

Matter, which seems to the present writer the root cause of such approximations of the old Physics to the new, as are to be found, for example, in the comparison of theories of inertia which Professor McWilliams notes. On this point of Induction it seems that the Professor (page 25) seeks to contradistinguish Physics and Metaphysics, on the ground that the former science is inductive, but the latter not so. He argues that Metaphysics is concerned with separated forms, which are simply Act, but do not 'exist,' (presumably in what may be called an independent manner, apart from the observer), whereas Physics is concerned with what exists in the sense of what may be sensibly perceived by us. These objects are not simply in act, like the separated forms of Metaphysics, but are both in potency and act, simultaneously. Thus, he concludes, Metaphysics studies the purely actual, or the purely potential; but Physics is the study of the actual in potency. This, he considers, is the existential, and thus the basis of induction. The strict inference from this is that it is one thing to be in Act, and another to Exist; therefore some things are in act which do not exist. If 'Exist' is the Latin '*Esse*,' then Metaphysics is in a bad way, for it lacks an inductive basis.

The commentary is well summarized, but with certain lapses. Thus on page 30 the author fails to reproduce S. Thomas's terminology and the sense of the text is lost. Saint Thomas is saying that '*Motus*,' unlike 'Being,' reduces to certain categories which are in fact predicamental; namely, Substance, Quantity, Quality, and Place. Now 'Being' is predicated of the categories on its own account, and is thus the common analogue of them all. Movement, on the other hand, is predicated of the categories not on its own account, but because it is an imperfect act, whose principle is precisely the form peculiar to the category in which it is; getting bigger, for instance, is in the category of Quantity, because the principle of the action is number. Since, therefore, movement is predicated of the categories, to which Being is common, the division of movement, because it is a division of the categories, is also a division of being, and thus a sufficient Division. The commentary succeeds in formulating the rather abstruse Division, but fails to assign clearly the reason for its completeness to the fact that it is a division of 'Being,' simply remarking that 'Being, of course, is analogously common to them' (i.e., the categories). This failure, taken technically, would cause the theory of movement worked out in the Physics to break down irreparably, as it would destroy the universality of its principles.      FELIX WATTS, O.P.

CHRISTENTUM ENDE ODER WENDE? Die religiöse Sinndeutung der Gegenwart aus der Vergangenheit—für die Zukunft. By Johannes Reeb. (Benziger & Co., Einsiedeln/Köln, 1941.).

It is strange that no historian of Catholic theology should have been tempted to write a history of lay-theology. So far as I am aware, the very interesting index X of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, giving some 700 names of lay theologians in the Middle Ages, has

never been worked up, nor an attempt made to show whether they wrote for laymen or for the clergy. Even more significant would be the study of the history of theology by and for laymen in the last 300 years, when the laity has become alienated from theological scholarship. At present, all the great movements prominent in the life of the Universal Church, the social, the missionary, the liturgical and the Thomist movements, are equally promoted by the clergy and by the laity, and it has become one of the characteristics of the Church's recent history that laymen take a more lively, and indeed a more active interest in scholarly theology. Whilst, on the one hand, it is generally felt, that the traditional, intellectual training of the laity had become inadequate to their ascetic and contemplative life, many theologians realise that with regard to theology itself the alienation from the laity has been detrimental. In the 18th and 19th centuries the gap between theological scholarship and laity was one of the main reasons for the considerable increase in that type of literature which has been appropriately termed paraphilosophy and paratheology. The enemies of the Church realised the significance of this gap much earlier than either the theologians or the faithful themselves. Since the appearance of Rationalism, an ever increasing literature catered for the intellectual wants of the laity, claiming that scholarly theology had become petrified and that at the same time the laity had been kept in undue ignorance.

Johannes Reeb's book is an outstanding example of popular instruction through lectures in theology, outstanding, however, less for its achievement than for its extreme methods. In a general way this book belongs to the group round the Institute for modern popular Education, the great arsenal of intellectual armament for German Catholics, organised by two young laymen, Heinz Raskop and Dr. Josef Pieper, at Dortmund. It is to be noted, however, that this Institute has not actually published Johannes Reeb's book. Not only does it compare unfavourably with the Institute's publications, such as the "Layman's Dogmatic," by Fr. Leo v. Rudloff, O.S.B., and the "Theology of the New Testament," by Dr. Otto Kuss, but it also is far more popular than these books. The author promises to give a groundplan of 2,000 years of spiritual history and of the present religious situation. According to Mr. Reeb, the de-Christianisation of Europe begins as early as 1300 and reaches its climax in present-day Collectivism which, however, is "merely" Liberalism, its alleged main antagonist, carried on to its final consequences. (Such a relativistic interpretation of antagonism between the enemies of the Church themselves reminds me of the attempts of the Nazis to demonstrate an internal relationship between Bolshevism and Christianity). It is deplorable that an attempt to popularise great historical developments should lead to such undue simplifications and falsifying generalisations. We should

