until the Peace of Augsburg, and the response of the Catholic Church throughout this period —to treat this great theme in all its political, social, ecclesiastical and religious implications, and to do so without once losing an all-pervasive simplicity of exposition, tone and judgment—is an achievement of astounding proportions. Four pages by Lortz on the Peasants' Revolt are worth more than four volumes by an historian of average competence. But to accomplish all this in a manner which will captivate the attention, not only of those who devote their lives or leisure to the study of such things, but of that wider audience to whom the Reformation is an event of pressing contemporary concern, is something which transforms an outstanding scientific and cultural achievement into an event possessing the most acute religious significance. At the conclusion of this book, Lortz expresses the hope that his work may have the effect, beyond its scientific purpose, of contributing to the dialogue between the confessions. As he himself declares, the facts which he has assembled, together with the affirmations and verdicts which they have elicited from him, 'certainly do demand that one should take part in the ecumenical dialogue'.

That was in 1940; circumstances today are more propitious. For this reason alone one must welcome the appearance of this work in English. Its effect can only be to ripen and grow more fruitful with the passage of time. It is even safe to predict that this will be so largely to the extent that its readership finds itself provoked by the explicitly Catholic character of Lortz's ecumenical perspective: his love of the Church and his regard for her living authority as ensured by papal primacy, and expressed in the teaching of the bishops, is manifest in every line. If, therefore, Lortz writes with real love for and admiration of Luther's profound grasp of sacred reality and his truly staggering greatness as a human being, he is by no means prone to exempt him on that account from all adverse judgment. Neither does he, having made due allowance for historical circumstance, refer to anything other than Catholic orthodoxy as the measure of doctrinal truth. There is nothing partisan or ungenerous about his judgment: his estimates of Luther and Leo X, of Paul III and Charles V, of Eck and Aleander, are marked by an extraordinary integrity which is concerned only with truth, and which derives from the union of purely historical and strictly theological criteria of evaluation. At the same time, it is this feature which provides the most continuous and disturbing challenge to the reader, forcing him to re-examine his own judgment of events in the light of these striking and highly charged evaluations of an issue which he cannot but regard as important, whatever his standpoint.

This is a challenge, then, which will be felt (albeit in different ways) by all readers, even by those with a largely academic interest in the question, or by those whose faith has never prompted them to question history. Most of all, perhaps, will it be felt by Catholics. But Lortz himself is deeply aware of the difficulties which those who are not in communion with Rome will experience in coming to terms with judgments so intimately associated with Catholic belief. Perhaps the most courteous mitigation of this difficulty lies in the objectivity which informs his historical understanding. It is not simply that he is contemptuous of rhetorical glibness or the casuistical adornment of historical fact for the sake of confessional advantage. It is rather that, as a Christian conscious of the cumulative role of sin and grace in history, his detachment is rooted in the conviction that 'there can be a fullness of meaning in the historical sense that yet does not manifest truth'. This conviction enables one to leave plenty of room in the historical fact for subjective merit and subjective guilt, without leading one to suppose that events carry within themselves their own built-in metaphysical justification. Thus it is possible for a Christian to judge a past epoch 'and yet maintain perfect reverence for it and a real sense of involvement in it'. This is exactly what Lortz accomplishes in these two great volumes. Theology and history, impartiality and religious commitment, are here reconciled at the most exacting level of potential conflict. He is a man passionately in love with truth, and his mighty achievement rests ultimately in the demonstration that such a love need fear neither division nor self-loss in rediscovering its own preoccupations in the light of faith.

DERMOT FENLON

METROPOLITAN CATHEDRAL OF CHRIST THE KING, LIVERPOOL, by Frank Gibberd. *The Architectural Press*, London, 45s.

