

BLACKFRIARS

flock. But he was never a true modernist at heart : as Mr. Christopher Dawson has said, ' he whole-heartedly accepted the dogmatic principle of Catholicism—the existence of a divine Truth and a divine Authority to which the human mind and will must conform themselves.' Mr. Vidler's statement, then, that the later ' obscuring of Von Hügel's modernism was also due to the modification which, from about 1907 onwards, it did in fact undergo,' is hardly adequate. He would have been nearer the mark if he had repeated of the Baron what earlier he says so well of Newman, that ' his explorations never in his own mind involved a calling in question of traditional orthodoxy as an infallible revelation of absolute truth.'

Mr. Vidler's book is interesting and well worth reading, but what is surprising is his total inability to see that the Catholic—he would say the Roman Catholic—position has anything to be said for it. He speaks of ' the myth of an unchanging orthodoxy,' and thinks it self-evident that ' the new knowledge of Christian origins ' renders absolutely necessary, not merely a more careful statement of particular dogmas, but a new attitude to dogma as such. For the school to which he belongs, religious experience, not truths revealed *ab extra*, constitutes the data of theology. In spite of these crudities this account of one of the strangest episodes in the history of the Church will be read with profit. Really instructive for Catholics are the pages which the author devotes to the influence of the Modernist Movement on the Anglican Church.

LUKE WALKER, O.P.

RELIGION ET VIE. By Dr. Arnold Rademacher. Traduit de l'allemand par l'Abbé Delaisse. (Éditions de la Cité Chrétienne, Bruxelles; 20 fr. belges.)

Pas de rénovation des conditions extérieures de la vie sans une renaissance intérieure. Atomism, theoretic and practical, stands in the way of any reformation of a disjointed world. The strength of medieval philosophy lay mainly in its power of synthesis; in modern philosophy the emphasis has been rather on the side of analysis. A common creed gave to past centuries at least theoretically a common basis of unity; to-day, the variety of creeds, natural and supernatural, and the absence of creeds, make for disruption. But logically prior to these external divisions is the inner disruption of atomism. There is no synthesis. Accept the existence of both nature and the supernatural: you have at once a tension; the claims of life and of religion have both to be met and here there has always been difficulty. You can reject life, like the Manichees; you can reject religion, like the pagan

REVIEWS

Humanists : this is in either case to despair of a solution. We in our time have seen an increasing divorce of religion from life—it is, says Dr. Rademacher, a sort of second original sin—and from the less perceptible influences of the dichotomy few are immune. Even those who would indignantly deny the charge of being either acosmist or atheist are none the less unable to make one the two elements in their lives. On Sunday mornings we accept the statement that to gain the world at the expense of one's soul is folly : for the rest of the week we accept a state of affairs in which a commercial industrialism is doing its best to rob the workman of his soul, his rationality, and turn him into a robot. This is positive contradiction. Or again, we have our theatre or our film, but fail to fit them, with prayer or Mass, into the general scheme of things. This is at least a negative disjunction. Perhaps we criticize the films as being anti-Christian ; but are we sure that we are applying general principles and not merely being motivated by rules of a conventional code? Can we pass from the *Summa* to Rabelais without feeling disjointed, or remain undismayed by the hot snorts of indignation aroused by the novels of Mr. Evelyn Waugh? Can we, in sum, detect truth and beauty in their various vestures, or are we at the mercy of unprincipled reactions to appearances, dictated by a non-Christian convention? There are two planes, natural and supernatural, but there is one truth and one beauty. There are two spheres of activity, but they must be made one, for the end is one. Culture is defined by Dr. Rademacher as the actualization of all our human virtuality ; religion is the worship and love of God. An ideal difficult, at best, of attainment ; certainly dangerous. But to be a good Christian is to live dangerously, to renounce the facile surrender of division : the worldly week, the 'curl for Sundays.' For 'culture without religion is soulless' and 'religion demands that it may spread itself throughout the entire domain of culture and is in suffering if it cannot.'

What is the name of this ideal unity after which one must strive? It is holiness. Mr. Eric Gill has written recently of holiness in the question of art and religion ; Dr. Rademacher here treats of the same theme in its widest setting. Holiness must, by making possible the restoration of the internal unity of man, make possible the external unity of mankind. And the more urgent the latter becomes, the more urgent the former. That is why the rather dry pages of this book are of extreme importance ; the Catholic is not unaffected by the atmosphere of the age ; discontinuity, the root of all our troubles, passes often unnoticed. It would be a good thing if we were all fully aware of the evil.

GERALD VANN, O.P.