take our adversaries and their mutual differences more seriously. Mr. Reeb wrote his book before the collapse of France; and he presents the political conditions underlying the present-day religious situation as follows: The collectivistic powers (Germany and Russia) are fighting the democratic powers (England and France), whilst the authoritarian powers (Italy and Spain) stand in between, and are actually to be highly praised for their exemplary attitude towards the Church. It is amusing to see how such high-sounding theories on universal history utterly fail in prognostic details. Unfortunately the non-Catholic readers for whom Mr. Reeb's book is also intended, will become suspicious with regard to other more important points. They will hardly agree with the author in his description of liberalism and socialism as a collection of slogans and deliberate lies. If it is necessary to characterise them as "satanic," a Catholic should take Satan a little more seriously. In popular Catholic literature we frequently find adversaries presented in such a way that the unbiased reader wonders how they can be so powerful, why every intelligent person does not perceive the superficiality, wickedness and falsehood depicted by the author (or lecturer). It is dangerous indeed to induce Catholic laymen to think of the great intellectual tradition of modern Europe as mere bluff, and to overlook the strong material foundations of this tradition.

Mr. Reeb advocates the distinction between theoretical conviction and real experience made by modern Continental philosophers. He rightly presents the connection established by Christ between God and man as real, and not merely spiritual. But we may protest at having to change our ideas on reality so radically when he says that instead of the internal-real unity existing within Mother-Church, the Reformers have set up a merely external spiritual unity. The spiritual is no longer identical with the internal sphere, nor is reality merely external, as claimed by the idealists. We have newly recognised that material facts count infinitely more than theories, and that however clever, an explanation of a failure can never make up for a success, however small. The traditional reproach that "Christianity has failed," e.g., in the spheres of political and social realities, can no longer be refuted by pointing out (as Mr. Reeb does) that Christianity is concerned with man's relationship with God and that in this respect it cannot fail and has not failed, that only single Christians have failed and that the blame for the present disaster lies exclusively on the de-Christianised world which has rejected the teaching of the Church and perverted some of her members. Is this a satisfactory explanation of the failure in "Catholic" countries to realise the social programme laid down in the Encyclicals? Does this explain why, for a thousand years past, Catholic princes and nations have waged war against one another. As long as we fail to recognise that the de-Christianisation of Europe is a historical process based on facts

rather than on ideas, and that its re-Christianisation must be based on real conversion rather than on ideas of universal history, we shall be unable to answer Mr. Reeb's question: Christianity, at its end or at its turning-point?

Mr. Reeb concludes with the characteristic antithesis of our age: Here Christ, there Anti-Christ! He acknowledges that the whole of the modern world is Satan's work, and at its main stages, a perversion of correct ideas held by the Church. Whilst the Reformers claimed that for a thousand years the world had been surrendered to Satan, Mr. Reeb says that since 1300 it has more and more come under the rule of Anti-Christ. With regard to the present age, he actually speaks of a considerable part of mankind being "without grace," and accordingly without any communion with Christians. This lack of communion between Christians and non-Christians however is less the result of different ideas than of the increase in the complexity of material reality, and in the difficulties of life.

I only mention these points because they appear rather typical of a certain class of Catholic literature which, in recent years, claims to have superseded the traditional methods of controversial tracts. If we intend to overhaul these methods, we must trust our lay-readers and their intellectual capacities a little more. We must teach them again the great art of distinction. This is indeed difficult in times of emergency when we would rather receive large-scale maps in order to regain orientation in the maze around us. Less than ever, however, Catholics can avail themselves of the simple methods, cleverly adopted and elaborated by their antagonists. Even the simplest layman cannot be spared the cumbersome task of seeing truth in detail, and, in fact, it will be one of the great duties of modern popular theology by and for laymen to teach again the great truth that intellectual work is as troublesome as any manual, professional work.

JOHN HENNIG.

THE RUSSIANS AND THEIR CHURCH. By Nicolas Zernov, Ph.D. (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d. net).

EASTERN CATHOLICS UNDER SOVIET RULE. By Michael Derrick. ("Sword of the Spirit," 1s. 6d.).

Dr Zernov here gives us a skilfully compressed and very readable conspectus of Russian history and of the Russian Orthodox Church in relation thereto. The view of Orthodoxy presented is rather that of one school of thought, and therefore may give a somewhat misleading impression to non-Orthodox; on the other hand, the English reader gets some salutary instruction on some of the historical reasons for Russian suspicion of the Catholic West since the thirteenth century. But we are already indebted to Dr Zernov for several books about his people and their church, and it is therefore permissible here to