This is a book by an architect about the design of one of his major works. It should give a rich, if highly internal, picture of the creative process which has resulted in the building of what may

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028428900057747 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well be the last European cathedral. Inevitably, the reviewer also acts as architectural critic. In it the designer explains not only the many practical conditions of the open competition which he won in 1960, but also his own interpretation of the brief, and his understanding of the liturgical and symbolic function of a cathedral.

The architect takes his stand simply and squarely on the principle which inspired Pugin; he dismisses the simple, small scale, practical solution: 'It may be that today the functional solution to the problem of relating a group of Christians to an altar is a simple and comparatively small, unadorned space but such a building would not be a cathedral, as that word is commonly understood. . . . The cathedral is the visible expression of man's belief in God: the space and forms that enclose it are expected to be the most perfect that it is possible to devise.' Pugin, whilst admitting that it was not incumbent upon all men to raise 'vast and splendid' churches, demanded that it was essential that buildings for religious purposes should be '. . . more vast and beautiful than those in which they (the builders) dwell'. He too complains that 'Churches are now built without the least regard to tradition, to mystical reasons, or even common propriety. A room full of seats at the least possible cost is the present idea of a church'; this was in 1853. Both assume that the architect has access to a formal system which is somehow divinely guaranteed to convey to the building users the appropriate religious ideas. Cardinal Heenan, in his letter to competitors, prayed for direct divine inspiration; for Gibberd, too, '. . . faith produces the finest architecture'. Size, scale, structural honesty, lack of estentatious ornamentation, combined with richness of glass and texture are basic to both Gibberd's and Pugin's beliefs. It is interesting to speculate how Gibberd saw his brief; did he understand the promoters to say, 'You must express our (Catholic) view of God, in forms you are free to devise', or 'You must express our belief in forms which are accepted by us as a meaningful visual expression of our belief'? Put another way, to what extent did he interpret the theological and liturgical brief in forms which were in accordance with traditional architectural values, and to what extent did he go direct to the theology and liturgy and express them in what, to him at least, were radical innovations of form?

Gibberd approached the task in the latter way; eschewing 'obvious symbolism' he falls back upon the imagination and intuition of the architect, upon which he says almost everything depends. This deliberate cutting of links with traditional images—whose meaning and effectiveness can be studied by the techniques of psychology and anthropology, and whose development can be historically traced—represents an inspirational attitude to architecture which was commonly accepted in Pugin's day for all building types. Gradually, under pressure of technological developments, increasingly complex human needs and economic constraints, it was abandoned. Gibberd himself says that the inspiration for form in projects such as power stations arises from function; but he sees no overwhelming functional requirements in a cathedral beyond the simple need to enclose a large space, for several thousand people, in such a way that they are all closely related to the central activity at the altar. Thus the project is seen as a kind of architectural holiday—in which the designer is free to generate form and imagery untrammelled by function.

But this implies a strange understanding of function; it indicates that the shape of a turbine, its vibration and drive mechanism, are functional inspirations for the architect, but that the functional problems of a large group of people sharing with each other and with their leader an activity have less clear or definable formal consequences. It leads architects to ignore the findings of behavioural scientists on the grounds that these would dictate forms; although these findings would seem to stand in the same relationship to their freedom of choice as the engineer's requirements for the mounting of a turbine. They are indicators, or constraints, but rarely deterministic.

It is interesting to trace the consequences of this attitude in the case of Gibberd's design. First, there is the assumption that the size and scale of space has to be primarily expressive of an assumed relationship between people and the 'Other'; and that the internal relationship within the group is unaffected by this decision. Certainly this relationship is nowhere discussed, except in the context of relationship to the celebrant and altar. It leaves unquestioned the effect of size and geometric formality on self-perception and inter-personal perceptions. It leads to some quite simple fallacies; for instance that by locating the tower with its massive glass areas over the central altar on

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028428900057747 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plan, a lighting effect will be achieved which emphasizes the altar and sanctuary. But in fact light cannot be seen—only illuminated surfaces. And the surfaces highly illuminated, because of the laws of physics, are the sanctuary floor and altar top—neither of which can be seen by the congregation. The vertical surfaces of the altar and the priest, especially his face, remain in gloom.

