools. It was given at home. But today the average family, buried under the cares and diversions that a prosperous materialistic society provides in abundance, is unable to provide it, and schools are taking up the task.

In making this change we should not lose sight of the fact that basic instruction in the truths of Christian living, of Christian morality and Catholic values, belongs primarily to the sponsors at baptism (Summa, III, 71, 4, ad 3) and the parents, and that they, with their extensive powers to reward and to punish, are far better suited to inculcate virtues than the school where the teachers authority is limited. The danger in the change lies in stressing the moral instruction at the expense of doctrine and sacred truth. When classes become discussion periods and the important task of
learning and memorizing the hard core of revealed truths is totally set aside we will have reason to be fearful.

A distinctive feature of *Teaching the Catholic Catechism* is the drawings, designed to sum up in symbolic fashion the heart of each lesson. They are line drawings, so simple any pupil, or teacher for that matter, can execute them. This symbolic summary, plus the catechism book and oral instruction are the principal means Fr. Goldbrunner uses to get catechism across to the child.

R.M.V.


The ecumenical movement has taken great strides in recent times and a greater and greater interest is being shown every day. But in order to keep interest alive and to shake some of the indifference that still exists, it is necessary to see clearly the urgency of the goal of Christian Unity. With this in mind, Fr. Dumont, a leading Catholic ecumenist, collected and ordered a number of his essays, which originally appeared as editorials in the bulletin *Vers l’Unite Chretienne*, into book form to make them available to the general public.

Approaching the problem of unity from several aspects, Fr. Dumont offers some reflections on unity from the liturgy, from the nature and mission of the Church and from the implications of the Theological Virtues. He also treats of prayer and its work in the attainment of unity.

The concise, informative chapters of this enlightening work will provide help for the preacher obliged by his office to preach Christian Unity. The ideas expressed in this work will give new insights to the Catholic who must pray and work for unity. To the non-Catholic, it will help to show the sincerity of Catholics in their striving to fulfill the mission given by Christ to His Church to Baptize and teach all nations all that He has commanded—that all may be one. N.A.H.


The ideal history of Religious Orders would have its chapters con-
tributed by representatives of each important Order. The spirit of each group is so individual that only the daily breathing of it will engender an accurate appreciation. This volume presents an outsider’s view of the Religious Orders, which is valuable for its objectivity, and almost always interesting.

One serious challenge to the author was space distribution. Of course the judgment was the author’s to make, but I think his work is a bit lopsided in this regard. For instance the Passionists are given one sentence whereas the founder of the Montfort Fathers enjoys the relative comfort of a full paragraph, which seems disproportionate to the size and influence of the two institutes. However we must allow some leeway here because what seems to be a lack of emphasis from a universal viewpoint, or to an American reader this may have corresponded adequately with the interests of the original French audience. All in all it is admirable that the author managed to enclose so much information in one volume without sacrificing readability.

Incidentally, the General Chapters meeting under St. Dominic’s presidency were in 1220 and 1221, not from 1220 to 1228 (p. 66). Dominic died in 1221, shortly after the second Chapter.

---


This is a new volume in the series entitled: “Religious Perspectives,” edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen, which represents a quest for a new understanding of man in the hope that this knowledge will point the way to a rediscovery of God. Among the authors of future volumes will be such mixed-company as W. W. Auden, Karl Barth, Martin d’Arcy, Mircea Eliade, Paul Tillich and Swami Nikhilananda. The avowed purpose of “Religious Perspectives” is to re-evaluate first principles, to witness not only the truth of religion but the effects of its meaning in society. But “religions” is to be distinguished from theology and its doctrinal forms and “is intended to denote the feelings, aspirations and acts of men as they relate to total man.”

In the very first pages of this new volume in the series, Professor Dawson sweeps aside these naturalistic notions of religion and tells us that the only true criterion of a Christian culture is the degree in which
the social way of life is based on the Christian faith. "There is no limit to the efficacy of faith and to the influence of these acts of spiritual decision which are ultimately the response of particular men to God's call, as revealed in particular, historical circumstances." Faith is the touchstone of Christian culture.

For those who would deny that anything as well-defined as a Christian culture has ever existed, Mr. Dawson has some forthright and convincing things to say in behalf of just such an historical reality. In this short work he gives us the hard core of his prodigious efforts and profound thinking on this important subject. He outlines just what he means by Christian culture and then analyzes briefly the six ages of the Church during which this reality has been in evidence, in greater or lesser degree.

