

CORRESPONDENCE
THE LAYMAN AND SOCIETY

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

SIR,—In the December (1934) issue of BLACKFRIARS, Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias expressed his views on *The Layman and Society* with a clearness and precision for which I should like first of all to thank him. I should not have anything else to say concerning his views on this question if Dr. Zacharias had given them as being only his own. But unfortunately, amongst the Catholic organisations quoted as giving those ideas bodily form, he was bold enough to mention (p. 812) the *Ad Lucem* Movement of Lille. As a vice-president of *Ad Lucem*, and in full agreement with its chaplain, Father R. Prévost, I want to make it quite clear that our society for the preparation of Catholic lay missionaries considers itself to be one of the many branches of Catholic Action in France. It never was anything else, nor ever will be. So far as I personally am concerned, I should not remain connected with it one day longer if its members were to consider themselves as being neither “religious” nor “Catholic Actionists”; in point of fact they are both. What the so-called *Laïcate* of Dr. Zacharias is going to be I am not prepared to say; the only thing I am sure of is that *Ad Lucem* has nothing to do with it. Its members are not monks nor priests; they have a full right to found a Catholic family, and they have even a duty to attend to their personal advancement. The only thing we ask them to do is to use what personal influence they may later acquire in their own profession for the benefit of the Church in missionary countries. The reference to *Ad Lucem*, made by Dr. Zacharias in your issue of December last, is therefore a completely mistaken one and I feel it my duty to make this perfectly clear to your readers.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

ETIENNE GILSON.

Professor at the Collège de France,
Vice-President of *Ad Lucem*.

THE BUILDING OF A CHURCH

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

SIR,—As your most valuable review is also interested in matters liturgical (as was its founder, Fr. Bede Jarrett, whose memory will ever last), would you be kind enough to open your columns to the following observations about Fr. Williamson’s book, which you reviewed in your December number?

Without discussing several general questions which your re-