It leads to a tacit acceptance that the acoustic problem of a basically unsuitable hollow cone over the sanctuary should be treated in a remedial manner, and that suitability for music is the prime requirement; speech '. . . in such a large building . . . must inevitably be amplified'. Technically this is just not so; moreover it removes the only direct human contact between celebrant and congregation. But to make it feasible would have meant abandoning preconceived notions of volume and seating pattern to take account of human 'functions'.

There is no indication that the dynamics of the situation is anywhere recognized—bishop and concelebrants moving about; people arriving, departing, processing; the whole liturgy is seen as a formal set piece whose static relationships can be expressed by axes, geometric patterns on the floor and fixed viewpoints.

It is Corbusier's 'illusion of plans'; the axis is to him the regulator of architecture, '. . . the means of every human act', a fact which the Schools have forgotten. 'The axes cross one another in star shapes, all leading to infinity, to the undefined, to the unknown, to nowhere, without end or aim. The axis of the Schools is a recipe and a dodge. . . . It must not be forgotten in drawing out a plan, that it is the human eye that judges the result.' The examples he condemns, as meaningless star patterns, grandiose, unperceivable formalizations, are Carlsruhe, Versailles, and later additions to St Peter's. One feels it would not be unjust to add the floor pattern in Liverpool, designed by painter David Atkins and characteristically illustrated in the book by an elaborate plan. The design '. . . begins in the main entrance porch, where it hesitates, to recognize the volume above it; it quickens through the low connecting link, expands into the vast space of the nave, where it echoes the sixteen concrete frames of the trusses and then focuses on to the sanctuary where it reaches its climax'. How well this echoes Corbusier's comment, 'He has not thought in terms of space, but has made stars on paper and drawn axes to form these stars. He has dealt with intentions which do not belong to the language of architecture.' For Corbusier it is proper to use axes as in the House of the Tragic Poet at Pompeii, where the axes are not arid things of theory but are based on a study of movement, subtle relationships between people, surfaces and landscape, optical illusions; by not having the most important object placed at the centre of the room, which hinders the observer from standing in the middle and getting an axial view, but at a subtly determined distance from the centre. 'Everything is on an axis, but it would be difficult to apply a true line anywhere.'

The questions one would like to ask are: what is it like to enter the Cathedral from outside, during the day, or at night? What are the dark and light adaptation problems? What will one actually be *able* to see during the first ten seconds? (In tunnels, where lack of thought about adaptation might lead to fatal accident, not just wasted visual experience, very careful provision is made for graduated illumination change between exterior and interior which can be adjusted not only between day and night but according to the brightness of the day.) What is the sound of footfall on different surfaces? What will the thermal experience be like—sudden coolness, or an even drop in temperature? Will the surfaces be cold to the touch? What is the view of a standing or seated man? Significantly, all the photographs of the Cathedral in use, during the consecration, are bird's (God's, or architect's?) eye views.

So, we must take our stand in judging the Cathedral and the book by its author-designer, on whether we believe God is 'up there', in the large open spaces, or 'down here', glimpsed in faces and in the figure of the priest seen through gaps between heads and with more faces looking at us from behind him; whether we believe the designer's task to start with human experience, perceptual, social, religious, or to start with abstract super-interpretations of this experience.

We must also ask a few questions about the use of resources. The Cathedral finally cost almost two million pounds; it is not simply a facile question to ask what else might have been done with this money; moreover one would also like to know the views of the unsuccessful competitors on the fact that the cost limit set in the competition conditions, one million, was exceeded by 50 per cent on the first detailed estimate being prepared. Here is a classical

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028428900057747 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case of the theory of 'diminishing cakes'. All human resources, time, manpower, energy, materials, money are limited. Demands always exceed available resources. An organization, such as the Church, disposes of its total resources, its cake, in one of a near-infinite number of ways—the cake can be sliced up in almost any pattern of segments between competitive demands. That segment allowed to the architect for a building becomes *his* complete cake—over which he rules and which he can slice up in any way he wishes. That slice which goes, say, to providing stained glass, becomes the stained glass artist's cake and so on. Unless this cake slicing operation is open, transparent to all those who finally consume the resources, and this is what politics are about, we may leave many desperately hungry in the end, in many different ways.