A remnant of the dynamic and historic Christian culture still exists in our own century, but it is a fast-waning reality, for "we have lost that spiritual vision man formerly possessed—the sense of an eternal world on which the transitory, temporal world of human affairs was dependent." Our situation today is critical and Christian culture faces extinction from that levelling Leviathan: secularism. According to Mr. Dawson, the most effective remedy against this evil is "religious education in the widest sense of the word." Upon all Christians there falls the burden of recovering their own cultural inheritance and then communicating it to a neo-pagan world, and the logical place for this to occur is on the higher-education level. Mr. Dawson admits that his recommendations are vague, but he is convinced that it is only in the study "of the much neglected (cultural) tradition that we can find the unifying principle which modern education requires."

He would place the study of culture at the center of the college and university curriculum as well as establishing centers for advanced study. It is here of course that Mr. Dawson has met his most concerted opposition. It might further be questioned just how the study of culture, no matter how deeply and universally pursued, will effectively bring about a change in an existing culture. Ideas are indeed powerful weapons, but they require vehicles of implementation.

This short readable introduction to the ideas of one of the mature thinkers of our day, should provoke further interest in his work. His vast historic knowledge and his great concern for the problems of the present have produced a work that will stimulate and challenge our pre-conceived notions of the heritage of the West, and will point up the grave problems that this heritage faces in the world today.

J.D.C.

Always having to answer "There is nothing I can suggest" when asked to recommend a general book on philosophy for beginners, Russell Colebert decided to remedy the situation. The solution was the publishing of his first work, An Introduction to Western Philosophy, which was judged to be the best book of its kind. Now in The Search for Values, Professor Colebert has made another scholarly, well written and interesting contribution to philosophical thought. He has provided an answer to a much more important problem—modern man's search for "what is worth while." Western civilization has achieved almost every goal even envisioned by our forefathers, yet men are increasingly feeling—to use their own terms—anguish, abandonment, anxiety and despair. Vexed with such modern attitudes, as for example, that of Jean Paul Sartre, who began with the principle that there was no God and concluded that man alone created and invented values, Russell Colebert has written this book as a crusade against such thought.

His answer is not a new one; he merely points out for our age those values which have been laboriously developed over centuries within the Judaeo-Christian heritage. He provides us first with what some modern thinkers believe to be of value and more especially, how they approach the question of what is important in life. Under "thinkers" he includes novelists, playwrights, painters, philosophers, and psychologists. Extensive consideration is given to contemporary art values, moral values, and religious values. In the light of modern perplexities, he has thought through the lasting values of man, and is vehement in offering his findings.

L.T.


Too many Catholics are unaware of the historic role that their Catholic brethren played in the evolution of political and religious liberty in colonial America. The result is too often a second-class citizenry and poor defenders of the Faith. Father Hanley in his readable little work delves into the beginnings of these liberties in the earliest settlements in southern Maryland after the arrival of the "Ark" and the "Dove," and
delineates the important role that Catholics played in the very earliest days of Church-State relations in America. He begins with the historic facts, the records of the first meetings and assemblies, and goes on to analyze the thought and tradition of Catholic and Reformation England that produced the historic reality of the Maryland Ordinance of 1639, which he considers the seedbed of future liberties.

It is in the light of the pronouncements of Pope Gelasius I, the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, Suarez and Bellarmine, and the political tracts of St. Thomas More that the Catholic tradition is traced. This tradition kept alive in Protestant England gave rise to the growing unrest and dissatisfaction with the curtailment of the right to freedom of worship and led to the foundation of Lord Baltimore's proprietary land-holding in America. When news of the venture was spread abroad in England, a storm of protest arose; too much freedom would be allowed to papists in the new colony. The Catholic position was ably defended in a pamphlet entitled "Objections Answered," which Father Hanley unobtrusively attributes to Father Andrew White, S.J., the future apostle of southern Maryland.

Most historians look upon the Toleration Act of 1649 as the touchstone of the freedom legislation in the Maryland Palatinate, but Father Hanley finds this Act contaminated with Puritan intolerance and consequently not nearly as important as the earlier Ordinance. It was in the light of the long Catholic traditions of freedom and tolerance that the early settlers of Maryland insisted on their right to initiate legislation. They embodied these ideas in the Ordinance of 1639; they went far beyond the conditions laid down in Lord Baltimore's Code of Laws, and in this action "their rights and liberties" were assured.

