

before, but most of them are between the covers of a book for the first time and deserve re-reading again and again.

It is interesting to read his praise of Newman's *Callista* as that rarest of rare things—a good historical novel, 'the only accurate piece of historical fiction written in English in the past generation'. This is great praise which would probably have surprised Newman who considered *Callista* a mere trifle, 'having in it little of actual history and not much claim to antiquarian research though it entailed a great deal of reading'.

The writers of horror comics should read the essay on Children's Books to find out the right technique and the due proportion of horror and comedy that the normal child can stand.

The tributes to the two Chestertons, Cecil and Gilbert, to St Thomas More and Foch show Belloc revealing his own ideals on human heroism. The essay entitled *Tender Farewell to the World* begins as a thing of lyrical beauty and then suddenly switches into an almost savage diatribe against the modern world, soiled and smeared with the horrors of our mechanical civilization: it is embittered and severe, but the wrath is surely justified. Belloc is here in all his moods, analysing the modern man, discoursing upon cookery and the choice of wines, on spelling, on his travels and on I know not what: and in it all he lives up to John Buchan's estimate, 'No one has in our time written nobler and purer prose in the great tradition'. Belloc himself tells of 'a German of a hundred years ago who said that the art of writing was to get the words down on the paper so that they could rise again from the paper alive in the reader's soul. To do that is to be lucid.' Belloc did not believe in the mystification of the moderns. He was lucid.

B.D.

THE NATURE OF SYMPATHY. By Max Scheler, translated by Peter Heath. (Routledge and Kegan Paul; 30s.)

There can be very few books which say so much of importance and say it so badly as the present work, now competently introduced to English readers by Dr Stark in the series *Rare Masterpieces of Philosophy and Science*; and it is difficult to understand how Scheler could have prepared three editions of it between 1912 and 1926 without doing more for it than making minor alterations and supplying it with additional chapters. In its present form it consists of a number of loosely connected essays on various aspects of human affectivity: its only real unity is in the extraordinarily fertile, restless, sensitive personality of its author. This simultaneous incoherence and unity appears both in the larger structure of the work (for instance, the chapters range in length from twenty-two to two pages, Freud is discussed in two places on

much the same matters) and in the detail of the writing. Some impression of the style of the work may be given in this (favourable) example, taken from a chapter called 'Genetic Theories of Fellow-Feeling':

Tradition is a sort of halfway house between the inheritance of a mental disposition and conscious communication. It shares with inheritance its automatic and unconscious mode of transference and with conscious communication its primarily mental influence. Whereas our mental inheritance, in the shape of inherent emotional dispositions and conative tendencies cannot be eliminated, it is possible, at some later stage of development, to get rid of our traditional loves and hates. Freud's psychoanalytic method, for instance, is an artificial means of eradicating certain genuinely traditional emotions, by making their traditional aspect an object of conscious recollection (whence there follows an 'abreaction' from the emotions involved in the original situation and subsequently repressed). The collective traditions of an entire group are unfortunately incapable, as yet, of being dissolved by such means. Critical historiography (as in Renaissance humanism, or in the higher criticism of the Bible) can dissolve traditions by letting loose upon the past, as it were, the power of those ideas and emotions which overshadow and constrict our lives today. . . . (pp. 38-9).

The failure of *style* here is so damaging as to make any profitable exchange of views impossible. (This is in no way the fault of the translator, who has done his work admirably.) The typically Germanic delving for the humane is being practised in the style of an equally characteristic preoccupation with psychology and *Soziologie*; what is actually said is not even questionable, and any discussion which the reader may wish to initiate must start with an examination of the habit of mind which could make possible a dubious analogy between the procedure of psychoanalysis and historiography. Throughout this work we are reminded that it was in fact written soon after the turn of the century; we can see a highly cultivated mind and sensibility struggling to define acceptably a humane standpoint over against mechanistic or genetic distortions of the humane, but the extended critical developments still retain the conceptual apparatus which the writer sets out to criticize. Although Scheler's book is still quoted in Germany as part of the current literature of the subject, and should indeed appear soon in the first uniform edition of his collected works now in course of publication, it is not unfair to say that its chief interest today is historical. By this it is meant that the intrinsic importance of its conclusions is more readily apprehended and more adequately situated when these conclusions are reached in the course of discussions more suggestively inclusive of our current experience of Being and of the

humane. In the case of Scheler's fellow-phenomenologist Heidegger, for example, 'phenomenology' is no longer merely a technique or even a slogan but has furnished a philosophical archetype—a coming to light as a type of what it is to *be*—by means of which the meta-categorical multiplicity of our experience of Being can be apprehended in simplicity. Such an apprehension in simplicity has made possible a unified style, intellectual and literary, which utters pregnantly and thus inclusively. In Scheler's work, on the contrary, the final impression is of an irreducible multiplicity, a boundless and undisciplined enthusiasm without 'objective correlative'. Problems are distinguished which would cease to be problematic if another centre, another point of departure had been hit upon. If, for instance, it had not been assumed without criticism that love was primarily an *experience* and as such to be analysed 'phenomenologically', but rather it had been seen that love is primarily a *motus*, an ontological dynamism, we could have been spared a great deal of entangled argument, though we might have lost some very real flashes of insight.

It is not of course being suggested here that such a point of departure (St Thomas's) simply makes all further discussion unnecessary. Those who are committed by conviction to the tradition of St Thomas have their problem of style as much as anybody else, as perhaps is only too obvious from the present review. It is not sufficient to maintain that love is an 'ontological dynamism' rather than an experience: this is rather to bring the problem of style into the open. *Motus* for St Thomas had a suggestive resonance (of the kind exploited by Dante, for instance, especially in the *Paradiso*) which *motion* or *movement* or even 'ontological dynamism' do not have for us: without some solution of the problem of style a writer in the tradition of St Thomas would simply be unable to utter the whole of precisely the experiential dimension of love, like the distinguished Thomist writing about St Thomas's solution of the problem of love who explicitly set aside at the beginning of his study the current, romantic acceptance of the term. Yet St Thomas's most extended treatment of *amor* is to be found in the treatise *de passionibus* of the *Summa Theologica*.

The problem of style is the problem of an assimilation into the European and Christian tradition of that humanism which we may sense to be coming to birth today. In the German cultural world Scheler contributed to this renewal of the humane as much as anybody else during the last fifty years; which is to say a great deal when we remember that his contemporaries include Pieper, Haecker, Thomas Mann, Rilke, Heidegger and Jung. It is important to see that this humanism should not be allowed to isolate itself from the Church.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.