THOMAS A. MARKUS

CLAUDEL: A REAPPRAISAL, edited by **Richard Griffiths**. *Rapp and Whiting*, London, 1968.

This symposium containing fourteen essays sets out, on the centenary of Claudel's birth, to acknowledge him in this country and to stimulate interest in his work. For this purpose the editor has gathered together an impressive body of writers, some of whom—Ernest Beaumont, Michael Wood and Edward Lucie-Smith for example—are already well known as students and admirers of Claudel's immense literary output. In his *Introduction* Dr Griffiths rightly underlines one of the main problems that has emerged in Claudel criticism to date, namely disapproval of and objection to his literary work on totally non-literary grounds: his religious and political views and even his personality. But he goes on to argue that far from restricting his theatre, for example, Claudel's Catholicism gives it greater depth and emerges as a central core not only for the complex network of symbols which he constructs, but also as a mean against which his characters' actions and thoughts can be measured.

The book is in three parts. The first aims to offer some new interpretations of a series of individual works; the second (which includes a text by Claudel himself expressing sympathy for Poland at the beginning of the Second World War) presents some hitherto unexplored subjects; the third contains a further two articles which trace some of Claudel's links with England and the English language. As is almost inevitable in a symposium of this kind the standard of essays varies considerably both in terms of their content and the way in which they are written. In the opening section two articles in particular merit close attention. Michael Wood's contribution on the *Soulier de Satin* in which he examines Claudel's view of the value of theatrical representations ('The spectacle is not a playful basis for an earnest metaphor. It is *as* play that the theatre is most valuable, it is *as* play that the metaphor comes nearest to its language' (p. 61)) and Moya Laverty's study of *Jeanne d'Arc au bûcher*, and in particular her consideration of Claudel's conception of the Virgin Mary which links him with Péguy and Michelet (though not with Bernanos?). Both are well documented and indicate further useful work to be done in these fields. Dr Barnes's article on the 1913 Hellerau production of *L'Annonce faite à Marie* based on a copy of the text which was annotated by Claudel himself, is, however, for all its interest, limited, and the absorbing matter of Claudel's views on the production of this, and indeed other, plays is left, undiscussed, 'to the Claudelians' (p. 46). The two remaining articles in Part One by Bernard Howells on *Partage de Midi* and by Edward Lucie-Smith on the *Cinq grandes Odes* add little that is not already known.

The same mixture reappears in Part Two. The influence of the figure of Divine Wisdom in Claudel's plays is examined by Ernest Beaumont in a carefully documented piece of work that is backed by evidence of some impressive scholarship in the field of Oriental and Russian philosophy. Witold Leitgeber's essay on 'Poland in the life and works of Claudel' while being less central in importance (except for the Ysé-Rose identification and the Polish Fausta in *La Cantate à trois vox*) is compiled with equal care and attention to detail. In this section, too, we find the only extensive study of Claudel's style in Elfrieda Dubois's reflections on Claudel's *verset*. She emphasizes Claudel's continual search for the most appropriate verse forms and also his belief in the poetic quality of prose. Her article concludes with a lucid analysis of two *Cantiques*. This part of the book closes with a description of the scrap-books which Claudel compiled so assiduously especially in his later years. The reproductions of paintings, photographs of performers of his plays and of famous people, odd news items and even accounts of violence are set out for us by Jean Mouton. Clearly

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028428900057747 Published online by Cambridge University Press