This is a readable and often convincing incursion in the realm of political theory. But Father Hanley is not always as successful in his analysis of the beginnings of religious liberty in Maryland. In his discussion based upon the textually difficult passage: "Holy Church(es) within this province shall have all her rights and liberties," it never becomes clear just how the Ordinance of 1639 contributed to the growth of religious toleration. We are not given any positive conclusions on this point; perhaps there are none. This should not prevent anyone from entering the discussion and reading this informative and interesting monograph. There is a forthright introduction by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota. J.D.C.


Helene Wieruszowski, expert in thirteenth-century Spanish history and, particularly, Peter of Aragon's part in hatching the conspiratorial intrigues against Charles of Anjou in Sicily, has leveled very basic criticism against Steven Runciman's recent study The Sicilian Vespers. In her review of Runciman for Speculum, April, 1959, Dr. Wieruszowski finds the very disposition of the book's material poorly balanced, with undue emphasis on remote preparation for the Sicilian revolt to the neglect of an adequate study of French administration of the island in the period proximate to the Vespers. She believes that Runciman also patently exaggerated the effect the Sicilian Vespers had on the future of the papal monarchy, then in alliance with Charles of Anjou. As for Catalonia-Aragon, she regrets that the English historian completely missed the rise of this new empire and how need for commercial expansion in the Mediterranean directed its political policy towards Sicily. This was due to Runciman's neglect of the Spanish historians like Zurita, Capmany, Miret i Sans, Soler, and, above all, Soldevila. Most seriously, Runciman's interpretation of the remote and immediate causes of the Sicilian Vespers suffers from its neglect of certain indispensable recent sources, notably Dr. Wieruszowski's own collection of documents reedited in Quellen und Forschungen (1957), E. Dupre Theiseider's summary of the new research and, finally, G. La Mantia's "Studi sulla rivoluzione Siciliana del 1282" (1940).

Though she praises Runciman's use of "a new and interesting piece of evidence from a memoir of Emperor Michael Palaeologus published in a Russian journal" for the light it sheds on Byzantium's part in the Sicilian revolt, she finds his citation of Bartolomeo of Neocastro's Chronicle to prove the effect of Byzantine money and agents, far less convincing. Again, Runciman takes no note of the arguments advanced by R. S. Lopez in his biography of the emperor's representative, Benedetto Zaccaria (Messina-Milan, 1933), which attempt to demonstrate that the Aragon-Constantinople alliance was not completed until the Sicilian revolt was already in progress.

Ironically, Deno Geanakoplos' study Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, which appeared the very next year (1959), and treated, per force, the Sicilian Vespers, quite unconsciously remedies Runciman's fail-
ings. It is thoroughgoing, if not quite exhaustive, in its use of secondary sources, and in "Appendix A," the associate professor of history at the university of Illinois, takes up, point by point, and ably refutes, Lopez' arguments. Geanakoplos seems quite justified in claiming that he is "presenting for the first time a fully documented account" of Emperor Michael's schemings which quite accidentally culminated in the Vespers.

The book is, in sum, the story of Michael Palaeologus' early efforts to restore Greek rule in Constantinople and, in Part III, his skillful diplomacy towards the West during his crucial reign, especially from 1261 to 1282. "... possibly the most subtle, Machiavellian diplomat ever produced by Byzantium," Michael, in the author's view, entered into ecclesiastical union with the Pope at Lyons as a coldly calculated means to hold in check, and in time, to destroy, Charles of Anjou's vast alliance posed to destroy his Empire. Distracted by this western aggression, in thwarting Charles of Anjou's dreams of eastern rule Michael so weakened his own home defenses that he paved the way for eventual conquest by the Turks.

Faced with this double threat from Turk and Norman, even a Machiavelli could carry off only a partial success. Yet even this limited achievement was flawed by personal disgrace: excommunicated by Rome and still hated by the anti-Union Greeks, he was to die without ecclesiastical rites.

W.S.


This work makes no pretense at originality. It is rather the author's own digestion of several modern, popular works on Communism.

The keynote is the essential antagonism between Christianity and Communism. Although Communism might seem a purely economic and social scheme for the reorganization of society, under the surface it is a philosophy which by its first tenet (everything is matter) denies the reality and the necessity of religion. In fact, "atheistic Communism can offer humanity no other ideal than that of an ant-heap in which the individual is predetermined to a task whose purpose, method and ends he cannot understand" (p. 27). Thus the author establishes with true perspective the seriousness of the most tragic collision of our times between two forces at once powerful and opposite. The struggle, then, is not so much between Capitalism and Communism as it is between Communism and Christianity.
It is to be noted that this encyclopedia was written by Frenchmen for their compatriots. Most of the factual matter, with the obvious exception of the universal statements of the popes, bespeak the French milieu; the examples are mostly about French Communism and its challenge to the Church in France. Yet, Fr. Chambre succeeds in convincing his reader that Communism is the universal foe, seeking to build its prison of atheism large enough to contain, not a people or a nation, but the whole world.

D.H.


This large and rich volume was put together in order to place before an inquirer the "materials which will put him in basic and solid contact with the prayer and theology of the Church." It is divided into two parts. The first gathers a number of essays, principally by distinguished European theologians and spiritual writers, upon basic doctrinal themes concerned with God, the Incarnation, the Church, the Sacraments, and the hierarchy. They constitute an apologetic that is expository rather than polemic, and are in general of such weight that the usefulness of the book is restricted to the more intelligent and better educated class of inquirer. By choosing to take the individual articles from different authors the editors have relinquished unity and order of exposition, except for that which extrinsic editorial comment can give. Therefore, the final unity of vision which a single author can achieve is lost; although there does remain a strong impression of the richness of the Church's thought. Questionable, also, is the selection of Newman's argument for belief in God from the human conscience, which can have only a persuasive appeal, and that only to the rare character with Newman's own high-mindedness. A detailed treatment of the regeneration of the Christian to a new, supernatural life in Christ through Grace seems to be a basic necessity to the understanding of Catholicism, but except for incidental references in essays on other themes it is lacking.

The second part of the book is a collection of the texts of Christian worship: the complete Midnight Mass of Christmas, Creeds, the rites for the administration of the sacraments, liturgical and extra-liturgical prayers, excerpts from the great mystical literature, and modern papal documents. By intention it constitutes a representative sampling rather than a complete reference section. It is a novel idea, and its usefulness will ultimately be proved by those who use it.

R.U.S.

The thirty articles collected in this book represent, by the intention of its editors, "the evidence of the variety and excellence of the Catholic press." But let it be noted that they do not represent the farthest advance, the keenest scholarship, or the most penetrating depth of contemporary American Catholic thought and writing. The selections were not taken from the avant garde, the heavy, or the specialized Catholic journals which are currently flourishing mightily. This is not what the editors intended, and that is all right; but the view of Catholic publications is not complete without them. These pieces are aimed at the same public as the magazines in which they first appeared, the interested, alert, reading Catholic, probably a college graduate, intelligent but not necessarily an intellectual.

The range is wide: some gratifyingly adult articles on politics and public affairs, Church and state relations, social and literary criticism, the spiritual life and mental and liturgical prayer, some more "—'s view of the Church in America" (every visiting foreigner must cover his expenses writing these), history and personal reminiscences, some bits of humor, and musings by Dorothy Day. They are sometimes a little slick, but although never dazzling are generally pleasing. Especially worthy of praise are Lebanese Ambassador Charles Malik's awkward and ardent plea for courage, moral strength, and leadership in the cold-war struggle, and Albert Miller's embarrassingly detailed exposition of the humiliations, frustrations, and anxieties which violate human dignity in our "liberal, tolerant," and self-righteous North.


No Catholic scholar can evaluate the theory of evolution satisfactorily, until he has assimilated the spirit and admonitions of Humani Generis. The late Professor Collin shows profound understanding of this encyclical, and of all the teachings of the Church regarding the body of fact and hypothesis called "evolution." In this compact and comprehensive study the author bluntly warns the Catholic evolutionist of the dangers he must face; Prof. Collin emphasizes especially the direct opposition between Catholic philosophy and the "monist, materialist philosophy under whose
auspices the theory of evolution has been developed." The Catholic student of evolution, even though he isn’t too conversant with some of the phenomenological ideas present in this book, will welcome its analysis and commentary on various aspects of the problem of evolution.

Unfortunately, some of the translation results in awkward sentence structure and expressions. A glossary of important terminology included as an appendix could easily have been expanded for a more complete and more valuable reference book. One of the highlights of Evolution is a succinct list in the last chapter, of the certainties and uncertainties in the theory of evolution.

A.M.B.
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